



# SURREY

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### **Minutes of meeting**

#### **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**Date:** THURSDAY 30 March 2006

**Time:** 7.00 pm

**Place:** WEST CLANDON VILLAGE HALL, THE STREET, WEST CLANDON GU4

### **Members present:**

#### **Surrey County Council**

Mr John Ades (Ash)  
Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)  
Mr David Davis (Shere)  
Ms Sarah Di Caprio (Guildford South-East)  
Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)  
Mr Mike Nevins (Worplesdon)  
Mr Eddie Owen (Guildford East)  
Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)  
Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)  
Ms Fiona White (Guildford West)

#### **Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)**

Mr Keith Chesterton (Stoke)  
Ms Liz Hogger (Effingham)  
Ms Vivienne Johnson (Christchurch)  
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)  
Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)  
Ms Jayne Marks (Stoughton) (substitute)  
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)  
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)  
Mr Sheridan Westlake (Marrow)  
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)

The following issues were raised during the informal public questions session:

- Merrow Park and Ride (proposed bus fares, journey times, greenbelt, costs, strategy, light pollution) - John Cordingley, Chairman, West Clandon Parish Council; Denise Price; Peter Hattersley; Joe Wright, Clandon Society; Tim Harrold, CPRE; Patrick Robson, Merrow Residents Association
- HGV traffic through West Clandon – Anne Lee; Mr Cousins
- Prioritisation of transport schemes, road accident statistics, Kings Road, Shalford - Mandy Worrall
- Parking in Guildford town on Sundays, time and cost of implementation of schemes - George Gunson
- Alleged widening of The Street, West Clandon - Duncan Preston
- West Clandon Village Safety Scheme

---

**All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.**

## **IN PUBLIC**

### **15/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Marilyn Spier, who was substituted by Jayne Marks (Stoughton).

### **16/06 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (9 February 2006) [Item 2]**

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

### **17/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

David Goodwin declared a personal interest in Item 10, being a holder of a CPZ residents parking permit.

### **18/06 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

None.

### **19/06 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

The following questions were received:

Peter Hattersley: SCC Budget for Heritage, Conservation and Rights of Way  
George Gunson: Possible closure of Trodds Lane  
Patrick Robson: Merrow Park and Ride  
Tim Harrold: Park and Ride in Guildford

The questions and answers are appended to these minutes.

## **20/06 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

The following questions were received:

Sheridan Westlake: Estimated costs of the Merrow Park and Ride scheme  
Terence Patrick: Road markings

The questions and answers are appended to these minutes.

## **21/06 PARK & RIDE STRATEGY [Item 12]**

Members raised various issues including:

- Concern at impact of traffic at Artington at peak periods
- Opportunities and difficulties at sites around Guildford
- Need to reduce congestion in Stoughton
- On-street parking charges

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that officers work with Guildford Borough Council (GBC) colleagues on the preparation and submission of the planning application for the Artington Park & Ride extension.
- (ii) that, following completion of the demand study for the Manor Farm site and the associated capacity studies, officers should work with officers of GBC and the Highways Agency to develop the proposal and bring a report back to the Committee at an appropriate stage.
- (iii) that, following receipt of the demand study for the northern corridor and further discussion with partners, officers report back to the Executive with site-specific proposals, including initial cost estimates.
- (iv) that an updated park & ride strategy be prepared and a further report be brought to Committee and to GBC's Executive in due course.

## **22/06 UPDATE ON THE PEGASUS SCHOOL BUS PROJECT [Item 7]**

Members raised various issues including:

- Number of schools included in the pilot
- Charges for parents/carers: amounts, timing, flexibility
- Targets and aims of the project
- Cost effectiveness of the project
- Off-peak use of the buses

The Principal Transport Officer for the project responded to the comments and questions.

The Committee noted the report.

## **23/06 PIRBRIGHT VILLAGE SAFETY SCHEME [Item 8]**

Dr Ansell (Pirbright resident) addressed the Committee, commenting that the speed tables were installed in an area of unsuitable soil conditions and should be removed as soon as possible.

Burnham Clinton (Chairman of Pirbright Parish Council) addressed the Committee, commenting that:

- the tables have been effective in slowing HGVs and should only be removed if replaced with other suitable measures e.g. chicanes
- an area-wide ban should be investigated further.

Mike Nevins argued for banning HGVs from a zone around Pirbright village at certain times and replacing the humps with alternative measures. Diana Lockyer-Nibbs objected to an HGV ban in Pirbright.

Other Members expressed concern at:

- the impact of measures in Pirbright on the availability of funds for other schemes in Guildford
- the estimated costs of measures e.g. removal of the speed tables in Cemetery Pales.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the proposed implementation of a 7.5 tonne weight restriction in Cemetery Pales be abandoned.
- (ii) that the proposed investigation of a 7.5 tonne weight restriction covering a wider area be abandoned.
- (iii) that the option in paragraph 26 of the report be pursued, that officers also be asked to consider any other measures which may be effective, and that the Senior Local Transportation Manager, in consultation with the local Member, local residents, the Parish Council and the Chairman, be given delegated authority to proceed with a scheme at Cemetery Pales up to a limit of £35,000 without further reference to the Local Committee.
- (iv) that any financial consequences of the decision reached under (iii) above be funded as a priority item from the 2006/07 LTP devolved funding, and that funding of Phase 2 of the Pirbright Village Safety Study be considered alongside other schemes in the forward programme.

## **24/06 GUILDFORD LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME 2006/7 [Item 9]**

[The Senior Local Transportation Manager circulated a set of revisions to the report and recommendations; the revisions were considered to be urgent as deferment of this item (to the next meeting - 15<sup>th</sup> June 2006) would delay implementation of important transportation schemes.]

The Senior Local Transportation Manager explained the financial context for the recommendations (as revised) on the programme.

[Members suspended discussion on this item to consider and decide on the related issues raised in Item 14.]

**25/06 FUNDING DELEGATED TO THE LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR 2006/7 [Item 14]**

Eddie Owen proposed (Tony Rooth seconded), and the Committee agreed that the £100,000 capital funding for 2006-2007 be allocated to the Local Transport Plan Programme.

[Members resumed discussion of Item 9.]

**26/06 GUILDFORD LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME 2006/7 [Item 9]**

Members expressed concern at the rise in construction costs. Liz Hogger proposed (Vivienne Johnson seconded) that the report in recommendation (iii) include details of the method of prioritisation of schemes and an explanation of the approach taken to the costing of schemes.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the Transportation Task Group's (TTG's) recommendations for the 2006/07 programme as set out in the revised ANNEXE 1 of the report be approved for implementation with the exception of the four schemes listed in the revised paragraph 24.
- (ii) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.
- (iii) that the TTG meet again to consider the prioritisation of the remaining schemes shown in ANNEXE 2, and that a further report be brought to the Committee in due course, and that the report include details of the method of prioritisation of schemes and an explanation of the approach taken to the costing of schemes.

**27/06 GUILDFORD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS [Item 10]**

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the proposed changes shown on the plans in ANNEXE 2 of the report be approved with the minor amendments referred to in ANNEXE 1.
- (ii) that Surrey County Council make an Order under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, giving effect to the changes shown on the plans in ANNEXE 2 with the minor amendments referred to in ANNEXE 1.

- (iii) to formally advertise the proposals to change the boundary of catchment area H to include Pewley Way in catchment area C and that the boundary of catchment area B is changed so the whole of Wodeland Avenue falls into catchment area F.
- (iv) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make an order under section 1,2,4,32,35 and 36 of parts III and IV of schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, giving effect to the proposed changes to the catchment areas boundaries described in (iii) above be advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the Order be made.

## **28/06 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING ANNUAL REPORT [Item 11]**

Members raised various issues including:

- future parking pricing
- reviewing parking on Saturdays
- need to include Park Barn in a future review
- abuse of parking system / funding for further administration and enforcement
- need to increase number of locations with parking meters
- parking and planning issues.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that 6-monthly reports are brought to the Committee to provide updates on issues relating to on-street parking and to present budget out-turns and estimates.
- (ii) that the proposed budget for 2006/07 with the exception of the split between the two sub accounts for the resources and income be agreed.
- (iii) that the issue with regard to the split in resources be noted, together with the proposal that this be referred to the Guildford DPE Steering Group; a further report will be presented at the September 28<sup>th</sup> Committee or earlier.
- (iv) that the audit recommendations as set out in paragraphs 54 to 57 and ANNEXE 4 of the report be agreed.

## **29/06 MEMBERS' REVENUE AND CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS 2004/5 AND 2005/6 [Item 13]**

The Committee agreed:

1. that the £2,000 be reallocated to the current Member for Worplesdon
2. that the £5,000 be given to the Waterside Centre
3. the following proposals for the use of the remaining revenue allocations for 2005-6, including a proposal for using the £2,000 in recommendation 1:

Eddie Owen: £1,000 for summer Shakespeare performances  
Eddie Owen: £2,000 for St Pius Youth groups  
Eddie Owen: £2,250 for the outdoor area at Bushy Hill Junior School  
Tony Rooth: £1,000 for a Community Speedwatch kit for Shalford division  
Tony Rooth: £1,500 for clearance of undergrowth adjoining the Hogs Back kiosk  
Tony Rooth: £6,000 for improvements to at schools in Shalford division  
Mike Nevins: £2,000 for improvements at Fairlands Community Hall.

**30/06 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 15]**

The Area Director invited Members to comment on the report, especially paragraph 1.3 concerning possible themed public engagement events.

Members made various comments and agreed the Forward Plan.

[Meeting ended 10.20 pm]

.....(Mr Bill Barker - Chairman)

**Contact:**

Dave Johnson (Area Director)

01483 517301  
[dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk)

Diccon Bright (Local Committee & Partnership Officer) 01483 517336

[diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk)

(The next meeting of the SCC Local Committee (Guildford) will be at 7pm on 15th June 2006, venue to be confirmed.)

**PETER HATTERSLEY**  
**RESIDENT OF WEST HORSLEY & CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS OF GUILDFORD MUSEUM**

**Q1 SCC BUDGET FOR HERITAGE, CONSERVATION AND RIGHTS OF WAY**

I refer to earlier questions and answers at SCC's Local Committee (Guildford) which resulted in confirmation that the Rights of Way budget is being reduced by £100,000, and reports in the Surrey Advertiser, which indicated that the Heritage and Conservation budgets were to be cut. Would the Committee and individual County Members please support the retention of the existing budgets for Heritage, Conservation and Rights of Way and take the message to the full Council meeting in April. Notes prepared by Surrey Archaeological Society, indicate that the cuts proposed in the cultural and heritage area, if implemented, will impact severely on the protection of the historic environment, museums and the service offered by the Surrey History Centre:

The key points relating to Museums, Archaeology and the Surrey History Service are likely to be

1. Loss of SCC funding to support the Museums Development Officer
2. A reduction in staff of approximately 25% at the Surrey History Centre
3. The heritage team which numbered 9 in 2004 is likely to be reduced to 4 or 5.

**A** Surrey County Council has undertaken a full review of all Services (with the exception of schools that are directly funded). This activity has not been undertaken lightly and aims to ensure that we are getting value for money. Services are fit for purpose & meeting the needs of Surrey residents.

The review team is working very closely with the SCC Museums & Galleries Service in order to further develop the proposals, thus enabling continued effective service delivery in this area. The proposals advocate a new and improved approach to Heritage, by fully integrating the work activity of the History Service, Museums & Galleries, the archaeology unit & Heritage conservation – in one Service in one location. (Surrey History Centre - Woking) This structure will both realize service delivery benefits and ensure:

- the excellent working relationship with the Districts & Boroughs is maintained,
- major projects continue
- new opportunities to secure external funding are explored
- museums expertise will be available across the new Heritage Service
- Surrey owned museums will be better supported.

The SCC Museum and Archive Services are fully involved in the ongoing discussions. This structure will offer a comprehensive Heritage package to customers and also maximize the expertise and resources already established.

Under the new structure there will be no loss of professional expertise, or support, for museums. There will be a part-time Museum Development Officer and the new Partnership & Learning team leader will be an experienced museum professional, who will spend 80% of their time on museum issues.

Reduction of staff in the current History Service has been lessened to 4.3 FTE (full-time equivalent) i.e. 12% of staffing, due to considerations over the new CPA (Comprehensive Performance Assessment) measures for archives.

The heritage conservation team now comprises 5.5 FTE including a new team leader at a grade suitable for a senior archaeological officer. Admin support (covering 1.5 FTE of the posts lost in 2005 and under BDR) will be provided by other staff in the new Heritage service.

All proposals will be fully considered and no final decision will be made until a meeting of full Council on 11 April 2006.

Members of the Local Committee will consider the issues raised and make representations as they feel appropriate, up to and at the full Council on 11 April 2006.



**Q2** In January 2005 Surrey County Council's Local Transportation Director stated in an interview with the Surrey Advertiser in connection with the then intended temporary closure of the Lane during the construction of the new roundabout for the Park and Ride, that –

'Trodds Lane is a road with a bad accident record, and as the accident rate was too high something needed to be done about it.'

As this work is about to commence some eighteen months later is it still the intention of the Council to close Trodds Lane? If not, and closure or not, in view of the comments made what further remedial measures are being planned by SCC to reduce speed to make Trodds Lane a safer road for all users on a permanent basis.

**A** The above is not an entirely accurate quotation, and in the intervening 15 months the position has moved on. The facts are as follows:

Trodds Lane had a poor accident record. In the 10 years between February 1994 and February 2004 there were 35 personal injury accidents. It was this that prompted the traffic calming measures which were installed in 2004.

In the 12 months since completion of the traffic calming measures there has been one injury accident. Although it is too soon for this to be a statistically reliable outcome, it is indicative that the measures have been a success.

The proposal that Trodds Lane be closed temporarily during the construction of the Merrow roundabout was put forward by officers since, having at the time only recently completed the traffic calming works, there was no evidence to show whether or not these had been successful. Officers were concerned to ensure that significant additional volumes of traffic should not be allowed to divert onto a lower classified road with possible safety consequences.

At the time of the proposal, there was a considerable outcry including many letters and emails and 2 petitions from those, mainly but not exclusively from the Tillingbourne area, whose ability to use Trodds Lane would have been curtailed. The residents of Trodds Lane were comparatively silent on the issue.

In view of the opposition to the closure, it is intended that the Merrow roundabout works should proceed without closing Trodds Lane. In the event that this were to cause undue difficulties, it remains possible to close Trodds Lane until July 2006 when the temporary traffic order expires.

**PATRICK ROBSON, MERROW RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION**

- Q3**
- (i) Given that Thames Water has banned all hosepipes and sprinklers from 3<sup>rd</sup> April and other water companies are following suit may we assume that work on the Golf Course – a non-essential use – will be postponed until the water shortage is over? In that case should not all work be put on hold bearing in mind the agreement that the three elements of this project should proceed concurrently?
  - (ii) Given that the issue of a bank bond or guarantee from the developer has been “in process” for 2 years and, in spite of agreement on all other legal aspects of the Park and Ride, is still not forthcoming is there any real prospect of this being resolved within the next few months? Is it therefore not time to abandon this development as costs continue to rise and other more suitable sites are now being considered?
- A**
- (i) Any effect of the hosepipe ban on the golf course will be a matter for the operator, and has no bearing on the planning permission, the construction of the development or the highway works which precede this.
  - (ii) The County and Borough Councils are committed to their various responsibilities under the development agreement which was exchanged on 7 February 2006. The developer’s bond has since been received and the highway works will therefore commence in the near future.

**Q4 Park & Ride at Guildford**

- (i) Is it not clear that the 10 year old strategy on Park & Ride has been long overdue for update, and was it not intended that this revised draft strategy was to be submitted to the Local Committee at this meeting rather than what amounts to only a limited progress report?
- (ii) Is it true that no substantive talks have yet taken place with the Highways Agency concerning Park & Ride sites adjacent to the A3 in the vicinity of Guildford?
- (iii) What is the reason for the continued delay in the developer supplying the bond - promised over so long a period- in connection with the Merrow Park & Ride, and is it the intention of Guildford Borough Council to issue a deadline for submission bearing in mind that the outline planning consent for a golf course at this site dates back 14 years?
- (iv) What impact will the current drought have on the Merrow golf course proposal at a time of hose-pipe bans, and has the Environment Agency issued a current licence permitting the necessary water extraction for the landscaping process to take place this year, and for the golf course's subsequent irrigation?
- (v) Will the decision to maintain town centre parking at current levels have an impact on the viability of the Merrow Park & Ride site?
- (vi) Having noted that the proposed 250 space extension to the Park & Ride at Artington is expected to cost £1 million (i.e. £4000 per space), can we be given an explanation as to how the cost for a new 486 space Park & Ride at Merrow is only estimated to be £1.5 million (i.e. £3090 per space)?
- (vii) Is the report on the traffic effects that could be caused by a Park & Ride at Manor Park available for public review, and when is it likely that the WSP report/demand study in the northern corridor will be available?
- (viii) At the time of the Public Inquiry into the University of Surrey plans for expansion at Manor Park, it was stated that the new campus was intended to be traffic free: can access be provided to the Park & Ride site allocated adjacent to Manor Park without dissecting the new campus with a road?
- (ix) Have the traffic flows on the A25, A246, and A247 been monitored recently, and if the Park & Ride at Merrow is successful what is the likely impact on traffic flows through West Clandon and Merrow? Is it the intention to continue monitoring these access routes regularly?
- (x) Are the cost estimates for the Park & Ride at Merrow at current cost levels, and what is the present view of what the final financial outcome expected to be?
- (xi) Is it correct that point 18 entitled "Sustainable Development Implications" should contain no reference to the environmental impact of Park & Ride on the openness of Green Belt land on the green approaches to the town, and its obtrusive character when viewed from AONB and AGLV designated countryside such as St Martha's Hill? Is the last sentence of this paragraph really a sufficient reference to the issue of environmental suitability?

## Item 5: Written Public Questions

- A**
- (i) The report makes clear that the park and ride strategy is in need of updating. The refreshed strategy needs to set out not only the progress made to date, but also a clear vision for the future of park and ride. Further survey work is needed (as explained in the report) before this can be completed. The strategy cannot be prepared until the outcomes of this are known. Prior to this meeting, no authority has been given by Members to update the strategy.
  - (ii) County and Borough Council officers meet regularly with the Highways Agency to discuss a range of transport issues, both strategic and operational and including park and ride. The next meeting at which the Manor Farm park and ride proposal will be discussed is planned for early May
  - (iii) The bond has now been provided.
  - (iv) See the response to question 3. The question of irrigation is one for the Environment Agency and the developer.
  - (v) The Parking Strategy sets the aim of maintaining the September 2003 level of short stay parking but there will be a loss of long stay parking. The sites that are being redeveloped are a mixture of short and long stay parking. As well as providing for the loss of long stay parking in the town park and ride will have to cater for any increase in short stay parking as a result of the extension of the Friary Shopping Centre. In addition the extension of on street parking controls further to the East of Guildford will also increase demand for a park and ride in this sector.
  - (vi) Both of these cost figures are broad estimates for budgetary purposes only. Only when the detailed design of each car park is complete will it be possible to arrive at a more detailed estimate. In the case of the Merrow figure, this is based on the cost of the Artington car park, factored to take account of the relative sizes of the 2 car parks and to allow for subsequent inflation. The Merrow car park is not 486 spaces; this figure includes the spaces for the development, the cost of which does not fall to GBC. The Artington figure is an early estimate to enable the scheme to be placed on GBC's "Wish List". Artington could be more expensive than Merrow (per space) because of the surface water and electricity supply issues referred to in the report.
  - (vii) The Manor Park draft report is currently being checked. When the final version is received, it will be available upon request in electronic format. The same will also be true of the report on the northern corridor, currently expected in late spring.
  - (viii) The residential element of the new Manor Park campus will be essentially car free apart from at the start and end of academic terms. The access to a future park and ride would be along part of the spine road that is intended for limited car access to the non-residential part of the campus, and which will also form the circular bus route.
  - (ix) Traffic flows on all Surrey A roads are monitored on a regular basis and there are no plans for this to change. While Merrow Park and Ride should reduce flows between the site and the town centre, it is unlikely to have any material impact on flows to the east of the site
  - (x) See the response to Members' written question (Item 6) question 1.
  - (xi) Paragraph 18 of the Park and Ride report (Item 12 on the agenda) makes clear that in order for the strategy to deliver benefits in the town centre, it is necessary to build car parks on the edge of town. The report cannot be considered to be a detailed environmental appraisal of a strategy which has not yet been written.

**SHERIDAN WESTLAKE, GBC MEMBER FOR MERROW**

**Q1** Will the Council publish updated figures for the estimated (1) yearly revenue costs, and (2) capital costs, of the Merrow Park & Ride scheme, to (a) Guildford Borough Council, (b) Surrey County Council, and (c) the developer?

**A** There have been no material changes in these figures since the report considered by this Committee on 20 January 2005. For ease of reference these are reproduced below.

**1. FIXED COSTS**

	<b>SCC contribution</b>	<b>GBC contribution</b>	<b>Developer's Contribution</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b><u>Highway works</u></b>				
Works costs	800,000	Nil	285,000	1,085,000
Design costs	75,000	Nil	Nil	75,000
<b>Total</b>				<b><u>1,160,000</u></b>
<b><u>Car Park</u></b>				
Acquisition of site	Nil	Nil	Unknown	Unknown
Construction, including lighting and CCTV.	Nil	730,000	Nil	730,000
Landscaping	Nil	56,000	Nil	56,000
WC facilities	Nil	125,000	Nil	125,000
<b>Total</b>				<b><u>911,000</u></b>

**2. ANNUAL REVENUE COSTS**

	<b>SCC contribution</b>	<b>GBC contribution</b>	<b>Developer's Contribution</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b><u>Park and ride bus services</u></b>				
Cost of bus service	335,000	Nil	Nil	335,000
Income	(122,400)	Nil	(30,000)	(152,400)
<b>Net cost</b>				<b><u>182,600</u></b>
<b><u>Car park maintenance costs</u></b>				
Maintenance	Nil	11,320	Nil	11,320
Cleaning	Nil	1,950	Nil	1,950
Staffing	Nil	30,300	Nil	30,300
Energy costs	Nil	1,530	Nil	1,530
Rates	Nil	52,280	Nil	52,280
<b>Total</b>				<b><u>97,380</u></b>

## Q2 ROAD MARKINGS

**At two previous meetings of the Guildford Local Committee, I have drawn this Committee's attention to the appalling state of the white lining on roads in Guildford's Town Centre and throughout the Borough of Guildford.**

With the new financial year starting in a few days time, can I please have an assurance that these road markings, which are vital to the safety of all road users, are repainted by the Surrey County Council Highways and their contractors Ringway without any further delay.

**A** On the last occasion when this matter was put to the Committee, officers provided (inter alia) the following information:

- White lining is assessed as part each road's periodic (usually 3 monthly) safety inspection and therefore we are able to monitor the situation closely. The vast majority of lining is there to provide guidance to the motorist; very little is a legal requirement. "Stop" and "Give Way" markings are the only lines which are safety related.
- As Members are aware revenue maintenance funding is extremely limited and officers must constantly make difficult decisions as to whether to remark a line, renew a sign or even clean it when funding is so restrictive and therefore we have to extract as much as we can from our signs and lines before we intervene.
- An order has been issued for the gyratory markings to be relaid. Arrangements have been made to inspect the approaches to Burnt Common Roundabout especially the approach from the A3 north bound. Officers believe the markings at Clandon crossroads to be serviceable for a little longer.

Also appended to the officer response was the financial summary from the annual Maintenance Plan for 2005/06 agreed by this Committee on 21 July 2005. The Committee was invited to consider whether it wished to spend more on road markings, and if so to identify which other activities should be reduced. One other Member commented that the balance between expenditure on different activities should not be altered, and the Committee made no resolution on the subject.

A number of the sites mentioned in the previous question are the subject of other works:

- **The gyratory system is subject to major works by Transco, and it is hoped that footway widening, resignalling and replacement of the surfacing will be carried out in 2007/08**
- **Millbrook by Debenhams is the site of a bus lane to be constructed during 2006/07**
- **The roundabout at the end of Onslow Street and Woodbridge Road will be replaced by traffic signals as part of the Friary development**

Despite this, a range of road marking work has been undertaken over the past few months. As highway inspectors and stewards record defects, these are batched to make the most efficient use of the contractor's time. This work also includes remarking required as a result of resurfacing or surface dressing. A full list is available and officers can provide details on request.