

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    | Item   | Update   | Actions and recommendations | Priority<br>A, B or C |
|----|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
|    | <b>Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG)</b> |  |                             |                       |
|    | <b>Date of meeting: Thursday 22nd September 2022</b>                   |  |                             |                       |
| 1. | <b>Attendees and apologies</b>   |  |                             |                       |
|    | Present:   | Cllr James Sheppard, Steve Hind, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Mervyn Hall, Richard Spencer-Williams Marlborough TC); Cllr Martin Phipps (Savernake PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Cllr Sheila Glass (Ramsbury PC); Cllr John Hetherington (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC) |                             |                       |
|    | Apologies:   | Cllr Jane Davies, Cllr Caroline Thomas, Martin Cook (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Rachel Inglefield, (Ogbourne St George PC); Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC)   |                             |                       |
| 2. | <b>Notes of last meeting</b>   |  |                             |                       |
|    |  | The minutes of the previous LHFIG meeting held on the 26 <sup>th</sup> May were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2022<br><br><i>Link can be found at <a href="#">Area Boards</a></i>  |                             |                       |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

### **Comments from the Chair on new Local Highways & Footways Improvement Group (LHFIG) arrangements:**

- 2022/23 Budget decision to move from CATG to Local Highways and Footpaths Improvement Group
- Double the overall budget allocated (£400k to £800k)
- suitable for schemes that improve safety, increase accessibility and sustainability by promoting walking, cycling and public transport and improve traffic management.

**Pedestrian improvements:** including dropped kerbs, new footways, substantive improvements to existing footways, pedestrian crossings (including assessments).

**Cycle improvements:** new cycle paths, cycle parking / storage.

**Bus infrastructure:** new and replacement Shelters (subject to agreement on future maintenance liability), bus border kerbs, bus stop road markings.

**Traffic signing:** new and replacement signs (including signposts), street name plates, village gateways.

**New road markings:** new and replacement of existing markings.

**Speed limits:** assessment and implementation.

**Waiting restrictions:** assessments and implementation.

**Footpath improvements:** styles, gates, surface improvements to rights of ways (council maintainable only).

**Drainage:** minor improvements, new gullies.

**Street lighting:** new installations.

**Traffic management measures:** including Sockets and posts for SID (Speed Indication Device) equipment.

Cannot be used to fund revenue functions, such as routine maintenance schemes or the provision of passenger transport services. As a general rule, an asset should exist at the end of the project, i.e. something new that wasn't there beforehand.

### **Meeting dates and programme**

While we have more budget, funds that are not committed – that is orders placed with contractors for delivery within the current financial year – uncommitted funds will be returned to WC to go into the Substantive Schemes pot. Exceptions will only be allowed when events outside of our control have impacted delivery...although I would hope in this first round there may be some leeway given on this.

This means we must be very clear, when agreeing priorities which are

- Approved and deliverable/paid for this year,
- Approved but need more work so will be developed with a view for delivery in the subsequent financial year (the Pipeline)
- Not yet approved but have potential to be reviewed when resources are available.

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |   |                                |  |
|----|---|--------------------------------|--|
|    | <p>We might label these blue, green and amber but I'll leave that to the Chairman to decide, possibly in consultation with other LHFIG groups for consistency</p> <p>So, it is less about 5 priorities, so much as identifying which schemes are deliverable this financial year, while clearly still being mindful of the workload on our officers, else little will ever reach completion.</p> <p>The advice, therefore, is that meetings should ideally take place as follows, each one 2 to 4 weeks in advance of the Area Board meetings where this group's decisions are ratified.</p> <p><b>April:</b> Budget confirmation and budget allocation to projects. ---- confirm the 'green' and 'ambers'</p> <p><b>July:</b> Progress meeting. Budget allocation (note: projects allocated beyond this meeting may not be delivered by the end of March).</p> <p><b>October:</b> Progress meeting. Agree projects to be put forward for funding from Substantive bid, ahead of end of November submission deadline. Small scale and low-cost projects at this meeting may be delivered before end of year deadline.</p> <p><b>January:</b> Progress meeting. Agreement of any funding to be returned for redistribution. Any projects prioritised at this meeting will not be delivered within this financial year.</p> <p>As already noted, in this first year, we expect some leeway allowed on this return of funding point. And I've also secured agreement from Cabinet that this matter will be included in the 6-month review following this financial year to see how it has worked in practice.</p> <p>Terms of reference expect town and parish councils to make at least a 20% contribution to the projects that pass through LHFIG. These can be circulated with the notes.</p> |                                |  |
| 3. | <b>Financial Position</b>   |                                |  |
|    |   | Finance sheet to be presented. | SH highlighted the current budget position.<br>SH and JS pointed out that Ringway have made an 11.25% increase in costs to all LHFIG projects agreed from April '22<br>This could have an impact on the amount that PCs are expected to pay, based on a 25% contribution. JS will check this |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|           |  |   |  |    |
|-----------|--|---|--|----|
|           |  |   | with Cabinet member for Highways.  |    |
| <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><br>Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, new Highways request forms are to be sent to <a href="mailto:LHFIGrequests@wiltshire.gov.uk">LHFIGrequests@wiltshire.gov.uk</a> |   |  |    |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Top Priority Schemes</b>  |   |  |    |
| a)        | Issue <a href="#">7027</a><br>New double yellow lining on B4003  | Decision required not to implement the waiting restrictions as originally advertised and wait until after further process to advertise the proposal to enable 22m parking length.<br><br>Advert 25 <sup>th</sup> August to 19 <sup>th</sup> September.<br>Further advert cost £2500<br><br>Road marking establishment cost will be incurred only once.<br><br>Note 'Primrose' yellow lines required within World Heritage site. | The advert has been published and awaiting any objections. SH is not expecting any. Once advert period is over and if no objections, work can go ahead.                        | A1 |
| b)        | 8-20-6<br>Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment  | This is on a list of 16 no 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins.<br><br>Report completed and sent to Parish Council for consideration.<br><br>PC funding agreed at 25%.<br><br>Advert for speed limit change undertaken with no objections.<br><br>Scheme delegated to complete works package for implementation.   | The advert period is now over and there are no objections. Implementation work can begin. Timescales are 2-3 months. Still needs to be on list to be checked until completion. | A2 |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
|    |   | PC contribution capped at 25% of £6500 or a minimum of 20% of the costs.   |  |   |
| c) | 8-21-6<br>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 developed for low cost scheme. Cost estimate &lt;£2k. PC contribution 25%.</p> <p>Signage installed. Road markings to be implemented under the ad hoc process during the summer.</p>                                 | <p>Signage complete. The new lines have been marked out and should be done by end of September or early October.</p> <p>Scheme should be off list in time for next meeting.</p>  | A3  |
| d) | 8-20-4<br>A4 Manton traffic calming                           | <p>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.</p> <p>Design and cost to be developed and consideration as a substantive scheme.</p> <p>TEAMS meeting organised to discuss the project options.</p> <p>Stage 1 – low cost signing and road marking scheme.<br/>Stage 2 – design work for new traffic island to the west of Downs Lane, Marlborough name signs and possible location of speed limit. Topo survey agreed to enable design.</p> | <p>SH said that design work had already been carried out for Stage 1 (low-cost signage). Marlborough TC had requested extra road markings, which have been added to design. This has also now been sent for approval. Again, further changes can be requested.</p> <p>MH asked about suitability of Stage 2 (traffic island) for Substantive Scheme funding. SH replied that to be eligible, the</p> | <p>A4 (stage 1)</p> <p>Pipeline (stage 2)</p> |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| e) | 8-21-2<br>Related to 8-20-4<br>A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island             | Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary<br><br>Refer to 8-20-4  | scheme had to cost more than LHFIG's annual budget. It was agreed that for the next LHFIG meeting (24 <sup>th</sup> November), a detailed update on Stage 2 work will be prepared in time to make assessment on whether to go forward with Substantive bid for '23. |   |
| f) | 8-21-3<br>Related to 8-20-4<br>A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for transverse yellow markings | Request for transverse yellow road markings on westbound approach to crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.<br><br>Refer to 8-20-4   |   |   |
| g) | 8-21-4<br>Related to 8-20-4<br>A4 Bath Road, Manton – request for sign.                    | Request for sign indicating Bridge St turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St.<br><br>Refer to 8-20-4  |   |   |
| h) | 8-19-2<br>Place a sign(s) at the entrance to Manton Hollow advising 'No Through Road'.     | <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> | Sign should have been installed by now. PM thought it was not. SH will check.   | A5<br>(leave on until confirmed complete) |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|           |   |   |  |                 |
|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------|
|           |   | <p>Request to consider 'No through road' sign at entrance to Manton Hollow. Can be installed. Cost estimate £175.</p> <p>'No through road' sign to be implemented at entrance to Manton Hollow. MTC 25% agreed. LHFIG 75%</p>   |  |                 |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Other Priority schemes</b>   |   |  |                 |
| a)        | <p>8-21-8<br/>Aldbourn – virtual paths</p>  | <p>Request for virtual paths along Farm Lane, entire length of Marlborough Rd, Castle St to Whitley Rd. To replace 18-19-11</p> <p>TEAMS meeting undertaken with PC rep Chris Ainsworth.</p> <p>Checks including Speed data and traffic volume being obtained to check for suitability of virtual footway along Marlborough Road from The Butts to the village centre.</p>  | <p>SH is making progress with design.</p>  | <p>Pipeline</p> |
| b)        | <p>Issue <a href="#">5190</a><br/>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> <p>Report sent to Guy Singleton/ Martin Phipps 11/3/22.</p> <p>Further investigation/ discussion required for a signing solution.</p> | <p>There was discussion around whether new signage would have the desired effect here and whether they would be worth the investment.</p> <p>SH described some possible signs and road markings for certain locations (e.g. cricket club junction) and will look further</p> | <p>Pipeline</p> |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|           |  |  |  |                 |
|-----------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| <p>c)</p> | <p>8-19-10<br/>Marlborough, Frees Avenue<br/>Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.</p>    | <p>Request to increase the length of the speed limit. However, for this to be achieved a further speed limit review will have to be undertaken as part of the justification process. Cost of speed limit review £2500.</p> <p>Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review. Contribution of £625 agreed.</p> <p>£1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Atkins undertook a site visit on Sunday 14<sup>th</sup> November to assess the situation while the rugby club was in operation.</p> <p>Report completed and sent to Town Clerk for distribution and consideration.</p> <p>The report did not recommend the speed is lowered past the rugby club but does suggest the 40mph speed limit is extended further out of town towards Rockley. Cost estimate for traffic order advert is £2500. Implementation is £2000 for signs.</p> <p>Scheme will cross into Preshute PC. Mervyn Hall to discuss contributions.</p> | <p>PM described how this mostly falls within Preshute PC but has also asked Ogbourne St Andrew PC for input.</p> <p>PM felt that 40mph all the way from Rockley to The Common would be too slow, but 50mph or a 40mph limit much closer to The Common might be more effective. There was discussion on this. JS asked Preshute and Ogbourne St Andrew PCs to write to SH with their recommendations.</p> <p>*Following the LHFIG meeting, PM has confirmed that Preshute PC has met and given support for 40mph limit to be applied to the whole length from Rockley to The Common. This is subject to cost estimates being given.</p> | <p>Pipeline</p> |
| <p>d)</p> | <p>8-19-1 and 8-22-3<br/>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>SH felt there was a need for another site visit with him present to confirm issues.</p>   | <p>Pipeline</p> |



## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |   |  |                             |  |
|----|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
|    |   | <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>CT took an action to initially agree an acceptable location for a zebra crossing with the Town Council before any initial design assessment is agreed at CATG.</p> <p>MH reported there had been a site meeting with MC and a suggestion that doesn't take away many car parking spaces. This plan needs to be drawn up to progress with designs. This will need to go to Marlborough TC for agreement, on the understanding SH will have to review the proposal.</p> |                             |  |
| e) | 8-21-5<br>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>  | This is for reference only. |  |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |   |   |  |  |
|----|---|---|--|--|
|    |   | <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.<br/>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>Town Council to write to landowners.</p>   |  |  |
| f) | 8-19-8 A346 Cadley – traffic lights on A4 | <p>Traffic modelling for junction would be required.<br/>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.<br/>The area board will take the lead in calling local PCs to be part of this study.</p> <p>MH discussions with Atkins undertaken.</p> <p>Atkins proposed costs need to be agreed with WC officers.</p> | <p>MH reported that MTC has been making progress on this work and has a quote for traffic modelling analysis at a cost of £48,000<br/>He felt this was very high. There was discussion on whether this would be value for money and would provide a solution to the town's traffic issues.</p> |  |
| g) | 8-20-8                                    | <p>PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review</p>  | <p>SG reported that Ramsbury PC now has the Metrocount results</p>   |  |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |  |   |   |  |
|----|--|---|---|--|
|    | Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village | <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.<br/>Request submitted by PC.</p> <p>Survey undertaken but apparently there are issues with the results due to a new contractor. To be resolved.</p> | and asked that this request be postponed until later.   |  |
| h) | 8-21-11<br>Clench Common - speeding                      | <p>Review speed limit, signing, gates</p> <p>Speed limit change unlikely. Possible warning signs. Community to discuss.</p> <p>PC are prepared to pay 100% for white gates, locations to be established. Appropriate warning signs also to be considered.</p>   | <p>SH has not worked on this scheme.<br/>Savernake PC is looking to install white gates funded 100% by themselves and is working with Martin Cook on this. They have some landowners' permission and will update at the next meeting.</p> |  |
| i) | 8-21-12<br>Ramsbury – Back Lane                          | <p>Traffic calming/ priority system</p> <p>Martin Cook suggested road markings to narrow the road could be undertaken quite quickly through maintenance.</p> <p>Scheme on maintenance list.</p>   | <p>SG reported that this work has not been carried out. SH will check if it is on a maintenance list.</p>   |  |
| j) | 8-21-13<br>Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit           | <p>Footway improvements/ speed calming measures.</p> <p>Metrocount to check speeds within the 30mph limit requested.</p>  | <p>The best location for a Metrocount has been identified and a survey requested.</p>   |  |
| k) | 8-22-1<br>Ramsbury – B4192<br>Whittonditch               | <p>Warning signs, traffic speed, gates, road markings.</p> <p>Metrocount being undertaken.</p>  | <p>SG confirms the new gates have been ordered and the site located. Now waiting for delivery. SG agrees this can come off list.</p>  |  |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|    |                                       |   |   |  |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
|    |                                       | Martin Cook has met with PC to discuss.   |   |  |
| l) | 8-22-2<br>Marlborough, The Common     | <p>Crossing points/ traffic calming</p> <p>Linked to 6a 8-19-10</p> <p>MTC in conjunction with the Rugby Club have produced a package of measures to help with safety.</p> <p>Note that WC Highways owns just the carriageway area and no part of the verge.</p>  | RS-W described the site visit and the suggestions made. These include moving the current 40mph sign north slightly to the far side of the cemetery junction, new rumble strips either side of a proposed informal crossing point where players will be directed to use and new Slow signage and markings in the area. |  |
| m) | 8-22-4<br>Marlborough A346            | <p>Pedestrian crossing between The Acres and The Common across the A346</p> <p>SH said that a pedestrian count would cost a fixed rate of £2,500. SH can send to MTC the eligibility criteria for a new crossing so they can assess if this will be successful.</p> <p>The Metrocount from November '21 was mentioned and how it showed that 85% of vehicles were speeding and these figures present a dangerous location for people looking to cross to The Common, especially children.</p> <p>Because of the high speeds seen here, this location is eligible for police speed checks to be carried out there.</p> | There was discussion about vehicle speeds at this location being too fast for Community Speedwatch and that the Police had risk-assessed it as unsafe for officers to use for their speed checks.   |  |
| n) | 8-22-5<br>Marlborough, Cherry Orchard | <p>Handrails for steps on steep banks</p> <p>SH has not worked on designs like this before and will need to call on colleagues for help here to understand more about the implementation.</p>   | SH reported no progress.  |  |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|           |  |   |  |  |
|-----------|--|---|--|--|
| o)        | 8-22-6<br>Ogbourne St George – A346<br>Ridgeway crossing at Hallam<br>Junction | Warning for the Ridgeway crossing.<br><br>SH said that Highways will not put signage like this at the crossing point and has already put other signs at a distance either side. RI describes signs at other points where the Ridgeway crosses roads. These are more likely to be agreed with the Countryside Team. AJ will contact Steve Leonard to get the Countryside Team to take this on. | There has been no support from Countryside officers and signage from Highways is not possible. It was agreed to close this request.  |  |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>New Requests / Issues</b>   |   |  |  |
| a)        | 8-22-7<br>Mildenhall, Woodlands Rd   | Unsuitable for HGV sign<br>To be funded by Mildenhall PC<br><br>Approved through LHFIG for ad hoc signing.  | No one from Mildenhall PC was present to discuss the request.  |  |
| b)        | 8-22-8<br>Ramsbury, B4192/ Crowood Lane  | Unsuitable for HGV's to be considered.  | SG said that Ramsbury PC was happy to pay 100% and wanted this looked at. SG needed permission to put up their own No HGV sign. SH and the LHFIG approved and the request can now go to Mark Stansby's signage team. |  |
| c)        | 8-22-9<br>Marlborough, Cardigan Rd   | No waiting at any time  |  |  |
| d)        | New pavement at Chilton Foliat   | New raised pavement for Chilton Foliat.   | SC described how the current virtual pavement is often blocked by parked cars forcing pedestrians to walk into the road to get passed, especially to   |  |

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

|           |   |  |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|---|--|
|           |   |  | access the village hall. Chilton Foliat PC are requesting a new raised pavement.<br>This request was accepted by the group. |  |
| <b>8.</b> | <b>Other items</b>  |  |   |  |
| a)        |   |  |   |  |
| <b>9.</b> | <b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> Thursday 24 <sup>th</sup> November 10.00am Court Room, Marlborough Town Hall.<br>Thursday 2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2023 10.00am |  |   |  |

### Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group

#### Highways Officer – Steve Hind

#### 1. Environmental & Community Implications

1.1. Environmental and community implications were considered by the LHFIG 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 LHFIG 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

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

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**