

Date: 3 November, 2010  
 Time: 15:30 am  
 Venue: De La Wyllye Meeting Room, Bourne Hill, Salisbury  
 Attendees: Mary Douglas (MD) Chair, Gill Anlezark (GA), Annie Child (AC), Cllr Chris Cochrane (CC), Marianna Dodd (M), Spencer Drinkwater (SD), Peter Durnan (PD), SCC Cllr John English (JE), Tom Gardner (TG), Cllr Cheryl Hill (CH), Winnie Manning (WM), Pam Rouquette (PR), Nicola Sage (NS), Steve Wilson (SW), Charlotte, Oly, Cameron

	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.0	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair stated that a representative for bus users, older people and young people had been invited to this meeting. Unfortunately, the representative for Age UK was unable to attend.</p>	
2.0	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Debrah Biggs, David Bullock, Margaret Willmot, Helen Rowe (Age UK) all sent their apologies to the meeting.</p>	
3.0	<p><b>Review of selected schemes</b></p> <p>The Chair explained the group would focus on schemes selected at the previous meeting held on 13 September - items 1,2,5,12,30 on the spreadsheet and prioritise those.. She asked SD to explain the column headings, particularly for those new members to the meeting. SD explained that points were given based on laid down criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street/Area Location – the areas chosen for consideration</li> <li>• Scheme description – what has been requested i.e., pedestrian refuge</li> <li>• No of ped/cyc accidents – incidents in this area</li> <li>• Traffic threat and intimidation traffic flows, speeds, %HGVs and through traffic</li> <li>• Number of people potential benefitting from the scheme</li> <li>• School travel scores – if the school has a travel plan, will score higher</li> <li>• Local Amenity – benefits of local access i.e., schools, shops</li> <li>• Linkages – refers to bus &amp; rail stations, where improved access, points given</li> <li>• Enviro scores – points given for environmental benefits such as air quality</li> <li>• Overall Scores – Indicate priority areas</li> </ul> <p>SD advised that the group should look at the expert opinion for guidance but apply own local knowledge to the exercise. TG would be carrying out further investigation into the schemes chosen by the group.</p> <p>JE thought it would be helpful to know what the potential solutions could be which doesn't necessarily mean they could be implemented. SD responded that the Board had only £14,758 to spend and highlighted the costs of implementing schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian refuge - £5k – 10k</li> <li>• Zebra crossing - £20k</li> <li>• Signalling puffin crossing - £60k</li> <li>• Traffic calming - £50k – 100k</li> <li>• Footways - £100 per metre</li> <li>• Bus stops - £5k - £10k</li> <li>• Mini roundabouts - £10k - £20k</li> </ul> <p>MD suggested that the group look at each of the 5 schemes in detail</p>	

**1) Stratford Road: Pedestrian refuge.**

MD explained that South Wilts Grammar School and older peoples' homes were on one side of Stratford Road; Victoria Park, and a one stop shop accessed through the park were on the other side. She was seeking a safe way for older people to cross the road and had been advised by Highways Officers that a pedestrian refuge was probably the best solution. SWGS was too far along the road for the refuge to also serve SWGS pupils.

**2) Cherry Orchard Lane: Footway improvements.**

This came to SD through the Area Board issue log. SD explained that one side was a bridge with the other side pedestrian access. The aim was to try to improve the footway and pedestrian access for one-way walking. This is potentially quite expensive. TG had had a discussion with CC about the problem of pedestrian's passing one another in different directions. This required further investigation.

**3) A3094 Harnham Road: Pedestrian and cycling safety improvements**

CH concerns were the traffic speeds along this road. Already a pedestrian had been killed outside Grasmere Road. A request had been made for a traffic refuge to be moved nearer the roundabout and something to slow traffic. PR asked if there was a standard width for a refuge. SD said the standard width was 1.2 but they have been increasing, now looking at 1.8/2 metres as a minimum. If the traffic refuge was moved it could also be widened. However, GA thought this would not be good for cyclists. TG said that speed humps would not be convenient as there were pinch points. SW suggested the following:

- Phase 1: Move Refuge
- Phase 2: Traffic calming.

**4) Coombe Road: Pedestrian and cycling safety improvements.**

CH advised of petitions had been submitted from residents on the southern side relating to problems of drivers breaking the speed limit, e.g., 60mph in a 30mph zone. SD said that the criteria would be speeding. SD stated the concern that the T junction was dangerous. PD referred to Section 106 money and said that Council officers should be proactive and talk to Developers about making a contribution which could go towards these transport schemes. 3 solutions were discussed:

- Flashing speed signs on entry to the city. SCC offered to pay for one if WC paid for a second, although the need for 2 signs was queried. TG said that a study on flashing signs showed that at first they were effective but the effectiveness decreased in time.
- Move existing pedestrian refuge nearer to the city, to the south of St Andrews Way
- Extend 30mph limit out to the junction with Blandford Rd and possibly put another flashing sign over the hill

**5) Laverstock Road/Manor Farm Road junction:**

A mini roundabout plus a pedestrian refuge would make provision for both pedestrians and cyclists.

MD asked the young people their views. They commented on the problem of having only one bus every hour finishing at 5-6pm from Bishopdown Farm. MD asked that they contact their Ward Councillor, Bill Moss to investigate this. PR advised that a recent bus retendering consultation was looking at late night buses, and altering routes to Bishopdown Farm, taking a circular route through Laverstock. Young people should raise this.

Charlotte said that more than one pedestrian crossing was required, one by the shop/cycle path and one on the road opposite Laverstock School. TG referred to the problems of vehicles parking near the crossing and that schools would be updating their travel plan for next year where these problems should be raised. MD suggested that the young people talk to their Head Teacher about their ideas, which would be welcomed by the school and could be included in the Travel Plans. Olly said the road was busy with students and cars and that sometimes students test their luck with the traffic. SD said there would be an opportunity to make comments at the consultation of the Local Transport Plan starting next week.

**4.0 Final Recommendations**

An open voting process commenced with each group member allowed 3 votes each. After the first vote, 3 schemes were tied, so a second vote took place.

Street/Area Location	Scheme description	1 <sup>st</sup> Vote	2 <sup>nd</sup> Vote
Stratford Road	a pedestrian refuge	4	2
Cherry Orchard Lane	footway improvements	3 x	n/a
A3094 Harnham Road	Move pedestrian Refuge Traffic calming	6 √	n/a
Coombe Road	Speeding – flashing signs Move pedestrian refuge Extend 30 mph zone	4	3
Laverstock Road/Manor Farm Road junction	A mini-roundabout a pedestrian refuge more than one pedestrian crossing	4	4

The 3 schemes chosen to go forward are:

- A3094 Harnham Road
- Coombe Road
- Laverstock Road/Manor Farm Road Junction

**5.0 Next steps**

The following points would be taken forward:

- A report with recommendations from the CATG would be submitted to the Salisbury Area Board meeting on the 30 November, 2010
- TG to look at the feasibility of the three chosen schemes as well as the costs to implement them

M

TG

CC felt strongly that the group would not want to see the £14,758 spent solely on the feasibility study as this exercise needed to be worthwhile with schemes being implemented.

The Chair thanked everyone for contributing to the Community Area Transport Scheme exercise.