**Meeting title**
London Road Active Travel Stakeholder Group meeting

**Meeting location**
Burpham Church, New Inn Lane, Guildford 7.00pm to 8.30pm

**Attendees**
Chair of meeting, Surrey County Council, Consultation Institute, Councillors,
Guildford Borough Council (GBC), G-Bug cycling group (GBUG), Stagecoach Bus company,
London Road Action Group (LRAG),
Guildford Residents Association (GRA),
Boxgrove Park Residents Association (BPRA) and Kingspost Parade Representative

**Absent/apologies:**
Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, Surrey Chamber of Commerce,
Surrey Youth Parliament, Surrey Climate Commission, Clock House Retirement Home,
Guildford High School, George Abbot School

**Agenda Reference 1**

**Discussion points**
Chair opened the meeting. Thanked everyone for attending.
All attendees introduced themselves and who they are representing.
Purpose of meeting to discuss the proposed questions. Final questions from this meeting to be prepared before the public engagement in September.
Workshop for stakeholder group for design and traffic management – plans to be shared a week in advance.
Question asked about representation for businesses. MF advised that there will be a separate session just for businesses on London Road, particularly for those open later at night.

LRAG advised they would only be an observer in the meeting as they had not had sufficient time to look at the document supplied by SCC.

**Agenda Reference 2**

**Presentation from Consultation Institute and discussion of Miro Board**

Discussed as a group that the Miro board closed on Tuesday 25 July at 9.00am. The board was left open as long as possible to collate as many ideas and comments as possible.

The Consultation Institute proposed, given the tight timeframe, to allow for as much data to be collated and given there were members of the group unable to attend the meeting (due to summer break) that the most logical thing would be to allow more time for everyone in the group to have more time to read the document and participate at a later stage.

**Where we are now.**

The past 6-8 weeks we have undertaken a process of 4 steps.

1. Stakeholder group established a body of discussion.
2. Meeting held regarding designs, agreed to look at further in design workshop.
3. Meeting held regarding Traffic Management.
4. Today's meeting, Think about questions from Miro Board and to analysis the content.

**Comments about the board**

Some found this a useful exercise and easy to use, others felt it was not easy to navigate and confusing.
Some felt others using the board needed to act in a more civil manner to each other – similar to social media. No aggressive posts were seen on the board.
68 participants accessed the board leaving 300 post it note comments.

The headings shown to the group from the Consultation Institute are not the final questions, these are the headings and themes that emerged from the data. In no order of importance or priority.

Started the process of themes for the questions from the Miro board. We will extend the time to finalise questions to allow extra time to participate and to allow those not present today to participate.
SCC did not submit any questions to the Miro board.
All comments will be looked at as some were not able to submit due to Miro board reaching capacity.

2 outcomes from boards comments

1. Comments made about the scheme.
2. Comments made on a larger scale sitting outside of the scheme.

Broad themes emerged from the raw data from the 300 comments made. Interesting topics presented. How can we use this raw data/raw themes/richer conversations?
This was a collection of data medium. The Miro Board will not be used going forward on a wider scale as it is not secure enough.

The Consultation Institute explained a Standard approach to coding to create the themes.

1. Read uncritically.
2. Re-read.
3. Start to develop codes.
4. Combine codes into the message – peer reviewed to challenge.

Action for agenda point 2.
The whole group discussed the Miro Board

**Agenda Reference 3**
**Process of developing questions for engagement**

Important to discuss over the summer holiday period, we need to work together as a group to develop and evolve questions. Either by virtual meetings or emails for audit trail.

All comments included to propose a development of themes to create meaningful engagement. Views expressed must be recorded and become part of engagement.
Develop a FAQ list.
Use Surrey Says is SCC platform for survey, Commonplace.
GIS map. Drop pin on map on area of interest, which would then open a box with answer in it.
Not all engagement will be online.


Cllr commented concern regarding survey, how can we be sure views on London Road are from those who live and use London Road and not someone who lives far away. How can we exclude those views? The Consultation Institute advised we cannot exclude views, however Commonplace does require a postcode to register, so this can be viewed by SCC. Commonplace will not allow tactics of multiple feedback or trends from same IP address.

LRAG asked does Commonplace generate much interest? The Consultation Institute advised that people's awareness is entirely dependent on the interest of the subject.

GRA asked how we will publicise this? The Consultation Institute advised that is the purpose of the Stakeholder Group as they have networks that can be utilised.


Action for agenda point 3
The whole group discussed how best to engage. Ongoing action


**Agenda Reference 4**

**Questions and headings discussion**

The headings with comments underneath and the 24 questions shown to the group from the Consultation Institute are not the final questions, these are the headings and themes that emerged from the data. In no order of importance or priority.

24 questions in a survey are too much, will create Survey drop off. This needs to be cut down to 8 or 9 questions.
The headings and questions were not intended to have a positive meaning. They will be neutral when the final questions are confirmed. Statements rather than headings from raw data.
BPRA suggested possibly use a scale of 1 to 10 under statements, e.g. on a scale of 1-10 agree/disagree with following statement (with key to indicate what 1 means and what 10 means so everyone knows what they are agreeing/disagreeing with) Cllr and the Consultation Institute agreed.
This is still a work in progress and not at the stage of a final survey.
GBUG asked how we involve pupils at high schools and young people's views. Important that they are included. More analysis is needed.
Cllr voiced concern that pupils at Guildford High School may not cycle to school due to distance but pupils at George Abbot may do due to catchment area. Public sector equalities,

SCC needs to ask the questions to all and cannot exclude the views from young people at any school in the area.

BPRA asked if postcodes can be considered (for example from Guildford High School) so that only road users and residents views are included.

Discussed further in group from some members that the engagement should be limited to residents only and London Road users. Reiterated that no demographic can be excluded from the engagement, however SCC can monitor.

The Consultation Institute suggested SCC needs to work with children and young people, disability groups and older people, broader intelligence and no group has their views excluded.

The survey is not the only tool of engagement.

LRAG advised that the headings are the first thing people see, need to be converted to neutral statements.

LRAG suggested the possibility of a vote on the scheme, the Consultation Institute advised it is not legally possible for SCC to have a referendum as the Electoral Register would have to be used.

Yes and No questions are not engaging enough and does not move debate forward. Important to get qualitative analysis.

BPRA asked what is meant by overwhelming opposition, what constitutes overwhelming? The Consultation Institute advised this is a good point, how is overwhelming measured? Ultimately the decision on support/opposition lies with the council.

GBUG voiced the Miro Board showed middle ground people who just want clarification on the scheme, it did not reflect the opinion from the public meeting in January.


The Consultation Institute went back to presentation of the Themes that emerged from Miro board. Agreed that some wording needs to be amended to a neutral status and themes need to be prioritized, e.g. Buses was a common theme that arose.


Action for agenda reference 4
The whole group discussed how best to engage. Ongoing action

**Agenda Reference 5**

**Possible Questions for Survey**

The list of 24 possible questions which arose from the Miro Board data section were discussed.

These are not the final questions.

Sliding scale would be more useful (1-10 with key to indicate what 1 means and what 10 means)

SCC will not participate in the questions.
Internal to the group at this stage
Priority of the group to cut down the 24 questions to 8/9 questions.

Cllr suggested that the Consultation Institute need to draft the questions first. Neutral statements.
GBC agreed that making the statements first will allow the group more time to look at them.

Action for agenda reference 5
The whole group discussed how best to engage. Ongoing action


**Agenda Reference 6**

**What we are doing over the Summer**

The concept of the scheme is important, not personal views of the scheme.

The Consultation Institute will:

1.  Review statement headings to ensure neutral status.
2.  Add any comments missed off the Miro Board
3.  Provide scoring mechanism for statements.
4.  Draft questions and length of questionnaire from themes


Plans to be seen and modelling meeting to be confirmed.

Chair advised that detailed workshops for design, Traffic Management and questions will be held, so questions and plans will be sent approx. a week before.

Action for agenda reference 6
The Consultation Institute to work on the 4 points raised. Workshop dates to be confirmed. Ongoing action.


**Agenda Reference 7**

**Any other business**

In summary SCC has engaged with the group for best practice and best approach. Group needs to be flexible. Move straight to questionnaire questions from Consultation Institute. This will then be put to group to discuss.

GBUG advised they did their own research on the scheme, information is available. GBUG advised members of group to seek out information available from all outlets e.g., GBC Press office.

Confirmation of Drop in dates will be confirmed.


**Next meeting:** Wednesday 6th September 2023 7.00pm to 9.00pm
**Location:** Burpham Church Hall, New Inn Lane, Guildford