

Devizes Community Area Transport Group – 27<sup>th</sup> July 2021 – Notes

IN PROGRESS	APPROVED – AWAITING SLOT	AWAITING UPDATE - X	AWAITING REMOVAL
Project approved & underway	Project approved but awaiting available resources	Project not yet approved and requires further input	Project to be removed by mutual agreement or failure to progress

	Item	Progress to Date	Actions and Recommendations	Who
1	Apologies and Attendees	<p><b>Apologies:</b> None</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Richard Culverhouse (Poulshot PC); Rebekah Jefferies (Rowde PC); Cllr Caroline West, (Erlestoke PC); Cllr Chris Greenwood (Devizes TC); Cllr Chris Saunders (Easterton PC); Cllr Julia Ford (West Lavington PC); Rosalind Humphries (Bromham PC); Cllr Terry James, Sue Bond (Seend PC); Cllr Chris Hall (Cheverell Magna PC); Cllr Richard Slack (Worton PC); Hannah Beckett (Bulkington PC); Cllr Dominic Muns (Chair), Cllr Philip Whitehead, Cllr Kelvin Nash, Gareth Rogers, Richard Dobson, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council)</p>		
2	Notes of last meeting	Notes from the Devizes CATG meeting on 25 <sup>th</sup> May were published at part of the agenda for Devizes Area Board’s meeting on 21 <sup>st</sup> June 2021: <a href="https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=163&amp;MId=13880&amp;Ver=4">https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=163&amp;MId=13880&amp;Ver=4</a>		
3	Financial Position	<p>Budget Available - <b>£16,447.97</b></p> <p><b>The allocation for 2021/22 is £15,984.</b></p> <p>Note: Order Values are subject to change</p>		
5	Top 5 Priority Schemes			

a)	<p><b>Issue 6120</b>  <b>Lydeaway - Request for speed limit reduction</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.01)</b></p>	<p><i>The speed limit or rather the lack of on the A 342 road between Lydeaway and Stert village entrance. When exiting the entrance of The Clock Inn Park the visibility is poor in both directions. Seeing that a lot of money has been spent on the work carried out in recent months on the renovation of the pathway between The Clock Inn Park and the entrance to Stert village which means more of the people from The clock Inn Park are using the pathway some of which have mobility scooters are finding it very difficult in crossing the road because of the speed of traffic which in some cases is in excess of the 60 miles per hour limit. In the last year there has been one accident of a car exiting The Clock Inn Park which in this case no one was hurt the police were not informed but both cars were written off. There are slow signs on the road and also illuminated 'slow down' signs before the 's' bends and the entrance to Stert village these do not seem to be effective.</i></p> <p>Stert PC have confirmed a contribution of £500 to the request.</p> <p>Atkins have completed the Speed Limit The assessment has concluded that a 50mph restriction can be considered. Indicative cost £6,000</p> <p>WH stated that the contribution which Stert PC agreed to make is £500 not £1,000 as listed within the budget. DM wanted to push through this project and was happy to accept this level of contribution from Stert PC. GR was happy to go ahead with this level.</p> <p>Scheme has been added to 2021/22 Programme and will be developed.</p>	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here.	In Progress
b)	<p><b>Issue 5964</b>  <b>Devizes, Rotherstone Speeding</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.02)</b></p>	<p>Initial issue description:</p> <p><i>The roads in Devizes SN10 2BJ area, Avon Terrace from Shopmobilty to Rotherstone cemetery is used as a race track. The speeds people do is ridiculous. I've spoken with few residents and all are for a speed watch group to happen. Its recently turn to 20mph but people are speeding more mounting pavements. Won't be long before some gets serious hurt.</i></p> <p>Open meeting held to discuss options. Town Council sent out follow up consultation questionnaire to all residents and following the results of this have sent a response stating that:</p>	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here with implementation due in October '21.	In Progress

		<p><i>"The Town Council supports a resident's request for Rotherstone to be made a no through road with one end being closed to motorised traffic and would ask the Community Area Transport Group to undertake the necessary work to determine the most suitable location for the closure for a viable of the scheme"</i></p> <p>Devizes TC have confirmed support for proposal and requested that the proposal proceeds.</p> <p>Initial Discussion with Police has indicated continued support with the condition of a physical feature enforcing restriction. Development costs - £3,000. KN confirms DTC's contribution towards the project.</p> <p>The TRO has been advertised and signed off by the Cabinet member for Highways. A resident had raised an issue, which has gone to the Council's legal team who feel this does not need to go any further and the resident has been informed.</p> <p>Implementation programmed for October 21. TC &amp; Local Member Informed.</p> <p>Implementation costs estimated at £6,000. Devizes TC to contribute 25%.</p>		
c)	<p><b>Issue 6-19-02</b> (Previously known as Issue 6569)</p> <p><b>Footway at Tanis, Conscience Lane, Rowde</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.03)</b></p>	<p>RJ asked about the Issue (6569) recorded to create a new footway from houses at Tanis on Conscience Lane to the A342. The parish council supports this request.</p> <p>An initial ballpark estimates of £6,000 provided to enable development of scheme. Awaiting RPC to confirm acceptance of need to contribute 25% of the development costs, ahead of 2020/21 Substantive CATG Bid.</p> <p>Rowde PC now confirm their 25% contribution Initial discussion with BT for Service diversion has indicated costs of circa £30,000. Alternative solution being discussed with WC Estates to dedicate some of adjacent field and relocate hedgerow ongoing.</p> <p>CATG confirms this can stay on the list of projects and can still go towards future Substantive CATG bid in 21/22. Briefing note has been circulated announcing</p>	DM described this as progressing towards a bid to Substantive funding. GR confirms he had all he needs to put in a bid in time for the deadline of 21 <sup>st</sup> September	In Progress

		<p>deadline for bids 21<sup>st</sup> September 2021.</p> <p>PB was not aware of the additional cost raised by the BT services found. She was just keen for this project to go ahead and connect the households at Tanis. GR said this cost does not have to stop the project. He described how the Substantive Scheme works to fund larger projects.</p> <p>PB asked if the route could be altered to avoid these services and save this additional cost. GR replied that it will be difficult to provide a safe route and there is a maintenance liability going onto 3<sup>rd</sup> party land.</p> <p>PW felt this needs to go to the Substantive fund. It was confirmed Rowde PC's contribution stays the same.</p>		
d)	<p><b>Issue Ref 06-20-01</b></p> <p><b>Bromham</b></p> <p><b>A342</b></p> <p><b>Request for Village Signs.</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.04)</b></p>	<p><i>Due to the decline in village shops the Parish Council would like to request brown signs indicating 'Village Shops' to be located on the A342 at the Roughmoor Junction and Pound Junctions to indicate that there are shops in the village centre.</i></p> <p>Tourist Signs (Brown Signs) are not permitted for this type of feature, however traditional road signs can be considered to direct point to village amenities. CATG Agreed to prioritise, and a proposal drawing and budget estimate to be prepared.</p> <p>Draft proposal has been sent to PC. Indicative cost is circa £1700.</p> <p>GR confirmed there are signs that will do what Bromham wants.</p> <p>RH confirmed Bromham PC will contribute £425 (25% of £1,700). CATG was happy to go move forward.</p> <p>Works have been ordered</p>	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here.	In Progress
e)	<p><b>Issue 6675</b></p> <p><b>A342 Bromham</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.05)</b></p>	<p><i>Bromham Parish Council would like to put in motion a speed restriction on the A342 from South of the Calne A3102 50/40mph speed restriction to the St Edith's Marsh 30 MPH restriction. This length of the A342 is now a 60MPH road with frequent occurring accidents which can be backed up by local police and a freedom of information request for the crash map information for accidents. This stretch of road starting at the Calne junction has the following: Farm shop, Residential properties, Chittoe junction - poor visibility. The Audi Garage, Residential properties, The A3102 Melksham junction with Collins Veg. Shop - minor accidents happen here on a regular basis not always police recorded- V P</i></p>	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here. GR confirmed he has spoken with the contractors and speed limit reviews can now resume. RH asked whether it made a difference that the current change in limit is 60mph to	In Progress

		<p><i>Collins Vegetables at 81 Devizes Road can support this. ACCIDENT SPOT; Double bends. ACCIDENT SPOT; New Farm and Digester entrance to A J Butlers Farm - between the double bends. Cross road junction to Highfield village centre and Roughmoor. Roughmoor 9 residential properties plus A J Butlers main Farm access and Open Reach telecom building. ACCIDENT SPOT; Cross road junction to Yard lane and The Pound village centre. ACCIDENT SPOT; Hawkstreet junction. A speed restriction has been requested on two previous occasions but without response. Bromham Parish Council ask that this request is seriously considered by that appropriate team.</i></p> <p>Speed Limit Assessment discussed at Nov 19 Meeting. Bromham PC to consider and advise if the wish to proceed with requesting a speed limit assessment. GR sent further information to PC 17.12.19. Awaiting BPC response on whether to proceed &amp; contribution.</p> <p>RH will have to check with BPC if they can contribute 50%. GR confirmed this can go ahead but report might not show what BPC wants to see happen.</p> <p>RH has confirmed that BPC are only prepared to contribute 25% of the assessment cost. Decision required as to whether the group wish to proceed.</p> <p>The level of contribution from the parish council had previously been a sticking point. DM was happy to go ahead with a 25% contribution, as offered by Bromham PC. GR was happy to go forward with this.</p> <p>Atkins have been holding Speed Limit assessments in abeyance due to pandemic related issues. GR is awaiting confirmation this have been removed, and Atkins will be instructed to commence with assessment.</p>	<p>30mph and if this is normal. Would it make a difference wanting a reduction to a 50mph limit instead?</p> <p>GR replied that there is nothing to suggest a limit cannot change from 60mph to 30, so this is part of the speed limit review.</p>	
f)	<p><b>06-20-21</b></p> <p><b>Devizes TC</b></p> <p><b>Request for 20mph Limit – Area 3</b></p> <p><b>(Priority No.06)</b></p>	<p><i>Access through this residential area is often used as a rat run, as it bypasses traffic congestion in New Park Street leading to rat run mentality. Commercial Road from the junction at the Sainsbury Mini Roundabout to Rotherstone, the whole of Couch Lane, the whole of New Park Road and the whole of Victoria Road all have high concentrations of pedestrian and frequent parking manoeuvres, therefore a 20mph speed limit would be more appropriate for this area.</i></p> <p><i>We would call this Zone Three, 20mph speed limit. See attached plan</i></p>	<p>DM described this as being all in place for assessments to begin in the smaller, individual areas. KN asked if there is still a delay in setting the Metrocounts. GR replied that for these assessments, they are handled differently and shouldn't be an issue.</p>	In Progress

		<p>KN spoke about how Devizes TC had looked at assessing the whole town centre for 20mph and wanted to know that CATG was happy with this and GR is in the conversation.</p> <p>RG asked about a contribution. GR has spoken to Simon Fisher about this and recommended splitting the request into 4, hence the several requests here. RG asked if CATG is happy to put 75% of costs to the assessment for the entire area. KN is happy with this.</p> <p>There were concerns about the cost of implementation, especially for such a large area. GR said this could be broken down into stages, although there was a risk some costs, such as adverts, might be repeated if that was the case.</p> <p>RG asked CATG to agree funds for the 20mph assessment (£2,500) and the group agreed to make the whole area a priority.</p> <p>KN confirmed the funding from the town council has been agreed. They are looking at getting the 1<sup>st</sup> assessment as a priority to begin this process. GR pointed out the consultants, Atkins, have a list of projects and are moving forward countywide, so progress will be made in next couple of months.</p> <p>Assessment work is ongoing.</p>		
	<p><b>06-20-22</b></p> <p><b>Devizes TC</b></p> <p><b>Request for 20mph Limit – Area 1</b></p>	<p><i>Long Street, St Johns Street, the Highstreet, Market Place and Station Road are access to the town centre but are often used as a rat run, as it is shorter route to get through the town than preferred arterial route of New Park Street, which in turn leads to a rat run mentality. All these roads have high concentrations of pedestrian and frequent parking manoeuvres, therefore a 20mph speed limit would be more appropriate for this area.</i></p> <p><i>We would call this Zone One, 20mph speed limit. See attached plan</i></p>	Linked to Issues Ref (f)	In Progress
	<p><b>06-20-23</b></p> <p><b>Devizes TC</b></p> <p><b>Request for 20mph Limit – Area 2</b></p>	<p><i>The whole of Bridewell Street, the whole of Hare and Hounds Street, the whole of Sheep Street, the whole of Sidmouth Street, the whole of Maryport Street and the whole of Monday Market Street are either within the main shopping area of the town or are the feeder road into this area and as such all have high concentrations of pedestrian and frequent parking manoeuvres and therefore a 20mph speed limit would be more appropriate for this area.</i></p>	Linked to Issues Ref (f)	In Progress

		<i>We would call this Zone Two, 20mph speed limit. See attached plan</i>		
	<b>06-20-24</b> <b>Devizes TC</b> <b>Request for 20mph Limit – Area 4</b>	<i>There has been a 20mph zone implemented for the Brickley Lane area for time, however Church Walk was missed off that scheme. It meets all the same criteria as Bickley Lane and is a feeder road into this wider scheme, therefore we believe it should have its speed limit reduced to 20mph.</i> <i>We would call this Zone Four, 20mph speed limit. See attached plan</i>	Linked to Issues Ref (f)	<b>In Progress</b>
g)	<b>06-20-18</b> <b>Market Lavington</b> <b>Request for Dropped Kerbs</b> <b>(Priority No.7)</b>	<i>There are several key locations in the village where the absence of dropped-kerbs means that anyone using a mobility scooter, wheelchair, or a pram, would find it impossible to manoeuvre on and off the pavement safely. This can either result in mobility scooter users having to make long detours to reach their destination, or having to use the road itself as a means of getting from one dropped-kerb to the next, which in some cases can be a significant distance away.</i>  <i>In order to help ensure the safety of everyone using the pavements, the Parish Council would like to request the installation of a number of dropped-kerbs at key locations in the Village (document attached with details of proposed locations). Could we please ask that this matter be submitted via the CATG committee, with a request for support towards the cost and installation of the dropped-kerbs. The Parish Council recognises that it will be required to contribute to the final cost.</i>  <i>5 Locations have been identified.</i>  <i>FD spoke about 5 locations in the village where wheeled access is not good – there are places with old and unsuitable pavements. GR said that CATG could take this on and gave an estimate of £750-1,000 per dropped kerb. With an economy of scale, this could come to approx. £4,000 for the whole scheme. GR will need to take a look at each location.</i>  <i>FD described this as centred on The Spring and Park Rd. They are targeting new dropped kerbs where wheelchair users are in the village. FD confirmed the parish’s contribution at 50% of the estimated cost of £4,000 or capped at £2,000. GR has a map from the PC of the proposed locations. CATG Agreed to</i>	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here. GR mentioned that one location is not on the Highway so is not eligible for action by CATG but he is working with the PC to still enable this one to go ahead.	<b>In Progress</b>

		commit balance of funds.  Programmed Construction for late August / Early September. GR has advised one location can not be brought forward as its outside of the Highway.		
h)	<b>06-20-17</b>  <b>Bromham</b>  <b>Request for Pedestrians in road Warning Sign</b>  <b>(Priority No. 8)</b>	<i>A request for new signs at the Pound and Horsepool to make drivers aware that there is no footpath/pedestrians in road?</i> RH was not aware of the agreement to fund 100% but is happy to fund 25%. PW felt many parts of Wiltshire do not have pavements so new signage adds to street clutter. He wanted to be re-assured the parish council is behind this request. DM was happy to go ahead and fund if this is what Bromham PC want. RH confirmed it is. GR said how engineers are recommended to keep signage to a minimum and how it increases liability on Wiltshire Highways.  Scheme added to the programme for 21/22.	DM described this project with funding agreed and being in progress as per the notes here.  DM pointed out there are still <b>eight</b> high priority projects on CATG's list when the intention is to work on <b>five</b> at any one time.	In Progress
<b>6.</b>	<b>Other priority schemes</b>			
a)				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Outstanding / Open issues</b>			
a)	<b>Issue 6736</b> <b>Market Lavington;</b> <b>Ledge Hill /</b> <b>Broadway</b> <b>Request for speed limit reduction</b>	<i>Cars driving too fast down Road that we live on Location Spin Hill Broadway Market Lavington SN10 5RH Cars and motorbikes speed up coming down hill to sometimes 70-100 miles an hour... the road bends in parts is relatively a short length of Road with a very dangerous junction at the end known as black dog junction where drivers have to stop. Currently the speed limit is 40 turning into 60 miles an hour - which does not make sense considering there are 6 residential homes various offices and businesses with vehicles entering and exiting throughout the day. There have been various incidents in the last 2 years... two cases of cars losing control driving into my gateway and telephone poll - causing a loss of telephone service and internet for 7 days - also the spot where my children have to stand waiting for their school bus - if they had been there they would have been killed 2 cars driving into the ditch where they have lost control on a bend a collision between two cars as one was leaving a small lane and</i>	DM pointed out this request had been on the agenda for some time without a great deal of progress. He felt that a SID here might help. He is also aware Market Lavington PC is having discussions about this in the background. DM felt that because this is open countryside, persistent speeders will continue to do so. There was no one from Market Lavington PC present so this was	Awaiting update



	<p><i>visibility is difficult caused by car driving too fast down the Road. These are the only ones I have witnessed and I am sure there have been more. And more recently my neighbour walking her dog was killed - both herself and large Labrador were both killed. We are still waiting to fully find out the full story but knowing where it happened I have witnessed many drivers going too fast around a difficult bend - I am sure it was down to negligent driving. It also does not make sense that such a small Road with bends throughout with residencies businesses etc. is marked as a national speed limit when the main Road from Devizes to Lavington is at 50 miles an hour Currently it is too dangerous for us to walk outside our home - even mowing my lawn is dangerous we are unable to walk to our local village which is just up the road.</i></p> <p>Awaiting information as to whether this is supported by the Parish Council Police investigation was concluded, and Coroner Inquest held (May 2019). No recommendations to the Highway Authority made.</p> <p>IM described the different speed limits at Ledge Hill, the accidents and it has no footpath. Residents have asked for a speed limit reduction all along length. In particular, there is a need to reduce the 40mph to 30mph, followed by the 60mph to 50mph. He asked the group to consider this.</p> <p>RG asked if there is space for a new footpath? With development happening there, money could be found to create this. IM said that this has been looked at, but he was not aware of the findings.</p> <p>FD mentioned ideas like permissive paths for walkers and the PC is working with CATG towards a new 40mph limit at the bottom of Ledge Hill. Residents there feel 60mph is not appropriate and want it reduced. There are 13 businesses and 8 residential properties there. FD wanted this left on as this is desired when an opportunity arises, and funding becomes available.</p> <p>FD described the background and the area of concern from the railway bridge to Broadway Farm. So far only drivers have been involved in incidents, not businesses or householders.</p> <p>FD wanted to concentrate on speed at Broadway. The parish council's position is that they want the speed limit changed to 50 or even 40mph as they feel that suits the road conditions, although they will leave the final speed to engineers.</p> <p>GR described that to achieve a lower limit, the road will need a speed limit review, to be carried out by Atkins at a fix cost of £2,500. It is up to CATG to agree to spend that money. GR felt that a 50mph limit was possible but said that</p>	<p>left for next meeting.</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------	--

		<p>this might not see a great reduction in overall speed or driver behaviour. DM put this back to FD. He felt this could have two effects – some drivers would go more slowly and it would allow enforcement of the lower speed limit to take place.</p> <p>FD went back to the group for a decision on allocating funding. PW was happy to do this. GR confirmed the funding split would be 75:25 from CATG and the parish council.</p>		
b)	<p><b>Issue 6881</b>  <b>A342 Lydeaway, Planks Farm Speed Limit reduction request.</b></p>	<p><i>As a safety measure to prevent death or serious injury we would like the current 50 mph reduced to 40mph as we believe that a contributory factor to the serious accidents which have already occurred is the speed. A cost-effective solution of reducing the speed limit by 10 mph will not stop those that speed regularly but even regular speeders are reticent to go very far above set limits. We suggest that the area of the A342 be from Lydeaway past Wedhampton to Chirton. This section of road has very tight bends and highly used junctions. This small measure we believe will lessen the chance of a fatality along this section of the A342.</i></p>	<p>This is linked to issue 6120 as discussed above.  GR wanted this issue left separately on the list.</p>	
c)	<p><b>Issue Ref 06-19-11</b>  <b>Potterne</b>  <b>Blounts Court</b>  <b>Request junction altered to form a Mini-Roundabout</b></p>	<p><i>Improvements require to previously agreed formal crossing</i></p> <p><i>Request the junction with the A360 &amp; Blount's Court is altered with the introduction of a min-roundabout and associated kerb line alterations. This will enable alterations to be made to the crossing point to improve visibility for pedestrians crossing in the vicinity of the George &amp; Dragon PH.</i></p> <p>GR confirmed that the issue has been logged. It will be for the PC to prioritise their schemes given the budget availability. PPC have done so and will revisit the scheme in due course once other priorities have been concluded.</p> <p>JM felt nothing can be done at the moment. He asks for any ideas for solutions from CATG about the pinch-points and speeding within the village. JM said that Potterne PC is still discussing but want these issues to stay on the list.</p> <p>No one from Potterne PC was present. PW asked for an estimate on a new mini roundabout. GR said this could be £20-25,000 but depending on any services</p>	<p>At a previous meeting, CATG went back to Potterne PC for an outcome but no one has been present for the last two meetings. GR had not heard anything either. DM felt the group cannot direct work on this project if the PC is not present.  DM asked GR that if this project is removed from the CATG but further work is done by the PC, can it then be added back? GR agreed that with 18 pages already on the agenda, if projects that have not moved forward for several meetings</p>	<p><b>To be removed</b></p>

		found during the work, could reach 6 figures.	can be removed, that will help. They can be added back if progress is then made. CATG agreed to remove this from the list.	
d)	<b>06-20-05</b> <b>A360 Potterne</b> <b>High Street</b> <b>Priority working system</b>	<p><i>Concern regard safety of pedestrians crossing the A360 at the informal crossing site between Blount's Court and the George and Dragon Public House due to poor sight lines and a lack of signage. Porch House is a Grade 1 listed building and despite a barrier in front of the building, it has been hit by passing lorries on several occasions.</i></p> <p><i>Considerable discussion has already taken place on various ways to improve pedestrian safety, particularly at the Blounts Court to George &amp; Dragon crossing, and to protect Porch House from damage by vehicles while also improving its environment.</i></p> <p><i>An option to improve both issues is to build a pavement from the Blount's Court crossing site to Porch House and move the crossing site to outside Porch House. To do this a more substantial protective 'island' could be created outside Porch House and on the opposite side of the High Street to form a safer crossing site across the A360. This would necessitate a one lane priority system but that would also help with traffic calming and the new pavement would improve the safety of vehicles exiting from Coxhill Lane (which is especially busy in the Summer because of the large, thriving cricket club).</i></p> <p><i>The loss of some parking places on the High Street would need consideration. RG will speak with John Mann of PPC. He felt this cannot be solved by CATG within its budget.</i></p> <p><i>JM said that Potterne PC is still discussing but want these issues to stay on the list.</i></p>	DM felt this project was at the same state as the one above. CATG agreed to remove this from the list.	To be removed
e)	<b>06-20-06</b> <b>A360 Potterne / Potterne Wick Junction</b>	<p><i>Sightlines at the A360/Potterne Wick junction are poor for those exiting the junction onto the A360 north-bound and traffic waiting to turn onto Potterne Wick from the A360 north-bound stands a good chance of being hit from behind due to poor sightlines around the bend in the A360.</i></p> <p><i>Discussion on this matter has already taken place, and it is possible that a mini-roundabout would alleviate the problem.</i></p> <p><i>We will continue discussions, with a view to placing concrete proposals at the next CATG meeting.</i></p> <p><i>RG will speak with John Mann of PPC. He felt this cannot be solved by CATG</i></p>	DM felt this project was at the same state as the one above. CATG agreed to remove this from the list.	To be removed

		<p>within its budget. JM felt the Potterne Wick issue was separate. GR suggested cutting the foliage to improve sight lines and this has been discussed with the landowner. A mini roundabout was suggested. JM said that Potterne PC is still discussing but want these issues to stay on the list.</p>		
f)	<p><b>06-20-16 Bromham</b></p> <p><b>Request for Street Lighting</b></p>	<p><i>In a recent survey the footpath across the Pound allotments - the only footpath from the Pound to the village, is the most used footpath in the village, used by parents and school children, parishioners including residents on buggies from Angell House going to the village shops/centre. It was also highlighted and requested that additional lighting is required. This footpath is across allotment ground a good ½+ mile long with only 3 lights - one at the entrance and 1 at each of the right angles in the path. Trees near the lights also block the light on the path, and the old lights (although just been replaced) were constantly off for periods of time until repaired.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council therefore would like to request a need for additional lighting. GR has looked at this location; it appears to be a footpath across fields. GR felt there could be landowner issues about access and installation. No one from Bromham present, RG wanted to skip this until Bromham can be represented. RH said the parish council would like new street lighting – there had been a survey asking for this and the PC has responded to that. She confirmed this is Crown Estate land. As far as Wiltshire Council is concerned this represents private land. RH said the current footpath had been put in by Wiltshire Council in the 1980s when the school closed.</i></p> <p>GR said this is this not adopted highway which restricts what can be done there. DM asked if Wiltshire Council money can be spent on private land. GR responded that local authority money cannot be spent for ‘private betterment’ and that it is difficult to do work or spend money not on Highways’ land. DM will look at this more closely outside of the meeting and recommended Bromham PC speaks with Crown Estate.</p>	<p>RH said that she had been in contact with the landowner, Crown Estates, and had an encouraging conversation – they suggested solar lighting. As of the meeting date, this is “still under review” by Crown Estate. RH has formally requested this and felt it is slow but still encouraging. DM asked GR about CATG funding to support this? Since it is not on Highways or public land, CATG should not support this and it would be down to the landowner or the PC to provide the new lighting. RH was happy to pursue this with Crown Estate and the PC. DM wanted to remove this from the CATG list and RH agreed.</p>	To be removed
g)	<p><b>09-20-10</b></p> <p><b>A361 Seend High Street.</b></p>	<p><i>There are two dropped kerbs either side of the A361 where the pavement ends each side between Spout Lane and Inmarsh Lane. It is difficult to cross this stretch of road as it is on a bend meaning that walkers cannot easily see cars coming when crossing from the south to the north side.</i></p>	<p>DM reviewed the previous agreements over the contributions from Seend PC. TJ confirmed they are happy to contribute 25% to both the new</p>	Approved – awaiting slot

	<p><b>Concern for Pedestrian Visibility</b></p> <p><i>(Transfer from Melksham CATG)</i></p>	<p><i>There are already dropped kerbs along this stretch of road. A high friction surface similar to the one installed at the Church Crossing would be useful to make drivers more aware that it is a crossing point. It won't improve visibility for the walkers, but may make drivers slow down a bit.</i></p> <p>The Following has previously been provided to Issue at Melksham CATG by Highways Officer:</p> <p>Officers have conducted a site visit and consider this to be more of an issue for outbound drivers as they approach from the s-bend near Spout Lane. The crossing point is more visible to drivers heading in the opposite direction.</p> <p>TJ wanted to see high friction surface and signage here and referenced Mark Stansby's comments when previously with Melksham CATG. GR accepted Mark Stansby's comments and has not looked at this himself but felt outbound drivers would be most affected. The quote for £600 would be just for signage. High friction surface would take that to £2.5-3000. SB agreed to 25% of the £600 but would need to check for a contribution towards £2,500.</p>	<p>signage and high friction surface. DM explained this project was now ready to proceed but needed to be given high priority. Since there are already 8 projects, this couldn't happen at this meeting.</p>	
h)	<p><b>09-21-01</b></p> <p><b>Townsend, Poulshot</b></p> <p><b>Request for new footway.</b></p>	<p><i>As an issue of safety it is requested that a pavement be built between the Church and Townsend farmhouse.</i></p> <p><i>After a request from several parishioners, the Parish Council discussed the idea of a new pavement because of the safety issue of pedestrians using the roadway between the Church and Townsend Farmhouse. There has been a site meeting with Andy Cadwallader resulting in a preliminary costing of £19,000. The Parish Council has also has looked at the costing and other ideas.</i></p> <p>The following has previously been provided to Issue at Melksham CATG by Highways Officer:</p> <p>Construction length is approximately 75m. New Footway with kerbing costs approximately £265 per metre and therefore a ball park estimate is £20K. This does not allow for temporary traffic management and establishment of site welfare facilities. A road closure might also be required.</p>	<p>RC confirmed that Poulshot PC will make the 25% contribution of the £20,000 cost. He wanted <b>RD</b> to visit the site to look at any costs savings such as materials or length of footway. GR pointed out that materials would not change as they are standard for highways works. There was detailed discussion about the length of new footway needed, where it needed to cover and if it could be reduced from 75m. Funding the project was discussed (the 75% of CATG</p>	Awaiting update

		<p>GR quoted a figure of £265 per metre for 75m of footway. RC had not had feedback during the change from Melksham to Devizes CATG.</p> <p>DM asked if Poulshot PC could contribute the 25% of the £20,000 total cost. RC would need to check and ask the parish council for thoughts on how to move forward.</p>	<p>funding is equivalent of a year's budget). DM suggested contributions from local development could support this, but RC didn't think there would be anything suitable. GR mentioned the Substantive Fund and bid process for larger projects. Work is needed to go into a bid to make it good quality and give it a higher chance of success. This usually includes £3-4,000 of CATG funding to reduce what's needed from Substantive funds. DM suggested taking this offline to develop a conversation and for GR to assess this in more detail and rate its chance of success.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>New Issues</b>			
a)	<p><b>06-21-02</b></p> <p><b>W Lavington, Duck Street</b></p> <p><b>Parking Concerns.</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21.</i></p>	<p><i>There have been ongoing parking issues in Duck Street and in particular around Dauntsey's Care Home for a period of time but has become more challenging over the last 6 months. The current inconsiderate parking extends to the end of Duck Street where it meets the main road and therefore at times visibility at the junction is compromised.</i></p> <p><i>Relationships between the home and residents has broken down in terms of communication and the impact being that there is inappropriate parking occurring regularly. The parish council receives complaints from residents and also local farmers who are unable to pass through the road to get to their fields. During April a nurse who came to visit the home had her car damaged whilst it was parked in Duck Street.</i></p> <p><i>The police have been advised and they have said that they need to see the inconsiderate parking when it is actually happening. Photographs have been sent but again the police advise that they need to be there at the time.</i></p> <p><i>A resolution needs to be found for visitors in Duck Street and particularly those visiting Dauntsey's care home and this would be for urgent and short-term</i></p>	<p>DM described how this creates an obstruction at Duck St, especially for emergency vehicles. He felt that double yellow lines here would help make enforcement easier. JF was happy with these discussions. She pointed out the situation had been getting worse and was of high concern in the village.</p> <p>GR pointed out that waiting restrictions are not normally for CATG to deal with but in these extreme circumstances CATG can take this on.</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> – <b>awaiting slot</b></p>

		<p><i>parking.</i></p> <p>The Highway is for passage and repassage of vehicle. Parking on the highway is only tolerated in those scenarios where it does not cause an obstruction. Where an obstruction is caused, or vehicles are ignoring the guidance in the Highway Code (do not park within 10m of a junction) then responsibility lies with the Police. Discussion with the local NPT is recommended if the issue is consistent (Daily)</p> <p>If the desire is to see waiting restriction, this sits outside of the CATG process and is managed via the Network Management Team with a separate process to record requests for waiting / parking restrictions. In this case, given that the issue is being generated locally, there is a risk that it may just exacerbate issues further away.</p>		
b)	<p><b>06-21-03</b></p> <p><b>Erlestoke</b></p> <p><b>Speed Limit Extension</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date</i> <i>27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>The COVID pandemic has meant the number of visitors to Erlestoke has increased manyfold all parking in the village car park and walking out across the B3098 to Erlestoke woods. We have a real issue with overflow parking and with visitors parking on the roads leading to the car park. The crossing point toward the woods is on the B3098 50-mph road and before reaching the 30-mph sign making the crossing dangerous.</i></p> <p><i>The 30-mph sign at the other end of Erlestoke coming from Westbury is placed after the entrance to the Old Vicarage when driving to the village. This means the entrance is again on the B3098 and in a 50-mph limit making this dangerous to drive in and out of the driveway. This together with high banks and trees along the road make the area dangerous.</i></p> <p><u><i>Discussed under AoB At 25/05/21 Meeting</i></u></p> <p>SJ and CW described how the village had seen a large increase in visitors coming to walk in Erlestoke woods during lockdown and the car park at the east end fills quickly. Pedestrians cross the road within the 50mph limit. To protect them and to get cars to slow down earlier, the parish council wants the 30mph limit moved further out from the village on the B3098. They requested a similar move at the west end of the village where driveways open onto the B3098 within the 50mph limit. DM proposed moving this to the July CATG meeting. GR referred to the document 01/04 on village speed limits and how signage too far away from a</p>	<p>CW agreed with the description of the situation and added that the current signs are getting very overgrown. She pointed out that the sign would need moving only 50m further out from the village, both east and west. The 50mph limit currently covers the car park and crossing to Erlestoke woods and several driveways. Metrocounts show that speed within the village is not a concern but on the approaches. GR showed photos from Streetview of the approaches to Erlestoke and recognised the signs may now be overgrown. He described how DfT policy 01/30 (?) states speed limits shouldn't be used to solve issues, such as speeding. So if</p>	<p>Awaiting update</p>

		<p>village can leave drivers wondering why they have to slow down, when they appear to be in open countryside, and not obey the limit.</p>	<p>people are crossing the road, then solutions need to be put in that will help them do so safely instead of simply changing the limit. He said that a speed limit review was the first way to go about getting the limit changed at these locations but he felt a review would not see a change. DM asked how to get a safer crossing from the car park and GR suggested opening up visibility for pedestrians to see the road. <b>RD</b> said he would get someone out to look at sightlines and foliage and cut back if needed.</p> <p>DM also asked about getting an engineer to look on the ground. <b>GR</b> can do so but CATG needed to commit to spending £2,500 on a speed limit review. He understood the PC's priorities but pointed out the costs are fixed, no matter the length of the move of the signage. DM wanted to know what other solutions can go in here before committing to a speed limit review. Metrocounts have been requested of the edges of the village to show approach speeds.</p>	
c)	<p><b>06-21-04</b></p> <p><b>Rowde, Bunnies Lane</b></p>	<p><i>Request for a 'Unsuitable for heavy vehicles' sign at the entrance to Bunnies Lane from the High Street.</i></p> <p><i>Sat Navs are taking heavy articulated lorries to the Common, via Bunnies Lane and the lane is not able to take such large vehicles which then get stuck and</i></p>	<p>DM wanted to know where the HGVs are going – to a development or going through? RJ thought they were going to</p>	<p>To be removed</p>



	<p><b>Unsuitable for HGV Signs</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>cause travel chaos.</i></p> <p><i>Discussed under AoB At 25/05/21 Meeting</i></p> <p><i>PB described this being less than 16ft wide so that parking is an issue and with development taking place, this will become more so. There is also a need to prevent HGVs from trying to go through there. DM was happy to move this onto the agenda of the next meeting to give GR time to look at this.</i></p> <p>Unsuitable for HGV signs are a possibility. Data on the frequency of occurrence's would be useful, as would an understanding of where the Vehicles are attempting to get too, if as stated at the previous meeting it is related to development works.</p> <p>Whilst the signs can be considered, the wider implication of addition infrastructure on the network, along with additional visual intrusion.</p>	<p>The Common and a farm there or maybe as a cut through tom Bromham and Melksham.</p> <p>There are no developments at Bunnies Lane.</p> <p>DM asked the PC to approach the farm to find out if the HGVs are for them. <b>RJ</b> was happy to do that. CG wondered if this traffic could still be waterways traffic for Cock Road and trying to avoid the restrictions on that.</p>	
d)	<p><b>06-21-05</b></p> <p><b>Bulkington</b></p> <p><b>Speed Limit / Speeding</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>Cars are still driving fast upon entering the village, the houses from number 1A onwards are a relatively recent addition to the village. The current 30mph sign is situated 9m from the end wall of the first house of the village. We do not feel like 9m is enough for cars to slow to enter the village safely.</i></p> <p><i>We feel that if the sign were moved further out of the village, in keeping with guidelines, traffic would have enough time to slow to 30mph to enter the village safely.</i></p> <p>The commencement of a speed limit should coincide with the commencement of the change in visual environment to ensure motorist are able to recognise the cognitive features associated with a lower limit. The onus is on the motorist to be travelling at the speed limit at the point in which they pass the signs. Simply extending beyond this point will not alter how motorists drive. Alternative methods to support the current speed limit, such as Community Speed Watch and / or measure which enhance the speed limit such as a gateway are much more effective solutions.</p>	<p>After describing the situation, DM felt this was an enforcement matter for the police or for Community Speedwatch (CSW).</p> <p>HB pointed out the houses were not there when the 30mph sign was first installed, so it wasn't such a problem, but now there are homes just 9m within the 30mph limit. There are also high hedgerows obscuring the signs and prevent drivers seeing the approach to the village.</p> <p>There is also no pavement and on-street parking that narrows the road down to one-way.</p> <p>DM felt moving the signs wouldn't tackle speed so needed enforcement. He described how SIDs and other devices can collect data to be passed to police to help inform their speed checks.</p>	To be removed

			HB asked how to go about getting Metrocounts and SIDs. <b>AJ</b> will send information. DM asked for this to be removed from the CATG list as it will be tackled via enforcement.	
	<p><b>06-21-06</b></p> <p><b>Bulkington</b></p> <p><b>Farm Animal Warning</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>Cows cross over to the pasture multiple times a day, totally blocking the road for traffic. We need cars to be slowing in preparation not only for entering the village at 30mph but also to come to a potential standstill if the cows are on the road, both for the cow's and the farmer's safety. When crossing the road, the cows bring a lot of mud; in dry conditions this can fly up when cars drive fast and in wet conditions it can make the road slippery. The farm entrance is right at the beginning of the village where traffic is still speeding, tractors and other farm vehicles are coming and going regularly from this area.</i></p> <p>In rural environments such as Wiltshire, it is not uncommon to be presented with hazards on the network such as this. Whilst Warning signs may be considered, this should be limited to locations where the visibility is poor and only used in scenarios where the hazard occurs regularly (e.g daily, and all year around). The onus is normally for the farm to undertake this with temporary signs when the hazard is taking place occasionally. Similarly, the onus is on the farm to ensure that debris is cleared from the road.</p>	DM felt this was for the farmer to put up temporary warning signs when needed. HB was happy with this and will feed back to the farmer. DM asked for this to be removed from the CATG list.	To be removed
	<p><b>06-21-07</b></p> <p><b>Bulkington</b></p> <p><b>Lack of Pedestrian Footway / Or Warning of Pedestrians in Road</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>Cars are still driving fast upon entering the village, the houses from number 1A onwards do not have a pavement and excess parking is on the road. When walking into the village they have to walk on the road and go around parked cars while traffic is speeding past. We feel that if warned, traffic can slow down in preparation for entering the village safely and keeping pedestrians walking into the village safe.</i></p> <p>Two Options can be considered in this scenario, and in this order. Firstly, is it possible to provide a pedestrian footway? Is there space available in the highway, or would resident be willing to dedicate land to enable a footway to be constructed?</p> <p>Secondly, it the use of Pedestrians in road signs. As per previous discussion, it is not unexpected in rural villages which have developed over time to find scenarios where footways don't exist. Signs can be erected, but this additional infrastructure to the network and can be seen as visually intrusive.</p>	DM felt that tacking speed via the issue above will help with this one. DM asked for this to be removed from the CATG list	To be removed

	<p><b>06-21-08</b></p> <p><b>Worton</b></p> <p><b>SID Posts/ Sockets</b></p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Date 27/07/21</i></p>	<p><i>There is a large volume of traffic exceeding the speed limit driving through Worton. This is confirmed by the Community Speed Watch figures. In just 11 hours monitoring during April – May, they reported 67 motorists to the police for driving 36 mph and over; a further 228 were found to be driving at less than 36 mph but still breaking the speed limit . During May – June in just 12 hours, 79 motorists were reported to the police for driving 36 mph and over; a further 306 were found to be breaking the speed limit.</i></p> <p><i>Worton Parish Council would like permission to install at least two Speed Indicator Devices at locations to be confirmed with CATG.</i></p> <p><i>Would CATG fund the installation of the necessary posts?</i></p> <p>To Be Discussed.</p>	<p>DM felt SIDs do not work in the long term, or when they are in a single location for a long time. They are best used for short periods and moved around, so that drivers do not become complacent. He gave his thoughts on enforcement and collecting data to be used by police.</p> <p>RS disagreed – his view was that CSW worked in the village and that Metrocount data is fairly positive but that police enforcement is unlikely but speeds are still too high. RS felt that SIDs are effective for most drivers and he recognised there will always be a minority of drivers who will go too fast. Worton PC is committed to installing SIDs and was coming to CATG for support towards the infrastructure. RS thanked GR and AJ for support on SID policy.</p> <p>GR referred to SID policy about frequently moving to new locations. CATG can put in sockets for moveable posts at approx. £500 per site. RS thought there were 4-5 sites in Worton and asked about what contribution is expected if the PC already buys the SID. DM felt this should be 25%. <b>RS</b> will confirm this funding with</p>	<p>Approved – awaiting slot</p>
--	---	--	--	---

			Worton PC	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Other items</b>			
a)	AoB	<p>B3098 Easterton – CS asked about double yellow lines near a T-junction to improve sightlines there. GR said that double yellows can be requested through CATG but will need to be paid for from its budget and they can be expensive for the results seen. Otherwise double yellows can be ordered through Highways in November/December using form WR1. CS asked about a white H-bar and GR was happy for CATG to consider that. CS will put in a new request.</p> <p>DM wanted to remove this from list but CS was no longer on the call.</p> <p>KN asked about Kiln Close in Devizes and residents feeling it is residents only, except for access. GR has looked this up and found this is highway and whilst traffic isn't encouraged to use Kiln Close, there are no restrictions in place.</p> <p>CG asked for information about costs of new white gates for Rowde and about SID sockets to be sent to RJ. He also mentioned the surface at Caen Hill coming away due to the high speed of vehicles now using it. GR and RD could not comment but would feed this back to the team.</p> <p>DM described a new 'Red, Amber, Green' system for labelling the progress of projects as they move through the CATG system. This will be used in the notes from 27/07/2021.</p>		
10	<p><b>Dates of next meetings: 9<sup>th</sup> November 2021 10.00am</b> – this meeting is still likely to be held via MS Teams.  <b>1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 10.00am</b></p>			