

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	<b>Marlborough Community Area Transport Group</b>			
	<b>Date of meeting: Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021</b>			
1.	<b>Attendees and apologies</b>			
	Present:	Cllr Jane Davies, Cllr Caroline Thomas, Cllr James Sheppard (Chair), Steve Hind, Martin Cook, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Rachel Inglefield (Ogbourne St George PC); Cllr John Hetherington (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Andrew George-Perutz (Berwick Bassett & Winterbourne Monkton PC); Cllr Stephen Stacey (Avebury PC); Cllr Mervyn Hall, Richard Spencer-Williams (Marlborough TC); Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Sheila Glass (Ramsbury PC); Cllr Chris Ainsworth (Aldbourne PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Cllr Lucy Kirkpatrick (Mildenhall PC).		
	Apologies:	Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC); Clare Harris (Marlborough TC)		
2.	<b>Notes of last meeting</b>			
		The minutes of the previous CATG meeting held on the 16 <sup>th</sup> September were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2021  <i>Link can be found at</i> <a href="https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=165&amp;Year=0">https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=165&amp;Year=0</a>		

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<b>3.</b>	<b>Financial Position</b>			
		Finance sheet to be presented.	SH presented the current budget, pointing out there is approx. £399 remaining this financial year. He said that some of his costs are over-estimates, so hopefully they will come down and the amount remaining increase. SH also pointed out this figure does not include the estimate of £13,000 towards implementing the speed limit changes on the A4361. This work will not go ahead until the new financial year but will take up nearly the entire budget allocation.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>New process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes</b>			
	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. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards</a> Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, new Highways request forms are to be sent to <a href="mailto:CATGRequests@wiltshire.gov.uk">CATGRequests@wiltshire.gov.uk</a>			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Top 5 Priority Schemes</b>			
	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 <b>five</b> projects to allow focus of limited time on those the group wants taking forward.			

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

a)	<p>Issue <a href="#">6874</a> Request for safety measures on A4361 near Winterbourne Bassett + Issue 7023 safety on the A4361 county boundary to Beckhampton.</p>	<p>Accidents on A4361 at Winterbourne Bassett mostly due to speeding and inadequate road markings. Parish council would 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>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&amp;WM PC.</p> <p>Scheme has been advertised and Cabinet Member Report prepared to address objections.</p> <p>Report signed off following further representation from Avebury PC at stage of 'intention to make decision'</p> <p>Cost estimate for implementation is £13k. Implementation and contributions to be agreed.</p>	<p>SS agreed it is good the limit is coming down but residents wanted to see 40mph instead. He mentioned the transport strategy for Avebury that had been agreed several years earlier that contained the aspiration for a 40mph limit around Avebury. JD agreed with these comments. SH said that the contributions towards the speed limit review and adverts have been agreed but now the group needs to look at the implementation costs and decide where to go with those. JS felt it is better to go ahead with the 50mph limit, monitor the situation for several years, then possibly look for another change later. SS agreed with this way forward. AG-P also agreed. SH confirms the contributions will be 12.5% per parish (25% total). This could not be removed from the High priority list as design work towards implementation still needs to be done.</p>	A1
b)	<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>SH confirmed Atkins have carried out assessment and site visit and that a report is due in January. Whilst the Metrocounts would have been set for 7 days, Atkins</p>	A2

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review. Contribution of £625 agreed.</p> <p>£1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Latest update is that Atkins undertook a site visit on Sunday 14<sup>th</sup> November. Speed readings are being undertaken and the aim is to produce draft findings in January.</p>	<p>were also present during a rugby session to see the situation there. MH mentioned plans by the rugby club for a new training area to be created at Free's Ave, making it even more important for speed reduction.</p> <p>PM pointed out Free's Ave is busy and fast all the way through to Rockley so affects more people than just the rugby club, so the length through to Rockley should be looked at. JS agreed but said that can be looked at later.</p>	
c)	<p>Issue <a href="#">7027</a> 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</p>	<p>JD described that a site meeting had taken place regarding the layby but to reach a solution and agreement a TEAMS meeting with all relevant parties is to be arranged by SH. Regarding the double yellow lines SH can amend the Cabinet member report to the correct distance and precise location to be agreed. The layby can be defined by the double yellows, and these can be actioned once the report is signed off.</p>	A3

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Wiltshire Council to discuss the layby details. Once the new layby is constructed, the waiting restrictions can be revised 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>Advert undertaken. However objections received including from Avebury PC. Cabinet member report will have to be written which will delay implementation.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken with Avebury PC and NT to discuss extent of lines and methodology for protecting the verge. No conclusion reached. Further meetings to be set up on TEAMS to make progress.</p>		
d)	8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment	<p>This is on a list of 16 no 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins. Speed data undertaken. Report due to be drafted in January.</p> <p>PC funding agreed at 25%</p>	The speed limit review has been undertaken and the report is due in January. Progress is being made and available options should be ready for the next meeting.	A4
e)	8-19-6 Right of Way PRES12 at junction with A4 at Clatford – request for barrier	<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>	SH confirms the sign is in and parish council is happy. CATG agrees this can be removed from list.	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Sign installed total cost £150. Issue can be CLOSED		
f)	<p>Issue <a href="#">5190</a> Request for safety works at London Rd, Marlborough</p> <p>8-21-7 Forest Hill speed limit review</p>	<p>The £1500 area board funding allocated to a speed limit review costing £2500. Savernake PC contribution 25%. Request for speed limit review issued to Atkins.</p> <p>Site visit undertaken and speed readings requested. Report due to be completed before end of March.</p>	SH confirms the speed limit review has not been undertaken but is on the list and, like the others, there should be a report in March.	A5
g)	8-19-4 Speed limit review at western end of Chilton Foliat (changed from 'Relocate 30mph limit at western end of Chilton Foliat').	<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>Site visit undertaken and speed readings requested. Report due to be completed before end of March.</p>	SH confirms the speed limit review has not been undertaken but is on the list and, like the others, there should be a report in March.	A6
h)	8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.	<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>Design being developed for low cost scheme. Cost estimate £5k.maximum. PC contribution 25%.</p>	SH said how the low-cost option is being looked at. This is approx. £5,000 but may be lower. He has sent this information to parish council to agree and fund. LK said the PC has discussed this and wants to go ahead with the low-cost solutions as set out by SH. She said how the PC has set a long-term goal of saving towards	A7

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			the more expensive footway scheme and want to look at options for this with CATG in the future.	
i)	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.</p> <p>In light of the new crossing, his recommendation was to wait 1-2 years for landowners to get used to it before approaching them.</p> <p>The decision to remove this from the list is with Marlborough TC</p>	<p>MH agreed this work is important but difficult due to landownership issues. This has not been discussed at Marlborough TC so he cannot comment.</p> <p>JD felt the new crossing at George Ln should relieve pressure on Van Diemans by giving extra pavement area. She recommended leaving the situation for some time.</p> <p>MH pointed out the issue with Covid social distancing as parents wait outside school along the path. JD has had advice from Wiltshire Council to write to landowners. MH will put this item on Marlborough TC's Planning agenda.</p> <p>JS agreed this can move down to the Other Priorities list.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Other Priority schemes</b>			
a)	Froxfield's Village Traffic Plan	<p>Construction of the western gateway completed June 2020. Commitment from the CATG to also progressing with the design of the eastern gateway.</p>	<p>SH confirmed still waiting for the safety audit. This is not a priority but still need to wait for any recommendations from report.</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Froxfield PC have agreed 25% contribution. Construction complete at the end of May.</p> <p>Stage 3 safety audit requested.</p>		
b)	<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 to take back to Marlborough TC to discuss and confirm preferred informal crossing locations.</p> <p>SH to look at traffic turning right in front of Town Hall to travel up Kingsbury St. SH discussed with CH and it was considered that additional road markings would not be helpful.</p>	<p>CT described that it might be possible to create a new zebra crossing between the existing build-outs on the High St. This would need a smaller zig-zag area either side of the crossing so car parking is not lost. She asked how this can be designed.</p> <p>JS said this needed to be taken to Marlborough TC to be agreed and funded. MH agreed but needs the detail of the scheme to take to the TC.</p> <p>SH pointed out he was not at the meeting where this was discussed. He confirmed that parking will be lost but the zig-zag can be reduced as much as possible. He was asked if he could design the crossing. SH wondered if there needed to be a pedestrian count to gauge demand at that location.</p> <p>CT wanted a 'mock-up' of the crossing for the TC to consider, not a detailed design. SH will need to know the exact location to</p>	



## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>assess criteria so the crossing is feasible.</p> <p>CT took an action to initially agree a location with the Town Council before any initial design assessment is agreed at CATG. SC recommended using Google Earth for mapping.</p>	
c)	<p><a href="#">6614</a> 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 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.</p> <p>This area is not currently prioritised for waiting restriction reviews by Jamie.</p>	<p>There is no progress here.</p>	
d)	<p>Issue <a href="#">6784</a> 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. 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>SH has met with Clare Harris remotely to look at possible solutions. There is only one solution at a streetlamp, however, the TC's SID is too large / heavy to go on this so SH recommended a new lighter one. CT pointed out MTC does have funding to buy a 2<sup>nd</sup> SID. She explained how this will also help traffic at the top of Kingsbury St trying to come down past the row of parked cars. SH showed an image of the streetlamp from Streetview. MH asked if the householder needs to</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>SH discussion with CH. No streetlighting columns are due to be replaced. The only possible location for a SID is on the column previously suggested. CH liaison with lighting team. Consider lighter SID unit.</p>	<p>be consulted about a SID going there. SH felt that would be a good idea. He also thought as the SID would face downhill, away from any windows, it shouldn't be an issue.</p> <p>Clare Harris to discuss with property owner and liaise with Street Lighting to agree to the use of the column.</p>	
e)	<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>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.</p> <p>SH considering options.</p>	<p>SH has looked at the current signage at Manton Hollow. He thought that this could be angled more to face along the A4 and a new sign installed facing the other direction, that would give drivers advance notice ahead of the junction.</p> <p>PM pointed out this scheme should be about preventing HGVs from entering Manton House instead of Downs Ln.</p> <p>RSW stated that Marlborough TC supports what SH had said. They felt it is too late to have signs just at the junction or further up.</p> <p>MC suggested using a directional sign to send people where they want to go, not just a 'no through road' sign. SH did not think that would fit the available space.</p> <p>JD asked if Manton Residents' Assoc. would be prepared to pay</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			100% of the new sign and PM agreed to this. JS asked SH to assess a design and cost for a 'No Through Road' Sign at the entrance to Manton Hollow.	
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. The area board will take the lead in calling local PCs to be part of this study.</p>	<p>MH said that there had been meetings with Dave Thomas from Highways. He had offered to put MH in touch with Atkins but this had not yet happened. JS will chase Dave Thomas for this contact.</p>	
g)	8-19-11 Aldbourne, request for virtual footway	To be prioritised - to be replaced by 8-21-8		
h)	8-20-1 Lockeridge, pedestrian safety Eckhard(Ivy) Lane	<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> <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 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.</p>	<p>JT said how Community Speedwatch is ongoing but now the issue is fallen and damaged trees. MC pointed out these are the responsibility of the landowner to maintain and clear if there is damage. JT also mentioned the need for refreshing white lining. MC said how now is not a good time of</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>year for this work as lines wear off very quickly. SH asked that since this is a maintenance issue it should be removed from the CATG list. This was agreed.</p>	
i)	<p>8-20-2 Ogbourne St George, Request for historic signs</p>	<p>Email received on 25/11/21 from PC to remove from Agenda</p>	<p>RI described that Ogbourne St George no longer wish to take this project forward and the PC is developing a new project for the 3 entrances to the village. She also asked about new warning signage for the junction of the Ridgeway National Trail on the A346. She said where the Ridgeway crosses other roads, it is named. SH said that those would be non-standard signs and that the standard pedestrian warning sign could be installed. RI will check with groups such as Friends of the Ridgeway to find out more about specific signs.</p>	
j)	<p>8-20-8 Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village</p>	<p>PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review</p> <p>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. Request submitted by PC</p>	<p>Metrocount request is in with Highways to be actioned. SH could not say when that might be.</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

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	<p>MH said how Marlborough TC have asked that these four requests are handled together as one and that they are considered towards a bid to the substantive scheme.</p> <p>AJ described this scheme: Bids are submitted once per year (July) and there is a clear scoring system to allocated funding to them. Part of this concerns the amount of funding already provided locally (CATG &amp;/or local council) and how well developed the project is. This means it needs to be thoroughly designed and costed by the engineer. This was noted and JS asked that CATG agree to this being added to the high priority list to be developed ready for a bid in '22.</p>	A8
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.		
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.		
<b>7.</b>	<b>New Requests / Issues</b>			
a)	8-21-8 Aldbourn – virtual paths	Request for virtual paths along Farm Lane, entire length of Marlborough Rd, Castle St to Whitley Rd to replace 18-19-11	<p>CA described the roads to the south of the village as being narrow and with no footways. They wanted to encourage people to walk into the village more and needed to make these roads safer.</p> <p>MC felt this could be done via the general maintenance budget but</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			would need to know the extent of the lining. SH said that a coloured surface would not last and recommended against that and said that this is a good CATG project. He thought this work would need a greater design element so wanted this added to the other priority list.	
b)	8-21-9 Avebury – speed limit reduction	Speed limits around Avebury to be reduced from 60mph to 40mph.	SS said how this is a request from a resident that Avebury PC supported. A 40mph limit had already been discussed and agreed as not possible now. SS agreed this could be removed.	
c)	8-21-10 Avebury – A4 west of Beckhampton	Double white lines or carriageway realignment.	SS described that this is about introducing new double white lines to prevent overtaking on exit to roundabout. MC stated that these cannot be used where there is sufficient forward sight lines so it would not be possible to use them here. It was agreed to remove this from list.	
d)	8-21-11 Clench Common - speeding	Review speed limit, signing, gates	No one from Savernake PC was present but this request was added to the other priorities list.	
e)	8-21-12 Ramsbury – Back Lane	Traffic calming/ priority system	SG asked if Ramsbury's request for new lining can be dealt with at the same time as Mildenhall. She	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>described what they wanted at Back Ln.            SH described what he thought would be needed to suit the request.            MC thought white lines that would act to narrow the road and help slow drivers could be done quite quickly. He confirmed this could be added to the maintenance list but pointed out the work would be on hold due to the weather and available resources.            JS asked to be kept informed.</p>	
f)	8-21-13 Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit	Footway improvements/ speed calming measures	MH did not have the detail of this request but would like it left on the list.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Other items</b>			
a)				

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

9.	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> Thursday 3 <sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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**