

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	Marlborough Community Area Transport Group			
	Date of meeting: Thursday 16th September 2021			
1.	Attendees and apologies			
	Present:	Cllr James Sheppard (Chair), Cllr Jane Davies, Steve Hind, Martin Cook, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Sheila Glass (Ramsbury PC); Cllr Jill Turner (Kennet Valley PC); Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC); Cllr Stephen Stacey (Avebury PC); Cllr Andrew George-Perutz (Berwick Bassett & Winterbourne Monkton PC); Cllr Rachel Inglefield, (Ogbourne St George PC); Cllr Nick Parsons (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Cllr Lucy Kirkpatrick (Mildenhall PC); Cllr Martin Phipps (Savernake PC); Clare Harris (Marlborough TC)		
	Apologies:	Cllr Caroline Thomas (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Richard Allen (Marlborough TC)		
2.	Notes of last meeting			
		The minutes of the previous CATG meeting held were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 15 th June 2021 <i>Link can be found at</i> https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=165&MId=13884&Ver=4		
3.	Financial Position			

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Finance sheet to be presented.	SH described that all commitments are on the sheet and the figure available is reducing as projects are agreed. The figure of £10,000 towards implementation of the new limit on the A4361 is a ballpark figure but this work could be costly due to the long length of the new limit and the need for traffic management.	
4.	New process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes			
	Wiltshire Council has now closed the online Issues system that was previously used to request new schemes for consideration by CATG and for Metrocounts. There are now new forms on the Wiltshire Council website. http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, new Highways request forms are to be sent to CATGRequests@wiltshire.gov.uk			
5.	Top 5 Priority Schemes			
	Following discussion of all projects currently being developed, the priority of remaining schemes was allocated. The letter given here reflects the new priority. SH stressed the need for the group to prioritise five projects to allow focus of limited time on those the group wants taking forward.			
a)	Froxfield's Village Traffic Plan	Construction of the western gateway completed June 2020. Commitment from the CATG to also progressing with the design of the eastern gateway. Froxfield PC have agreed 25% contribution. Construction complete at the end of May. Stage 3 safety audit required.	SH said that this work is now complete and Froxfield PC are happy with it. Highways need to carry out a safety audit before final sign-off. Froxfield have not been billed yet. JS asked how much work this will involve and SH agrees he will arrange the audit and the project can come off the CATG list.	
b)	Issue 6874	Accidents on A4361 at Winterbourne Bassett mostly due to speeding and inadequate road markings. Parish council would	The change to the limit on the A4361 has been advertised and	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	<p>Request for safety measures on A4361 near Winterbourne Bassett + Issue 7023 safety on the A4361 county boundary to Beckhampton.</p>	<p>like present white lines on section from Winterbourne Bassett towards Broad Hinton changed from single to double. Also stretch of road either side of the Winterbourne Bassett turning be reduced to 50mph This has been combined with 7023 to cover the A4361 from the county boundary through to Beckhampton roundabout.</p> <p>Atkins have completed the Speed limit review of the A4361 from the County boundary to Beckhampton. The report has been submitted for consideration. Once supported by the Parish Councils, the proposal can be formally advertised. The cost estimate for implementation including the advert for traffic order will be approx. £13k and this is too high for the current financial year. Agreement to proceed through CATG required before advert. PC contributions to be agreed.</p> <p>CATG have agreed to proceed with the speed limit. Costs for the advert process will be £3k.</p> <p>12.5% contribution from Avebury PC and 12.5% from BB&WM PC.</p> <p>Scheme has been advertised and Cabinet Member Report being prepared to address objections.</p>	<p>objections received. These are mainly to do with wanting a lower limit or extending the length of it. SH now has to write a report to the Cabinet member. SH felt these objections are unlikely to be upheld. Following SH's report, it will need sign-off to begin the detailed design, then implementation. SH will develop the cost estimate. SS felt this had been around a long time and wanted to see implementation. He asked for a timetable. SH replied that the Cabinet report will be complete shortly and the detailed cost estimate will be undertaken to enable the CATG to confirm implementation at the next meeting. SH felt work is unlikely to take place before spring '22.</p>	
c)	<p>8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>Site meeting undertaken.</p> <p>Request to increase the length of the speed limit. However, for this to be achieved a further speed limit review will have to be undertaken as part of the justification process. Cost of speed limit review £2500.</p> <p>Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review.</p>	<p>SH thought this assessment will have been carried out by the next CATG meeting, since the consultants are now able to do this work. There is a backlog of assessments but since this request is old, it should be near</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Contribution of £625 agreed.</p> <p>£1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Survey request sent to Atkins. Issues with the Covid-19 restrictions are causing delay with progress. This work will not progress until car sharing is allowed.</p> <p>Latest update is that Atkins will be undertaking assessments this autumn.</p>	<p>the top of the list. SH will keep chasing this work.</p>	
d)	<p>Issue 7027</p> <p>New double yellow lining on B4003</p>	<p>Construction improvement to lay-by unlikely to take place soon due to construction issues and costs. Waiting restrictions could be extended to edge of existing lay-by and then reviewed when improvements have been undertaken. Costs if this is undertaken through CATG would be around £2500 including the advert procedure.</p> <p>The TRO for extension to the waiting restrictions will be around 34m and will allow parking for 4-5 vehicles. The intention is for this to be advertised and implemented to enable enforcement to be undertaken on vehicles parking outside this area until the new layby is constructed.</p> <p>SS felt the layby needed to hold just 3 car lengths.</p> <p>'Primrose' yellow lines required within the World Heritage site agreed to be implemented initially.</p> <p>SS agreed it best to hold another site meeting and the include all parties, inc. National Trust and the new WHS officer with Wiltshire Council to discuss the layby details. Once the new layby is constructed, the waiting restrictions can be revised</p>	<p>SS described why Avebury PC and National Trust objected to lining design – it would still allow a large number of cars to park there, when the point was to control the number until the new layby could be created, which would take no more than 3 vehicles.</p> <p>SH described the design of the layby. The proposal would allow parking enforcement to start. It would allow approx. 6 cars to park, which is a reduction on present and would protect the verges. He can put a recommendation in the Cabinet report to reduce the number of spaces to 3 and get the design completed. The scheme should not need to be re-advertised after this change. JS recommended</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>again but until this achieved, the interim waiting restrictions will help to reduce further damage to the existing verge with the excessive parking.</p> <p>TRO schedule issued to Traffic Orders Team.</p> <p>Advert undertaken. However objections received including from Avebury PC. Cabinet member report will have to be written which will delay implementation.</p>	<p>consulting with Avebury PC and National Trust.</p> <p>JD asked about building and designing the new layby. SH said the difficulty is from the National Trust and the design and materials they recommend (chalk packed sandbags used to create new banks). These would not be considered as a highways asset and so CATG funding cannot be spent on it. A design from Highways with their materials would be appropriate.</p> <p>JD pointed out she would like this information before CATG meetings take place and wanted to see a compromise found. She asked for a site visit to take place with herself, SS, SH, MC and National Trust.</p>	
e)	8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment	<p>PC funded 100%</p> <p>This is on a list of 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins.</p> <p>Atkins are now progressing the speed limit review programme.</p>	<p>NP has recently taken over as PC Chair. He was not aware of the commitment to fund this work, even the assessment, at 100% and felt this had not been agreed by the PC. They might be able to afford 50% but could not fund 100%.</p> <p>There was discussion about how this decision had come about.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>SH confirmed the 100% commitment related only to the assessment.</p> <p>JS asked the group to vote on contributing 75% of the cost of the assessment, with Ogbourne St Andrew PC contributing the other 25%. This was agreed.</p>	
f)	8-19-6 Right of Way PRES12 at junction with A4 at Clatford – request for barrier	<p>Site meeting undertaken.</p> <p>It was agreed that because this is a byway and open to all traffic, a barrier would not be appropriate. A proposal for a Give Way sign and crossroads warning signs on the A4 is being developed.</p> <p>On further investigation a Give Way sign is not appropriate. An alternative signing solution has been sent to the PC for consideration.</p>	<p>PM confirmed Preshute PC had received this new design and was happy with it and have agreed 25% contribution.</p> <p>SH said if this is approved, the new sign and post can go ahead and be installed.</p> <p>This can come off the CATG list once implemented.</p>	
g)	Issue 5190 Request for safety works at London Rd, Marlborough	<p>Further to resurfacing the climbing lane has been removed and the de acceleration lane for the turning into the hospital increased.</p> <p>Overtaking issues have improved, however there are problems with getting in and out of the hospital junction. A topo survey would cost around £1500 -£2000. MH to discuss acceptable contribution with Marlborough TC and Savernake PC for survey. Savernake PC are prepared to contribute 25% for a topo survey.</p> <p>Group site meeting undertaken. Issues were concerned with reducing the speed limit. There is nothing that can be achieved by changing the junction layout and therefore a topo survey is</p>	<p>SH confirmed the site meeting had gone ahead. This meeting confirmed the situation was mostly around speed and he recommended carrying out a speed limit review. This has gone forwards and is now on Atkins' list MP asked about the criteria looked for in a review. Atkins will take into consideration accesses, road alignment and injury collisions</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>not required, although £1500 has been allocated from the Area Board.</p> <p>The £1500 area board funding allocated to a speed limit review. Request for speed limit review issued to Atkins.</p>		
h)	<p>8-19-4 Speed limit review at western end of Chilton Foliat (changed from 'Relocate 30mph limit at western end of Chilton Foliat').</p>	<p>This request does not meet the criteria for a 30mph limit which requires 3 frontages/ 100m. A speed limit review costing £2500 would give further information on whether a 40 or 50mph limit would be appropriate.</p> <p>PC have agreed 25% of costs for speed limit review, with anticipation of a 40 or 50mph limit in advance of the existing 30mph limit.</p> <p>Atkins have received request for speed limit review.</p>	<p>SH confirmed Atkins has this request. The scheme is to try to bring a lower limit further out from village to cover properties currently in higher limit.</p>	A
i)	<p>8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.</p>	<p>Improvements for pedestrians including traffic calming requested.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken. Low-cost option includes warning signs and road markings to enhance the gateway.</p> <p>Footway and bus stop can be reconsidered and time can be given to this if agreed through the CATG.</p>	<p>SH has met with LK on site and looked at the situation. A virtual footway is possible but is not appropriate in that a full footway is possible. This will be expensive but could be covered by a bid to the Substantive scheme next year or the year after. Alternatively, warning signs and gateway markings on road surface are possible to make drivers aware of approach to village.</p> <p>LK has put this to the PC. In the short term, they are in favour of signage and road markings as a cheaper, quicker solution.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>However, in the long term, they would like to build funds to look at the proposal for a footway to the bus stop. In the meantime, they would like to see development work towards designs for the footway and a Substantive bid in 1-2 years' time.</p> <p>It was agreed for SH to work up designs for a low cost scheme, including gateway markings, by the next CATG meeting. SH gave a cost estimate of £5,000 of which the PC will contribute 25%.</p> <p>SH pointed out that to develop the project further in order to make a Substantive scheme bid, this will need to be prioritised and more funding allocated to allow him to spent time working on it.</p>	
j)	8-21-5 Footpath between Van Diemans Close and George Lane.	<p>Request to widen footpath to access St Mary's school.</p> <p>Several owners of the land either side of the path. The Rights of Way team would need to be involved.</p> <p>CATG agreed to make this scheme a high priority to show political desire to move this forward but it is recognised that SH will not currently work on this scheme.</p>	<p>JS has contacted Perry Holmes, Head of Legal at Wilts Council. The first step is to contact landowners or neighbours to ask permission for use of the land. In light of the new crossing, his recommendation was to wait 1-2 years for landowners to get used to it before approaching them. The decision to remove this from the list is with Marlborough TC.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

6.	Other Priority schemes			
a)	<p>8-19-1 Request for new pedestrian crossing at Marlborough High St.</p>	<p>Marlborough Town Council supports and endorses the petition requesting a pedestrian crossing in Marlborough High Street and will seek further expert advice in order to make supporting recommendations.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to possible formal crossings in Kingsbury St by Patten Alley and across the High St by the White Horse bookshop. Both locations are unsuitable for a formal crossing.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken. Consideration to be given to an informal crossing enhancement across Kingsbury St towards the steps at the front of the Town Hall.</p> <p>Scheme details, including design and costs, to be proposed to Town Council and implementation costs including traffic management required. This is removed from priority list until temporary social distancing schemes are no longer necessary.</p> <p>Crossing to be looked at in conjunction with the town wide traffic strategy.</p>	<p>CH described the need for a crossing at the High St, at the Kingsbury St end, especially for visually impaired people. JS referred to the route from Whitehorse Bookshop across to the town hall steps. SH has looked at this point and at Pattern Alley and neither are suitable for a formal pedestrian crossing. These locations would have to be informal dropped kerb crossings. AJ asked if tactile surfacing would be possible / suitable, for visually impaired people? CH would take back to Marlborough TC to re discuss and confirm preferred informal crossing locations. There was also discussion about traffic from New Rd turning right, in front of the town hall, to travel up Kingsbury St and the difficulties this poses without any road markings, give way, etc. SH will take a look at this location.</p>	
b)	<p>6614 Request for No Parking measures on A4 at Fyfield</p>	<p>Vehicles, including HGVs, park on both sides of the road on the A4 at the filling station at Fyfield. This causes an obstruction and can be dangerous when other vehicles try to</p>	<p>Jamie Mundy has said that this location is not a priority for lining at this time. SH felt double</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>pass them on the opposite side of the road. The PC would like new markings to stop vehicles parking at the sides the A4. JT is liaising with Jamie Mundy. It may be possible to combine this with the work on the B4003</p> <p>This area is not currently prioritised for waiting restriction reviews by Jamie.</p>	<p>yellow would be ignored with the chance of enforcement being low. He will speak with JM to find out more and what can be done. MC felt many HGV drivers stopping beside the road in order to visit the shop in the garage, would claim to be unloading which they are allowed to do. JS raised the issue of flooding on this stretch of the A4 (Fyfield – Marlborough) which has been a problem for a number of years. It was agreed this needs to be tackled. MC described what is being done, including the need to contact landowners. He will be dealing with this as part of upcoming re-surfacing work. Double or solid white lines were also considered to try to prevent dangerous overtaking. MC described these only apply when sight lines ahead are obstructed and that the A4 route would have been designed to minimise these, therefore he thought new lines would not be possible.</p>	
c)	<p>Issue 6784 Request for new signage location for new SID</p>	<p>Marlborough TC is keen to reduce speeding in the town and are looking at buying SIDs to deploy on a rotational basis. There are no suitable columns on Kingsbury St to install a SID. It has been suggested that if a new warning sign is installed at a location on Kingsbury St, it could also be suitable for the SID.</p>	<p>CH described how Marlborough TC has looked at a location for the SID. None of the streetlamps on Kingsbury St are suitable, so she has worked with MC to install</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>CATG agrees to wait until new 20mph limit is installed in case a new post for a repeater sign become available.</p> <p>SH has given details of the suitable lighting column to Marlborough TC Clerk. Marlborough TC needs to speak with nearby homeowner to get approval. MH confirms this is in hand.</p> <p>MTC considering funding a post installation further down the hill.</p>	<p>a new post at the top of the street. This quote, at approx. £2,000 was too high.</p> <p>SH has walked the road looking for a location to place a socket for a removable post for the SID but has not identified one. He is happy to meet again to look for a location.</p> <p>JD asked if any of the existing streetlamps will be replaced as part of the LED lighting scheme so would become suitable. SH did not know but would find out.</p>	
d)	<p>8-19-2 Place a sign(s) at the entrance to Manton Hollow advising 'No Through Road'.</p>	<p>Manton Hollow is a no through road that appears on many maps and sat-navs as a through road. It is a regular occurrence that cars and HGVs attempt to turn in the very restricted turning area at western end of the southern arm of Manton Hollow. This has resulted in damage to the two houses that front on to the turning area.</p> <p>A 'No through road' sign' is already installed at junction of Downs Lane with A4. PC have requested another sign is installed at the junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow.</p> <p>This can be progressed as a signing request if fully funded by the Town Council and the principle is agreed through CATG.</p> <p>MH to confirm if Marlborough TC will pay around £300 and then SH will get a formal quote.</p>	<p>CH did not have the background on this. SH to consider options for Marlborough TC. If Marlborough TC are prepared to fund this, it does not need to go through CATG.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		MTC do not support a sign at junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow but wish to consider replacing the sign at the junction of Downs Lane with the A4.		
e)	8-19-7 A346 Cadley – request for speed limit review, signing and gates.	<p>Detailed cost for signs £713.92</p> <p>MP confirmed that the cost is acceptable to the PC and that the PC are identifying positions for the signs.</p> <p>Signing installed. To be confirmed</p>	SH confirms this is installed and can be removed from the CATG list. MP is happy with it.	
f)	8-19-8 A346 Cadley – traffic lights on A4	<p>Traffic modelling for junction would be required. CATG have approved in principle traffic modelling for Marlborough.</p> <p>JS to pursue this with area board and town councillors.</p>	<p>This request began a conversation about the need for a wider traffic plan. AJ described speaking with Dave Thomas where he offered to take a look at this plan if the local area could provide the scope they wanted it to cover.</p> <p>The area board will take the lead in calling local PCs to be part of this study.</p>	
g)	8-19-11 Aldbourne, request for virtual footway	To be prioritised.	No one from Aldbourne PC was present and this was not discussed.	
h)	8-20-1 Lockeridge, pedestrian safety Eckhard(Ivy) Lane	<p>To be prioritised</p> <p>JT said she is now liaising with MC on a different idea. Now thinking of models or images of children in the road to encourage drivers to slow down</p>	JT said how the local Community Speedwatch group was about to start again and that white lines needed refreshing. MC described the budget constraints over white lining in this area and how the	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			poor weather has also affected this work. SH said how the idea of models of children had gone to the Integrated Transport team. They are not supported by Highways but he can look at other solutions.	
i)	8-20-2 Ogbourne St George, Request for historic signs	To be discussed/ prioritised	RI from Ogbourne St George had to leave the meeting before this item was discussed.	
j)	8-20-8 Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village	PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review Whilst a full speed limit review cost £2,500, a Metrocount is free of charge. It was recommended SG tests vehicle speed via a Metrocount before committing to the full speed limit review. SG will submit this via the correct form.	SG was recommended to request a Metrocount to look at speeds. These happen outside of the CATG process and have re-started again after Covid restrictions.	
k)	8-21-2 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island	Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary	This, 8-21-3 and 8-21-4 are to be dealt with together as a Substantive scheme bid. This decision is mainly based on the cost of the new traffic island which will be the greatest expense. SH felt moving the speed limit further out is unlikely to go ahead. He also said these can either be treated separately as funding become available or together as a Substantive scheme bid.	
l)	8-21-3 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for transverse yellow markings	Request for transverse yellow road markings on western approach to zebra crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.		
m)	8-21-4 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Road, Manton – request for sign.	Request for sign indicating Bridge St turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St.		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			JS did not want to add more projects to the A priority list, especially as many are with Atkins and proceeding with those are out of SH's hands.	
n)	8-20-4 A4 Manton traffic calming	Request for a substantive scheme to include 8-21-2, 8-21-3, 8-21-4 plus move speed limit and alteration to Pelican traffic light.		
7.	New Requests / Issues			
a)	8-21-7 Forest Hill Speed limit		This new request is a duplicate of the work at 5 g) for a speed limit review at Forest Hill. This can be removed.	
b)				
8.	Other items			
a)		<p>SC described the increase in traffic through Baydon village, especially HGVs. She has been discussing with SH and MC a weight restriction for the village to try to prevent this and is looking for advice.</p> <p>SH said how this would normally be dealt with by the Freight Management Partnership, but this has been temporarily handed to CATGs. SH was not sure if they would normally allow this to go ahead.</p> <p>SC thought that Wiltshire Highways is talking with Highways England to take Baydon off the diversion route when the M4 is closed. MC said that Baydon is no longer on the strategic diversion route but this would not stop vehicles choosing to go that way.</p> <p>SH needs to find out if Wiltshire Council would support a weight restriction and to understand the relevance of traffic counts. It is recommended to undertake counts just inside the county boundary if these are necessary.</p>		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

9.	Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 9 th December, 10.00am location tbc. Thursday 3 rd March, 10.00am location tbc
----	---

Marlborough Community Area Transport Group

Highways Officer – Steve Hind

1. Environmental & Community Implications

1.1. Environmental and community implications were considered by the CATG during their deliberations. The funding of projects will contribute to the continuance and/or improvement of environmental, social and community wellbeing in the community area, the extent and specifics of which will be dependent upon the individual project.

2. Financial Implications

2.1. All decisions must fall within the Highways funding allocated to Marlborough Area Board.

2.2. If funding is allocated in line with CATG recommendations outlined in this report, and all relevant 3rd party contributions are confirmed, Marlborough Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of £

3. Legal Implications

3.1. There are no specific legal implications related to this report.

4. HR Implications

4.1. There are no specific HR implications related to this report.

5. Equality and Inclusion Implications

5.1 The schemes recommended to the Area Board will improve road safety for all users of the highway.

6. Safeguarding implications