

CHIPPENHAM COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION TRACKER/ NOTES LOG

25th JUNE 2018

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|--|---|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | Appointment of Chairman & Support Arrangements for CATG | | | | |
| | Appointment of Chairman | CATG members asked MD to remain as Chairman pending the response to concerns raised by the group regarding future support. | CATG recommendation - Chippenham Area Board note temporary appointment of Cllr Maurice Dixson as Chairman | | |
| | Support for CATG | MD referred CATG to Briefing Note 357 which he circulated prior to the meeting. Discussions included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CATG members were aggrieved that Briefing Note 357 made several assumptions about current support arrangements for CATGs; it was felt that the briefing note did not reflect how the CATG operates in Chippenham CATG members have concerns that Chippenham CATG cannot function effectively using the process set out in the briefing note Concerns were raised about the use of different volunteer note takers; reliability, accuracy, consistency, potential for bias (or perception of bias) compliance with GDPR CATG members were of the opinion that Briefing Note 357 overlooked the number of officer hours required between meetings to prepare | HG to write to Cabinet member to outline CATG concerns RH to submit request to Overview and Scrutiny to carry out a formal review of the CATG process | | HG RH |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p>paperwork, update the community issues system. (The Community Issues system was not designed with Highways Improvements in mind, but approximately 98% of the issues submitted are highways related) e-mail correspondents, liaise with Road Safety Unit to arrange Metro Counts, liaise with CATG members, keep Councillors and Parish Clerks informed etc</p> <p>5. CATG members questioned whether making Highways Officers responsible for administrative tasks was the best use of a qualified professional officer's time</p> <p>6. CATG members were of the opinion that enhancements to "My Wiltshire" would significantly improve the on-line process to deal with Highways Improvement Requests.</p> <p>7. CATG members acknowledged the budget constraints and need to streamline support; but it was felt that that members of all CATGs should be given the opportunity to participate in a review to identify a workable solution for all CATGs, not just the smaller groups with fewer issues to contend with.</p> <p>8. The CATG Chairman and several members of CATG have stated their intention to resign if the process outlined in Briefing Note 357 is not reviewed</p> <p>9. Chairman of Chippenham Area Board will write to the Cabinet Member to request review. Whilst it was acknowledged that Briefing Note 357 was issued by Corporate Services (Cabinet Member</p> | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p>Councillor Richard Clewer) it was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Highways (Councillor Bridget Wayman) also needed to be contacted as the change to CATG support will directly impact upon the way Wiltshire Council is able to deal with requests for Highways Improvements.</p> <p>10. Councillor Ross Henning stated his intention to request that Overview and Scrutiny conduct a review of the support for CATG</p> | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| 2. | Attendees, Apologies & Introductions | | | | |
| | Present | Councillor Maurice Dixson (MD) Councillor Ross Henning (RH) Councillor John Scragg (JS) Councillor Angela Williams (AW) Councillor Lesley Palmer (LPa) Martin Rose (MR) Chris Clark (CC) Spencer Drinkwater (SD) Victoria Welsh (VW) | | | |
| | Apologies | Councillor Ashley O'Neill Councillor Bill Douglas (BD) Councillor Nick Murry (NM) Adrian Jones (AJ) | | | |
| | Observers | Councillor Michelle Pearce (MP) Councillor Richard Banbury (RB) Philip Allnatt (PA) | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|--|---|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 3. | Notes of the last meeting (27th February 2018) | | | | |
| | | <p>The recommendations contained in the Note Tracker from the Chippenham CATG meeting held on 28-Feb-18 were agreed at the Chippenham Area Board meeting on 19-Mar-18 with one exception – see issue 5753</p> <p>Actions from 28-Feb-17: NM to follow up suggestion for cycle route to be installed on New Road (when resurfacing takes place) with SD and Transport & Development Team</p> | | | |
| 4. | Finance | | | | |
| | | <p>Financial position at 7th June 2018</p> <p>2018-19 allocation = £18,087.00 2017-18 underspend = £7,626.16 2018 -19 3rd party Contributions £3,775.00 Total Budget for 2018-19 = £29,488.16 Existing commitments = £15,617.00 Current Balance = £13,871.16</p> <p><i>See Appendix 1</i></p> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the financial position | | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|--------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 5. | Annual Dropped Kerbs Exercise | | | | |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped kerbs requests are considered once a year in June to maximise the budget • Dropped Kerb requests must demonstrate benefit to community, requests from individuals will not be considered • Town/Parish Councils to contribute 40% of the cost in their area. Indication of costs: A Guide to the Cost of Highways Works • CATG feel that new developments should include dropped kerbs to avoid remedial work at a later date • CATG agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget of £4,500 for dropped kerbs in 2018/19 ○ Level of contribution from Town/Parish to increase to 40% • 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed the recommendation to allocate £4,500 towards dropped kerbs and increase the level of contribution required from Town/Parish Councils to 40% • 5-Jun-18 Reminder issued to Town & Parish Councils inviting proposals for dropped kerbs 2018/19. • CATG to consider at next meeting 18-Sep-18 | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | | VW |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|--|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 6. | Freight Assessment and Priority Mechanism (FAPM) exercise | | | | |
| | Standing item for update | <p>Sites agreed by Chippenham Area Board 13th March 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malmesbury Road, Chippenham • Hill Corner Road, Chippenham • SD advised that neither of the sites submitted by Chippenham would be taken forward as there were other higher priorities within the county. • 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board noted the update • SD advised 100 requests on the list across the county and Wiltshire Council has a budget to address two per year. Criteria include characteristics of road, volume of traffic, proximity roads services, accidents related to HGVs • Hill Corner Road traffic situation due to development is a separate issue. • SD advised that 2018/19 FAPM exercise will take place in autumn ready for next year. • Chippenham CATG will need to agree top two submissions for 2018/19 at the next CATG meeting | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | | SD |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 7. | Major Maintenance in 2018/19 | | | | |
| | | <p>Sites agreed by Chippenham Area Board 13th March 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ford to Slaughterford ○ Leigh Deli South ○ Ladyfield Rd ○ Foghamshire ○ C173 Nettleton ○ Derby Close ○ Grittleton Dead Hill - completed ○ Ham Lane Biddestone ○ Cuttle Lane to Giddea Hall ○ Ashes Lane Biddestone ○ Days Lane A350 ○ Brook St ○ Thornhill Lane, Langley Burrell ○ Charter Road, Chippenham <p>CC will check on Ashes Lane as this should read Kington Langley not Biddestone</p> <p>CC provided update of current works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Park Lane starting 30-Jul-18 ● New Road starting 3-Aug-18 ● Malmesbury Road starting 9-Aug-18 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Diane Ware will attend next meeting to provide comprehensive update for this item | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> <p>CC to check on Ashes Lane</p> | | CC |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 8. | Priority One Schemes | | | | |
| | <p>CATG agreed that once work orders have been placed for Priority One schemes a full entry is not required on Action Tracker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief summary will be retained • The entry will be “greyed out” to indicate that it is in progress and no further discussion is required at the CATG meeting • MR will provide updates • The item will be removed once the scheme has been implemented | | | | |
| 8.1 | <p><u>3013</u> Blackthorn Mews / Canal Road / Lodge Road Upgrade pedestrian crossing</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13th March 2017, Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indicative costs £22,800 noted ○ To allocate £5,000 from CATG funds, conditional upon the contribution of £2,000 from Chippenham Town Council • Bid to Substantive Scheme successful. • Works Programmed for 12th November for 10 days (Evenings) | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 1 | MR |
| 8.2 | <p><u>3885</u> Plough Lane, Kington Langley</p> <p>Extend kerbing Request to extend the kerbing that starts at the school and finishes at the Chapel - extend to the entrance of the Stables in Plough Lane, Kington Langley</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13th March 2017, Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indicative costs £17,000 noted ○ To allocate £5,000 from CATG funds, conditional upon the contribution of £2,500 from Kington Langley Parish Council • Bid to Substantive Scheme successful. • Programmed for 12th November 2018 for 10 days. Possible temporary road closure. Kerbing type agreed with PC by email dated 15-May-18. (See 5348) | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.3 | 4704 - Zebra Crossing Wedmore Avenue and Malmesbury Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request: <i>Zebra crossings required for access to John Coles park and schools as currently lethal on Wedmore Avenue and Malmesbury Road. These access points are used by secondary school children to access school during rush hour when cars are rushing. Also used by people accessing the park both are on blind bends and are lethal it is too dangerous making the park sometimes inaccessible I often see parents crossing the road one child at a time this is a lovely facility needing to be more accessible by foot.</i> Town Council considered on 3-Aug-17: Recommend that a pedestrian survey is carried out and agrees a contribution of £200 (25% of the cost advised) 2-Oct-17 Telecon with requestor to establish which crossing was felt to be the highest priority. Requestor stated that both were important and she would like both surveyed. CATG considered requestors comments. It was agreed that one pedestrian survey should take place on Malmesbury Road; the CATG agreed that less pedestrians cross Wedmore Avenue 6-Nov-17 Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendation to designate as Priority One and funding allocation of £600, for a pedestrian survey assessment to be carried out on Malmesbury Road, conditional upon a contribution of £200 from Town Council. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to prioritise this location and instruct Principal Highways Engineer to proceed with the pedestrian assessment for this scheme. | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR advises that formal quotes have come back with the cheapest at £1500. • This issue is subject to an online petition https://www.change.org/p/wiltshire-council-add-safety-measures-to-dangerous-chippenham-crossing • 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendation and allocated an increased contribution of £1,125 towards the pedestrian survey conditional upon an increased contribution of £375 from Chippenham Town Council. • 19-Apr-18 Chippenham Town Council agreed to contribute an additional £175 towards this project (total contribution £375). • Survey results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Average speed 36 mph both directions ○ Zone C 367 per day at crossing point • CATG was asked to consider issues 4704 and 5753 at the same time as the requests are similar. MR advised the group that his workload would only allow him to produce one scheme/design of this type in 2018/19. • CATG noted the survey results for both issues, acknowledged the concerns for each and concluded that 4704 Malmesbury Road should be prioritised due to a higher number of movements at that location. Issue 5753 will remain on the list of requests and will be reconsidered in 2019/20. | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.4 | <p>5159 - Danger to pedestrians and property blind bend London House Corner Hullavington</p> | <p>Correspondent requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some speed restriction</i> • <i>Warning of blind bend the continuation of the kerb a warning sign against the building improve the camber</i> • Hullavington Parish Council would like to be informed of the potential solutions to this issue • 13-Sep-17 Parish Council considered solutions provided by MR and confirm Parish Council would support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Road Narrow Signs £350 ○ Road Markers £600 ○ Extend existing kerb (double) £2000 ○ Total cost £2,950 ○ Parish Council contribution £737.50 • 6-Nov-17 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendations to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Designate as Priority One ○ Allocate funding £2,212.50 conditional upon a contribution of £737.50 from Hullavington Parish Council. • MR confirms that design work to commence. Implementation summer 2018. • 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board noted the update • Works 18th July 2018 for 3 days | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.5 | 5311 - Size and placement of No Through Road sign St Mary Street | <p>Correspondent requests: <i>The simple and most cost-effective answer is to erect a larger sign and site it in a more prominent position.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways recommendation is that: “No Through Road” is added to the Street Name Plate. Cost approximately £400 therefore a contribution of £100 is required from Chippenham Town Council 6-Nov-17 Chippenham Area Board agreed this scheme is designated as a Priority One and Funding allocation of £300 conditional upon a contribution of £100 from Chippenham Town Council. Work to be undertaken by local highways. Currently outstanding. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |
| 8.6 | 5348 - Erosion Upper Common east end Parkers Lane Kington Langley | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish Council requests installation of new kerbing to follow the eroded line rather than a reinstatement of the old line 6-Nov-17 Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendation to designate as a Priority One scheme for the Chippenham Community Area. £2000 allocated dependent on 25% contribution of £500 from Kington Langley PC MR confirms works to be implemented at the same time as issue 3885. Programmed for 25-Oct-18 for 10 days. Possible temporary road closure. Kerbing type agreed with PC by email dated 15-May-18 | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|--|---|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.7 | 5329 – Inconsiderate parking blocking access to private driveway Allington Way | <p>Request: <i>A white line across my property to stop parking across my drive</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CATG agreed that an allocation of £500 should be made to address this request and others (see 5524 & 5655) 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to allocate £500 to cover the cost of Ad-hoc lining works for H- Bars and SLOW markings (see issues 5329, 5524 & 5655) Order for Chippenham ad-hoc lining issued May 18. Site marked | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |
| 8.8 | 5524 - Inconsiderate parking causing obstruction to driveway Ladyfield Road | <p>Request: <i>Lines placed so that the confrontation with neighbours stops.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CATG agreed that an allocation of £500 should be made to address this request and others (see 5329 & 5655) 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to allocate £500 to cover the cost of Ad-hoc lining works for H- Bars and SLOW markings (see issues 5329, 5524 & 5655) Order for Chippenham ad-hoc lining issued May 18. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.9 | 5655 - Speed of traffic A420 Prestgrove North Wraxall | <p>Metro Count results (60mph Speed Limit) East of Old Coach Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CATG agreed that an allocation of £500 should be made to address this request and others (see 5329 & 5524) 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to allocate £500 to cover the cost of Ad-hoc lining works for H- Bars and SLOW markings (see issues 5329, 5524 & 5655) Order for Chippenham ad-hoc lining issued May 18 | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |
| 8.10 | 5845 - improved street name signage required, Wessex Road | <p>Request: <i>A clearer street sign showing where Wessex Close is or leading to Wessex Close</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15-Feb-18 Town Councillors agreed to support MRs recommendation to change the street nameplate at the eastern end to read Wessex Road (leading to Wessex Close & Saxon Street) and agreed a contribution of £62.50 being 25% of the total cost of £250 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to allocate £187.50 towards the new sign conditional upon a contribution of £62.50 from Chippenham Town Council. Order outstanding. Awaiting cost from Ringway https://www.google.co.uk/maps/place/Wessex+Cl | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|--|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.11 | <p>5489 – Vehicles driving across green open space Derriads Lane, Chippenham</p> | <p>Request:</p> <p><i>There is one bollard in situ at the moment it needs 2 more to stop the vans bumping up the kerb to access the open space or a galvanised railing to stop vehicles.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR suggests some post and rail fencing would be a quick and easy way to resolve this issue rather than another bollard. However, we'd have to be mindful of the need to maintain access for grass cutting • Considered by Chippenham Town Council 3-Aug-17: Support 2 additional bollards. • CATG discussed and consider that soft landscaping may assist • MR & PB advise that options are low level fencing (£500) or installation of two additional bollards (£875). Alternatively, there may be two bollards available in store though they are unlikely to match. • CATG agreed that the installation of two recycled bollards should be investigated. • PB & MR to liaise to secure 2 bollards. No allocation at this stage until costs are established • 4 replacement bollards sourced from existing stock. Installation cost £395. • CATG agreed recommendation to Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate funding of £395, conditional upon contribution of £100 from Chippenham Town Council | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate £395 funding for installation of bollards, conditional upon a contribution of £100 from Chippenham Town Council</p> | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.12 | <p>5829 - Vehicles ignoring No Entry and No Right Turn signs</p> | <p>Correspondent requests: <i>Police to take action against drivers breaking law. Install an island at the entrance of Rowden Lane to discourage right turn</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22-Mar-18 Town Council PET Committee asked to reconsider with the following recommendation provided by MR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A straight arrow road marking “AHEAD ONLY” may discourage traffic from turning into the “No Entry” ○ Remove the existing give way triangle and replace with “NO ENTRY” road marking ○ Cost approx. £400 assuming the work is undertaken as part of the “ad-hoc” lining works to avoid the £861 standing charge. • Chippenham Town Council reconsidered this issue on 19-Apr-18 and the following was agreed: Issue 5829 - Vehicles ignoring No Entry and No Right Turn signs and using Rowden Lane as a short cut. - The Town Council supports this request and agrees a contribution of £100 towards the cost. • CATG agreed to recommend that this request is elevate to Priority one. • MR will contact the developer to enquire about the possibility to include in current works to further reduce costs. | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate £300 funding, conditional upon a contribution of £100 from Chippenham Town Council</p> | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 8.13 | 5942 - Vehicles misdirected in to The Cloisters by sat nav. causing damage and disturbance | <p>Request: <i>“Some form of sign to prevent drivers getting into the position where they cannot continue.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways advise there are two options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No through road sign – cost £200 approx New Street Name Plate (similar to St Mary Street) but this may not be as visible to traffic. 14-Mar-18 Chippenham Town Council confirms support for this request and is happy for the Highway Officer to decide which of the two options suggested would be best. It agreed to a contribution of £62.50 towards the cost. <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Cloisters</p> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate £140 funding, conditional upon a contribution of £62.50 from Chippenham Town Council | 1 | MR |
| 8.14 | 5948 - Vehicles misdirected by sat nav. | <p>Request from Langley Burrell Parish Council: <i>“For street name signs to be erected on the junction of The Common and the B4069”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MR advised cost approximately £250 per sign Advice required from Land charges re. road name. Records show ‘Maud Heaths Causeway’ but residential addresses indicate ‘The Common’ 2 no. Street nameplates required. Approx. £500 total <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Langley Burrell</p> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate £375 funding, conditional upon a contribution of £125 from Langley Burrell Parish Council | 1 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|--|---|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 9. | Priority Two/Pending Schemes | | | | |
| 9.1 | <p>4052 B4039 Burton Village</p> <p>Concerns relating to speeding traffic through Village. Request for traffic calming including VAS, coloured surfacing, additional signing and road markings.</p> | <p>17-Aug-15 Nettleton Parish Council confirms support for this request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Metro Count results 6-Jun-16: ○ The Street (near Pear Tree House) (30mph limit) 85th percentile = 39.4mph ○ Mean = 33.7mph ○ B4039 Hillside (40mph limit) ○ 85th percentile = 47.2mph ○ Mean = 40.7mph ○ C161 Near junction of Toll Down Way (30mph limit) ○ 85th percentile = 32.0mph ○ Mean = 25.9mph <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CATG noted Speedwatch in operation here ● MR is awaiting contact from Nettleton Parish Council. Issue remains 'on hold' ● CATG noted that this request has been on hold for a long period and agreed that it was time to confirm whether the Parish Council wish to pursue the request for traffic calming or whether this request can be closed. | <p>MR To contact Nettleton Parish Council and clarify whether this issue is to proceed or whether it can be closed</p> <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 2 | MR |
| 9.2 | <p>5645 – HGVs using Pewsham Estate for driver training</p> | <p>Request from Chippenham Town Council:</p> <p><i>Pewsham Ward Members have received complaints from residents regarding training lorries of 7.5 tonne or over entering Pewsham Estate.</i></p> <p><i>Residents feel that this presents a safety risk and given that it is a residential estate a weight limit should be imposed with the exception of delivery vehicles and buses.</i></p> | <p>RB to recommend to Town Council that Town Council PET Committee pursue this matter by contacting the MOD and the Chairman of Mainstream.</p> <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 2 | RB |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p><i>The Mainstream Group who organise Large Good Vehicle LGV training on behalf of the MOD use the Pewsham Estate as part of their training route from Lyneham. Other companies use Pewsham for training and it is also used by the Ministry of Transport for tests. This results in a high number of lorries using the estate each day twenty plus on some days. There are also many similar residential estates in Wiltshire which has this similar weight limit.</i></p> <p><i>The Town Councils Planning Environment Transport (PET) Committee invited The Mainstream Group to present to the Committee</i></p> <p><i>A report was taken to the PET Committee on 24 August 2017 report available upon request and it was agreed that a request be submitted to Wiltshire Council for a 7.5 tonne weight limit to be imposed on the Pewsham Estate with the exception of delivery vehicles and buses. The Town Council requests that this is forwarded to CATG for consideration.</i></p> <p>Town Council request: A 7.5 tonne weight limit imposed on the Pewsham Estate with the exception of delivery vehicles and buses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AJ Advised that representatives from the Military Training Scheme made a presentation to the Town Council in 2017 and it was well received • Town Councillors have received complaints from residents that traffic movements have taken place during school drop off and collection times despite assurances that this wouldn't happen. • SD advised CATG that as the roads are public highway the vehicles are entitled to use them | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD advised that Chippenham CATG could submit this area as one of the two suggestions for the Freight Assessment Exercise 2018/19, although he anticipates that it would be unlikely to be successful. He did point out that there is no weight limit for large vehicles that are not HGVs • CATG asked SD to contact Mainstream Group to highlight concern about safety of school children. • SD has spoken with Peter Hammond at Mainstream. Mainstream confirm estate is only used 9:30 – 2:30 for lessons and testing. • MOD declined to discuss with SD due to Data Protection • RB maintained that high numbers of vehicles were still using the estate and some were present before 9:30 and after 2:30. RB asked for 7.5 tonne limit. • SD advised imposing a weight limit should be a last resort and reminded the group that the request was unlikely to be successful as the location would not meet the criteria • SD recommended that the content of contract between Mainstream and MOD needs to be established and that this was a matter for the PET Committee. | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|--|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 9.3 | 5660 - Review of traffic management measures Market Cross Castle Combe | <p>Requested by Castle Combe Parish Council: <i>Review of possible traffic engineering measures in the location of the Market Cross to examine potential to reduce risk of collisions. Prior discussions have been held with Highways Bill Parks who has recommended that CATG would be the appropriate initial avenue.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CATG agreed site visit and liaison with the Parish Council required. Parish Council confirms on hold any further action due to budget constraints 25-Jun-18 - remains on hold | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |
| 9.4 | 5734 - Emergency vehicles unable to park at front of Croft Court Residential Care Home | <p>Request: <i>Yellow hatch lines to at least half of the layby</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-Feb-18 referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment. MR advises approx. costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Order required £2,500 Hatch markings £500 Costs can be reduced considerably by considering this request and issue number 6063 at the same time and if supported, the legal order could cover both schemes 8-Mar-18 this request was considered by Chippenham Town Council. The Town Council <u>does not support</u> this request as Councillors were of the opinion that it was not a priority for the area. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AO asked MD to brief CATG in his absence. AO intends to request Chippenham Town Council PET Committee reviews this issue. The Manager at Croft Court has reported that ambulances are regularly called to the home to attend the older residents; the majority of the time the emergency vehicles are obliged to park some way down the street because the layby is occupied by vehicles belonging to visitors or local residents from nearby properties. • Clearly this impacts upon paramedic's response times and it is not uncommon for the patients to be wheeled some distance down the pavement to the ambulance; this is not only uncomfortable (sometimes cold and/or wet) it can be unnecessarily distressing and does little to preserve the dignity of the older person. • Reasons for review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A similar request from a nursery school for a drop off zone to accommodate parents dropping off young children at a nursery school (6063) has been supported 2. Supporting the request from Croft Court would afford older people the same consideration as the parents and children, at what is a most distressing time, when they have either been taken ill or sustained an injury and need to get to hospital 3. The cost to implement the nursery drop off is £3,000 4. The cost to implement both schemes is £3,500 - just £500 additional cost <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Croft court</p> | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|---|--|--|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 9.5 | <p>5753 - Replace informal crossing points with zebra crossings Queens Crescent</p> | <p>Division Councillor requests: <i>I would like to see a study performed to see whether 2 x Zebra crossing would be appropriate for Queens Crescent. Can we perform the study during peak school time children crossing?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered by Town Council 25-Jan-18 - Town Council supports this request for an up to date survey and agrees to contribute £250 towards the cost (25%). If possible, the survey should also monitor speeds. • CATG noted petition had been received. • CATG noted that Queens Crescent School has updated its travel plan but did not mention any problems with crossings • 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board allocated £600 from CATG funds conditional upon a contribution of £200 from Town Council. • The 2018 survey focused on the existing demarcated crossing points, whereas the 2011 feasibility study count covered a much wider area with a larger number of zones. To provide a worthwhile comparison between the counts I've only extracted the relevant zone data from the 2011 study and the results are shown below. • The 2018 pedestrian numbers are shown in red with the 2011 numbers in green and in brackets <p>SITE 1 Queens Crescent (adjacent to Carnarvon Close)</p> <p>306 (322) 1000 vehicles per day approx</p> | <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>MR</p> |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p><u>SITE 2 Queens Crescent (Adjacent to Minster Way)</u></p> <p>264 (254) 3000 vehicles per day approx</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CATG also noted that a 20mph limit has been installed as part of the travel plan and agreed that the impact of this should be monitored • AO asked MD to brief CATG in his absence. The main concern is the ambiguity/potential confusion for pedestrian and drivers about the appropriate way to use the advisory crossings. MR confirmed that in his professional opinion, the advisory crossing on the Minster Way side of Queens Crescent should be considered a higher priority than the advisory crossing on the Carnarvon Close side of Queens Crescent. • CATG was asked to consider issues 4704 and 5753 at the same time as the requests are similar. MR advised the group that his workload would only allow him to produce one scheme/design of this type in 2018/19. • CATG noted the survey results for both issues, acknowledged the concerns for each and concluded that 4704 Malmesbury Road should be prioritised due to a higher number of movements at that location. Issue 5753 will remain on the list of requests and will be reconsidered in 2019/20. <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Queens_Crescent</p> | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|-----|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 9.6 | 5825 – lack of footway Turnpike Cottage to corner of Cuttle Lane Biddestone | <p>Parish Council requests: <i>Road surface prepared to slow vehicles down and a marked pavement/footway from Turnpike Cottage to the end of Cuttle Lane introduced.</i> Further details available in a document prepared by the Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site meeting held 10th April 2018. • Cost estimate £8,000 - £10,000 • AW advised that Parish Council is willing to contribute more than the normal 25% <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone</p> | <p>AW to confirm with Parish Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which request is the highest priority 5825 or 5826? Or 2. Does the Parish Council wish for 5825 & 5826 to be “batched together”? 3. Level of contribution the Parish Council is prepared to commit <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update.</p> | 2 | AW |
| 9.7 | 5826 - Lack of footway Biddestone Arms to the Village Green | <p>Parish Council requests: <i>Installation of a marked footway</i></p> <p>Further details available in a document prepared by the Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site meeting held 1^{0th} April 2018. • MR advised that we could consider batching 5825 & 5826 and submitting to substantive bid in 2019/20. • Cost Estimate £30,000. NB a topographical survey will be required and combining the two requests would mean that implementation will take considerably longer. <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone Arms</p> | <p>AW to confirm with Parish Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Which request is the highest priority 5825 or 5826? Or 5. Does the Parish Council wish for 5825 & 5826 to be “batched together”? 6. Level of contribution the Parish Council is prepared to commit <p>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</p> | 2 | AW |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| 9.10 | 5827 – Installation of four sets of White Gates | <p>Parish Council requests: <i>Installation of white gates:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pair from A420 into village • 1 pair from Corsham into village • 1 pair Hartham into village • 1 pair from Giddea Hall into village <p><i>To slow down traffic.</i> Further details available in a document prepared by the Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of gate approx. £1000 each installed. • Site meeting held 10th April 2018. On hold pending completion of other identified priorities. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | AW |
| 9.11 | 5886 - Replace advisory crossing point near St Peters School with zebra crossing | <p>Request: <i>The church and school community have been asked to voice their concerns to Wiltshire Council to replace the advisory crossing with a pelican crossing. Hopefully you will receive enough support to action this request</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment 3-Feb-18. • 14-Mar-18 - The Town Council supports the Highway Officers recommendation for a formal assessment and agrees a contribution of £250 towards the cost of a pedestrian count. • CATG considered and agreed that school needs to tackle this through their travel plan <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Frogwell</p> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to remove this from the list of Highways Improvements Requests for CATG, advise the school to address their concerns via the Taking Action on School Journeys (TAOSJ) scheme. | 2 | VW |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 9.12 | 5937 Reduce speed limit on B4039 | <p>Request from Yatton Keynell Parish Council: <i>“Request reduction in speed limit on B4039”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MR has carried out site visit. Site does not meet the requirements of circular 01/13 to extend existing 30mph limit at Yatton Keynell to cover Kents Bottom due to lack of frontage development. Single recorded collision (slight) in 5 years (Driver fell asleep). 40mph criteria also not strictly met but may be possible, providing min length can be achieved. Local signing improvements may be better option CATG requested MR discuss options with Parish Council <p>https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Yatton Keynell</p> | MR to discuss options with Parish Council | 2 | MR |
| 9.13 | 6058 – Reduction of speed limit to 20mph throughout Castle Combe village | <p>Request from Castle Combe Parish Council: <i>“Formal investigation into the feasibility and costs of implementing a revised speed limit together with requisite signage”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MR has arranged for Metro Counts to be carried out in the village. | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |
| 9.14 | 6063 – Need for safe drop off zone outside of Little Pips Nursery, Goldney Avenue, Chippenham | <p>Request: <i>A restricted parking zone or drop off zone outside the nursery along Lowden Avenue and Goldney Avenue to enable our parents to drop off safely and easily.</i></p> <p>3-Feb-18 Referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MR advises approx. costs: | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Order required £2,500 • Restricted/time limited bays £500 • Costs can be reduced considerably by considering this request and issue number 5734 at the same time if supported, the legal order could cover both schemes • 14-Mar-18 Chippenham Town Council confirms support for the Highway Officers recommendation for a time limited bay to be installed and agree a contribution of £750 towards the cost. However, there were some concerns raised regarding future enforcement. Councillors suggested this request could possibly be combined with a future request to reduce the cost. • CATG noted the Town Council comments regarding combining with another scheme to reduce costs. • The cost to implement the nursery drop off is £3,000. The cost to implement together with issue 5734 is £3,500 - just £500 additional cost • On hold pending review of Croft Court. https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Little Pips Nursery | | | |
| 9.15 | 6119 - Speed of vehicles on Sadlers Mead Chippenham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request is from Chippenham Town Councillor for traffic calming measures • 6-Mar-18 Following discussions with Highways Officer when the town councillor was briefed about previous requests relating to the parking arrangements in this location, the town councillor has indicated that he may withdraw this request | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | | <p>and instead pursue a review of the waiting restrictions on Sadlers Mead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Jun-18 Correspondent confirms that following consultation with residents in Sadlers Mead, he wishes to proceed with this request for traffic calming. Referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment. | | | |
| 9.16 | 6140 – Request to reduce speed limit to 30mph in Upper Wraxall | <p>Request from North Wraxall Parish Council:</p> <p><i>Reduce speed limit to 30mph - Speeding cars through Upper Wraxall village from A420. The road through the village has no walkways and pedestrians are at risk from cars leaving the 50mph A420 onto a non-restricted speed road.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CATG asked the Highways Engineer to contact the Parish Council to discuss the matter in more detail, visit the site if necessary and update the next CATG meeting. | MR to contact North Wraxall Parish Council | 2 | MR |
| 9.17 | 6144 – Speed reduction to 20mph for High Street in Chippenham | <p>Request made by Chippenham Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following safety concerns regarding market traders setting up and backing into moving vehicles and pedestrians presuming that as the market is being set up the High Street is closed to traffic Chippenham Town Councils Planning Environment Transport Committee agreed to | MR to arrange for SDR to establish statistics | 2 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p>apply to Wiltshire Council for a temporary road closure of the High Street to all vehicle traffic</p> <p>This application was approved but revoked by the Town Council at week 7 of the 12-week closure following a review of the overall position and feedback from residents and businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The High Street currently closes to traffic in accordance with Traffic Orders between 9.30am and 7.30pm Monday to Sunday with the exception of a Saturday i.e. to coincide with the setting-up of the market when it closes from 6.30am. • Due to these safety concerns affecting all High Street visitors market traders and pedestrians a temporary trial closure of the High Street on a Friday from 6.30am was pursued thereby aligning the closure time to that of the Saturday market. • Residents and businesses expressed a number of concerns regarding the temporary road closure offering suggestions on how the safety of all High Street users might be ensured and how the area might best be managed. • Due to the problems associated with the temporary closure of the High Street the Town Council revoked the temporary road closure and a High Street Working Party was set up to look at alternative ways to ensure the High Street is a safe place to visit whilst it is open to traffic. These included re-aligning the market moving it away from the High Street installing traffic | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p>calming measures as well as the introduction of a 20mph speed limit as introduced in other high-risk areas such as Redlands. The Town Council would like to apply for the High Street speed limit to be reduced to 20mph for the reasons given above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Officer advises that if considered a priority for the area by the CATG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An assessment will be required cost approx. £2,500. ○ If the outcome recommends the introduction of the lower limit the typical cost is £3500 - £5000 depending on the size. This includes legal costs. If electrical works required, cost may rise to £8000 | | | |
| 9.18 | 6287 – Speed of vehicles Sutton Lane | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro Count Requested by Community Speedwatch Coordinator to evidence the need to extend the Community Speedwatch Scheme in the village. • Completed Metro Count request form forwarded to Road Safety Unit 16-May-18 | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |
| 9.19 | 6288 – Speed of vehicles on Marshfield Road, Chippenham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed Metro Count request form forwarded to Road Safety Unit 1-Jun-18 | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | MR |
| 9.20 | 6324 - Lack of passing places on Long Dean Lane near Yatton Keynell | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referred to Yatton Keynell Parish Council for comment 1-Jun-18 • Parish Council considered 5-Jun-18 <i>“Unanimously agreed to support a local</i> | MR to visit site to assess and contact Parish Council to discuss options | 2 | MR |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <i>resident's request to investigate whether it is possible to add more passing points.</i> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | | |
| 9.21 | 6331 – Dangerous driving near Sainsburys, Chippenham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment 1-Jun-18</i> • <i>Highways Officer provided the following guidance regarding each element of the request:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Painting double white line on the access road</u> <i>This is <u>not</u> the correct use of solid white lines as per Chapter 5 of the Traffic Signs Manual 2003. Such markings should only be used on higher speed roads where forward visibility is severely restricted below a particular threshold.</i> 2. <u>Installing several no overtaking signs</u> <i>This is regulatory sign and backed by a legal order. Its use is dictated by Chapter 3 TSM which states: The sign to diagram 632 is used to give effect to an order which prohibits overtaking. Such orders will be exceptional as situations where forward visibility makes overtaking hazardous can normally be dealt with by double white lines.</i> <i>In theory, we could use this sign, but would seem totally excessive for the circumstances and would most likely be ignored by a determined motorist. Police may only prosecute when they witness offence taking place.</i> 3. <u>Erecting warning signs</u> | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|--|------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | | <p><i>There is no prescribed sign in the TSRGD 2016 for this purpose. Also see point 2 above</i></p> <p>4. Charging McDonalds to change road layout <i>The access road into MacDonald's/ Sainsbury's in part of the adopted highway. We do not have legal power to force McDonald's to change the road layout at their cost. How McDonald's manage their own internal layout and traffic within site is their responsibility and we can't change this</i></p> <p>5. Preventing Sainsbury's traffic from using the road, but that's unfair on innocent shoppers <i>As per above. Wiltshire Council cannot force Sainsbury's to change their access arrangements to permit egress only from the western end. This aside, it appears to be totally excessive for what was an isolated incident. Such a change would fundamentally change traffic movements on the access roads and roundabout on A420</i></p> <p>6. Charging a few people with dangerous driving (assuming the guy this morning wasn't a one off) <i>See above. This would rely on the Police witnessing such incidents, stopping and prosecuting individuals</i></p> <p>7. Other steps – you are the experts <i>We do not have a solution to every single incident on the highway particularly where the cause is purely down to driver impatience and poor judgement.</i></p> | | | |

| | Item | Update | Actions & Recommendations | Priority 1 – High 2 - Low | Who |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| 9.22 | 6350 – Speed of vehicles Stanton St Quintin | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondent requests “Speed curbing is installed” Metro Count Request form issued for completion 1-Jun-18. This issue will be referred to the Parish Council once the Metro Count results are available | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | 2 | |
| 10 | Pavement Improvement Exercise | | | | |
| | Funding for improvements to Footways 2017/18 announced by the Cabinet Member for Highways | CC confirmed this exercise was now complete. CATG noted there was no further funding for 2018/19 | CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update | | |
| 11 | AOB | | | | |
| | None | | | | |
| Date of next meeting 18th September 2018 10:00 – 12:00 Education Room, Wiltshire & Swindon History Centre | | | | | |

Highways Officer – Martin Rose

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 Chippenham 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, Chippenham Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of £12,919.,00

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 - none