

**CHIPPENHAM COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION TRACKER/ NOTES LOG**

**18<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
1.	<b>Appointment of Chairman</b>				
		Maurice Dixson was proposed and seconded as Chairman.	CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note		
2.	<b>Attendees, Apologies &amp; Introductions</b>				
	<b>Present</b>	Councillor Maurice Dixson (MD) (CATG Chairman) Councillor Nick Murry (NM) Councillor John Scragg (JS) Councillor Angela Williams (AW) Martin Rose (MR) Chris Clark (CC) Diane Ware (DW) Victoria Welsh (VW)			
	<b>Apologies</b>	Councillor Ross Henning (RH) Councillor Ashley O’Neill Adrian Jones (AJ) Councillor Lesley Palmer (LP) Spencer Drinkwater (SD)			
	<b>Observers</b>	Alistair Parker (AP) Yatton Keynell David Kerr (DK) North Wraxall			

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
3.	<b>Notes of the last meeting (25<sup>th</sup> June 2018)</b>				
		The recommendations contained in the Note Tracker from the Chippenham CATG meeting held on 25-Jun-18 were agreed at the Chippenham Area Board meeting on 23-Jul-18.			
4.	<b>Finance</b>				
		<p>Financial position at 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018</p> <p>2018-19 allocation = £18,087.00</p> <p>2017-18 underspend = £7,626.16</p> <p>2018 -19 3<sup>rd</sup> party Contributions £3,691.64</p> <p>Total Budget for 2018-19 = £29,404.79</p> <p>Existing commitments = £15,283.54</p> <p>Current Balance = <b>£14,121.25</b></p> <p><i>See Appendix 1</i></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the financial position</b>		MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
5.	<b>Annual Dropped Kerbs Exercise</b>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dropped kerbs requests are considered once a year in June to maximise the budget</li> <li>• Dropped Kerb requests must demonstrate benefit to community, requests from individuals will not be considered</li> <li>• Town/Parish Councils to contribute 40% of the cost in their area. Indication of costs: <a href="#">A Guide to the Cost of Highways Works</a></li> <li>• CATG feel that new developments should include dropped kerbs to avoid remedial work at a later date</li> <li>• CATG agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposed budget of £4,500 for dropped kerbs in 2018/19</li> <li>○ Level of contribution from Town/Parish to increase to 40%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 CATG selected dropped kerbs that are a priority for the community area. See item 8.8</li> </ul>	<b>See item 8.8 for recommendation</b>		

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
6.	<b>Freight Assessment and Priority Mechanism (FAPM) exercise</b>				
	<b>Standing item for update</b>	<p>Sites agreed by Chippenham Area Board <a href="#">13<sup>th</sup> March 2017</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Malmesbury Road, Chippenham</li> <li>• Hill Corner Road, Chippenham</li> <li>• SD advised that neither of the sites submitted by Chippenham would be taken forward as there were other higher priorities within the county.</li> <li>• 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board noted the update</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Hill Corner Road traffic situation due to development is a separate issue.</li> <li>• SD advised that 2018/19 FAPM exercise will take place in autumn ready for next year.</li> <li>• Chippenham CATG will need to agree top two submissions for 2018/19 at the next CATG meeting</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 SD not available to attend. This item postponed until next CATG meeting.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b></p> <p><b>SD to provide Chippenham CATG with information in advance of next CATG meeting</b></p>		SD

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
7.	<b>Major Maintenance in 2018/19</b>				
		<p>Sites agreed by Chippenham Area Board <a href="#">13<sup>th</sup> March 2017</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ford to Slaughterford</li> <li>• Leigh Deli South</li> <li>• Ladyfield Rd</li> <li>• Foghamshire</li> <li>• C173 Nettleton</li> <li>• Derby Close</li> <li>• Grittleton Dead Hill - completed</li> <li>• Ham Lane Biddestone</li> <li>• Cuttle Lane to Giddea Hall</li> <li>• Ashes Lane, Kington Langley</li> <li>• Days Lane A350</li> <li>• Brook St</li> <li>• Thornhill Lane, Langley Burrell</li> <li>• Charter Road, Chippenham</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DW confirmed that:</li> <li>• The March 2017 list (above) was on a reserve list with the consultant Atkins and is currently being assessed into a priority order.</li> <li>• The list will be a 5-year programme, I am moving away from the allocated spend per year for each area as some works required are in excess of those budgets, therefore it may be that the spend in each board will vary depending on need.</li> <li>• All surface dressing jobs planned for 2018/19 have been completed</li> <li>• Major maintenance costing approximately £700,000 is likely commence in 2019 the list of proposed sites includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A4 Bath Road</li> <li>○ Sadlers Mead Chippenham</li> <li>○ High Street Chippenham</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b></p> <p><b>DW to provide list in November</b></p>		DW

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The schedule for major maintenance is based on:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Technical surveys/condition assessment</li> <li>○ Usage</li> <li>○ My Wiltshire reports of potholes etc from members of the public</li> <li>○ Prioritised by CATG and Area Board</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A list of the final sites verified and costed by the consultants Atkins will be sent to CATGs in November 2018.</li> <li>• Chippenham CATG to consider list from DW and identify top 10 priorities at next CATG meeting</li> </ul>			

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
<b>8.</b>	<b>Priority One Schemes</b>				
	CATG agreed that once work orders have been placed for Priority One schemes a full entry is not required on Action Tracker: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A brief summary will be retained</li> <li>• The entry will be “greyed out” to indicate that it is in progress and no further discussion is required at the CATG meeting</li> <li>• MR will provide updates</li> <li>• The item will be removed once the scheme has been implemented</li> </ul>				
	<b>Completed Priority One Schemes</b>	<a href="#">5311</a> – St Mary Street No Through Road Sign <a href="#">5329</a> – H Bar marking Allington Way <a href="#">5524</a> – H Bar Marking Ladyfield Road <a href="#">5655</a> – SLOW marking to address speed of traffic A420 Prestgrove North Wraxall <a href="#">5845</a> - Improved street name signage Wessex Road			
<b>8.1</b>	<a href="#">3885</a> <b>Plough Lane, Kington Langley</b>  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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017, Chippenham Area Board agreed recommendations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Indicative costs £17,000 noted</li> <li>○ To allocate £5,000 from CATG funds, conditional upon the contribution of £2,500 from Kington Langley Parish Council</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bid to Substantive Scheme successful.</li> <li>• Programmed for 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018 for 10 days. Possible temporary road closure. Kerbing type agreed with PC by email dated 15-May-18. (See 5348)</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update.</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>MR</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<a href="#">4704</a> - Pedestrian Crossing Malmesbury Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</i></li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>MR</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<p><i>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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• MR advises that formal quotes have come back with the cheapest at £1500.</li> <li>• This issue is subject to an online petition <a href="https://www.change.org/p/wiltshire-council-add-safety-measures-to-dangerous-chippenham-crossing">https://www.change.org/p/wiltshire-council-add-safety-measures-to-dangerous-chippenham-crossing</a></li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 19-Apr-18 Chippenham Town Council agreed to contribute an additional £175 towards this project (total contribution £375).</li> <li>• Survey results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Average speed 36 mph both directions</li> <li>○ Zone C 367 per day at crossing point</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			



	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation to prioritise this location and instruct Principal Highways Engineer to proceed with the pedestrian assessment for this scheme.</li> <li>MR advised that full pedestrian assessment will take place in early 2019. If the recommendation is for a formal crossing, this would need to be submitted to Substantive Scheme for funding as estimated cost is approximately £70,000.</li> </ul>			
8.3	<a href="#">5348</a> - Erosion Upper Common east end Parkers Lane Kington Langley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish Council requests installation of new kerbing to follow the eroded line rather than a reinstatement of the old line</li> <li>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</li> <li>MR confirms works to be implemented at the same time as issue 3885.</li> <li>Programmed for 25-Oct-18 for 10 days. Possible temporary road closure. Kerbing type agreed with PC by email dated 15-May-18</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	1	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
8.4	<a href="#">5489</a> – Vehicles driving across green open space Derriads Lane, Chippenham	<p>Request: <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"> <li>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</li> <li>Considered by Chippenham Town Council 3-Aug-17: Support 2 additional bollards.</li> <li>MR &amp; 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.</li> <li>CATG agreed that the installation of two recycled bollards should be investigated.</li> <li>4 replacement bollards sourced from existing stock. Installation cost £395.</li> <li>CATG agreed recommendation to Area Board to elevate to Priority One and allocate funding of £395, conditional upon contribution of £100 from Town Council</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed the CATG recommendation</li> <li>15-Aug-18 MR confirms works order issued.</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	1	MR
8.5	<a href="#">5829</a> - Vehicles ignoring No Entry and No Right Turn signs	<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"> <li>22-Mar-18 Town Council PET Committee asked to reconsider with the following recommendation provided by MR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A straight arrow road marking “AHEAD ONLY” may discourage traffic from turning into the “No Entry”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	1	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remove the existing give way triangle and replace with “NO ENTRY” road marking</li> <li>○ Cost approx. £400 assuming the work is undertaken as part of the “ad-hoc” lining works to avoid the £861 standing charge.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● CATG agreed to recommend that this request is elevated to Priority One, allocate £300 funding conditional upon a contribution of £100 from Town Council.</li> <li>● 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed the CATG recommendation.</li> <li>● 15-Aug-18 MR to prepare plan and add to next ad-hoc road markings order estimated for November</li> </ul>			
8.6	<p><a href="#">5942</a> - Vehicles misdirected in to The Cloisters by sat nav. causing damage and disturbance</p>	<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"> <li>● Highways advise there are two options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No through road sign – cost £200 approx</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● Chippenham Area Board agreed the recommendation to elevate to Priority One and allocate £140 conditional upon a contribution of £62.50 from Chippenham Town Council.</li> <li>● MR to prepare plan and issue works order.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Cloisters">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Cloisters</a></p>	<p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>MR</b></p>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
8.7	<a href="#">5948</a> - 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"> <li>MR advised cost approximately £250 per sign</li> <li>Advice required from Land charges re. road name. Records show ‘Maud Heaths Causeway’ but residential addresses indicate ‘The Common’ 2 street nameplates required. Approx. £500 total</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board agreed CATG recommendation to elevate to Priority One and allocate £375 funding, conditional upon a contribution of £125 from Langley Burrell Parish Council</li> <li>Langley Burrell Parish Council to consider 20-Sep-18</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Langley+Burrell">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Langley Burrell</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	1	MR
8.8	<p>Dropped kerbs:</p> <p><a href="#">6597</a> Dropped kerb request Phillips Close junction with Chamberlain Road Chippenham</p> <p><a href="#">6625</a> Ivy Road and Ivy Lane/Bridge Centre roundabout Chippenham</p> <p><a href="#">6608</a> Dropped Kerb request Avonmead junction with Downham Mead, Chippenham</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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%</li> <li>CATG noted 6 requests received. MR confirmed that all are feasible.</li> <li>CATG recommend proceeding with the following dropped kerbs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6597</li> <li>6625</li> <li>6608 (one side only) if budget allows</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>conditional upon a 40% contribution from Chippenham Town Council</p>	<p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to proceed with the following dropped kerbs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6597</li> <li>6625</li> <li>6608 (one side only) if budget allows</li> </ul> <p><b>conditional upon a 40% contribution from Chippenham Town Council</b></p>	1	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
8.9	<p><a href="#">5734</a> - Emergency vehicles unable to park at front of Croft Court Residential Care Home</p>	<p>Request: <i>Yellow hatch lines to at least half of the layby</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-Feb-18 referred to Chippenham Town Council for comment.</li> <li>• MR advises approx. costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal Order required £2,500</li> <li>• Hatch markings £500</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Costs can be reduced considerably by considering this request and issue number <b>6063</b> at the same time and if supported, the legal order could cover both schemes</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Reasons for review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>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,</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p><b>CATG recommendation Chippenham Area Board elevate 5734 &amp; 6063 to Priority One and taken together to achieve best value. Funding allocation is £2,625 conditional upon a contribution of £875 from Chippenham Town Council.</b></p>	1	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<p>when they have either been taken ill or sustained an injury and need to get to hospital</p> <p>3. The cost to implement the nursery drop off is £3,000</p> <p>4. The cost to implement both schemes is £3,500 - just £500 additional cost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9-Aug-18 Reconsidered by Chippenham Town Council. Town Councillors agreed to support it and contribute £125 (25% of £500 cost)</li> <li>CATG recommend that 5734 &amp; 6063 are elevated to Priority One and taken together to achieve best value. Funding allocation is £ 2,625 conditional upon a contribution of £875 from Chippenham Town Council.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Croft+court">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Croft+court</a></p>			
8.10	<b>6063</b> – Need for safe drop off zone outside of Little Pips Nursery, Lowden 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"> <li>MR advises approx. costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal Order required £2,500</li> <li>Restricted/time limited bays £500</li> <li>Costs can be reduced considerably by considering this request and issue number <b>5734</b> at the same time if supported, the legal order could cover both schemes</li> </ul> </li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation Chippenham Area Board elevate 5734 &amp; 6063 to Priority One and taken together to achieve best value. Funding allocation is £2,625 conditional upon a contribution of £875 from Chippenham Town Council.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>MR</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CATG noted the Town Council comments regarding combining with another scheme to reduce costs.</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 9-Aug-18 Town Council confirmed support for 5734 Croft Court</li> <li>• CATG recommend that 5734 &amp; 6063 are elevated to Priority One and taken together to achieve best value. Funding allocation is £ 2,625 conditional upon a contribution of £875 from Chippenham Town Council.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Little Pips Nursery">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Little Pips Nursery</a></p>			
8.11	<p><b>5825</b> – Lack of footway Turnpike Cottage to corner of Cuttle Lane Biddestone</p>	<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"> <li>• Site meeting held 10<sup>th</sup> April 2018.</li> <li>• Cost estimate £8,000 - £10,000</li> <li>• AW advised that Parish Council is willing to contribute more than the normal 25%</li> <li>• AW to confirm with Parish Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which request is the highest priority 5825 or 5826? <i>Or</i></li> <li>○ Does the Parish Council wish for 5825 &amp; 5826 to be “batched together”?</li> <li>○ Level of contribution the Parish Council is prepared to commit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted the update</li> <li>• Biddestone Parish Council confirm 5825 is the top priority</li> <li>• CATG recommendation is to elevate to Priority One, allocate £1,050 for topographical survey conditional upon contribution of £350 from Parish Council</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone</a></p>	<p><b>CATG recommendation Chippenham Area Board elevate to Priority One and allocate £1,050 for a topographical survey conditional upon a contribution of £350 from Biddestone Parish Council</b></p>	1	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
8.12	<a href="#">5937</a> Reduce speed limit on B4039 Kents Bottom near Yatton Keynell	<p>Request from Yatton Keynell Parish Council: <i>“Reduction in speed limit on B4039”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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</li> <li>MR confirmed that a site meeting took place 17-Sep-18 with Parish Chairman: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently 50mph</li> <li>Doesn't meet criteria for 30mph</li> <li>Potential for signing and lining</li> <li>Not dissimilar to Tiddleywink at the other end of the village therefore 40mph seems reasonable</li> <li>Installation of Hamlet name plate would assist</li> <li>Cost estimate for surveys £2,500</li> <li>Installation if scheme proceeds cost estimate a further £3,500</li> </ul> </li> <li>CATG recommendation Priority One, allocate £1,875 conditional upon contribution of £625 Parish Council</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Yatton+Keynell">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Yatton Keynell</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation Chippenham Area Board elevate to Priority One and allocate £1,875 conditional upon a contribution of £625 from Yatton Keynell Parish Council</b>	<b>1MR</b>	
8.13	<a href="#">6559</a> - Risk to pedestrians on B4039 in Burton narrow road without footway	<p>Request from Parish Council: <i>“Provision of signs on the roadside to warn drivers Pedestrians in Road.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18-Sep-18 MR advised CATG standard pedestrian in road sign is sensible in these circumstances. Cost approx £500 for sign.</li> <li>CATG agreed recommendation to elevate to Priority One and allocate £375 conditional upon a contribution of £125 from North Wraxall Parish Council</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Google image</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation Chippenham Area Board elevate to Priority One and allocate £375 conditional upon a contribution of £125 from North Wraxall Parish Council</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>MR</b>



	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
<b>9.</b>	<b>Priority Two/Pending Schemes</b>				
<b>9.1</b>	<b>5660</b> - 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"> <li>• CATG agreed site visit and liaison with the Parish Council required. Parish Council confirms on hold any further action due to budget constraints</li> <li>• 25-Jun-18 - remains on hold</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 – remains on hold</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>
<b>9.2</b>	<b>5753</b> - Replace informal crossing points with zebra crossings Queens Crescent	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• CATG noted petition had been received.</li> <li>• CATG noted that Queens Crescent School has updated its travel plan but did not mention any problems with crossings</li> <li>• 19-Mar-18 Chippenham Area Board allocated £600 from CATG funds conditional upon a contribution of £200 from Town Council.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<p>extracted the relevant zone data from the 2011 study and the results are shown below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2018 data in red 2011 data in green</li> </ul> <p><b>SITE 1 Queens Crescent (adjacent to Carnarvon Close)</b></p> <p>306 (322) 1000 vehicles per day approx</p> <p><b>SITE 2 Queens Crescent (Adjacent to Minster Way)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(254) 3000 vehicles per day approx</li> <li>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</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>DW advised that Queens Crescent will be resurfaced (date to be confirmed) at which point consideration could be given to removing the informal crossing at no additional cost.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Queens Crescent">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Queens Crescent</a></p>			

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
9.3	<a href="#">5826</a> - 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"> <li>• Site meeting held 1<sup>0th</sup> April 2018.</li> <li>• MR advised that we could consider batching 5825 &amp; 5826 and submitting to substantive bid in 2019/20.</li> <li>• Cost Estimate £30,000. NB a topographical survey will be required and combining the two requests would mean that implementation will take considerably longer.</li> <li>• AW to confirm with Parish Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which request is the highest priority 5825 or 5826? <i>Or</i></li> <li>○ Does the Parish Council wish for 5825 &amp; 5826 to be “batched together”?</li> <li>○ Level of contribution the Parish Council is prepared to commit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted the update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 Biddestone Parish Council confirm 5825 is the top priority – 5826 on hold</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone Arms">https://www.google.co.uk/maps/Biddestone Arms</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>AW</b>
9.4	<a href="#">5827</a> – Installation of four sets of White Gates	<p>Parish Council requests: <i>Installation of white gates:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 pair from A420 into village</li> <li>• 1 pair from Corsham into village</li> <li>• 1 pair Hartham into village</li> <li>• 1 pair from Giddea Hall into village</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Cost of gate approx. £1000 each installed.</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>AW</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site meeting held 10<sup>th</sup> April 2018. On hold pending completion of other identified priorities.</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>18-Sep-18 Biddestone Parish Council confirm 5825 is the top priority – 5826 on hold</li> </ul>			
9.5	<a href="#">6058</a> – Reduction of speed limit to 20mph throughout Castle Combe village	<p>Request from Castle Combe Parish Council:</p> <p><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"> <li>MR has arranged for Metro Counts to be carried out in the village.</li> <li>23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>18-Sep-18 MR advises we are awaiting results of Metro Count</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>
9.6	<a href="#">6119</a> - Speed of vehicles on Sadlers Mead Chippenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request is from Chippenham Town Councillor for traffic calming measures</li> <li>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 and instead pursue a review of the waiting restrictions on Sadlers Mead.</li> <li>1-Jun-18 Correspondent confirms that following consultation with residents in Sadlers Mead, he wishes to proceed with this request for traffic calming.</li> <li>28-Jun-18 Town Council considered this request and provided the following comments:</li> <li><i>Councillor Nick Murry described how he’d had extensive conversations with Wiltshire Council Highways officers on the issue, as well as writing to the police,</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>MR to establish whether the posters are available</b></p> <p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b></p>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<p><i>but the speed recordings didn't qualify for community speed watch or for consideration by CATG.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Councillor Murry will look at how traffic measures resulting from planned developments near the Olympiad might help improve the situation and also proposed that the Committee write to the Principal Traffic Engineer at Wiltshire Council to enquire about any possible signage that could help.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee was also asked for its advice on dealing with similar situations in other areas</i></li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR suggested that informal posters requesting vehicles slow down (previously used for a road safety campaign in Wood Lane) could be temporarily displayed for a short period.</li> </ul>			
9.7	<a href="#">6140</a> – 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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR advised that he is awaiting a response from Parish Council</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>
9.8	<a href="#">6144</a> – Speed reduction to 20mph for High Street in Chippenham	<p>Request made by Chippenham Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 apply to Wiltshire Council for a temporary road closure of the High Street to all vehicle traffic</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
		<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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 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.</li> <li>• Highways Officer advises that if considered a priority for the area by the CATG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An assessment will be required cost approx. £2,500.</li> <li>○ 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</li> </ul> </li> <li>• MR to arrange for SDR to establish statistics</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR confirms he will provide data/results from SDR at the next CATG meeting and will also recommend where the 20mph limit might be installed</li> </ul>			

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
9.9	<a href="#">6287</a> – Speed of vehicles Sutton Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro Count Requested by Community Speedwatch Coordinator to evidence the need to extend the Community Speedwatch Scheme in the village.</li> <li>• Completed Metro Count request form forwarded to Road Safety Unit 16-May-18</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR advised metro-count results are awaited</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	2	MR
9.10	<a href="#">6288</a> – Speed of vehicles on Marshfield Road, Chippenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed Metro Count request form forwarded to Road Safety Unit 1-Jun-18</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR advised metro count results are awaited</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	2	MR
9.11	<a href="#">6324</a> - Lack of passing places on Long Dean Lane near Yatton Keynell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referred to Yatton Keynell Parish Council for comment 1-Jun-18</li> <li>• Parish Council considered 5-Jun-18 <i>“Unanimously agreed to support a local resident’s request to investigate whether it is possible to add more passing points.”</i></li> <li>• MR to visit site to assess and contact Parish Council to discuss options</li> <li>• 23-Jul-18 Chippenham Area Board noted update</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR confirms he carried out site visit on 12<sup>th</sup> September. There are some “informal passing bays” along the lane</li> <li>• CATG would like clear indication of optimum location and number of bays required.</li> <li>• MR asked to coordinate a site meeting and advise next CATG meeting. <a href="#">Google Image</a></li> </ul>	<b>MR to coordinate a site meeting with correspondent and Parish Council representative</b>  <b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	2	MR

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
9.12	<a href="#">6350</a> – Speed of vehicles Stanton St Quintin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requests “Speed curbing is installed”</li> <li>Metro Count Request form issued for completion 1-Jun-18.</li> <li>This issue will be referred to the Parish Council once the Metro Count results are available</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	
9.13	<a href="#">6431</a> – HGV traffic ignoring signs & increased traffic through Kington Langley	<p>Request from Kington Langley Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Incorporate a 7.5t weight limit sign in the vicinity of the A350.</i></li> <li><i>Equestrian warning signs covering a 2-mile distance”</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for weight limit referred to Sustainable Transport Team for guidance.</li> <li>Highways Engineer advises: There is a stud farm on Ashes Lane and equestrian activity on nearby Days Lane so warning signs may be considered. The following should be taken into consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local authorities have been directed by central government to reduce the amount of sign clutter on our roads</li> <li>This is even more important in rural locations where too many signs can detract from the character of the area</li> <li>Should drivers expect to see riders on horseback on a rural single-track road? Will signs make a difference?</li> <li>Wiltshire Council policy is to ask the Requestor to pay the full cost for any non-essential signage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR to consider proposals and obtain cost estimates for consideration at next CATG</li> <li>MD confirmed Parish Council will pay for the horse signs</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Google Image</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>MR</b>



	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
9.14	<a href="#">6433</a> - Lack of signs for Jacksoms Lane	<p>Request from resident:</p> <p><i>“A sign erected part way down the A350 between the Kington Langley traffic lights and Jacksoms Lane indicating that there is a turning there. Also, a reflective sign at the entrance to the lane.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16-Jul-18 - Referred to Kington Langley Parish Council</li> <li>• 13-Aug-18 considered by Kington Langley Parish Council. Parish Council confirm support providing Langley Burrell is also approached for support and consequently will share the Parish Council costs as part of Jacksoms Lane is in Langley Burrell</li> <li>• 14-Aug-18 – referred to Langley Burrell Parish Council</li> <li>• Langley Burrell Parish Council to consider on 20-Sep-18</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Google Image</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>2</b>	
9.15	<a href="#">6483</a> - Width or weight restriction needed on Biddestone Lane	<p>Request from Yatton Keynell Parish Council:</p> <p><i>“Width Weight restriction placed on Biddestone Lane”</i></p> <p>12-Jul-18 Referred to Sustainable Transport Team (SD) for guidance</p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>		
9.16	<a href="#">6495</a> - Speed of vehicles on Eastern Avenue Chippenham	<p>Request from Division Councillor:</p> <p><i>“Check the speed here e.g. using a metro count device. Put in place appropriate measures to deter speeders e.g. look at current parking restrictions signage etc.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16-Jul-18 Metro Count Request Form issued for completion and return</li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 Second Metro Count Request form issued for completion and return</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>		

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
9.17	<a href="#">6509</a> - Lack of signage Tor Hill Crossroads	<p>Request from resident: <i>“Signage to draw attention to the danger of traveling at 50 mph toward this junction is not appropriate”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20-Jul-17 Referred to Kington Langley Parish Council for comment.</li> <li>• 27-Jul-17 Referred to Kington St Michael (KSM) Parish Council for comment</li> <li>• 17-Sep-18 KSM Parish Clerk confirms Parish Council support this request but have the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>“Wiltshire Council should have done this years ago and now just want money on what they should be doing anyway if it’s a highway danger”</i></li> <li>b. <i>“How about asking the adjacent PCs who should also assist, being Chippenham Without and Kington Langley?”</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• 18-Sep-18 MR advised that this location is not on the cluster site list, but there have been some collisions.</li> <li>• CATG agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ KSM Parish Council should approach Chippenham Without Parish Council and Kington Langley Parish Council with a proposal to address the concerns of the member of the public</li> <li>○ CATG will be pleased to receive feedback from KSM at the next CATG meeting</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Kington St Michael Parish Council to contact other Parishes and submit a proposal to CATG</b></p> <p><b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b></p>		<b>VV</b>

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
<b>10</b>	<b>New Requests</b>				
<b>10.1</b>	<b>6407</b> - Signs required Stanton St Quintin - The old A429 No Through road behind the BP Garage on the A429 Lower Stanton St Quintin SN14 6BN	<p>Request from Stanton St Quintin Parish Council:</p> <p><i>"We would like the No Through Road sign to be reinstated but more importantly we need a prominent sign pointing to the right saying All Traffic This Way to ensure traffic returns to the main road the correct way."</i></p> <p>18-Sep-18 CC confirmed that local Highways Team already has this in hand.</p> <p>Request to be closed. No action for CATG on this occasion.</p> <p><a href="#">Google Image</a></p>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>10.2</b>	<b>6552</b> – Access to private driveway frequently obstructed by parked vehicles	<p>Request from resident, Long Close, Chippenham:</p> <p><i>"A solid white line painted at the entrance to drive"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CATG noted that a nominal charge is now made by the Highways Team for "H Bar" markings across driveways.</li> <li>• CATG agreed that with immediate effect, all lining requests must demonstrate benefit to community, requests from individuals will not be considered.</li> <li>• Request to be closed. No action for CATG on this occasion.</li> <li>• Future requests should be submitted via My Wiltshire</li> </ul>	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board determine that requests for lining must demonstrate benefit to community, requests from individuals will not be considered</b>		

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
10.3	<a href="#">6564</a> – Speed limit in Yatton Keynell	<p>Request from Parish Council: <i>A resident attended Yatton Keynell Parish Council on 6th August 2018 with the statement below which was unanimously endorsed by Councillors.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“A week or so ago the Mayor of London announced that a 20mph speed limit will be introduced on all roads within the congestion charge area of Central London. The new regulations will come into effect within two years. Plans are already underway to extend the ruling to roads outside the congestion charge zone. The Mayor made it clear that the reason the sole reason for the decision was the safety of pedestrians. He quoted the statistic that a pedestrian hit by a car travelling at 20mph has a 90 chance of survival. That percentage falls to 40 when the car is travelling at 30mph. The new limit is considered essential for public safety in a city where most if not all roads have reasonably wide and well-maintained pavements. This being the case must there not be an even more pressing need for a 20mph speed limit to be introduced on all roads through into and out of Yatton Keynell where footpaths are so narrow that passing is difficult in some areas particularly when pushchairs are involved and there are long sections of road in the built-up area where there are no footpaths at all. I therefore ask the Parish Council to urge the appropriate authority to introduce a 20mph speed limit throughout the Yatton Keynell area without delay and certainly within the 2-year time frame set for London. What is so important for public safety in London is just as important in our village if not more so.”</i></li> <li>Wiltshire council’s current policy on 20mph limits does not permit the rural 20mph limits on strategic routes namely A &amp; B class roads or where the primary function of the road is that of through vehicle movement. This is in keeping with the DfT circular 01/13 ‘Setting local speed limits’ (para 132).</li> </ul> <p>Request to be closed. No action for CATG on this occasion.</p>			
11	<b>AOB</b>				
11.1	Metro Counts	MR advised that in future there will be a charge of £150 per count. Counts requested by Town/Parish Council will be charged in full to the Town Parish Council.	<b>CATG recommendation – Chippenham Area Board to note the update</b>		

	Item	Update	Actions & Recommendations	Priority 1 – High 2 - Low	Who
11.2	Safety	JS raised safety issue at pedestrian crossing on Avenue La Fleche junction with Gladstone Bridge conflict between cars coming across bridge and pedestrians  CC will refer on to traffic signals team to adjust the hood on traffic lights to deter this	CC to contact Traffic Signals Team		CC
<b>Date of next meeting</b> <b>15<sup>th</sup> January 2019</b> <b>10:00 – 12:00</b> <b>Committee Rooms B &amp; C, Monkton Park Offices, Chippenham</b>					

## 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 3<sup>rd</sup> party contributions are confirmed, Chippenham Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of £7,658.75

### 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