

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<b>Attendees</b>	
Councillor Brian Dalton (Chair)	Salisbury Area Board
Marianna Dodd (MD)	Community Area Manager
Peter Durnan (PD)	COGS
Patricia Fagan (PF)	Elizabeth House
David Law (DL)	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council
Pam Rouquette (PR)	Salisbury Walking Forum
Helen Rowe (HR)	Age UK
Paul Shaddock (PS)	Senior Highways Technician
Margaret Willmot (MW)	Agenda 21 & SCCAP
Tim Woolford (TW)	Area Manager, Highways & Streetscene
<b>Apologies</b>	
Graham Axtell (GA)	Highways and Streetscene Engineer
Cllr John Collier (JC)	City Councillor
Elizabeth Piner (EP)	Community Transport
Heather Blake (HB)	Senior Transport Planner
Cllr James Robertson (JR)	City Councillor
Cllr Mark Timbrell	City Councillor
<b>Stakeholders Invited into the meeting</b>	
Cllr Ricky Rogers	Chair Salisbury Area Board
David Brown	Resident
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<p><b>1. Welcome, Apologies &amp; Introductions</b> As noted above.</p> <p><b>2. Action &amp; Matters Arising</b> Matters arising from the last meeting</p> <p><b>Shady Bower:</b> PF asked for an update as it was taking a long time to resolve. PS advised that all requests for waiting restrictions had to be made through the City Council who liaise with Network Management at Trowbridge who prioritise the request against criteria prior to a decision being made. The request might be on the list for a number of years until funding becomes available. PS asked MD to circulate information about the request for waiting restrictions to CATG members. The Chair said that any queries of this type should be followed through with the City Council and/or the Wiltshire Council highways officers.</p> <p><b>30 and 20 mph wheelie bin stickers:</b> MD confirmed that arrangements are in hand to leave these with the City Council, Salisbury Library and Milford Street Offices for distribution and for the public to collect as appropriate. A press release has been organised to inform the public of this initiative.</p> <p><b>Roman/Pembroke Road Junction:</b> Following discussion between Mr David Brown and the Chair of the Area Board, Cllr Ricky Rogers, amendments have been made to this item in the Minutes of the last CATG meeting held on the 21 February, 2013 (shown in italics). A copy of these Minutes will be forwarded along with the Minutes of this meeting.</p>	<p>Marianna attach parking document</p> <p>Marianna to follow up</p> <p>Marianna attach 21 Feb Minutes</p>

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p><b>3. Update on Last Year's Priorities</b></p> <p>PS provided an update on the following schemes:</p> <p><b>Orchard, House, Stratford Road:</b> A substantive CATG bid had been submitted for £23,000 to implement the scheme at Orchard House, Stratford Road. A decision on the awarding of substantive CATG funding is expected by the end of August 2013. The outcome of the bid would be relayed to members of the group in due course.</p> <p><b>Dropped kerbs at various city centre locations:</b> Awaiting a quote from Balfour Beatty (council's contractors) to construct the dropped kerbs. Highways officers to chase a response from Balfour Beatty.</p> <p><b>Cherry Orchard Lane:</b> Awaiting a quote from Balfour Beatty (council's contractors) to undertake the footway improvements. Highways officers to chase a response from Balfour Beatty.</p> <p><b>Feasibility Study for a Pedestrian Crossing outside Stratford Court Residential Home:</b> Residents Parking Zone H implementation to commence in September 2013 and will take approximately eight weeks to complete. Once implemented a further pedestrian crossing assessment will be undertaken and the results reported back to the CATG.</p>	<p>Paul to chase up Balfour Beatty</p> <p>Paul to chase up Balfour Beatty</p> <p>Paul to feed back to CATG</p>
<p><b>4. Schemes to be considered in 2013/14</b></p> <p><b>4.1 Review of Speed Limits on C and UC roads</b></p> <p>PS advised on changes to the process to the review of speed limits on C &amp; unclassified routes. Information describing this in more detail would be appended to the Notes of this meeting. PS advised that the current 2013/14 CATG budget stood at £14,758. However, a further £150k had been reallocated to all CATG's in Wiltshire giving them the flexibility to choose whether to use this additional funding to do speed limit reviews or use it to fund CATG schemes. This amounts to a further £4,500 for Salisbury bringing the total CATG fund to £19,258.</p> <p><b>4.2 List of small scale transport schemes</b></p> <p>MD advised that a list of schemes raised as issues on the Issues Log were forwarded to the City Council's Planning and Transportation Committee to rank in order of priority. The Committee met on 8 July and commented that 'Cllrs felt there was inadequate information available to form a satisfactory assessment and the budget is insufficient to complete many of the schemes listed'. However, the committee did rank the schemes from 1 – 5 (1 being highest score) and these are displayed at the top of the List of Schemes circulated to CATG members for this meeting.</p> <p>CATG members discussed the schemes, starting with those ranked by the City Council, made comments followed by the Chair moving a recommendation followed by a show of hands. The following are the notes and the outcomes:</p>	<p>Marianna to append info to Notes</p>

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)**  
**Action Notes of Meeting**  
**07 August, 2013**

<p><b>Issue 2942: BP Garage London Road – Coloured surface treatment &amp; bollards – £2,500 London Road only/£4,500 - £5,000 for London Road &amp; Downton Road</b>  PS commented: A scheme similar to that introduced on the A36 Southampton Road at the entrance to the Esso garage would be possible at the entrance to the London Road BP garage and would address the concerns of cyclists using the shared use path running in front of it.</p> <p>If a scheme is introduced at the entrance to the London Road BP garage it may also be worth considering introducing a similar scheme on the shared use path running in front of the BP garage on Downton Road which would address similar concerns at this location</p> <p>CATG comments: Members asked if the scheme on Southampton Road had proven successful. PS commented that the scheme on Southampton Road was in response to a number of recorded collisions involving cyclists (and one mobility scooter user) and that following its implementation of scheme there had been no further recorded collisions. PS advised that the situation on London Road and Downton Road was slightly different in that there were no recorded collisions involving cyclists at these locations.</p> <p>PD &amp; MW commented that as regular cyclists they felt these schemes would help to allay cyclists concerns when travelling in front of the filling stations on London Road and Downton Road. MW commented that the scheme on Downton Road was particularly welcome as this was on a popular cycle from the city centre to Salisbury District Hospital.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved to proceed to fund both the London Road and Downton Road schemes which was carried</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding (£5k)</p>
<p><b>Issue 1990: Water Lane – double mirror requirement - £400</b>  PS advised: From a highways point of view I would question the need for a mirror to be erected. Footpaths/ways with 90° bends and/or ending at a t-junction are commonplace on the public highway and typically do not have mirrors erected.</p> <p>Technically this scheme is possible. There is an existing lamp column on the footway between East Street and Water Lane to which a mirror could be attached.</p> <p>Ultimately, this is a community safety issue rather than a transport one so it is up to the group to decide if they wish to fund the erection of a mirror.</p> <p>CATG comments:  If the cost is reasonably cheap, and it would allay people's fears why not fund this. Others were not sure this was something that should be funded by CATG. The Chair felt it could set a precedent for other such schemes in the community area.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding  If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>
<p><b>Issue 2950: The Oakbournes, Ash Crescent – dropped kerbs - £2,000</b>  PS advised: Technically it would be possible to introduce a dropped kerb across the junction of The Oakbournes and Ash Crescent. The group needs to decide where exactly the dropped to be located - either straight across the junction or slightly set back from the junction (as per Oldfield Road and Poplar Way)</p> <p>CATG comments:  The City Council had felt there should have been a dropped kerb here at the outset. The Chair said he was surprised that a dropped kerb wasn't included.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that this scheme proceeds which was carried</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding (£2k)</p>

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p><b>Issue 2969: Balmoral Road – bus shelter - £2,000</b> PS advised: A shelter with end panels can be provided. However, in doing so it would require the shelter to be relocated grass verge at the junction of Balmoral Road and Downsway. In doing so due to the larger footprint of a shelter with end panels it would require part of the grass verge to be removed to provide a hard standing for the shelter, accordingly the cost of relocating this shelter has increased.</p> <p>The position of the new shelter would be directly in front of No. 54 Balmoral Road / No. 1 Downsway who would need to be consulted about the relocation of the shelter.</p> <p>Possible Area Board project/Cllr bid to replace bus shelters.</p> <p>CATG comments: Could money be found through the Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF) to put towards this work? PS advised that the BBAF monies had been awarded to specific schemes and a scheme to replace bus shelters didn't form part of the BBAF project and as such it was highly unlikely that any money could be allocated for this purpose. The City Council thought that if a disused shelter could be brought from elsewhere, this would bring the cost down ie £700. PS agreed that this could happen, however, the earlier price didn't include costs of, for instance, an extra area of hard stand. This was an exposed area, so there was a need for a bus shelter, particularly as there was a need for elderly people in the locality to use it.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved this be put forwarded as an Area Board project and recommended that the Area Board looked at it as one single scheme which included the replacement of more than one bus shelter which was carried.</p>	<p>MD to include this recommendation in the CATG report to the 12 Sept Area Board. Keep on CATG list.</p>
<p><b>Issue 2480: Odstock Road near junction of Rowbarrow – dropped kerbs - £2,000</b> PS advised: Request for dropped kerbs to help improve access to bus stops on Odstock Road is reasonable and the provision of dropped kerbs is technically possible.</p> <p>CATG comments: The City Council agreed with this. Should a refuge be put in the middle? PS advised that it would be difficult to put in because there was a right turn. The cost would be about £5k. Could consider putting in a refuge at a later stage if needed.</p> <p>Action: The Chair moved that this scheme proceeds which was carried</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding (£2k)</p>
<p><b>Issue 1769: Netherampton Road – hazardous crossing - £5,000</b> PS advised: A road safety audit undertaken following installation of the zebra crossing found no problems with the location of the belisha beacons. The belisha's have been fitted with LED surrounds to improve visibility. However, the road safety audit did suggest that the existing signalised pelican crossing adjacent to the old post office be removed as there is no longer a pedestrian crossing desire line at this location. The audit also concluded that drivers may not expect the presence of a second controlled crossing (the zebra) immediately after passing through the pelican crossing. This may explain why some eastbound drivers are failing to give way. It is recommended that the crossing be removed.</p> <p>The cost includes removing the traffic signal equipment and the dropped kerbs associated with the crossing points.</p> <p>CATG Comments: The Chair commented that a few people had complained the zebra crossing was in the wrong place. If you look from traffic island looking up, this crossing is not easy to see, issue is that this pelican crossing should have been removed many years ago. The Chair strongly felt that this crossing should be removed but it should be funded from</p>	

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)**  
**Action Notes of Meeting**  
**07 August, 2013**

<p>another budget in WC and not the CATG budget.  PR didn't like to see any pedestrian crossing removed unless it was going to be replaced. Would removing it improve the safety of crossing this road? Could it be moved elsewhere?  The Chair said this was put in 1996 and was approaching the end of its service life. PS advised that Highways wouldn't be able to reuse this equipment. Even if the equipment could be reused any proposed new location would have to be subject to a pedestrian crossing assessment and meet the relevant criteria (i.e. a certain number of movements), before a signalled crossing would be installed. PS advised that the CATG budget should be used for this.</p> <p><b>Action:</b>  The Chair moved that CATG's budget would not be used to fund this scheme, that it should be left on the list and that PS investigate if funding could be found elsewhere. This was carried.</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding at this time  Leave on list  PS to investigate if funding can be found elsewhere</p>
<p><b>Issue 2500: North side of Lower Road – dropped kerbs - £5,000</b></p> <p>PS advised: It would not be possible to provide dropped kerbs either opposite Nos. 44-50 Lower Road or at the junction of Cecil Terrace due to the existing footway widths being too narrow to provide a dropped kerb with a DDA compliant 1 in 12 gradient.</p> <p>At the junction of Lower Road and Cecil Terrace it would be possible to provide a build out on which a dropped kerb could be accommodated. However, doing so would likely result in the loss of parking.</p> <p>A build out could not be provided opposite Nos. 44-50 Lower Road because of potential road safety issues arising from the physical layout of the road.</p> <p>Another issue to be considered is that even if a build out were to be provided with dropped kerbs at the junction of Cecil Terrace the footway it links into is sub-standard and would remain difficult to use for wheelchair users and mothers with prams.</p> <p>CATG comments:  PS advised that issue 2500 and issue 2539 below were effectively the same issue. This was not prioritised by the SCC, and members felt that pedestrians/wheelchair users should not be encouraged to use dropped kerbs/buildout to access a substandard footway</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding  If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>
<p><b>Issue 2539: Lower Road (where Broken Bridges footpath meets Lower Road) – footpath/dropped kerbs - £5,000</b></p> <p>It would not be possible to provide a dropped kerb opposite the exit from the Broken Bridges path due to the existing footway width being too narrow to provide a dropped kerb with a DDA compliant 1 in 12 gradient.</p> <p>It would be possible to provide a build out outside No. 65 Lower Road if the group felt this to be of benefit. Doing so would likely result in the loss of parking.</p> <p>Another issue to be considered is that even if a build out were to be provided with dropped kerbs opposite the exit from the Broken Bridges path the footway it links into is sub-standard and would remain difficult to use for wheelchair users and mothers with prams.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding  If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p><b>Issue 2684: Odstock Road - Controlled crossing near bus stop adjacent to Ambulance Station - £800 - £1,000</b></p> <p>This issue should be linked with Issue No. 2900.</p> <p>PS advised: It is recommended that a pedestrian crossing assessment be undertaken on Odstock Road between its junctions with Coombe Road and Heronswood. This assessment will identify where and what type of crossing facility is suitable based on the pedestrian crossing movements currently taking place.</p> <p>One possible improvement that could be undertaken is the removal of two large bushes at the rear of the Ambulance Station on Odstock Road. Doing so would improve visibility of vehicles travelling down the hill for pedestrians looking to cross from the bus shelter to Ridings Mead.</p> <p>CATG Comments: PS advised that Issue 2684 and 2900 need to be considered as one scheme as cannot have two controlled crossings here. Unlikely that it would meet formal crossing criteria. Would need to do a crossing assessment and see what is necessary at this location.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that the crossing assessment for these schemes proceed (Issue 2684 and Issue 2900 be considered as one scheme) which was carried.</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding (£1k)</p>
<p><b>Issue 2900: Ridings Mead – Zebra Crossing - £0.00</b></p> <p>Please refer to comments in response to issue 2684.</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding – see above</p>
<p><b>Issue 2868: Devizes Road, nr Highbury Ave – Pedestrian Crossing - £500</b></p> <p>PS advised: A pedestrian crossing assessment previously undertaken in relation to this request recommend that there was insufficient demand to provide a formal crossing facility and it was not possible provide an informal facility without obstructing turning manoeuvres from private driveways. The possible introduction of an additional bus stop on Roman Road has been identified as a possible solution to this issue as it would reduce the number of people who have to cross Devizes Road to access the existing bus stop.</p> <p>The installation of an additional bus stop on Roman Road is technically possible, subject to confirmation that the bus company are happy for a bus to be stop at the agreed location.</p> <p>CATG comments:</p> <p>MW A resident would appreciate having a bus stop here – opposite a surgery</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that a bus stop should be installed on Roman Road which was carried</p>	<p>Recommended for CATG funding (£500)</p>
<p><b>Issue 2538: Lower Road – footpath requirement - £0.00</b></p> <p>PS advised: The provision of a footway at the requested location would be extremely difficult to achieve. The provision of a footway would require that all parking be removed from this section of Lower Road which is likely to be unpopular with local residents. The provision of a footway might make maintaining two traffic flow impossible. If two way traffic flow could not be maintained a one way system would need to be introduced resulting in long diversions for residents possibly involving Church Lane, A36 Wilton Road and Cherry Orchard Lane. Again this is likely to prove</p>	

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)**  
**Action Notes of Meeting**  
**07 August, 2013**

<p>unpopular.</p> <p>CATG comments:  PS advised that local councillors, via their parish newsletter, might like to undertake consultation with local residents to gauge the level of support for the provision of a footpath at this location before any further work is undertaken. If there is support for the provision of a footpath then the CATG group could consider whether or not it wishes to fund such a scheme.</p> <p>MW commented that the need to remove parking and possibly introduce a one way system would likely get very limited, if any, support from local residents. MW recommend that this scheme should be removed from the list and she would like to pursue addressing problems in Lower Bemerton through the introduction of a 20mph zone.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme at this time which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding  If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>
<p><b>Issue 2571: Junction of York Road/Devizes Road – Improve the junction - £0.00</b></p> <p>PS advised: Tom Gardner, Highways had previously advised that there were very few modifications to enable traffic to exit York Road on to Devizes Road more easily that could take place without major junction realignment and signalling alterations. This would need to be undertaken in collaboration with the Highways Agency as they control the A36. Any solution would be outside the budget of the CATG, and probably outside the budget of Substantive CATG fund.</p> <p>It may be possible to investigate how the one-way system is managed within the York Road area to enable better access to Devizes Road from other streets. This could include, for example, reversing the one-way order on Gas Lane thus enabling vehicles to legally exit at this point rather than at York Road.</p> <p>CATG comments:  MW advised that the City Council had commented that there could be some redesign on the roundabout as part of the Salisbury Transport Plan so there might be some scope to do something here.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that further investigation and consultation with residents (Cllr Clewer) should take place before any funding was committed to this scheme which was carried.</p>	<p>Not recommended for funding at this time.  Cllr Richard Clewer to do further investigation and consultation with residents</p>
<p><b>Issue 2819: Macklin Road – request for one-way system - £0.00</b></p> <p>PS advised: Technically a one way system could be introduced but this wouldn't address the problem raised as the introduction of a one way system is likely to result in an increase in the speed of traffic using Macklin Road as motorists would know that they won't meet traffic travelling in the opposite direction. Therefore no road safety benefit would be accrued.</p> <p>There is a play area in the centre of Macklin Road which can be used by children playing as opposed to children playing in the road..</p> <p>CATG Comments:  TW advised of plans to improve the play area which will encourage children to use the play area and not the road.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that a metro count be undertaken in Macklin Road to determine the volume and speed of traffic using the road to identify if additional traffic calming measures are necessary. The scheme should stay on the list. This was carried.</p>	<p>Not recommended for funding at this time.  Scheme remains on list  Metro count to be undertaken</p>

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p><b>Issue 2890: New Canal, St Catherine Street – Pedestrian crossing - £0.00</b></p> <p>PS advised: The recent works undertaken in New Canal reduced the crossing width at the eastern end of the road from 10 to 8 metres which should make it slightly easier for pedestrians to cross at this location.</p> <p>A previous report looking at possible improvements at the Catherine Street / New Canal / Queen Street / Milford Street junctions recommended 4 way signalisation. The cost of this work is likely to be in the region £500,000 and would be outside of the remit of the CATG. However, this work would only be considered by the council should road safety deteriorate at this location. The council will continue to monitor this area as part of its road safety duties.</p> <p>CATG comments: PF asked if there had been an accident here recently? PS There was an accident here but they are few and far between. Very few accidents happen at this junction considering the volume of people crossing. PR said that as you come out of Catherine Street, any form of signage would be useful that would make people look right and left, stop and look. There might not be any accidents but people and cyclists are really hesitant.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried with one abstention.</p> <p>PS to look at potential of signage to alert both pedestrians motorists to stop and look before they cross.</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p> <p>PS to look at signage</p>
<p><b>Issue 2908: Junction of Harnham Road and Old Blandford Road - Tarmac on grass section of bus stop area</b></p> <p>PS advised: Having inspected the verge I believe that generally it is in reasonable condition and appears not to be subject to regular overrunning by vehicles – I can supply photos taken in July 2013 of the verge for reference. There is a rut in the verge that has been created by a vehicle over-running it. I would suggest that the best way forward is to fill in the rutted area with earth and plant some grass seed. Given the general condition of the verge it would seem to be overkill at this time to replace the grass surface with a tarmac surface. This is an issue for the council's Highways Maintenance Team and as such I have asked them to undertake the remedial measures suggested above.</p> <p>CATG Comment:</p> <p>All in favour of removing scheme from list. PS advised should the condition of the verge deteriorate in the future then a request to replace the grass verge with a tarmac one can be resubmitted.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>
<p><b>Issue 1768: Improvements to the crossing facilities close to Queensberry Road.</b></p> <p>PS advised that there is an existing narrow pedestrian refuge close to the bottom of Queensberry Road that is protected by a large hatched area which should afford pedestrians a reasonable level of safety when using it. There is an existing signal controlled pedestrian crossing facility nearby at the junction of Castle Road and Stratford Road which could be used as part of a safe route to South Wilts Grammar School (SWGS). The route to SWGS via the pedestrian refuge measures approximately 276 metres and the route via the signal controlled crossing measures approximately 356 metres.</p>	



**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p>There have been no recorded collisions resulting in personal injury as a result of people using the pedestrian refuge at this location in the last 5 years.</p> <p>Whilst it would be possible to widen the existing refuge it would be difficult to justify doing so given the road safety record at this location and the presence of alternative crossing facilities.</p> <p>CATG Comment:</p> <p>It was felt given the presence of alternative pedestrian crossing facilities that it would be sensible to remove this scheme from the list</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved not to proceed with this scheme which was carried</p>	<p>Not recommended for CATG funding If recommendation ratified at the Board, MD to remove from List, advise outcome on Issues Log and close issue</p>
<p><b>Further Business</b></p> <p>The Chair advised that following a discussion with the Chair of the Salisbury Area Board, Cllr Ricky Rogers, it was felt that due to the large volume of transport schemes that require funding and a limited CATG budget, that a request should be made to the Salisbury Area board to move some funding from the core grant budget to the CATG budget in order that more transport schemes are actioned. The Chair asked members to comment. All were in favour.</p> <p>MD advised the Chair and the group that the grant budget and the CATG budget were delegated from different departments, for instance, the grant budget from Communities and the CATG budget from Highways which also meant they were the responsibility of different budget holders. This might cause some difficulty. MD said she would speak to the Head of Governance about the request to move funding from one budget to another and advise the Chair accordingly.</p> <p>MW said she was concerned that only a small proportion of the annual highways budget is delegated to Area Boards, and that approximately 80% is spent without local people's knowledge. MW felt that CATG should look into this. TW advised that most highways schemes planned can be found on the Salisbury Area Board website under Salisbury Highway Information, see link provided below: <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council/areaboards/salisburyareaboard.htm">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council/areaboards/salisburyareaboard.htm</a></p> <p><b>Action:</b> The Chair moved that funding be removed from the grant budget to the CATG budget subject to permissions from the Head of Governance which was carried.</p>	<p>MD to speak to Steve Milton about budgets</p>
<p><b>5. Repair &amp; Maintenance, Roads &amp; Pavements</b> Tim Woolford, Area Manager, Highways &amp; Streetscene updated the meeting as follows:</p> <p>Resurfacing of carriageways</p> <p>September – Blue Boar Row, night works; Wainalong Road; Castle Street (from roundabout south under the bridge, night works)</p> <p>Early 2014 – Exeter and Brown Street, work is likely to be completed on Sundays. We are going to try to include Winchester Street in these works.</p> <p>Essex Square and Norfolk Street, we are waiting for confirmation of dates for resurfacing</p> <p>The Chair asked TW to speak to Graham Axtell about a dropped kerb on Norfolk Road, which was a serious hazard for a disabled resident, causing her to tip out of her</p>	

**Salisbury Community Area Transport Group (CATG)  
Action Notes of Meeting  
07 August, 2013**

<p>wheelchair into oncoming traffic.</p> <p>PR asked who she should ring for problems about overgrown shrubs. TW advised she ring Customer Services or Clarence. MD to send PR the link to Clarence. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/parkingtransportandstreets/roadshighwayspavements/reporahighwayproblem.htm">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/parkingtransportandstreets/roadshighwayspavements/reporahighwayproblem.htm</a></p> <p>PD alerted TW of a missing white line at the north end of the central car park, off millstream approach. TW noted this.</p> <p>The Chair thanked TW for his report.</p>	<p>Marianna to send Pam the link</p>
<p><b>7. Any other business</b></p> <p><b>20mph zones.</b> PS advised members of the group consultation on the council's proposed new policy on the introduction 20mph speed limits was currently ongoing and would continue until mid September. If members wish to view and find out how they can comment on the policy, they can do so via the below: <a href="http://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=847">http://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=847</a></p>	<p>All to consider commenting on the policy</p>
<p><b>8. Dates for future meetings</b> The next two meetings will be held on: Friday, 18 October at 10am. Thursday, 12 December at 2pm</p> <p>Venues to be advised.</p>	<p>Marianna</p>