

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	Marlborough Community Area Transport Group			
	Date of meeting: Thursday 3rd March 2022			
1.	Attendees and apologies			
	Present:	Cllr James Sheppard (Chair), Steve Hind, Martin Cook, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Chris Ainsworth, Karen Clay (Aldbourne PC); Cllr Stephen Stacy (Avebury PC); Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC); Cllr Jill Turner (Fyfield & West Overton PC); Cllr Mervyn Hall, Richard Spencer-Williams (Marlborough TC); Cllr John Hetherington (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Rachel Inglefield (Ogbourne St George PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Cllr Sheila Glass, Rob Audritt (Ramsbury PC); Cllr Martin Phipps (Savernake PC).		
	Apologies:	Cllr Jae Davies, Cllr Caroline Thomas (Wiltshire Council).		
2.	Notes of last meeting			
		The minutes of the previous CATG meeting held on the 9 th December were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 11 th January 2022 <i>Link can be found at</i> https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=165&Year=0		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

3.	Financial Position			
		Finance sheet to be presented.	SH ran through the financial commitments to the different projects underway through CATG. Even with contributions, the current balance is -£6,240 AJ quickly mentioned changes to CATG from April '22: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They will become known as Local Highways & Footpaths Improvement Groups (LHFIG) • They will begin to look at improvements to Rights of Way. Discussions have started to bring in RoW officers to add their expertise to meetings • The budget will be doubled to reflect this extra work 	
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 5 Priority Schemes Following discussion of all projects currently being developed, the priority of remaining schemes was allocated. The letter given here reflects the new priority. SH stressed the need for the group to prioritise five projects to allow focus of limited time on those the group wants taking forward.			
a)	Issue 6874 Request for safety measures on A4361 near Winterbourne Bassett +	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	SH said the works package is with Ringway and he is liaising with them and the project is moving forward. He is not doing	A1

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	<p>Issue 7023 safety on the A4361 county boundary to Beckhampton.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>CATG have agreed to proceed with the speed limit. Costs for the advert process will be £3k.</p> <p>12.5% contribution from Avebury PC and 12.5% from BB&WM PC.</p> <p>Scheme has been advertised and Cabinet Member Report prepared to address objections.</p> <p>Report signed off following further representation from Avebury PC at stage of 'intention to make decision'</p> <p>Detail design complete and works package with Ringway for implementation. Updated cost estimate £14300.</p>	<p>much work on the scheme but is managing the team that is doing the detailed work. This will need to stay on the High Priority list until completion and will hopefully be removed next time.</p> <p>SS questioned the cost of £14,300 and asked if this was the length from Beckhampton through to the northern edge of Berwick Bassett. SH said that is the correct cost – implementation will be expensive due to the need for repeater signage along the whole length and the new posts for them involving traffic management.</p>	
b)	<p>8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>Site meeting undertaken.</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>SH reported the report is complete and been sent to the TC. The report did not recommend the speed is lowered past the rugby club but does suggest the 40mph limit is extended further out of town towards Rockley.</p> <p>MH was disappointed in the result and wanted this re-assessed. SH felt there was more that the rugby club could do to help players cross the road more</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<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>safely. RSW said he had spoken with the club about this more and there was a new CATG request for other measures for Frees Ave waiting to be agreed by MTC. JS felt there was more pressure that Wiltshire Councillors could apply to allow communities to reduce the speeds of their roads</p>	
c)	<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>SH reported there had been several meetings. There had been a design but there were objections from Avebury PC and the NT. There has been a site meeting to establish where the yellow markings are to go. SH is now writing a Cabinet report stating these changes. Once this is signed off, the new layby can be implemented. This will allow enforcement to begin. SH will have a meeting with the NT to discuss construction methods for the layby, but this will be difficult. SS was grateful to SH for these meetings and is happy with progress. He asked SH to confirm that the new layby will hold just 3 cars. SH confirms that is correct.</p>	A2

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<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>		
d)	<p>8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment</p>	<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>SH said that the report is complete and has been sent to the PC. It recommends a change to 20mph and that speeds are currently under 20mph already. JH reported that the PC is happy with the report and will probably go ahead but has not had a meeting to formally agree it. SH asked to confirm the 25% contribution and to progress with the scheme. JH confirms.</p>	A3
e)	<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>SH has had the report but is currently discussing this with Atkins. They have recommended no change but SH has pointed out features that he feels are worthy of a reduced limit. He would like Atkins to re-assess. SH will send the report to Savernake PC. MP was disappointed there is no change and would like Atkins' justifications for that.</p>	A4

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			SH can look at signing and marking solutions that will help if there is no progress on changing the limit.	
f)	8-19-4 Speed limit review at western end of Chilton Foliat (changed from 'Relocate 30mph limit at western end of Chilton Foliat').	<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>SH has the report back but this has not yet been sent on to the PC. It recommends no change. SG has counted 13 issues on this agenda related to speed and feels more needs to be done to allow communities to take charge of speeding in their areas. AJ described the difference in "speeding" between drivers going too fast and breaking the law and where communities feel the current speed limit is too fast for road conditions and wanting to see the limit reduced to increase safety. SS felt this is about a democratic process to allow communities to make their own choice. JS wanted the report taken to Chilton Foliat PC and asked if there was any likelihood of the report changing? SH said how Atkins had given their professional judgement based on road conditions and this was not likely to change</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

g)	<p>8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.</p>	<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>SH reported that signage has been ordered and going for implementation. Road markings are on Ringway's lining programme. This will need dry conditions to go down and need to wait for a bundle of similar works to come together. This will remain on the list until implementation is complete.</p>	A5
h)	<p>8-20-4 A4 Manton traffic calming</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.</p>	<p>SH explained it is the traffic island element that is going towards the Substantive bid and that other, smaller elements could be implemented through CATG. Completing these could give a clearer picture and show the need for the traffic island. SH recommended a meeting to discuss and agree solutions for the different elements. MH was disappointed and felt this was a step backwards in treating the different parts separately. SH disagreed and said this is a way to deal with the whole project without having to wait for one</p>	A6

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>overall bid, which might not be successful.</p> <p>PM asked if this could go to a TC meeting to take forward at that forum. SH said that's why a Teams meeting is helpful to look at different solutions. If 2-5 people could have input to possible solutions, that would be easier.</p> <p>JS liked a meeting between Manton Residents' Assoc and the town council. RSW agreed for the need for a project group to take this forward by the next CATG meeting.</p> <p>MH was worried about not knowing the cost of these suggestions before progressing.</p> <p>JS felt there needed to be some meetings to discuss solutions first so that SH can provide estimates.</p>	
i)	<p>8-21-2 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island</p>	<p>Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary</p>		
j)	<p>8-21-3 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for transverse yellow markings</p>	<p>Request for transverse yellow road markings on westbound approach to crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.</p>		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

k)	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.		
6.	Other Priority schemes			
a)	8-21-5 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> <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>To be moved to 'other priorities' list.</p>	For monitoring only.	
b)	Froxfield's Village Traffic Plan	Construction of the western gateway completed June 2020. Commitment from the CATG to also progressing with the design of the eastern gateway.	SH said how a safety audit has been carried out and has picked up on some minor signing issues. These will be picked up through	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Froxfield PC have agreed 25% contribution. Construction complete at the end of May.</p> <p>Stage 3 safety audit undertaken. Minor signing changes recommended.</p>	<p>the general budget and those changes made. This can now be removed from the list.</p>	
c)	<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 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>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>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		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.		
d)	6614 Request for No Parking measures on A4 at Fyfield	<p>Vehicles, including HGVs, park on both sides of the road on the A4 at the filling station at Fyfield. This causes an obstruction and can be dangerous when other vehicles try to pass them on the opposite side of the road. The PC would like new markings to stop vehicles parking at the sides the A4. JT is liaising with Jamie Mundy.</p> <p>This area is not currently prioritised for waiting restriction reviews by Jamie Mundy.</p>	JT was able to confirm that the TRO consultation has taken place and that the new lines can go in. It was agreed this can be removed from the list.	
e)	Issue 6784 Request for new signage location for new SID	<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>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>RSW said that he is waiting on quotes for a new SID for deployment around the town. This could be of a different design but will need to refer back to Clare Harris, who is leading on this work.</p> <p>SH reported that Atkins were not happy with MTC using their current SID on the light column as it is too heavy, so MTC would need to buy a new, lighter unit if they want to go ahead with this location. To proceed with the same unit would need a removable post and socket to be installed for Kingsbury St. RSW replied that a new SID would need to serve the whole of the</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Either new column to be installed or post and socket to enable removal of post.	town, so they need to look at the best solution. RSW suggested a small project group is set up to look at this and make the decision	
f)	8-19-2 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> <p>Request to consider 'No through road' sign at entrance to Manton Hollow. Can be installed. Cost estimate £175.</p>	<p>SH asked where the funding for this would come from. MH said that MTC was reluctant to set a precedent of funding projects 100%. PM reported that Manton Residents' Assoc. did not support paying for the new sign. SH then suggested removing this from the CATG list.</p> <p>MH said that MTC is able to contribute the usual 25%. Following a vote, members agreed for CATG to fund the remaining 75%. 'No through road' sign to be implemented at entrance to Manton Hollow.</p>	A7
g)	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</p>	<p>MH said how he had met with Atkins to discuss the survey and traffic modelling needed. This could be done including data gathered via ANPR. MH felt this would be expensive and wanted to know more about this and any alternatives, along with costs.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>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. JS will chase Dave Thomas for this contact.</p>	<p>JS felt progress is being made, which was the main thing.</p>	
h)	8-19-11 Aldbourn, request for virtual footway	To be prioritised - to be replaced by 8-21-8		
i)	8-20-8 Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village	<p>PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review</p> <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>SG reported that the Metrocount should now be done as the tubes had been at the location several weeks ago. SH will chase up the report.</p>	
j)	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	<p>CA said how there is plenty of local support for this scheme and how it will make it safer to for residents to walk into the village and to encourage walking generally. JS agreed with this. SH said how this project needs to be given a high priority to allow him to begin assessments into suitability.</p>	1 st Reserve

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			JS felt the village is keen for all three roads to be looked at at the same time.	
k)	8-21-11 Clench Common - speeding	Review speed limit, signing, gates	<p>MP described that residents are feeling that this is becoming a rat run down from the A345 to Wootton Rivers at 60mph and there needs to be something to slow down this traffic. He said how this includes HGV traffic to a local business and also delivery drivers using this as a cut-through.</p> <p>SH felt that a speed limit change would not be possible but warning signage, particularly at pinch points could be. MC said how he knew about this already.</p> <p>JS felt the community needed to discuss and agree what's possible and what they'd like to see implemented</p>	
l)	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>MC thought this can be achieved by lining and has put this job onto a list. SH thought that a Slow marking would be effective. MC could not put a date on the work, only saying he can put requests on a list</p>	
m)	8-21-13 Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit	Footway improvements/ speed calming measures	MH reported this is a speeding problem as vehicles enter the town from the east. This is made worse by there being no footway.	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			Here, the speed transitions from 60mph, to 30mph to 20mph. SH recommended a Metrocount to test speeds within the 30mph limit	
7.	New Requests / Issues			
a)	8-22-1 Ramsbury – B4192 Whittonditch	Warning signs, traffic speed, gates, road markings.	<p>SG described the crossroads at Whittonditch and four new houses there plus several entrances onto the B4192. Drivers think this point is the only place to overtake, so try to do so which can be dangerous for any vehicles coming out of properties or the crossroads. A Metrocount had been turned down as being in a 60mph limit.</p> <p>SG asked for white gates to highlight a settlement there. JS agreed with this. SG said how the PC would pay 100% if they get permission to go ahead.</p> <p>SH mentioned a number of ideas here and MC suggested improved signing to show the crossroads. SG and MC will meet on site to look further.</p>	
8.	Other items			
a)				

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

9.	Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 26 th May, 10.00am location tbc Thursday 22 nd September, 10.00am 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

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