

AGENDA

Meeting: Corsham Community Area Transport Group (CATG)
Place: Committee Room A, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER
Date: Wednesday 23 August 2017
Time: 10.00 am

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Kate Wysocki, Traffic Engineer, 01225 713302 direct line or email kate.wysocki@wiltshire.gov.uk

AGENDA

Membership of the CATG

For membership please click on the link below:

<http://moderngov.wiltshire.council/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=1308>

1 **Note Tracker** (*Pages 3 - 20*)

The following information is included in the attached Note Tracker:

- Attendees and Apologies
- Approval of notes of the previous meeting
- Financial Position
- Top 5 Priority Schemes
- Other Priority Schemes
- New Requests/Issues
- Current / ongoing schemes
- Other items

2 **Date of the next meeting**

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Who
	Date of meeting: 23rd August 2017			
1.	Attendees and apologies			
	<p>Attendees:</p> <p>Apologies:</p>	<p>Spencer Drinkwater Wiltshire Council Richard Rogers Wiltshire Council Simon Scott Corsham Town Council Cllr Phil Whalley Wiltshire Council Cllr Ruth Hopkinson Wiltshire Council Kate Wysocki Wiltshire Council Rod Taylor Corsham Town Council Paul Bollen Wiltshire Council Stuart Gregory Lacock Parish Council Cllr Ben Anderson Wiltshire Council Cllr Brian Mathew Wiltshire Council Glenys Gill Colerne PC Peter Shaw Lacock PC Vaughan Hill Box Parish Council Chris Wilson Colerne PC Brian Withers Residents of Tutton Hill, Colerne Donald Thompson Residents of Tutton Hill, Colerne Neville Farmer Corsham Town Council</p> <p>No apologies received</p>		

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

Page 4	2.	Notes of last meeting		
			The notes of the last meeting held on 7 th June 2017 were accepted as a true record.	
	3.	Financial Position		
			The current financial situation is attached at the end of this report	
	4.	Top 5 Priority Schemes		
	a)	Skynet Drive	<p>A legal document which includes a plan of the route, is required to be completed before the barrier can be installed. The recommendation from Wiltshire Council and originally accepted by the MOD were for improvements at Bradford Road to increase visibility. These would need to be reflected in the plan. It does not seem that these improvements will now occur.</p> <p>The heads of terms of the legal agreement has been sent to the MOD for their agreement</p>	
	b)	<p>Issue No: 4482 Devizes Road, Box</p> <p>Installation of white gates. The Box Parish Council would like to see this funded by CATG.</p>	<p>Work has been completed bar some final signing which Kate Wysocki is dealing with.</p> <p>Site work now complete and invoice sent. Recommend issue be closed.</p>	<p>Close issue</p> <p>RR</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>c)</p>	<p>Issue No: 4364 Hither Way Lacock</p> <p>Dangerous crossing across Hither Way from National Trust visitor car park into Lacock.</p>	<p>Cost estimate is approx. £55k. NT have confirmed they will contribute £25k towards the construction of this project. CATG group to consider the feasibility of funding remaining cost of £30k.</p> <p>There was a discussion around who should fund the project. It was agreed to approach Lacock Parish Council to fund 25% of the remaining balance of £30k.</p> <p>Lacock Parish Council have been approached regarding contributing 25% minus the £500 already paid (£7,000 in total).</p> <p>Lacock Parish Council have agreed that they (via the National Trust) will pay the additional £7k</p> <p>There is an opportunity to apply for the substantial bid pot in Wiltshire Council. It was agreed that this will be done for the remaining £23k. The CATG will look to fund it themselves if unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Put in substantial bid for £23k</p> <p>Schedule in the work so that it can be done as soon as possible once the funding has been found.</p>	<p>KW</p> <p>KW</p>
-----------	--	--	--	---------------------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>d)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue 4911: Pickwick, Corsham</p> <p>Various traffic management requests.</p>	<p>A discussion about the effectiveness of white gates was had and it was agreed to bring any evidence to the next CATG meeting for information.</p> <p>The TC reported that they would not provide the 25% of the costs. However, they are not opposed to the project. It was agreed that unless 25% contribution of the funding can be found then the project can't take place.</p> <p>Wiltshire haven't carried out any specific before/after research on the effectiveness of village gates. I refer you to LTN 01/07 Traffic Calming pages 83-85 (extract attached at end of this document for information). It is difficult to quantify the effectiveness of gateways as each location is different. I would recommend that this type of feature creates more of a visual impact to alert drivers to the change in environment.</p> <p>RH to confirm the position of the Pickwick Association on this proposal.</p> <p>The Pickwick Association are not willing to fund the remaining 25% of the funding. Hence it is to be closed as no more action can be taken.</p> <p>The evidence provided from research elsewhere suggests that the affect white gates has on speed is minimal. However, there was a difference of opinion from those attending the CATG as to their value with some pointing to other evidence and other factors to consider</p>	<p>Close the issue</p>	<p>RR</p>
-----------	--	---	------------------------	-----------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>e)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue 5481: Traffic calming measures for Lacock Village.</p> <p>Various traffic management requests around Lacock</p>	<p>Lacock Parish Council is concerned with the amount of traffic that comes through the village particularly because of the surrounding development. A report has been carried out and the question was asked of how this should be taken forward.</p> <p>The first request is the installation of white gates with consideration later of a 20mph limit. The CATG agreed to recommend funding the White Gates location survey.</p> <p>KW submitted revised preliminary designs after further discussion with the Parish Council. The revised proposals will be discussed at the Parish Council meeting to be held on 14th August and the outcome will be presented at the CATG meeting.</p> <p>The Parish Council agreed to support and fund 25% of the proposals if there is support locally. A consultation event will take place on the proposals to ensure this is the case. As a result of the consultation, some adjustments may be required.</p>	<p>Report back to CATG once the consultation has taken place.</p> <p>Look to see if there is somewhere to carry out a metro count where one was carried out before white gates installed e.g. Box</p>	<p>Lacock PC</p> <p>KW</p>
-----------	--	---	---	----------------------------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

5.	Other Priority Schemes		
a)	Issue 4105 HGV's Speeding on A365 Box	<p>Survey results are expected in June.</p> <p>SD to discuss the report at the meeting.</p> <p>The results came back in July but the report that came back had some gaps and so it has been sent back for some changes.</p>	<p>Chase up the revised report so that it can be viewed as soon as possible.</p> <p>SD</p>
b)	<p>Area Board Issue 4820: The Stoneworks, Neston, SN13 9YJ</p> <p>Request for amendment to street nameplate.</p>	<p>Request for issues relating to street name plates which should be dealt with through the Area Office.</p> <p>The TC discussed the issue and agreed that it was not the responsibility of them or Wiltshire Council but the responsibility of the residents who should be expected to pay for it.</p> <p>PB reported that costs would be £130 for each sign.</p> <p>It was agreed that the sign that is not the developer's responsibility should be replaced</p>	<p>Recommendation – Arrange for a new sign to be put up that points people to Stoneworks from Moor Park. The cost to be approximately £130.</p> <p>See if the developer will put up the amended sign they are responsible for (SD).</p> <p>PB</p> <p>SD</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>c)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue 5046: Gastard Lane, Gastard</p> <p>Request for weight limit on Gastard Lane from C153 to Thingley.</p>	<p>Request for weight restriction along Gastard Lane from C153 to where the lane forks at Thingley and to join the Corsham/Lacock Road.</p> <p>The road is very narrow and it is unlikely that anyone can speed along it or that many HGV's would choose to use it. A metro count could be considered but there is no obvious place to safely attach it.</p> <p>SS to report back if it was possible to carry out metro count at this location.</p> <p>SS has looked at the site but will catch up with the metro count officer to check that one can be installed.</p>	<p>Action – Put in metro count if possible.</p>	<p>SS</p>
-----------	---	---	---	-----------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>d)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue 5295: Pool Green, Neston</p> <p>Vehicles driving the wrong way along a one way road.</p>	<p>Pool Green has a one-way system with no entry signage at one end. However, a number of drivers are still driving this route in the wrong direction causing a safety issue.</p> <p>Signage checked on site and all in place. KW has sent the TRO to the police and requested some enforcement take place. Recommend issue now be closed.</p>	<p>Close issue</p>	<p>RR</p>
-----------	---	--	--------------------	-----------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>e)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue 5291: 7.5t weight restriction in Lacock Village</p> <p>HGV vehicles and large farm vehicles using this route in contravention of existing weight restriction.</p>	<p>HGV and farm traffic using the roads through Lacock which are subject to a 7.5t weight restriction. Request to improve signage for the weight restriction and erect additional signs to warn of forthcoming restriction on A350. The weight restriction signs cannot be relocated without amending the TRO.</p> <p>Metro count data collected over a 14 day period on Forest Lane & Bowden Hill to identify how many HGV movements are taking place:</p> <p>Forest Lane – busiest day Friday 7th July 2017 with a total of 129 HVG vehicles out of a total of 1883 vehicle movements resulting in 7% being HGV's.</p> <p>Bowden Hill – busiest day Friday 30th June 2017 with a total of 134 HGV vehicles out of a total of 2217 vehicle movements resulting in 6% being HGV's.</p> <p>NB: Agricultural vehicles are exempt from the environmental weight restriction which covers Lacock village.</p> <p>Discuss whether the group want to make this a top priority for a signing review to erect additional signage on A350 & A342 to give advance warning of the weight restriction in Lacock.</p>	<p>Put this on the priority list</p>	<p>KW</p>
-----------	--	--	--------------------------------------	-----------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

6.	New Requests / Issues		
a)	<p>Area Board Issue 5548: Bus stop – Melksham Road, Lacock</p> <p>Bus stop sign is not visible from the buses and it is an unsafe place to wait for a bus.</p>	<p>Bus stop located on the northbound carriageway of Melksham Road, Lacock opposite Talbot View has a sign which is not visible from the bushes and there is concern over the safety of waiting for the bus at this location. Request to put a new post in at the informal layby south of the existing bus stop to allow pedestrians to wait safely for the bus.</p> <p>Passenger Transport team are happy for the sign/post to be moved if funding can be agreed</p> <p>Part of the issue is to cut some of the hedge down. However, for safety reasons, the bus stop should be moved. A rough estimate of cost is @£400 but Lacock PC will need to contribute 25% of the cost</p> <p>The CATG supported this issue but felt that it was not one of the top 5 priorities at the moment. It would be kept on the agenda so that when there is an opportunity, it can be considered again to be a priority.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

b)	<p>Area Board Issue 5540: HGV vehicles – A4 Box HGV vehicles using unsuitable routes between Box & Colerne</p>	<p>HGV traffic ignoring the advisory signage along the A4 and using unsuitable routes to get from Box to Colerne such as Tutton Hill/Mill Lane.</p> <p>Tutton Hill is one of the CATG's priorities for the 2017/18 Freight Assessment & Prioritization Mechanism (FAPM) process. However due to the elections, WC are still waiting for all community areas to submit their priorities before any decision is made.</p> <p>Signage has been checked and is correct at the moment, although it is agreed that it is not sufficient. No more action can be taken at the moment and the process for change is through the FAPM.</p>		
c)	<p>Area Board Issue 5530: HGV vehicles – A4 Box</p> <p>HGV vehicles using unsuitable routes between Box & Colerne</p>	<p>**Same as issue number 5540 above**</p>	Close Issue	RR
d)	<p>Area Board Issue 5379: 7.5t weight restriction in Lacock Village</p> <p>HGV vehicles and large farm vehicles using this route in contravention of existing weight restriction.</p>	<p>**Same as issue number 5291 above**</p>	Close Issue	RR

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

e)	<p>Area Board Issue: 5366: Bus stop on Bradford Road between Westwood Road & Skynet Drive, Corsham</p> <p>Pedestrians crossing from the westbound bus stop to get to the residential properties.</p>	<p>Concerns raised over safety of pedestrians using the westbound bus stop on B3109 Bradford Road (between junctions of Skynet Drive & Westwood Road). Once they have been dropped off they have to cross this road to access the existing footway and residential properties. Request for crossing or ask that the bus service turns into Westwood Road and stops on the residential side of Bradford Road.</p> <p>To be discussed at the meeting. This issue should be linked to the Skynet Drive proposals as this work includes the provision of a Toucan crossing at this location.</p> <p>No action can be taken on this now until Skynet is progressed</p>	<p>Close issue and inform requester this will be considered as part of the Skynet Drive Project.</p>	RR
f)	<p>Area Board Issue: 5501: HGV vehicles – A4 Box</p> <p>HGV vehicles using unsuitable routes between Box & Colerne</p>	<p>**Same as issue number 5540 above**</p>	<p>Close issue and refer to 5540</p>	RR
g)	<p>Area Board Issue: 5495: Pickwick Road, Corsham</p> <p>Request for Traffic Calming measures.</p>	<p>**Relates to issue number 4911 – Village gates for Pickwick Road, Corsham**</p>	<p>Merge with issue 4911 and close</p>	RR

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>h)</p>	<p>Area Board Issue: 5494: Pound Pill, Corsham</p> <p>Vehicles mounting the footway because of parking and oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>Concerns raised over vehicles mounting the footway along Pound Pill due to existing on street parking conflict with oncoming traffic. Request for a change to the parking arrangement on the opposite side of the road or to raise the footway level/kerb line to deter vehicles from mounting the footway.</p> <p>To be discussed at the meeting.</p> <p>The proposals for changes to parking restrictions on Pound Pill will only extend the double yellow lines by approx. 8m.</p> <p>If this is to be changed again, it will not be picked up for several years as Corsham is having all changes done this year.</p> <p>If there was no parking this would increase speeding which may not be desirable with the school at the bottom of the hill.</p> <p>It was agreed to ask Highways to look to see if any minor improvements can be carried out.</p>	<p>Add to priority list and look to see if any improvements can be carried out</p>	<p>KW / PB</p>
-----------	---	---	--	----------------

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

7.	Other items			
a)	Re-location of 2 bus shelters from Westwells Road	<p>As a consequence of the location of the new pedestrian crossing designed by our consultant Atkins and due to be installed Autumn 2017, there are 2 bus shelters which require removal. They are in good condition and it is considered they could be relocated elsewhere in Corsham area.</p> <p>This was discussed to determine if the group wish to fund the relocation of these shelters or they will be removed and put into storage when the formal crossing is constructed.</p> <p>The Town Council would need to decide if they wish to take them on including the future maintenance.</p> <p>Costings are required in order for the Town Council and CATG to discuss whether they wish to take them on. A possible location is the Campus.</p> <p>Confirmation received from MoD that the installation of the new pedestrian crossing on Westwells Road has been put on hold due to funding constraints. KW has costed the relocation of the bus shelters which will be in the region of £2,500.</p> <p>A decision on whether to relocate the shelters at this time or wait to see the outcome of the crossing installation to be discussed at the meeting.</p> <p>The CATG and the Town Council agreed that the shelters are not required at the moment. The issue can be closed.</p>	remove issue	RR / KW

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>b)</p>	<p>Beechfield Road parking issue.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding parking along Beechfield Road outside the Community Campus parking entrance. Problems have been reported of near misses on the corner.</p>	<p>Issue discussed with Network Management and it is recommended the most appropriate action would be additional waiting restrictions in this area. This can be incorporated within the Corsham Town Review which is currently ongoing. Suggested TC/Local Member undertake consultation with affected businesses/properties before this is taken further.</p> <p>It was agreed that this is an issue but the only option would be waiting restrictions but these are not without challenges. Corsham TC confirmed this with Network Management and it has been added to the Corsham Review.</p> <p>This scheme for double yellow lines is being drawn up with the Town Council for a TRO. Keep issue open to the work is complete.</p> <p>Review formal advertisement period is 16th June – 10th July 2017. Objections have been received therefore the next stage is to submit a report to the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport.</p>		
<p>c)</p>	<p>Corsham Cycle Network</p>	<p>Discuss the priorities for the town's cycle network going forward.</p> <p>A budget has been allotted in Corsham TC.to take it forward but there are insufficient resources within WC. The proposal to add it to the priority list so that Kate can put some of her time to it was agreed.</p>	<p>Make one of the cycle network priority schemes part of the top 5 priorities for the CATG.</p>	<p>KW</p>
<p>d)</p>	<p>The role of the Parish Steward</p>	<p>Discuss the expectations for and responsibilities of the Parish Steward. Weed spraying is not now carried out but pot hole filling is.</p>	<p>Contact Bill Parks about what Parish Stewards provide and copy in CATG and PC's (RR).</p>	<p>RR</p>

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 13</p>	<p>AOB Issue 5305 – Woodland Adventurers / Boxfields Junction</p>	<p>There are two issues tied into this topic. The first is the speed of vehicles approaching the crossroads adjacent to Woodland Adventurers (Boxfields/White Ennox Lane). The second is the parking of Woodlands Adventurers Customers vehicles on Boxfields. The combined issues represent a considerable traffic hazard which would benefit from a metro count which the PC will complete. This issue is aligned with 5353 as the White Ennox/Boxfields is used as a 'rat run' by vehicles seeking to avoid the traffic congestion on the Bradford Road caused by the severe congestion on Westwells.</p>	<p>Check that a metro count for Boxfields request has been submitted by Box Parish Council.</p>	<p>Vaughan Hill (Box PC)</p>
	<p>Issue 5353 – Traffic congestion at peak times on Westwells Road</p>	<p>This issue is centered firmly on the volume of traffic entering MOD Corsham at the peak period 0800-0900 hours. Noting that the congestions ripples back onto the Bradford Road, Park Lane, and Leafy Lane. Box PC recommend a metro count on Westwells Road and the Bradford Road.</p> <p>The MOD have committed to working with their staff to alleviate traffic at peak times.</p>	<p>Keep on note tracker for information only.</p>	<p>RR</p>
<p>Date of Next Meeting</p>	<p>Wednesday 25th October. 10am</p>			

Corsham Community Area Transport Group

Highways Officer – Kate Wysocki

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 Corsham 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, Corsham Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of approximately £-4,218.32

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

6.1. There are no safeguarding issues

7. Recommendations to Corsham Area Board

7.1. The priority list be

1. Area Board Issue: 5494: Pound Pill, Corsham
2. Skynet Drive
3. Area Board Issue No: 4364 Hither Way, Lacock – White Gates
4. Area Board Issue 5481: Traffic calming measures for Lacock Village.
5. Area Board Issue 5291: 7.5t weight restriction in Lacock Village
6. One of the Corsham cycle network routes

7.2. Area Board Issue 4820 – To agree to funding of £130 to change the sign on Moor Park to point to The Stoneworks.

Gateways and entry treatments

7.1 Bae ground

7.1.1 Gateways (TAL 13/93) are used to signify the approach into a village, or into a traffic-calmed area such as a 20 mph zone. Gateways are sometimes called 'entry treatments' (Section 7.3) or 'thresholds'. They can have many different forms, but those implemented to date have most commonly incorporated a distinctive change in road surface colour or material, a prominent sign to alert drivers to the calmed area and perhaps other measures such as 'dragon's teeth'. In some areas the conspicuity of the signs and markings can raise objections, but trials have shown that conspicuity of the gateway is a requirement for them to be effective. Some local authorities have overcome this problem by using existing features such as historic arches, or features using local materials such as fences or brickwork coming near to the edge of the carriageway to emphasise the gateway in a manner more in keeping with the surroundings. It is advisable that gateway features are set at least 450 mm from the edge of the carriageway (increasing to 600 mm where there is a severe camber or crossfall), to avoid the risk of vehicles clipping them. Linking gateway features to the visual start of a village may also help to reduce vehicle speeds.

7.1.2 A report entitled *Natural Traffic Calming: guidance and research report* (Scottish Executive, 1999a) concluded that the calming of roads as they enter settlements requires a process of adjustment and transition involving a range of different physical and perceptual factors.

7.2 Gateways to villages

Visibility

7.2.1 A gateway (Fig. 7.1) should be sited so that drivers do not encounter it suddenly. It should be visible over at least the stopping distance for the 85th percentile of the approach speed of vehicles.



Fig. 7.1 Village gateway at Charlwood

Basing the distance on the speed limit will often not be sufficient, and speed measurements should be taken to identify the 85th percentile speed. Site inspection will determine if the stopping distance is sufficient or if it needs to be increased. Care should be taken when considering placing gateways on long curves where they may not be initially in the driver's line of vision. Gateways should be linked to the visual start of the villages. TAL 01/04 (*Village Speed Limits*) defines a village as having at least 20 houses and a minimum length of 600 metres, with a recommended average density of at least 3 houses per 100 metres.

Conspicuity

7.2.2 Gateways should be as conspicuous as possible, whilst remaining in keeping with the surroundings. The effectiveness of various individual gateways is described in Wheeler *et al.*, 1993 and Wheeler *et al.*, 1994. The conspicuity of a gateway may be marginally enhanced by the use of dragon's teeth (TAL 01/00), which are not road markings and therefore do not require special authorisation. However, it should be noted that, as the markings are not visible from a distance or in wet weather, their impact is likely to be minimal and the use of such markings alone would not be advisable. If dragon's teeth markings are being considered, the negative



Fig. 7.2 Entry treatment at the start of a 20 mph zone

visual impact on the local environment should be weighed up against the slight potential for additional speed reduction.

Horizontal elements

7.2.3 These can have the form of a contrasting coloured surface, which may also be textured or form a rumble device (see Chapter 5). The area should be at least 5 metres long. Longer lengths up to 10 metres can improve conspicuity, but beyond this length they may detract from the effect of the gateway. Edgeline hatched markings with a dashed border (diagram 1040.4 of TSRGD) can make the carriageway appear narrower, whilst still allowing larger vehicles to overrun the areas if necessary. Islands or build-outs can be used to narrow the carriageway at the gateway, but care should be taken to maintain adequate road width for the vehicles that use the road. Ghost islands or overrun areas can be used where farm machinery or specialist vehicles are likely to need to negotiate the narrowing. Islands can be placed towards one side of a gateway to give protection to cycle lanes or cycle bypasses.

e 1c e e e s cud. g
oa. signs)

2.4 Speed limit and village nameplate signs are prescribed in TSRGD. Roadfurniture positioned at

the gateway should be set sufficiently far back so that vehicles do not come into contact with the furniture. Location on the footway or cycle track should be avoided, unless there is sufficient space remaining to allow safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists. If signs span the footway or cycle track, there should be adequate headroom for users. For any structure erected as part of the gateway, careful consideration needs to be given to the effect if impacted by a vehicle.

7.3 Entry treatments

7.3.1 An entry treatment is a form of gateway, usually used in urban areas (Fig. 7.2). Entry treatments have been developed for use at side roads to let drivers know that they are leaving a major road and entering an area of different character, which may be a residential road. They may indicate the start of a series of traffic calming measures, or they may identify the gateway at the boundary of a 20 mph zone or Home Zone.

7.3.2 Gateways to 20 mph areas can incorporate coloured surfaces, with or without a 20 mph elongated roundel marking. Where a 20 mph roundel marking is used, a coloured background can give it added prominence. Under TSRGD, such roundels do not require authorisation by the Department.

3.3 Entry treatments in urban areas can include features such as raised crossings. These give drivers

further encouragement to decrease their speed. If used, these must be appropriately signed and marked (see paragraph 4.1.9).

7.3.4 Entry treatments must not interfere with access to the frontage of properties.

7.4 Effectiveness

Gateways

7.4.1 The effect on speeds at gateways can sometimes be difficult to quantify, since the design of a scheme may include measures on the approach to the gateway that can contribute to the overall effectiveness, such as rumble strips (see Chapter 5). Results from the VISP village speed project (TAL 01/94) showed that minor gateway treatments achieved 85th percentile speed reductions of generally below 3 mph at the gateways. With more significant treatments at gateways, speed reductions of 6-7 mph were attained. Where major gateways relying on more physically restrictive treatments were installed, reductions in 85th percentile speeds were up to 10 mph in some cases. Further information can be found in TRL reports (Wheeler *et al.*, 1993; Wheeler *et al.*, 1994; Wheeler & Taylor, 1999).

7.4.2 Where speed reductions have been achieved, these have not been sustained over any distance, and speeds within villages have at most been reduced by 1 or 2 mph if there are no additional measures in place. For maximum benefit, gateways need to be used in conjunction with other measures within the village, so that drivers are made aware that lower speeds are required throughout.

7.4.3 An analysis of accidents at village traffic calming schemes (Wheeler & Taylor, 2000) has shown that traffic calming measures can yield reductions in speed that are associated with substantial reductions

in injury accidents (a 1 mph reduction in mean speed gave a 4.3 per cent reduction in accidents), particularly accidents involving fatal or serious injury (see TAL 11/00).

Entry treatments

7.4.4 Entry treatments are designed to be used at points where speeds should be low because they are a visual message to drivers, and therefore their individual effectiveness is difficult to assess.

7.5 Environmental Impact

Visual intrusion

7.5.1 It is important to balance the speed- and accident-reducing impact of a gateway against the potential visual intrusion it will cause in the local landscape. By their nature, gateways are designed to be conspicuous, but careful design can minimise the negative impacts on the village character and reduce urbanisation of the rural environment. Signs can be mounted on structures built with local materials such as stone walls or fences. Similarly, build-outs at gateways can be made into features or be designed to complement local buildings. The use of coloured surfacing and/or dragon's teeth markings should be avoided in sensitive areas.

Other impacts

7.5.2 Where gateways are combined with additional traffic calming within villages, speed reductions caused by the gateway may be maintained throughout the village. For village residents, this can lead to improvements in quality of life arising from reductions in noise, vibrations, community severance and vehicle emissions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Corsham CATG

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

BUDGET 2017-18

CATG Allocation 2017-18 £10,951.00

2016-17 Underspend £25,490.71

Contributions

Box PC - Village Gates £1,154.00 Invoice sent
Corsham Town Council - Leafield Ind. Estate £275.00 Invoice sent
National Trust for removal of Lacock experimental access signs £374.25 Invoice sent
National Trust for Hither Way Zebra Crossing £25,000.00 Contribution agreed 30/5/17
Lacock Parish Council for Hither Way Zebra Crossing £7,000.00 Contribution agreed 23/08/17

Total Budget 2017-18 £70,244.96

Commitments 2016-17

A365 Box Village gates £4,617.49 Actual
Corsham Leafield Industrial estate improved weight limit signs £1,099 Actual
Lacock, Hither Way design £1,500 Actual

New Schemes 17-18

Lacock The village removal of experimental access signs £1,497 Actual
Lacock , Hither Way Zebra Crossing £55,000 Estimate
Lacock Village gates £5,000 approx. £ per location (total 3 sites)
Street name plate x 2 at Moors Park/Stoneworks, Corsham £260 Estimate

Total Spend / Commitments 17-18 £68,973.28

Remaining Budget 2017-18 £1,271.68

This page is intentionally left blank