

**ITEM XX
A REVIEW OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE’S WORKING GROUPS**

Annex 5 – Responses to questions about the Infrastructure Delivery and Transportation working group

A short survey of eight questions was sent to all Joint Committee members and those officers who regularly contribute to the working group’s meetings, totalling 36 people. Responses were received from 9 people and these are summarised below.

Question	Comments from respondents
<p>1. Does the Working Group meet frequently enough to cover business?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Maybe. Given the current scope of this WG, some meetings have been quite long and some items at the end of the agenda may not always have received the attention that they deserve. Particularly, if the remit remains the same and given the response to question 3 below, it might be necessary to have more frequent meetings e.g. 2 prior to each full Committee meeting.</p> <p>Yes possibly enough</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>Should be quarterly</p> <p>With the emphasis on the need for infrastructure for delivery of the Guildford Local Plan, I think it would help if the committee could meet more frequently as it would give an opportunity to delve into particular issues in more detail.</p> <p>Yes - The three months period is a good length as it will give enough time for new issues to be discussed/considered.</p> <p>Yes. It is useful to have quarterly in between/ahead of Formal Committee to discuss upcoming items. It has been good to have these meetings on MSteam/on line as easier to attend for items of interest. Also it has been good that these meeting are held during the working day and would like this to continue.</p>

<p>2. Are you clear on the purpose and remit of the Working Group?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but it needs officers to set out clear priorities for the county and Guildford on the subject of infrastructure and each meeting cover a subject from county's perspective.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>3. Do you think the Working Group is fulfilling its remit?</p>	<p>No - has not shown sufficient linkage of prioritising schemes to the local plan.</p> <p>Not completely. Pressure of Officer time has meant that the WG has never managed to review all aspects of the Infrastructure Schedule e.g. key infrastructure required from utilities.</p> <p>no it is too focussed on minutiae rather than big issues eg A3/highways /congestion/travel trends and future changes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. That is not necessarily a criticism but I think that the importance of infrastructure is now becoming clearer and needs to be addressed. It is an issue that residents consider to be very important as well.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

<p>4. Do you think the Working Group reports back to the JC often enough with recommendations and advice?</p>	<p>no - I think issues such as the A3 widening which is a key constraint in the local plan should have been picked up and addressed much sooner.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but can be improved.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fine</p> <p>Yes. If meetings are increased, then the reporting back will increase too even if it's in email format.</p> <p>No - For the reasons in question 3.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes - I believe so as I think that the LEP schemes have reported progress to the working group and the feedback has helped to ensure that the resultant Joint Committee reports provide the information required to enable the Committee to make an informed decision.</p>
<p>5. How often does the JC act on the advice of the Working Group?</p>	<p>Occasionally.</p> <p>Often.</p> <p>Not sure as covid has interfered with process.</p> <p>Often.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Often.</p> <p>Occasionally.</p> <p>Often.</p> <p>Unable to comment but would think that as the views of the Working Group are considered by officers in preparing the subsequent Committee reports the advice is at least considered. It might be worth reviewing the actions/advice of the Working group through the previous meeting minutes and tabulate to compare to the resultant agreed recommendations/actions to have examples of how this is working on specific schemes.</p>

<p>6. Is Infrastructure Delivery & Transportation still the right combination for a JC Working Group?</p>	<p>yes - provided it also looks at wider transport strategy.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Possibly not ideal but it is hard to see how else to deal with both issues in one committee given that the other working group deals with infrastructure and transport. I think it would add too much to the infrastructure workload if air quality was added in as well.</p> <p>No. The infrastructure delivery and transportation should be independent from the working group and report directly to the committee.</p> <p>As links to the infrastructure schedule I would say so and the agenda is already a full/lengthy agenda.</p>
<p>7. Is the Working Group building effective partnership working between the two councils?</p>	<p>No - I see information in public domain holding SCC responsible for GBC failings.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Better than no group but needs to be better and a joint ambitions approach rather than political positioning.</p> <p>Yes - very effective.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Somewhat. SCC could be more proactive and joined-up.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes - I say this as it brings both SCC, GBC and SCC/GBC joint projects together in one forum and can foster regular communication.</p>
<p>8. Attached are the existing terms of reference; please can you comment on the following aspects and</p>	<p>If there is an issue it is that The Chairman acts outside his remit. He is there to CHAIR meetings.</p>

anything else you feel is important?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership 	<p>Too many who don't read their papers.</p> <p>About right. 8 members has meant that we have normally had at least 5 or 6 attending.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay - but other members should be able to join if they want to.</p> <p>I think there are too many members that are not necessarily required.</p> <p>About right.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role 	<p>Toothless.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Not all members have roles in decision making.</p> <p>I think these are in line with other Informal; Mode Committee meetings I have attended in other D&B's.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remit 	<p>Wide but not actionable.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Too light.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Fine.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>It would be easier not to go to the working group for approval of the schemes and go to one body such as the joint committee for approval.</p> <p>Has a comparison been undertaken with what other Committees are doing in terms of informal/infrastructure & transport meetings?</p>
---	---