

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	Marlborough CATG now Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG)			
	Date of meeting: Thursday 26th May 2022			
1.	Attendees and apologies			
	Present:	Cllr Caroline Thomas (Chair), Cllr Jane Davies, Steve Hind, Martin Cook, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Mervyn Hall, Richard Spencer-Williams (Marlborough TC); Andrew George-Perutz (Berwick Bassett & Winterbourne Monkton PC); Cllr Nic Combe (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Bob Parker (Avebury PC); Cllr Martin Phipps (Savernake PC); Cllr Nick Parsons (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Rachel Inglefield (Ogbourne St George PC); Cllr Lucy Kirkpatrick (Mildenhall PC); Cllr Chris Ainsworth (Aldbourn PC)		
	Apologies:	Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC); Cllr James Sheppard (Wiltshire Council)		
2.	Notes of last meeting			
		The minutes of the previous CATG meeting held on the 3 rd March and were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 22 nd March 2022 <i>Link can be found at</i> https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=165&MId=13887&Ver=4		

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>April: Budget confirmation and budget allocation to projects. ---- confirm the 'green' and 'ambers'</p> <p>July: Progress meeting. Budget allocation (note: projects allocated beyond this meeting may not be delivered by the end of March).</p> <p>October: 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>January: 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.	Financial Position		
		Finance sheet to be presented.	<p>SH discussed the budget position for the beginning of 22/23. The group's budget had doubled to £25,246 and £5,647 had rolled forward into 22/23. Along with local contributions, £34,856 was available.</p> <p>Two projects have carried over from last year totalling costs of £15,850.</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			This leaves LHFIG with £19,006 available to spend for 22/23	
4.	New process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes			
	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. http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, new Highways request forms are to be sent to CATGRequests@wiltshire.gov.uk			
5.	Top Priority Schemes			
a)	Issue 6874 Request for safety measures on A4361 near Winterbourne Bassett + Issue 7023 safety on the A4361 county boundary to Beckhampton.	Accidents on A4361 at Winterbourne Bassett mostly due to speeding and inadequate road markings. Parish council would like present white lines on section from Winterbourne Bassett towards Broad Hinton changed from single to double. Also stretch of road either side of the Winterbourne Bassett turning be reduced to 50mph This has been combined with 7023 to cover the A4361 from the county boundary through to Beckhampton roundabout. CATG have agreed to proceed with the speed limit. Costs for the advert process will be £3k. 12.5% contribution from Avebury PC and 12.5% from BB&WM PC. Detail design complete and works package with Ringway for implementation. Updated cost £14476. Works complete.	This work is now complete and all signage is installed. AGP mentioned a number of side roads off the A4361 that still have a national speed limit on them. He said how the 50mph and national limit signs are on the same post and this is causing confusion for drivers. He asked if the national limit signs can be taken down? SH said he will need to take a look at these locations to see if new posts are needed so signs can be repositioned. BP gave Avebury PC's thanks for the new limits. He also mentions a similar situation at the entrance to Avebury Trusloe where there are now national speed limit signs at the entrance to the residential area. SH will look at this too. It was agreed this request can come off the list.	To be removed

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>b)</p>	<p>Issue 7027 New double yellow lining on B4003</p>	<p>Construction improvement to lay-by unlikely to take place soon due to construction issues and costs. Waiting restrictions could be extended to edge of existing lay-by and then reviewed when improvements have been undertaken. Costs if this is undertaken through CATG would be around £2500 including the advert procedure.</p> <p>The TRO for extension to the waiting restrictions will be around 34m and will allow parking for 4-5 vehicles. The intention is for this to be advertised and implemented to enable enforcement to be undertaken on vehicles parking outside this area until the new layby is constructed. SS felt the layby needed to hold just 3 car lengths.</p> <p>'Primrose' yellow lines required within the World Heritage site agreed to be implemented initially.</p> <p>Advert undertaken. However objections received including from Avebury PC. Cabinet member report will have to be written which will delay implementation.</p> <p>Site meetings and Teams meetings undertaken and included Avebury PC and NT to discuss extent of lines and methodology for protecting the verge.</p> <p>SH to amend the Cabinet member report to the correct distance and precise location agreed. The layby will then be defined by the double yellow lines and these can be actioned once the report is signed off.</p> <p>SH has not been able to amend the report in the way as requested. Because the waiting restrictions will be extended to</p>	<p>SH described how this is complicated and that the Cabinet member's report has not been signed off as the waiting restrictions or parking area are less than advertised. In order to get what Avebury PC and the National Trust want, the new scheme will need to be re-advertised. SH is working on this now. He said there are 2 options: to implement the yellow lines as advertised at 34m of parking space, then to re-advertise in order to change this to the smaller amount of parking (22m). Or to not implement any yellow lines until the new advertisement and consultation period has ended. CT asked about the costs of doing both of these options: the advert process costs £2,500, the establishment costs are £1,000 and the lining itself costs £1-200. JD had concerns about the initial communication of this and suggested the re-advertisement goes ahead quickly. BP thought the original agreement was space for 3 vehicles.</p> <p>The group agreed that work on the larger parking area will stop,</p>	<p>A1</p>
-----------	---	---	---	-----------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>the reduce the car parking, the amendments will have to be re advertised.</p> <p>Decision required on whether to implement the waiting restrictions as originally advertised or wait until after further advert process.</p>	<p>and the re-advertisement of the smaller area will go ahead quickly.</p> <p>A cost of £2,500 has already been incurred in advertising the 34m of parking. To re-advertise at 22m of parking will incur another £2,500. Because no work has been carried out on the ground, the establishment and lining costs will be incurred only once.</p> <p>CT asked if the work to finish the layby with kerb stones to protect the verge would be included in the costs indicated? SH said no, that would need to be in a new request given the complexity of the materials requested by the NT.</p>	
c)	8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment	<p>This is on a list of 16 no 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins.</p> <p>Report completed and sent to Parish Council for consideration.</p> <p>PC funding agreed at 25%.</p> <p>Advert for speed limit change to be undertaken.</p>	<p>SH felt this project is deliverable within 22/23. He did not have the costs to hand, but NP said that original quote from Atkins was for £6,500.</p> <p>NP asked about timescales for completion as he is being asked by residents about this almost every day. SH could not commit to a date, especially if there are objections to the advert, which will then need a Cabinet member report. He said that the advert period is 3 weeks and if no</p>	A2

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>objections, then design can go ahead looking at locations, then the manufacture and installation of the signs. So could be a few months.</p> <p>NP wanted to know if there are any changes to costs. SH did not think so at this stage.</p> <p>The group agreed to cap the parish's contribution at 25% of £6,500 or a minimum of 20% of costs.</p>	
d)	<p>Issue 5190 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>After questioning the recommendation for no change, SH confirmed that there is no way the speed limit review will be changed to alter the speed limit. He said that there are alternatives such as new signing and SLOW markings on the road.</p> <p>MP said that Savernake PC is disappointed with this and felt that the conversation had at the site visit was not taken into consideration. He asked if there is an appeal process but there is not. He felt there needs to be more liaison from Atkins with the parish council or LHFIG to have greater input of local concerns to the process. SH supported that. RSW said this issue came up a lot and that the review does not</p>	Pipeline

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>support the community's needs. He asked if this is based on national standards and SH said that it is based on DfT guidelines. MP felt the review was a waste of money if the feelings of residents are not taken into account. He felt that sightlines at the junction are too poor. CT suggested taking this conversation out of the meeting to look at further solutions that could be implemented this year. JD didn't feel challenging Atkins will get anywhere so felt this needs to be removed from the list. She suggested that CT as the Wilts Councillor should lobby the Cabinet member for a change in approach to speed reviews and taking community wishes into account. She felt the DfT guidelines do not need to be adopted in full. MC pointed out there are additional signs that could be installed at some of the junctions, e.g. for cricket club, that would highlight traffic turning for these. JD asked if this would block any other projects from taking a high priority slot.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			CT suggested this go on the "pipeline" list.	
e)	8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.	<p>Improvements for pedestrians including traffic calming requested.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken. Low-cost option includes warning signs and road markings to enhance the gateway.</p> <p>Footway and bus stop can be reconsidered and time can be given to this if agreed through the CATG.</p> <p>Design developed for low cost scheme. Cost estimate <£2k. PC contribution 25%.</p> <p>Signing due to be installed before the end of March. Road markings due late spring.</p> <p>Signing installed. Road markings to be implemented under the ad hoc process during the summer.</p>	<p>SH confirmed the signage is complete but the project still needs the establishment costs for the lining gang. That work needs to be packaged with other schemes in the area and would cost £3-400, including the PC contribution. SH confirmed this will be delivered this year.</p> <p>LK mentioned the full request also included construction of a full pavement to link whole village. She said how the PC has already allocated funding towards this work.</p> <p>SH confirm this footway will need a separate request form so it is logged properly. He felt that would need a substantive scheme big due to the scale of that work.</p>	A3
f)	8-20-4 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>f – i are connected and dealt with here together. SH mentioned a Teams meeting to discuss the strategy to move forward. This work will be broken into 2 steps: 1st will include SLOW markings, bars and improved signing, which could all be done in 22/23.</p>	A4

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

g)	8-21-2 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island	Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary Refer to 8-20-4	2 nd step would initially include the design work to move the speed limit out to Downs Lane, a new traffic island and use of “Marlborough” name signs on the island to create a gateway and let drivers know they are entering the town. The island in particular will be expensive and complicated and could cost £20,000+ Because they can be designed and implemented separately, irrespective of Step 2 and a Substantive bid, the lower cost items within Step 1 can be delivered with 22/23. MH asked for the progress notes to be updated to show this. JD agreed the low-cost work in step 1 should be done this financial year and also wanted SH to work towards the substantive bid. SH said that working on the design is likely to need a Topo survey and wanted the group’s agreement to fund one at approx. £1,500 CT agreed the step 1 work should go ahead. SH gave an estimate cost of £5,000. RSW noted he needed a clear design for step 1 and costs to	
h)	8-21-3 Related to 8-20-4 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. Refer to 8-20-4		
i)	8-21-4 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Road, Manton – request for sign.	Request for sign indicating Bridge St turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St. Refer to 8-20-4		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>take to MTC to agree it and their contribution. MH didn't think there will be a delay but needed the process done properly.</p> <p>SH asked for 8-20-4 (=5f and duplicate 5g) to stay on the list as step 2 but be moved into Pipeline for design work to be done this year including the Topo survey at £1500, with the others rolled into one as step 1. He felt step 1 plus the Topo survey from step 2 could be delivered this year. This was agreed as the way forward.</p>	
j)	<p>8-19-2 Place a sign(s) at the entrance to Manton Hollow advising 'No Through Road'.</p>	<p>Manton Hollow is a no through road that appears on many maps and sat-navs as a through road. It is a regular occurrence that cars and HGVs attempt to turn in the very restricted turning area at western end of the southern arm of Manton Hollow. This has resulted in damage to the two houses that front on to the turning area.</p> <p>A 'No through road' sign' is already installed at junction of Downs Lane with A4. PC have requested another sign is installed at the junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow.</p> <p>This can be progressed as a signing request if fully funded by the Town Council and the principle is agreed through CATG.</p> <p>MTC do not support a sign at junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow but wish to consider replacing the sign at the junction of Downs Lane with the A4.</p>	<p>SH gave the cost as £175 and confirmed this is going ahead.</p>	<p>A5 (leave on until confirmed complete)</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Request to consider 'No through road' sign at entrance to Manton Hollow. Can be installed. Cost estimate £175. 'No through road' sign to be implemented at entrance to Manton Hollow. MTC 25% agreed. CATG 75%		
k)	8-21-8 Aldbourn – virtual paths	Request for virtual paths along Farm Lane, entire length of Marlborough Rd, Castle St to Whitley Rd. To replace 18-19-11 TEAMS meeting undertaken with PC rep Chris Ainsworth.	Following a Teams meeting with the PC, SH has reduced the scope of this application from 4 down to 2 feasible roads – Marlborough Rd and Farm Ln. SH is looking at whether these roads will work within the scope of project and will come up with designs to go to Aldbourn PC. Costs are not that high - £3,000 per road. SH felt if an agreed solution can be developed, it is possible implementation could be delivered this year. CA asked what the PC could do to help	Pipeline
6.	Other Priority schemes			
a)	8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.	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. Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review. Contribution of £625 agreed.	CT asked about parish boundaries and which parishes will be involved in extending the 40mph limit towards Rockley. There was discussion about this. AJ felt there had not been any agreement as to how far towards Rockley would be included whilst	Pipeline

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>£1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Atkins undertook a site visit on Sunday 14th 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.</p>	<p>MH thought the recommendation was for just past the cemetery on Free's Ave.</p> <p>In terms of cost, SH said it would depend on how far the limit was moved.</p> <p>MC showed the group mapping of parish boundaries which indicated MTC's boundary ended a few hundred metres beyond the cemetery.</p> <p>MH thought that Preshute PC would be happy to contribute towards the costs. He will contact Preshute PC. Cost estimate will then be required.</p>	
b)	<p>8-19-4 Speed limit review at western end of Chilton Foliat (changed from 'Relocate 30mph limit at western end of Chilton Foliat').</p>	<p>This request does not meet the criteria for a 30mph limit which requires 3 frontages/ 100m. A speed limit review costing £2500 would give further information on whether a 40 or 50mph limit would be appropriate.</p> <p>PC have agreed 25% of costs for speed limit review, with anticipation of a 40 or 50mph limit in advance of the existing 30mph limit.</p> <p>Site visit undertaken and speed readings requested. Report due to be completed before end of March.</p> <p>Report sent to Chilton Foliat. No change recommended.</p>	<p>NC said the PC was not happy with this outcome. He asked of the PC was able to install their own lower speed limit if they paid 100% towards it. SH was clear this is not possible.</p> <p>NC accepted that this request could be closed.</p>	<p>To be removed</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

c)	<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>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. 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>For monitoring only.</p> <p>CT understood this item was to be reviewed at a later stage. MH asked if the landowners had been contacted and JD noted this was an action for MTC. JD asked if the new crossing had made an impact on pedestrian numbers on the pavement but MH said there can still be a queue of parents waiting along the footpath. It was agreed no further action at this stage.</p>	
d)	<p>8-19-1 Request for new pedestrian crossing at Marlborough High St.</p>	<p>Marlborough Town Council supports and endorses the petition requesting a pedestrian crossing in Marlborough High Street and will seek further expert advice in order to make supporting recommendations.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to possible formal crossings in Kingsbury St by Patten Alley and across the High St by the White Horse bookshop. Both locations are unsuitable for a formal crossing.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken. Consideration to be given to an informal crossing enhancement across Kingsbury St towards the steps at the front of the Town Hall.</p> <p>Scheme details, including design and costs, to be proposed to Town Council and implementation costs including traffic</p>	<p>CT thought the scale of this work meant it would need to be a substantive bid. MH said this would need a pedestrian count or survey to help establish the need for a crossing point before any design or bid could be made. SH said he needed to see the suggested proposals to look at its feasibility it was pointed out that these had been submitted over a month ago and incorrectly set up as a new item, 7b (which should be removed).</p>	Pipeline

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>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>	<p>There was a discussion on workload and JD noted that the increase in LHFIFG funding included new officer posts to help support the increased work of the groups. She suggested writing to the Cabinet member to find out when they will be appointed. SH said that there are trainee technicians being interviewed, however he felt more experienced officers were needed.</p> <p>CT asked for this project to be put in the "pipeline" category for SH to review the submitted proposal.</p>	
e)	<p>Issue 6784 Request for new signage location for new SID</p>	<p>Marlborough TC is keen to reduce speeding in the town and are looking at buying SIDs to deploy on a rotational basis. There are no suitable columns on Kingsbury St to install a SID. It has been suggested that if a new warning sign is installed at a location on Kingsbury St, it could also be suitable for the SID. CATG agrees to wait until new 20mph limit is installed in case a new post for a repeater sign become available.</p> <p>SH has given details of the suitable lighting column to Marlborough TC Clerk. Marlborough TC needs to speak with nearby homeowner to get approval. MH confirms this is in hand.</p>	<p>The SID has now been installed and this request can be removed.</p>	<p>To be removed</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>SH discussion with CH. No streetlighting columns are due to be replaced. The only possible location for a SID is on the column previously suggested. CH liaison with lighting team. Consider lighter SID unit.</p> <p>Either new column to be installed or post and socket to enable removal of post.</p> <p>Discussion on TEAMS including Atkins. Lighting column adjacent to No 39 has been given approval for the SID to be attached.</p>		
f)	8-19-8 A346 Cadley – traffic lights on A4	<p>Traffic modelling for junction would be required. CATG have approved in principle traffic modelling for Marlborough.</p> <p>JS to pursue this with area board and town councillors.</p> <p>This request began a conversation about the need for a wider traffic plan. AJ described speaking with Dave Thomas where he offered to take a look at this plan if the local area could provide the scope they wanted it to cover. The area board will take the lead in calling local PCs to be part of this study.</p> <p>MH said that there had been meetings with Dave Thomas from Highways. He had offered to put MH in touch with Atkins but this had not yet happened. MH discussions with Atkins undertaken.</p>	<p>This request has become the basis for the town's traffic study. CT explained that Atkins has come back with a proposed way forward and costs based on WC/Highway's brief, but these are significantly in excess of those mentioned in the pre brief discussion, with regard to data analysis/modelling after the data capture. Agreement on the funding needs to be agreed with WC officers.</p>	
g)	8-20-8	<p>PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review</p>	<p>SH said the data collected needed to be confirmed as acceptable</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. 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>		
h)	8-21-11 Clench Common - speeding	<p>Review speed limit, signing, gates</p> <p>Speed limit change unlikely. Possible warning signs. Community to discuss.</p>	<p>MP said how he wanted to progress with white gates which the PC will pay for 100% and has spoken with landowners, who are happy with this. He also wanted LHFIFG to consider putting in new warning signage, e.g. for horses, children, pedestrians, whatever was most appropriate. SH thought the gates would need to go in, to then look at where signage was best placed. MP was happy with this approach.</p>	
i)	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.</p> <p>Scheme on maintenance list.</p>	<p>MC was going to be installing the new markings. He will take this on and not put through LHFIFG. Request will need to stay on list for monitoring</p>	
j)	8-21-13 Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit	<p>Footway improvements/ speed calming measures.</p> <p>Metrocount to check speeds within the 30mph limit.</p>	<p>The Metrocount request has gone in. RSW will follow up if the survey has actually taken place.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

k)	8-22-1 Ramsbury – B4192 Whittonditch	Warning signs, traffic speed, gates, road markings. Metrocount being undertaken. MC and SG to discuss further on site.	MC has met with the PC to discuss this. He has used radar speed measuring at this location but the data is not yet ready.	
7.	New Requests / Issues			
a)	8-22-2 Marlborough, The Common	Crossing points/ traffic calming	This request is linked to item 6a and speed limits at Frees Ave and the recommendation not to lower the limit there from 40mph. It also links with item 5d and the need for greater liaison between Atkins and the local community about what they want to achieve from a speed limit review. SH felt it is up to the clubs operating at Frees Ave to manage their own players crossing the road. MC confirmed that Wilts Highways owns just the tarmacked road and no part of the verge. With responsibility for The Common, that falls to MTC. RSW and AJ mentioned some of the options they had discussed with the rugby club about provision for pedestrians. These include barriers on the verge to	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			channel pedestrians to cross at 1 point only and other features to show to drivers that people cross at that point. With the volume of people crossing, JD felt that LHFIFG needed to try and do something to help.	
b)	8-22-3 Marlborough, High Street	Pedestrian crossing	This was felt to be a duplicate of 8-19-1 and can be removed	To be removed
c)	8-22-4 Marlborough A346	Pedestrian crossing between The Acres and The Common across the A346	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. 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. Because of the high speeds seen here, this location is eligible for police speed checks to be carried out there.	
d)	8-22-5 Marlborough, Cherry Orchard	Handrails for steps on steep banks	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.	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

e)	8-22-6 Ogbourne St George – A346 Ridgeway crossing at Hallam Junction	Warning for the Ridgeway crossing.	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.
8.	Other items		
a)		NP mentioned that as coordinator of Ogbourne St Andrew's Community Speedwatch group, the location where checks were due to take place has been risk assessed and found that speeds there are too high for checks to be carried out. LK asked about a new request sent in to AJ for a new "No HGV" warning sign for within the village. This can be sent to the Ad Hoc signage team but will need to be ratified by LHFIG first. The group gave that agreement, so this request can move on and be handled by the Ad Hoc signage team outside of the LHFIG process.	
9.	Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 22 nd September, 10.00am Court Room, Marlborough Town Hall or via Teams (hybrid) if not possible to attend Thursday 24 th November, 10.00am Thursday 2 nd March 2023, 10.00am		

Marlborough Community Area Transport 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 CATG during their deliberations. The funding of projects will contribute to the continuance and/or improvement of environmental, social and community wellbeing in the community area, the extent and specifics of which will be dependent upon the individual project.

2. Financial Implications

2.1. All decisions must fall within the Highways funding allocated to Marlborough Area Board.

2.2. If funding is allocated in line with CATG recommendations outlined in this report, and all relevant 3rd party contributions are confirmed, Marlborough Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of £

3. Legal Implications

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

4. HR Implications

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

5. Equality and Inclusion Implications

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

6. Safeguarding implications