

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| A | Item | Update | Actions and recommendations | Priority A, B or C |
|----|--|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG) - Thursday 2nd March 2023 | | | |
| 1. | Attendees and apologies | | | |
| | Cllr James Sheppard (Aldbourn and Ramsbury) (chair); Cllr Caroline Thomas (Marlborough East); Cllr Jane Davies (Marlborough West); Steve Hind; Martin Cook; Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Martin Phipps; (Savernake PC); Cllr Sheila Glass (Ramsbury and Axford PC); Cllr Mervyn Hall (Marlborough TC); Richard Spencer Williams (Marlborough TC); Cllr John Hetherington (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Stephen Stacey (Avebury PC); Cllr Lucy Kirkpatrick (Mildenhall PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC) | | | |
| 2. | Introductory Notes | | | |
| | The minutes of the previous LHFIG meeting held on the 24 th November 2022 were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 10 th January 2023. The minutes can be found via this link Area Boards | | | |
| | <p>Comments from the Chair on Local Highways & Footways Improvement Group (LHFIG) arrangements:</p> <p>Reminder Local Highways and Footpaths Improvement Group is suitable for schemes that improve safety, increase accessibility and sustainability by promoting walking, cycling and public transport and improve traffic management:</p> <p>Pedestrian improvements: including dropped kerbs, new footways, substantive improvements to existing footways, pedestrian crossings (including assessments).</p> <p>Cycle improvements: new cycle paths, cycle parking / storage.</p> <p>Bus infrastructure: new and replacement Shelters (subject to agreement on future maintenance liability), bus border kerbs, bus stop road markings.</p> <p>Traffic signing: new and replacement signs (including signposts), street name plates, village gateways.</p> <p>New road markings: new and replacement of existing markings.</p> <p>Speed limits: assessment and implementation.</p> <p>Waiting restrictions: assessments and implementation.</p> | | | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

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.

Funds cannot be used for 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 for work completed or orders placed with contractors for delivery within the current financial year – will typically 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 Highways have confirmed that for 22/23, unallocated funds will roll into 23/24 as it was acknowledge resource shortages affected project delivery. Cabinet also confirmed a review will be undertaken after the first 12 months of operation.

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
- Not yet approved but have potential to be reviewed when resources are available.

It is less about '5 priorities', so much as identifying which schemes are deliverable this financial year, being mindful of the workload on our officers, else little will ever reach completion.

The advice was that meetings should ideally take place as below, each one 2 to 4 weeks in advance of the Area Board meetings where this group's decisions are ratified. 22/23 dates are in brackets.

April (May 22/23): Budget confirmation and budget allocation to projects. Agree projects to be put forward for funding from Substantive bid, ahead of end of submission deadlines.

July (September 22/23): Progress meeting. Budget allocation (note: projects allocated beyond this meeting may not be delivered by the end of March).

October (November 22/23): Progress meeting. Small scale and low-cost projects at this meeting may be delivered before end of year deadline.

January (March 22/23): Progress meeting. Agreement of any funding to be returned for redistribution. Any projects prioritised at this meeting are unlikely to be delivered within this financial year.

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|---|
| | 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. | | | |
| 3. | Financial Position | | | |
| | Finance sheet – the updated position is attached. | | | |
| 4. | Process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes | | | |
| | LHFIG requests forms are on the Wiltshire Council website. http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards Once completed they should be submitted to the local town or parish council. If agreed the Clerk will send them to LHFIGrequests@wiltshire.gov.uk | | | |
| 5. | 22/23 Priority Schemes (NB completed work and closed items moved to final sections) NB unless otherwise indicated, will now move into 23/24 | | | |
| | Issue 7027 New double yellow lining on B4003 | Note 'Primrose' yellow lines are required within the World Heritage site. Advertisement received no objections. Implementation of 22m parking length confirmed. Evidence suggests waiting restriction is being ignored ACTION: SH to follow up targeted enforcement. Position may be improved if the pot holes where cars are allowed to park were filled. NT is insisting on the correct type of chalk although noted that it's not their land so WC may need to take control. For the layby improvement, as a new piece of highway, WC need to ensure the design is robust enough including for HGVs. SH was planning a discussion with Atkins to | Layby maintenance in the short term and improvement design being undertaken within Wiltshire Highways following CT discussion with Dave Thomas. Councillors expressed concern about the lack of action with repair to the potholes/verges, noting that where they have control, NT have simply filled these with chalk. March 23: ACTION 1) SH/MC to investigate the source of chalk supplies used by NT/its volunteers to address immediate issues in line with National Trust requirements before | Waiting restriction - 22/23 (complete) Layby maintenance – immediate / 22/23 priority to prevent further damage. Layby improvement – ground surface and |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>initiate the work which includes checking the condition of the ground. May need archaeologists involved due to the NT/World Heritage location.</p> <p>JD suggested this is all beyond the remit of LHFIG expertise, time and budget.</p> <p>ACTION – JD to raise with Dave Thomas to get specialist attention and traction. It's complicated, particularly with NT stipulations.</p> | <p>Ringway's contract ends and Milestone take over.</p> <p>2) CT to clarify with Dave Thomas the need to tackle the immediate pot hole/verge issues to limit further damage as well as more permanent improvements. (DT confirmed Jack Francis and Ben Leverette will deal with both aspects).</p> <p>CT agreed to oversee progress with support of JD and Briony from NT</p> | <p>verges – Priority for 23/24</p> |
| a) | <p>8-20-4 A4 Manton traffic calming</p> <p>8-21-2 – request for Traffic Island</p> <p>8-21-3 – Request for transverse yellow road markings on westbound approach to crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.</p> <p>8-21-4 – request for sign Bridge St</p> | <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. Project options agreed as</p> <p>Stage 1 – low cost signing and road marking scheme. 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>Stage 1 plan and estimate sent to RSW for approval. Supported by Marlborough TC. Cost estimate increased to £6790. Contribution 25%. Confirmation from LHFIG to proceed.</p> <p>Stage 2 cost estimate for topo survey sent to RSW for approval. Cost £1700. Confirmation from LHFIG to proceed.</p> | <p>Stage 1 low cost measures – scheme package issued to Ringway with the intention of implementation before the end of March.</p> <p>Stage 2 - Topo survey requested via Atkins to be undertaken.</p> <p>ACTION – SH to ensure both are progressed and continue work on substantive bid ready for summer 23.</p> <p>ACTION - SH to revert back to the Committee to update us on progress at each meeting.</p> | <p>Stage 1 - 22/23 Priority if possible, else 23/24</p> <p>TOPO Survey – 22/23 Priority</p> <p>Stage 2 23/24 Priority</p> |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------------|
| | turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St | | | |
| d) | 8-22-9 Marlborough, Cardigan Rd | <p>'No waiting at any time' requested - there is a soak away that can't be accessed due to the parking in an unrestricted area which applies to both sides of the road.</p> <p>Long term issue...requests have been on the yellow line list previously and partially completed. But yellow lines now managed by LHFIG.</p> <p>ACTION - SH to seek clarity over design advertising etc work to date (e.g. via Traffic Management Group / Infrastructure Team / Jamie Mundy).</p> <p>ACTION – SH to progress the advertising if it's required.</p> <p>ACTION – CT to ask Highways to provide clarity to town and Parish councils regarding changes to responsibilities (e.g. yellow lining) – See end of report</p> | <p>Traffic order prepared and sent to TRO team for advertisement.</p> <p>If there are no objections, there is a section of the c/way where cars are parked which will require some maintenance before yellow lines can be effectively implemented.</p> <p>March 23: ACTION – MC to clarify maintenance work required.</p> | 22/23 Priority |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| 6. | 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | |
| a) | 8-21-8 Aldbourne – virtual paths | <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>Site meeting undertaken with Parish Council.</p> <p>ACTION – SH Design for virtual path being undertaken along part of Marlborough Road. Once design is complete, it is likely to</p> | 23/24 Priority agreed |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| 6. 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | <p>Checks including Speed data and traffic volume to be obtained to check for suitability of virtual footway along Marlborough Road from The Butts to the village centre.</p> <p>Traffic volumes and speeds obtained along Marlborough Road being reviewed by SH</p> <p>Speed data suggests continuation of design assessment is appropriate.</p> | require approval via an independent safety check before it can be implemented. | |
| b) | <p>Issue 5190 Request for safety works at London Rd, Marlborough</p> <p>8-21-7 Forest Hill speed limit review</p> | <p>£1500 funding allocated to a speed limit review costing £2500. Savernake PC contribution 25%. Atkins report of 11/3/22 did not recommend a lower restriction to the current 50 mph</p> <p>LHFIG agreed further investigation/ discussion was appropriate for a signing solution including at location of Cricket club.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Phipps, Savernake PC has asked MC for 'reduce speed now' signs. • MH noted the Cricket Club is also now used in winter for football <p>SH agreed the review and implementation (if suitable) is doable in 23/24</p> <p>ACTION – SH to request a signage review (Mark Stansby).</p> | Signing review in progress;; expect to report back at next meeting. | 23/24 Priority agreed |
| c) | <p>8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.</p> | <p>Linked to item 8-22-2 as a pedestrian safety request in 2 parts - the speed limit and other safety measures</p> <p>Cost of speed limit review £2500. Marlborough TC supported with contribution of £625; £1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> | MTC Planning declined payment of 25% of costs as benefit of extending the 40mph limit to Rockley wasn't accepted. | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 6. | 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | |
| | | <p>Atkins site visit on Sunday 14th November while the rugby club was in operation. Assessment report did not recommend the speed is lowered but does suggest the 40mph speed limit is extended further out of town to Rockley, which will cross into Preshute PC.</p> <p>Preshute PC initially supported 40mph limit from Rockley in principle.</p> <p>£4500 costs (advert and implementation) supplied to RSW; 25% contribution= £1125. Shared proportions with PPC to be agreed.</p> <p>CT noted the proposal to extend 40mph to Rockley would need to be agreed by MTC as it wasn't what was requested. JD noted the benefits of reducing speeds approaching Frees Avenue.</p> <p>PM (Preshute PC) flagged that the PC wasn't sure it represented good value for its residents and it hadn't been included in their 23/24 precept budget. MC flagged that Rockley is in Ogbourne St Andrew PC and PM noted its chair had said he wasn't sure residents would support it either.</p> <p>November 22: ACTION – Marlborough, Preshute and OsA PCs to confirm their positions on contributing to costs for the 40mph restriction extension to Rockley; with the PCs potentially doing so based on respective headcounts in the 3 areas.</p> <p>ACTION – MTC to also consider 100% contribution if just move the 40/National Speed Limit signs west, to the edge of the Common. Nb Still have all the advertising costs so not a huge saving.</p> | <p>Preshute PC confirmed would be interested if share of 25% was based on headcount.</p> <p>JD argued for the benefits of slower speeds as drivers approach the Common</p> <p>March 23: ACTION – Marlborough, Preshute and OsA PCs to review and confirm their positions on contributing to costs for the 40mph restriction extension to Rockley.</p> | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| 6. | 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| d) | 8-22-2 Marlborough, The Common | <p>Frees Avenue Crossing points/ traffic calming - Linked to 8-19-10</p> <p>MTC in conjunction with the Rugby Club have produced a package of measures to help with safety, noting that WC Highways owns just the carriageway area and no part of the verge.</p> <p>SH and Clare Harris discussed on site and SH to develop measures</p> <p>The pedestrian safety plans include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance visibility of the current pedestrian crossing point with guide railings - Put up 'welcome to Marlborough' white gates - Add yellow line markings and warning signs. <p>SH confirmed MTC can proceed with the railing and white gates at their cost, and the signage and road markings could be done in 23/24 if prioritised. Nb also potentially doable for 22/23</p> <p>ACTION – SH to progress work on signage and road marking designs and inform MTC of likely costs and implementation timescales.</p> | <p>Designs approved by Marlborough TC but with request from RSW to exclude the 'Cemetery' signs.</p> <p>March 23: ACTION - To be implemented from April 23 under the new Milestone contract.</p> | 23/24 Priority agreed (if not 22/23) |
| e) | 8-21-12 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. However, this hasn't been allowed as they are new.</p> <p>SH confirmed the work is doable in 23/24</p> | <p>SH proposal for a 'SLOW' at each end of the narrow section.</p> <p>The PC are also requesting continuous edge line on both sides.</p> <p>SH is not convinced white lines will make any difference at the road is less than 4m wide; JD</p> | Prioritise for 23/24 |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| 6. | 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | |
|----|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>supported their use based on their impact in Lockridge.</p> <p>The PC have agreed to pay the costs</p> <p>March 23: ACTION – SH to re-consider continuous edge lines.</p> <p>Implementation would be after April under the Milestone contract.</p> | |
| f) | <p>8-22-8 Ramsbury, B4192/ Crowood Lane</p> <p>And</p> <p>8-22-16 Ramsbury – Froxfield Road</p> | <p>‘Unsuitable for HGV’s’ sign requests</p> <p>Ramsbury PC is happy to pay 100% to help push this forward but they still need Highways approval.</p> <p>LHFIG approved and the requests can go to Mark Stansby’s signage team.</p> <p>If prioritised, the PC will only need to pay a contribution.</p> <p>ACTION – SH to progress a request for signage to include Foxfield Road (8-22-16) and Back Lane (8-21-12) warning signs.</p> | <p>Design for two signs for each location proposed sent to Ramsbury PC.</p> <p>PC have requested scheme to be implemented.</p> <p>March 23: ACTION – SH to instruct installation undertaken under the Milestone contract from April.</p> <p>NB Costs/PC Contribution to be added to the budget position sheet</p> | <p>Prioritise for 23/24</p> |
| g) | <p>8-22-5 Marlborough, Cherry Orchard</p> | <p>Handrails for steps on steep banks</p> | <p>The handrails will increase safety for those people that want to use the steps.</p> | <p>Prioritised 23/24</p> |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|
| 6. | 23/24 Priority schemes NB Consider a priority order to help SH manage his workload. | | | |
| | | <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> <p>MC noted the steps were put in as part of social housing in the 40s when it was a route to the railway station. They were installed to meet standards of the time and those standards still apply even though we would build them very differently today.</p> <p>ACTION - SH to continue enquiries before group consider prioritising. We don't know how the steps are constructed/how feasible adding hand rails might be</p> <p>Options seem to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • Add rails • Remove steps <p>JD flagged that a handrail encourages use (which is dangerous); could be left to personal judgement.</p> | <p>CT/DT arranged for a specialist engineer site visit – confirmed cost estimate c£4K and the rail will need to stop short of the final step by the roadside where there is no pavement to ensure cars do not hit the end of the rail.</p> <p>ACTION – Marlborough TC to consider whether to approve 25% contribution.</p> | |
| 7. | Other potential schemes – not yet prioritised | | | |
| a) | 8-21-13 Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit | <p>Request for footpath improvements and speed calming measures.</p> <p>Metrocount required to check speeds within the 30mph limit requested – request remains outstanding</p> <p>RSW noted Metro counts are on hold due to issues with the contractor</p> <p>ACTION - SH to check out what the issues are</p> | <p>This request is an expensive range of issues including a request to widen the footway and traffic calming.</p> <p>Footpath might be widened by scrubbing out vegetation.</p> | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| 7. | Other potential schemes – not yet prioritised | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>ACTION: MTC to make request of the Parish Steward</p> <p>Metro count results are required before any further decisions can be made.</p> | |
| b) | 8-22-4 Marlborough A346 | <p>Pedestrian crossing between The Acres and The Common across the A346</p> <p>Pedestrian count required - 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 showed that 85% of vehicles were speeding and these figures present a dangerous location for people looking to cross to The Common, especially children and makes it eligible for police enforcement.</p> <p>The speeds are too fast for Community Speed Watch (and no local team) and Town Clerk was told the Police had risked assessed it as unsafe for officers to do speed checks.</p> <p>CT noted the 'impasse' we seem to have – dangerous 5-way junction with metro count indicating 85% of vehicles are speeding at a point where pedestrians need to cross from a residential housing area to The Common but the Police Speed watch team suggest it's too dangerous for enforcement.</p> <p>A pole for a SID is being looked at by MTC.</p> | <p>ACTION – JS to arrange meeting with Police.</p> | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| 7. Other potential schemes – not yet prioritised | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | ACTION - JD/CT/JS to follow up previous enquires with PW and the PCC | | |
| d) | 8-22-10 New Pavement at Chilton Foliat | New raised pavement in Chilton Foliat between Village Hall and current pavement on eastern side to replace the virtual pavement SH initial view is that it doesn't look feasible. | ACTION – SH to arrange meeting with Chilton Foliat rep to discuss. | |
| e) | 8-22-13 Marlborough – Tin Pit | Improved parking provision request. There are 11 cottages along the lane, none of which have parking provision but all have one or more vehicles. Some properties have their own drives, but poor parking impinges access. Residents of the neighbouring Poulton Crescent have limited parking and so overspill into Tin Pit. | ACTION – MTC to clarify what they are requesting at this location. | |
| f) | 8-22-14 A346 Ogbourne St George to County boundary north | Request for a review of two bus stops along the A346 to make them more accessible and safer for residents. | ACTION – SH to discuss with PC | |
| g) | 8-22-15 Aldbourne, Castle Street | Request for 20mph assessment There is no footway along Castle Street, Aldbourne. It is not suitable for a virtual footway. Request to reduce traffic speed by introducing 20mph. | Not discussed as no representative attending. | |

| 8. New Requests / Issues not yet reviewed | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| a) | 8-22-17 Chilton Foliat – HGV issues on the B4001 | Request to contribute to West Berkshire for implementation of a signing scheme (cost £20K) to reduce HGV issues in Chilton Foliat linked to Membury Trading Estate. 12 signs involved. County line approx. 1m north of village. PC willing to contribute £1250 (25% of £5k considered by Mark McClelland) | ACTION – Steve Campbell to send details of West Berkshire Scheme and contacts to CT. | |
| b) | 8-23-1 | Consideration to widen the review area. Review George Lane | ACTION – SH to find original review and send to JD. | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Marlborough, 20mph review | | | |
| | | AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mildenhall – request for site visit to be lodged shortly re footway - Mildenhall – No HGV sign has been stolen. | ACTION – MC to consider HGV sign replacement (c£800) under maintenance budget | |

| | |
|----|--|
| 9. | Date of Next Meeting: To be confirmed |
|----|--|

Completed/Closed Work

| | Reference | Progress | Position | Priority |
|--|--|--|-----------|-------------------|
| | 8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment | PC contribution capped at 25% of £6500 or a minimum of 20% of the costs. PC very pleased and thanked the Committee for help and support. Will request a metro count to assess the implementation ACTION – LC or JH (OsA PC) to confirm implementation next meeting | Complete. | 22/23 Priority |
| | 8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east. | Improvements for pedestrians including traffic calming requested. Site meeting undertaken. Low-cost option includes warning signs and road markings to enhance the gateway. Footway and bus stop can be reconsidered and time can be given to this if agreed through the CATG. Design developed for low cost scheme, estimated <£2k. PC contribution 25%. Signing installed. Road markings to be implemented under the ad hoc process during the summer. | Complete | 22/23 |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | Reference | Progress | Position | Priority |
|--|--|---|--|----------|
| | | Road markings still not complete. | | |
| | 8-19-2 | <p>Request for a sign at the entrance to Manton Hollow (at the junction with Downs Lane) advising 'No Through Road' as it appears on many maps and sat-navs as a through road resulting in cars and HGVs attempting 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.</p> <p>MTC did not support a sign at junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow preferring to replace the sign at the junction of Downs Lane with the A4.</p> <p>Cost estimate £175. MTC 25% agreed Sign installed</p> | Complete | 22/23 |
| | 8-22-7 Mildenhall, Woodlands Rd | <p>Unsuitable for HGV sign To be funded by Mildenhall PC</p> <p>Approved through LHFIG for ad hoc signing. Sign implemented.</p> | Complete | |
| | 8-21-11 Clench Common - speeding | <p>Request to review speed limit, add signing, introduce gates. Speed limit change considered unlikely. Possible warning signs. Community to discuss. PC are prepared to pay 100% for white gates, locations to be established. Appropriate warning signs also to be considered. Savernake PC working with Martin Cook on white gates. Have landowners' permission and will update at the next meeting.</p> | Gates bought and installation being progressed on Martinsell side where the village road is NSL while main road is 50mph | NFA |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | Reference | Progress | Position | Priority |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| | 8-22-12 Crooked Soley (nr Chilton Foliat) | Footpath signpost replacements (maintenance issue) | Works complete. CLOSED | |
| | | Closed/Not proceeded with | | |
| | 8-22-18 Marlborough, Kennet Place - residents parking | Request for residents parking. Forms sent to Jamie Mundy. | March 23 - The Group had a majority vote against progress. To be CLOSED. | Not prioritised |
| e) | 8-19-1 and 8-22-3 Request for new pedestrian crossing at Marlborough High St. | <p>Marlborough Town Council supported the petition signed by over 600 people requesting a pedestrian crossing in Marlborough High Street due to safety concerns for the elderly and visually impaired.</p> <p>Consideration has previously been given to possible formal crossings in Kingsbury St by Patten Alley, across to the Town Hall steps or across the High St by the White Horse bookshop. No location is suitable for a formal crossing.</p> <p>Site meeting with MC and several Cllrs, identified a solution that doesn't take away many car parking spaces - drafted and reviewed by MTC before being passed on to SH in March.</p> <p>SH noted it would need an island or change of surface in the middle. MC flagged possible use of existing pavement build outs in place on each side. A TOPO survey is likely to be required.</p> <p>It was noted the request had been raised as a disability issue. People can and do cross the High Street in numerous places but a safe place is required for the more vulnerable and some</p> | <p>SH submitted a design sketch to Marlborough TC which indicated the number of car parking spaces that would have to be removed to install a formal crossing.</p> <p>March 23 - Marlborough TC have</p> | <p>23/24 Priority agreed - to move forwards with initial feasibility work by summer 23.</p> |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | Reference | Progress | Position | Priority |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| | | <p>incorrectly assume there is a crossing point where the raised pavement extensions are. NOTE For justification of a formal crossing, a pedestrian count will have to be undertaken but this could include a distance 50m either side of the proposed location.</p> <p>Assume the scheme would need to be a Substantive bid and that we'd need to consider its priority with the A4 Manton work after the feasibility stage e.g. if 2 bids are not considered feasible and/or appropriate.</p> | <p>decided not to continue with this request and informed the local resident.</p> <p>Issue to be CLOSED</p> | |
| | <p>8-21-5 Footpath between Van Diemans Close and George Lane.</p> | <p>Request to widen footpath to access St Mary's school.</p> <p>Several owners of the land either side of the path. The Rights of Way team would need to be involved.</p> <p>CATG agreed to make this scheme a high priority to show political desire to move this forward but it is recognised that SH will not currently work on this scheme.</p> <p>JD has contacted Perry Holmes, Head of Legal at Wilts Council. The first step is to contact landowners or neighbours to ask permission for use of the land. In light of the new crossing, his recommendation was to wait 1-2 years for landowners to get used to it before approaching them.</p> <p>Town Council to write to landowners.</p> | <p>No further action to be undertaken.</p> | |
| | <p>8-19-8 A346 (Cadley – traffic lights on A4)</p> | <p>Traffic modelling for a junction would be required. JS to pursue this with area board and town councillors. AJ discussed with Dave Thomas who initiated discussions with Atkins. Brief agreed in discussion with JD and CT</p> | <p>No further action to be undertaken.</p> | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | Reference | Progress | Position | Priority |
|--|--|---|--------------------|----------|
| | Now - traffic survey and modelling | Quote for traffic survey and modelling received for c£48,000. WC have agreed to contribute (as they have with Bradford on Avon) Wider traffic plan and need for a detailed survey and modelling is being taken forward by MTC as not an LHFIG item. Detailed proposals may be made at a later date so retain in the list | | |
| | 8-20-8 Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village | PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review Whilst a full speed limit review cost £2,500, a Metrocount is free of charge. It was recommended SG tests vehicle speed via a Metrocount before committing to the full speed limit review. Request submitted by PC. SG reported that Ramsbury PC now has the Metrocount results and asked that this request be postponed until later. Metro Count – 85% at around 60mph | Issue to be CLOSED | |
| | | | | |

Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group

Highways Officer – Steve Hind

1. Environmental & Community Implications

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

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 3rd party contributions are confirmed, Marlborough Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of £2983

3. Legal Implications

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

4. HR Implications

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

5. Equality and Inclusion Implications

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

6. Safeguarding implications

For information - Highways Responsibilities

| Department | Head of Service |
|--|-----------------|
| Asset Management and Commissioning | Dave Thomas |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset Management of 4381km of highway infrastructure – condition surveys, records, status • Operate and maintain 80 signal control junctions and 136 signal crossings • Inspect and maintain 981 bridges and structures • Draft, award, and administer all Highways contracts • Operate and maintain 45,000 streetlights | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design & Install new infrastructure (cycle lanes, crossings, collision reduction etc) funding through central budgets and LHFIGs • Drainage & Flooding advise and repair. Act as Lead Local Flood Authority • Network Management, permits and inspections (approx. 24,000 permits per year) | |
| Highway Operations | Adrian Hampton |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscene (Grounds Maintenance, Cleansing) • Parking • Highway and Waste Enforcement • Highway Accesses • Taxi Licencing and inspection • Event Management • Fly Tipping and Abandoned Vehicles - (really positive WTF campaign and successful prosecutions) • Unauthorised Encampments • Planning Section 106 Amenity Funding • Burials and Cemeteries • Depots • Highway Resilience (weather, out of hour highway issues) • Electric Vehicle Charging • Fleet - emerging strategy | |
| Local Highways | Chris Clark |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Routine Planned and Reactive Highway Maintenance • Delivery of Primary Duties as Highway Authority – Actioning Obstructions, licencing skips Scaffolds. • Undertaking scheduled Highway Safety Inspections (4381KLM) • Assisting with the response to Weather and other emergency operations • Site supervision of development works undertaken as part of Section 38/278 agreements • Management of the Public rights of way Network (6000KLM) Access team . • Tree Maintenance – Including response to Ash Die Back • Updating and responding to enquiries on Definitive Map and Highway records • Acting as the Town and Village Green Authority | |

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG