

---

## **AMESBURY AREA HIGHWAYS BUDGET 2010/11** **PRIORITISATION OF SCHEMES**

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1. To seek the board's approval of the Amesbury Community Area Transport Group's (CATG) recommendations for the prioritisation of schemes for funding from the Amesbury Area Highway's Budget in 2010/11.

### **2. Background**

- 2.1. During the course of each year, Wiltshire Council receives numerous petitions and requests for small-scale transport and highway improvement schemes.
- 2.2. In previous years, an allocation has been made in the budget to fund a small number of the schemes requested by town and parish councils. To identify those that would receive funding, all requests were assessed and prioritised using the Council's Scheme Assessment Framework, which provides an objective, quantitative and rapid method for evaluating and ranking schemes. However, following the establishment of area boards, this area of funding presents an opportunity for decisions on investment in highway improvements to be taken locally.
- 2.3. The Area Boards have been allocated a budget of £250,000 in 2010/11 and are being involved in the assessment and selection of small-scale transport schemes to be progressed in their community areas. This funding was been distributed between the Area Boards in accordance with a formula which takes into account population and the area covered. In the case of the Amesbury Area, £17,731 has been allocated for this scheme in 2010/11.
- 2.4. The Area Board convened a Community Area Transport Group (CATG) to work with officers at the beginning of October 2010 to consider the 26 schemes on the list at [Appendix 1](#), and to devise recommendations to the Area Board as to which schemes should be prioritised for further assessment.
- 2.5. Based on the recommendations of the CATG, the Area Board agreed that 6 schemes should be further assessed, and a seventh – the purchase of a mobile Speed Indicator Device, be investigated.
- 2.6. These assessments and investigations were carried out over the winter months, and the findings reported to the CATG on the 1<sup>st</sup> March. After careful consideration of these findings, the CATG has confirmed its conclusions and recommendations to the board (as detailed at Table 1, pages 3 and 4).

### **3. Main Considerations**

- 3.1. In choosing their local transport scheme(s), the Area Board will need to be mindful of the objectives of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the likely availability of future funding for implementation. Current LTP objectives are safety, accessibility, economy, integration and environment.
- 3.2. It should be noted that the £17,731 budget is for capital projects and can only be used to provide new and improved infrastructure. It is to be used for schemes that improve safety, increase accessibility and sustainability by promoting walking, cycling and public transport, and improve traffic management. It cannot be used to fund maintenance schemes, these are selected using technical surveys and inspections. In addition, it cannot be used to pay for revenue functions such as passenger transport.
- 3.3. In considering which of the 26 schemes in the attached were eligible under this scheme, the CATG also took into account alternative funding avenues, including S106, other LTP funding streams and match funding opportunities.
- 3.4. The typical schemes (and their corresponding approximate costs) eligible within the Area Board's highways budget are:

Pedestrian Refuge	:	£5k < 10k
Zebra crossing	:	£20k
Signalised (Puffin) crossing:		£60k
Footways	:	£100 per metre length
Traffic calming	:	£50k < £150k
Gateway feature	:	£5k

- 3.5. Based on advice from Highways' officers following their assessment of the schemes listed at Appendix 1, and having due regard for how feasible and affordable each scheme is likely to be, the CATG concluded that the following 2 schemes should be prioritised funding in 2010/11.
- 3.6. In addition, officers hope to confirm before the 31<sup>st</sup> March whether or not the Area Board could purchase one or two mobile Speed Indicator Devices that could be shared across the Area, not only to monitor speeds, flash speed warning signs, but also to gather data for subsequent analysis:

Table 1

Location	Scheme / Recommended investigation in Oct 2010	Findings from Investigations/Assessments	CATG Conclusion Mar 2011
Earls Court Road/Boscombe Down Rd, Amesbury	<p><i>Traffic Calming</i></p> <p>Further assessment needed to establish which traffic calming measures could be effective and affordable</p>	<p>(a) metrocount found some evidence of speeding, but not significant (85<sup>th</sup> percentile below 30mph)</p> <p>(b) 3 accidents in last year</p> <p>(c) school traffic/parking helps to slow traffic down</p> <p>(d) possible mitigating measures could be to add in pinch points, priority narrowing or speed bumps, and/or a designated crossing point based on crossing activity in this area</p>	<p>Not a priority for spend in 10/11 – needs reassessing in 11/12</p>
The Packway, Larkhill	<p><i>Upgrade Zebra to Pelican Crossing</i></p> <p>Pelican crossing would be too expensive (approx £60k), but further assessment is required to see what other measures could be put in place, e.g. an advanced feature on the approach to the crossing to slow traffic down</p>	<p>(a) a well used crossing, but gets obscured by trees</p> <p>(b) this could be remedied by making the crossing more visible to drivers through use of anti-skid road surface in red on approach to crossing (approx £3.5k) and zebrite LED surrounds to belisha beacons (approx £3.5k)</p> <p>(c) Cost of upgrade to pelican not justified</p>	<p>This is a priority for spend in 10/11 – recommend allocate up to £8k for anti-skid road surface and zebrite led surrounds to the belisha beacons</p>
Winterslow Rd, Porton	<p><i>Pedestrian Crossing</i></p> <p>Further assessment needed to establish if a pedestrian crossing could be effective and affordable</p>	<p>(a) this is a busy road, especially around the shop, with pedestrians, parked cars and traffic all combining to present hazards</p> <p>(b) there is no obvious place for a pedestrian crossing, particularly as visibility is an issue for approaching traffic from the direction of Porton Down</p> <p>(c) potential kerb re-engineering works to the road junction outside the shop could help to slow the flow of traffic</p> <p>(d) possible road markings could be used to better demarcate a crossing</p> <p>(e) it is hoped that Winterslow Rd will be resurfaced in 11/12 – this should either take place before or at the same time as any works to make crossing safer on this road</p> <p>(f) in the meantime, a count of the number of people crossing the road could be carried out</p>	<p>This is a priority - to survey numbers of people crossing the road. Survey needs to justify possible kerb/crossing engineering works that will need to take place either after or at the same time as the resurfacing works. A basic pedestrian crossing assessment to be undertaken in house to determine type and location. No CATG funding needed for initial assessment</p>

Church Road, Idmiston	<p><i>Traffic Calming</i></p> <p>Further assessment needed to establish which traffic calming measures could be effective and affordable</p>	<p>(a) despite the quiet rural nature of this road, local residents have concerns about the speed/volume of traffic especially at peak times for work/school run – therefore could be a site for speedwatch</p> <p>(b) any traffic calming measures would need not to detract from the pleasant rural appearance – maybe could use suitably sized granite patches to serve as speed bumps</p> <p>(c) Tom to investigate other low cost rural traffic calming measures</p>	Not a priority for spend in 10/11 – needs reassessing in 11/12
A338 Porton Crossroads	<p><i>Crossroads request</i></p> <p>Whilst a crossroads could not be funded under this scheme in 2010/11, further assessment was requested to see if any advanced warning signs/rumble strips could be introduced as you approach the bend travelling from Salisbury to Porton</p>	<p>(a) accident rate is high – 5 in last year, 4 serious – therefore this site features high on the councils accident cluster site list</p> <p>(b) any remedial measures should be funded through the Local Safety Schemes Budget (LSS). However, the board could look to introduce more low cost measures such as warning signs on crossroads if the scheme is not progressed under LSS</p> <p>(c) however, any lower cost measures would still need to be significantly sufficient to mitigate the hazards pose by the crossroads</p>	Await confirmation as to whether or not this site will be improved from the LSS Budget. If not, an assessment towards low cost remedial measures required.
C42 Upper Woodford into West Amesbury	<p><i>Improved traffic control and calming</i></p> <p>Further assessment needed to establish which traffic calming/control measures might be feasible/affordable</p>	<p>(a) limited carriageway and verge width to render traffic calming/control measures very difficult</p> <p>(b) important not to urbanise the current rural appearance</p> <p>(c) recent metrocounts not identified as eligible for speedwatch or speed control measures</p> <p>(d) awaiting the outcome of the C class review is one option – but outcome is a number of years off</p> <p>(e) possibility of negotiating a strip of land from the adjacent field to route pedestrians through the field and off of the road</p>	Not prioritised for spend in 10/11, but transport officer to revisit the site with a representative of local residents, and the town council to further assess the issue

## **4. Implications**

### **4.1. Environmental Impact of the Proposals**

There are no immediate environmental implications from the recommendations made in this report. Once the Area Board agrees which schemes should go forward with funding in 2010/11, the environmental impact of these schemes will be assessed.

### **4.2. Financial Implications**

The Area Board has a discretionary highways budget of £17,731 to allocate in 2010/11. Any underspend can be rolled forward to 2011/12. It is anticipated that the board will receive the same level of funding in 2011/12, i.e. a further £17,731.

The board can also choose to supplement funding of schemes from its Community Area Grants budget.

If the two schemes (The Packway, Larkhill – crossing improvements; and Winterslow Rd, Porton – crossing assessment) highlighted in bold in Table 1 above are approved, the Area Board is recommended to allocate £8,000 from the 2010/12 budget to cover the cost of these works. This leaves £9,731 in 2010/11 and, yet to be confirmed, a further £17,731 for spend in 2011/12.

## **5. Recommendations**

- (a) That the 2 schemes listed in bold above on page 3 be agreed as two of the Area Board's local transport schemes, for funding from the 2010/11 discretionary highways budget.
- (b) That the scheme (A338 Porton Crossroads) be prioritised for spend in 2011/12 on low cost remedial measures, should this scheme not be approved for spend under the council's central Local Safety Schemes Budget in 2010/11.
- (c) That the scheme (Church Rd, Idmiston – traffic calming) not be prioritised for spend in 2010/11, but be further investigated to assess what low cost rural traffic calming measures might be feasible in 2011/12.
- (d) That officers, town council and resident representatives meet on site to further assess the need for improved traffic control / calming on the C42 Upper Woodford to West Amesbury road.
- (e) That, subject to the outcome of officers' investigations e.g. feasibility and cost, the Area Board prioritise funds in 2011/12 to purchase one or more mobile speed indicator devices to share across sites in the Area to monitor speeds and to gather data for subsequent analysis.
- (f) That all other schemes not prioritised for action or spend in 2010/11, and any additional schemes put forward by parish councils, be considered by the CATG in 2011/12 for potential prioritisation.

## Amesbury Area: Discretionary Highways Budget (for small transport schemes) 2010/11 – Transport Group's Recommendations

	Location	Parish	Scheme	Reason	Transport Group's Recommendation
<i>Schemes logged with the Highways Department over the past 5 years</i>					
1	Church Street	Amesbury	Pedestrian crossing	Pedestrian safety	In relation to other schemes on the list, this is not a priority in 10/11
2	Earls Court Rd/Boscombe Down Rd	Amesbury	Traffic calming	Highway safety	In relation to other schemes on the list, this is not a priority in 10/11
3	Porton Road	Amesbury	Pedestrian crossing	Pedestrian safety	As S106 funding has been agreed as part of the RDC development for this pedestrian crossing, this scheme should not be prioritised for this budget in 2010/11
4	Bulford to Solstice Park	Bulford	Footpath from Salisbury Road, Bulford - Solstice Park	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised under this scheme as S106 funding has been secured from the recent Tesco store development
5	<b>The Packway</b>	<b>Durrington</b>	<b>Zebra to Pelican crossing</b>	<b>Pedestrian safety</b>	<b>This is a priority for spend in 10/11 – recommend allocate up to £8k for anti-skid road surface and zebrite led surrounds to the belisha beacons</b>
6	B3085 Hackthorn Rd to Bulford Road	Durrington	20 mph speed limit	Highway safety	Not prioritised for funding under this scheme in 10/11 – await outcome of national policy / Wilts Council pilot of 20mph zones, and investigate potential for S106 funding from nearby future development
7	<b>Winterslow Rd, Porton</b>	<b>Idmiston</b>	<b>Pedestrian crossing</b>	<b>Pedestrian safety</b>	<b>Recommend pedestrian crossing assessment to determine type / location of crossing - to justify possible kerb/crossing engineering works that will need to take place either after/at same time as resurfacing works in 11/12</b>
8	Porton village to Gomeldon Primary (Gomeldon Road)	Idmiston	Footway from Porton village to Gomeldon Primary School	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised, due to length of footway required (at cost of £100 per mtr), and due to concerns that carriageway is too narrow to accommodate a footway
9	A338 (between Idmiston village & School)	Idmiston	Footpath	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised, due to length of footway required (at a cost of £100 per mtr), and due to concerns that carriageway was too narrow to accommodate a footway. The PC could investigate putting in place footpath to rear of dwellings with funding from the Pathways Improvement Grant, and community payback to clear vegetation.
10	Winterslow Road, Porton	Idmiston	Provision of footway (Porton village to Porton Down)	Encourage more walking / less traffic through village?	Not prioritised due to the length of the footway required rendering the scheme unaffordable in 2010/11
11	Church Road	Idmiston	Traffic Calming	Highway safety	Not prioritised for spend in 2010/11, but requested further assessment to see what other low cost rural traffic calming measures could be implemented
12	A338 (between Idmiston & Porton)	Idmiston	Footpath	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised due to the length of the footway required rendering the scheme unaffordable in 2010/11

13	Through Newton Tony	Newton Tony	20 mph speed limit	Highway safety	Not prioritised for funding under this scheme in 2010/11 – await outcome of national policy and Wiltshire Council pilot of 20mph zones
14	London Rd, B3086	Shrewton	Traffic calming	Highway safety	Not prioritised, as speed limit is currently 30mph. Instead Parish Council should pursue camera enforcement
15	B3083	Stapleford	Footway	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised due to the length of the footway required rendering the scheme unaffordable in 2010/11
16	A360	Tilshead	Traffic calming	Highway safety	Not prioritised for funding under this scheme in 2010/11

*Schemes requested at area board meetings / the community issues system since June 2009*

	Location	Parish	Scheme	Reason	Transport Group's Recommendation
17	Salisbury Rd	Amesbury	General state of repair of highway needs attention	Maintenance	This budget is unable to fund highway maintenance schemes. Ensure being pursued through correct avenue of funding
18	Road layout by Baptist Church, Porton Rd	Amesbury	Adaptations requested to encourage traffic to slow down	Pedestrian safety	As S106 funding has been agreed as part of the RDC development for this pedestrian crossing, this scheme should not be prioritised for this budget in 2010/11
19	Amesbury – Bulford	Amesbury / Bulford	Cycle Route	Transport links	This scheme is benefiting from S106 funding from the Tesco store development
20	Countess Roundabout	Amesbury / Durrington	Traffic flow / congestion	Congestion	This road is managed by the Highways Agency and not Wiltshire Council
21	<b>C42 Upper Woodford into West Amesbury</b>	<b>Amesbury /Woodford Valley</b>	<b>Traffic calming and control to make road less hazardous</b>	<b>Highway and pedestrian safety</b>	<b>Further assessment needed to establish which traffic calming/control measures might be feasible/affordable</b>
22	Coronation Rd	Durrington	No through route signs and weight /width restrictions	Highway safety / residential amenity	Officers advised that these measures would not be appropriate
23	<b>A338 Porton Crossroads</b>	<b>Idmiston</b>	<b>Crossroads requested</b>	<b>Highway and pedestrian safety</b>	Await confirmation as to whether or not this site will be improved from the LSS Budget. If not, an assessment towards low cost remedial measures required.
24	Salisbury – Amesbury	Bourne / Amesbury	Cycle routes	Transport links	Not prioritised under this scheme, as this project is being developed with funding from alternative sources
25	Porton, Idmiston & Gomeldon	Idmiston	Traffic calming and speed restrictions, including 20mph limit	Highway safety	Not prioritised under this scheme in 2010/11 - – await outcome of national policy and Wiltshire Council pilot of 20mph zones
26	Gomeldon School, Winterslow Rd	Idmiston	Pedestrian priority crossings	Pedestrian safety	Not prioritised in 2010/11 for reasons of affordability