

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

A	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	<b>Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG)</b>  <b>Date of meeting: Thursday 24th November 2022</b>			
1.	<b>Attendees and apologies</b>			
	<p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cllr Caroline Thomas - Marlborough East</li> <li>Cllr Jane Davies - Marlborough West</li> <li>Steve Hind – Wiltshire Council Highways</li> <li>Martin Cook - Wiltshire Council Highways</li> <li>Cllr Peter Morgan – Preshute PC</li> <li>Cllr Mervyn Hall – Marlborough TC</li> <li>Richard Spencer Williams – town clerk, Marlborough TC</li> <li>Cllr Leigh Clode – Ogbourne St Andrew PC</li> <li>Cllr Bob Parker – Avebury PC</li> <li>Cllr Sheila Glass - Ramsbury PC</li> </ul> <p>Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cllr James Shepherd - Aldbourne and Ramsbury</li> </ul>			
2.	<b>Notes of last meeting</b>			
	<p>The minutes of the previous LHFIG meeting held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> September were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2022. The minutes can be found via this link  <a href="#">Area Boards</a></p>			

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

### **Comments from the Chair on Local Highways & Footways Improvement Group (LHFIG) arrangements:**

#### **Reminder of the**

- 2022/23 Budget decision to move from CATG to Local Highways and Footpaths Improvement Group
- and to double the overall budget allocated (£400k to £800k)
- which is suitable for schemes that improve safety, increase accessibility and sustainability by promoting walking, cycling and public transport and improve traffic management.

**Pedestrian improvements:** including dropped kerbs, new footways, substantive improvements to existing footways, pedestrian crossings (including assessments).

**Cycle improvements:** new cycle paths, cycle parking / storage.

**Bus infrastructure:** new and replacement Shelters (subject to agreement on future maintenance liability), bus border kerbs, bus stop road markings.

**Traffic signing:** new and replacement signs (including signposts), street name plates, village gateways.

**New road markings:** new and replacement of existing markings.

**Speed limits:** assessment and implementation.

**Waiting restrictions:** assessments and implementation.

**Footpath improvements:** styles, gates, surface improvements to rights of ways (council maintainable only).

**Drainage:** minor improvements, new gullies.

**Street lighting:** new installations.

**Traffic management measures:** including Sockets and posts for SID (Speed Indication Device) equipment.

Funds cannot be used for revenue functions, such as routine maintenance schemes or the provision of passenger transport services. As a general rule, an asset should exist at the end of the project, i.e. something new that wasn't there beforehand.

#### **Meeting dates and programme**

While we have more budget, funds that are not committed – that is for work completed or orders placed with contractors for delivery within the current financial year – will be returned to WC to go into the Substantive Schemes pot. Exceptions will only be allowed when events outside of our control have impacted deliver, although I would hope in this first round there may be some leeway given on this.

This means we must be very clear, when agreeing priorities, which are

- Approved and deliverable/paid for this year,
- Approved but need more work so will be developed with a view for delivery in the subsequent financial year

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not yet approved but have potential to be reviewed when resources are available.</li> </ul> <p>It is less about '5 priorities', so much as identifying which schemes are deliverable this financial year, being mindful of the workload on our officers, else little will ever reach completion.</p> <p>I propose that for this November meeting, with most of the current priorities delivered or scheduled, we review the priorities for 23/24 so we roll forward smoothly and avoid delays. And I'm pleased to note we have one or two 'pipeline' activities that have had some initial work.</p> <p>However, I understand the most likely contender for a Substantive funding bid – work on the A4 near Manton - has not progressed sufficiently far, for a bid to be submitted this year. The window offered was very short. Next year we should plan to have such bids ready in the summer.</p> <p>The advice was that meetings should ideally take place as below, each one 2 to 4 weeks in advance of the Area Board meetings where this group's decisions are ratified. However, the 22/23 timetable was set beforehand so the dates are not as aligned as they should be moving forward.</p> <p><b>April (May 22/23):</b> Budget confirmation and budget allocation to projects. ---- confirm the 'green' and 'ambers'</p> <p><b>July (September 22/23):</b> Progress meeting. Budget allocation (note: projects allocated beyond this meeting may not be delivered by the end of March).</p> <p><b>October (November 22/23) :</b> Progress meeting. Agree projects to be put forward for funding from Substantive bid, ahead of end of November submission deadline. Small scale and low-cost projects at this meeting may be delivered before end of year deadline.</p> <p><b>January (March 22/23):</b> Progress meeting. Agreement of any funding to be returned for redistribution. Any projects prioritised at this meeting will not be delivered within this financial year.</p> <p>As already noted, in this first year, we expect some leeway allowed on this return of funding point. Cabinet have agreed that this matter will be included in the 6-month review following this financial year to see how it has worked in practice.</p> <p>Terms of reference expect town and parish councils to make at least a 20% contribution to the projects that pass through LHFIG. These can be circulated with the notes.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Financial Position</b></p>
	<p>Finance sheet – as at the September meeting - is attached. This will be updated to reflect decisions made today.</p>

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

4.	<b>Process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes</b>			
	LHFIG requests forms are on the Wiltshire Council website. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards</a> Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, request forms should be sent to <a href="mailto:LHFIGrequests@wiltshire.gov.uk">LHFIGrequests@wiltshire.gov.uk</a>			
5.	<b>22/23 Priority Schemes (NB completed work moved to final section)</b>			
	Item	Prior Position	Discussion Notes and Actions	Priority for Year
a)	Issue <a href="#">7027</a> New double yellow lining on B4003	<p>Construction improvement to lay-by had been requested but unlikely to take place quickly due to complexity of construction issues within World Heritage site with land owned/managed by the NT.</p> <p>Waiting restrictions could be extended to edge of existing lay-by and the position reviewed when improvements have been undertaken. Costs if this is undertaken through CATG would be around £2500 including the advert procedure.</p> <p>Decision taken not to implement the waiting restrictions originally advertised and wait to advertise the 22m parking length. Second advert ran 25<sup>th</sup> August to 19<sup>th</sup> September '22 at an additional cost of £2500</p> <p>Note 'Primrose' yellow lines are required within the World Heritage site. Advertisement received no objections.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests waiting restriction is being ignored</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> SH to follow up targeted enforcement.</p> <p>Position may be improved if the pot holes where cars are allowed to park were filled. NT is insisting on the correct type of chalk although noted that it's not their land so WC may need to take control.</p> <p>For the layby improvement, as a new piece of highway, WC need to ensure the design is robust enough including for HGVs. SH was planning a discussion with Atkins to initiate the work which includes checking the condition of the ground. May need archaeologists involved due to the NT/World Heritage location.</p>	<p>Waiting restriction - 22/23 (complete)</p> <p>Layby - TBC</p>

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Implemented of 22m parking length confirmed	<p>JD suggested this is all beyond the remit of LHFIG expertise, time and budget.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – JD to raise with Dave Thomas to get specialist attention and traction. It's complicated, particularly with NT stipulations.</p>	
b)	8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment	<p>This is on a list of 16 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins. Report completed and sent to Parish Council for consideration. Advert for speed limit change undertaken with no objections. Scheme delegated to complete works package for implementation. PC contribution capped at 25% of £6500 or a minimum of 20% of the costs.</p> <p>Programmed to be implemented last week in November.</p>	<p>PC very pleased and thanked the Committee for help and support.</p> <p>Will request a metro count to assess the implementation</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – LC or JH (OsA PC) to confirm implementation next meeting</p>	22/23 Priority
c)	8-20-4 A4 Manton traffic calming	<p>Request for a substantive scheme to include 8-21-2, 8-21-3, 8-21-4 plus move speed limit and alteration to Pelican traffic light.</p> <p>Design and cost to be developed and consideration as a substantive scheme. TEAMS meeting organised to discuss the project options, which were agreed as</p> <p>Stage 1 – low cost signing and road marking scheme. Stage 2 – design work for new traffic island to the west of Downs Lane, Marlborough name signs and possible location of speed limit. Topo survey agreed to enable design.</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b> – SH to progress Stage 1 and the TOPO Survey</p> <p>Stage 2 to be developed for a substantive scheme bid, ready for summer 23.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> - SH to revert back to the Committee to update us on progress at each meeting.</p>	<p>Stage 1 - 22/23 Priority if possible, else 23/24</p> <p>TOPO Survey – 22/23 Priority</p> <p>Stage 2 23/24 Priority</p>

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Stage 1 plan and estimate sent to RSW for approval. Supported by Marlborough TC. Cost estimate increased to £6790. Contribution 25%. Confirmation from LHFIG to proceed.</p> <p>Stage 2 cost estimate for topo survey sent to RSW for approval. Cost £1700. Confirmation from LHFIG to proceed.</p>		
	8-21-2 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island	<p>Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary</p> <p>Refer to 8-20-4</p>		
	8-21-3 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for transverse yellow markings	<p>Request for transverse yellow road markings on westbound approach to crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.</p> <p>Refer to 8-20-4</p>		
	8-21-4 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Road, Manton – request for sign.	<p>Request for sign indicating Bridge St turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St.</p> <p>Refer to 8-20-4</p>		
d)	8-22-9 Marlborough, Cardigan Rd	<p>'No waiting at any time' requested - there is a soak away that can't be accessed due to the parking in an unrestricted area which applies to both sides of the road.</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b> - SH to seek clarity over design advertising etc work to date (e.g. via Traffic Management Group / Infrastructure Team / Jamie Mundy).</p>	22/23 Priority

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		Long term issue...requests have been on the yellow line list previously and partially completed. But yellow lines now managed by LHFIG.	<p><b>ACTION</b> – SH to progress the advertising if it's required</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – CT to ask Highways to provide clarity to town and Parish councils regarding changes to responsibilities (e.g. yellow lining)</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Other Priority schemes – reviewed for progress and consideration as a 23/24 Priority action</b>			
	<b>NB all items noted below as a 23/24 Priority will need putting into a priority order to help SH manage his workload.</b>			
a)	8-21-8 Aldbourn – virtual paths	<p>Request for virtual paths along Farm Lane, entire length of Marlborough Rd, Castle St to Whitley Rd. To replace 18-19-11</p> <p>TEAMS meeting undertaken with PC rep Chris Ainsworth.</p> <p>Checks including Speed data and traffic volume to be obtained to check for suitability of virtual footway along Marlborough Road from The Butts to the village centre.</p> <p>Traffic volumes and speeds obtained along Marlborough Road being reviewed by SH</p>	<p>Speed data suggests continuation of design assessment is appropriate.</p> <p>SH confirmed that if prioritised and a satisfactory solution can be developed, implementation could be in 2023</p>	23/24 Priority agreed
b)	<p>Issue <a href="#">5190</a> Request for safety works at London Rd, Marlborough</p> <p>8-21-7 Forest Hill speed limit review</p>	<p>The £1500 area board funding allocated to a speed limit review costing £2500. Savernake PC contribution 25%. Request for speed limit review issued to Atkins.</p> <p>Site visit undertaken and Speed report sent to Savernake PC (Guy Singleton/ Martin Phipps) 11/3/22 but which did not recommend a lower restriction to the current 50 mph</p>	<p>Martin Phipps, Savernake PC has asked MC for 'reduce speed now' signs.</p> <p>MH noted the Cricket Club is also now used in winter for football</p> <p>SH agreed the review and implementation (if suitable) is doable in 23/24</p>	23/24 Priority agreed

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		LHFIG agreed further investigation/ discussion was appropriate for a signing solution including at location of Cricket club.	<b>ACTION</b> – SH to request a signage review (Mark Stansby).	
c)	8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.	<p>Request to increase the length of the speed limit. requires a further speed limit review to justify the cost. Cost of speed limit review £2500.</p> <p>Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review. Contribution of £625 with £1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Atkins site visit on Sunday 14<sup>th</sup> November to assess the situation while the rugby club was in operation. Report completed and sent to Town Clerk for distribution and consideration.</p> <p>The report did not recommend the speed is lowered past the rugby club but does suggest the 40mph speed limit is extended further out of town to Rockley.</p> <p>Scheme will cross into Preshute PC. Mervyn Hall to discuss contributions.</p> <p>Preshute PC support 40mph limit from Rockley in principle.</p> <p>£4500 costs (advert and implementation) supplied to RSW. 25% contribution £1125. Shared proportions to be agreed.</p>	<p>CT noted this was directly linked to item 8-22-2 as a pedestrian safety request in 2 parts - the speed limit and other safety measures</p> <p>CT noted the proposal to extend 40mph to Rockley would need to be agreed by MTC as it wasn't what was requested. JD noted the benefits of reducing speeds approaching Frees Avenue.</p> <p>PM (Preshute PC) flagged that the PC wasn't sure it represented good value for its residents and it hadn't been included in their 23/24 precept budget. MC flagged that Rockley is in Ogbourne St Andrew PC and PM noted its chair had said he wasn't sure residents would support it either.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Marlborough, Preshute and OsA PCs to confirm their positions on contributing to costs for the 40mph restriction extension to Rockley; with the PCs potentially doing so based on respective headcounts in the 3 areas.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – MTC to also consider 100% contribution to just moving the 40/National Speed Limit signs west, to the edge of the Common.</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>Nb Still have all the advertising costs so not a huge saving. NOTE It is not an option for MTC to move the 40mph where they wish.</p> <p>PCs are asked to feedback to CT, JD, JS and SH as soon as they can.</p>	
d)	8-22-2 Marlborough, The Common	<p>Crossing points/ traffic calming</p> <p>Linked to 8-19-10</p> <p>MTC in conjunction with the Rugby Club have produced a package of measures to help with safety.</p> <p>Note that WC Highways owns just the carriageway area and no part of the verge.</p> <p>SH and Clare Harris have discussed on site. SH to develop measures if prioritised.</p>	<p>Linked to 8-19-10 above</p> <p>The pedestrian safety plans include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhance visibility of the current pedestrian crossing point with guide railings</li> <li>- Put up 'welcome to Marlborough' white gates</li> <li>- Add yellow line markings and warning signs</li> </ul> <p>SH confirmed MTC can proceed with the railing and white gates at their cost, and the signage and road markings could be done in 23/24 if prioritised. Nb also potentially doable for 22/23</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – SH to progress work on signage and road marking designs and inform MTC of likely costs and implementation timescales.</p>	23/24 Priority agreed (if not 22/23)
e)	8-19-1 and 8-22-3 Request for new pedestrian crossing at Marlborough High St.	<p>Marlborough Town Council supported and endorsed the petition signed by over 600 people requesting a pedestrian crossing in Marlborough High Street due to safety concerns for the elderly and visually impaired.</p> <p>Consideration has previously been given to possible formal crossings in Kingsbury St by Patten Alley, across</p>	<p>SH noted he looked at the potential site this morning. It would need an island or change of surface in the middle. MC flagged possible use of existing pavement build outs in place on each side. A TOPO survey is likely to be required.</p>	23/24 Priority agreed - to move forwards with initial feasibility

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>to the Town Hall steps or across the High St by the White Horse bookshop. No location is suitable for a formal crossing.</p> <p>Removed from priority list until temporary social distancing schemes were no longer necessary.</p> <p>Crossing to be looked at in conjunction with the town wide traffic strategy.</p> <p>CT took an action to agree an acceptable location for a zebra crossing with the Town Council and following a site meeting with MC and several Cllrs, a solution that doesn't take away many car parking spaces was drafted and reviewed by MTC before being passed on to SH in March.</p>	<p>It was noted the request had been raised as a disability issue. People can and do cross the High Street in numerous places but a safe place is required for the more vulnerable and some incorrectly assume there is a crossing point where the raised pavement extensions are. NOTE For justification of a formal crossing, a pedestrian count will have to be undertaken but this could include a distance 50m either side of the proposed location.</p> <p>We can assume the scheme would need to be a Substantive bid and that we'd need to consider its priority with the A4 Manton work after the feasibility stage e.g. if 2 bids are not considered feasible and/or appropriate.</p>	<p>work by summer 23.</p>
f)	8-21-12 Ramsbury – Back Lane	<p>Traffic calming / priority system</p> <p>Martin Cook suggested road markings to narrow the road could be undertaken quite quickly through maintenance.</p> <p>However, this hasn't been allowed as they are new.</p>	<p>Missed out by contractors even though other white lining was completed in the area. Various budgets are involved that weren't linked up</p> <p>SH confirmed the work is doable in 23/24</p>	<p>Prioritise for 23/24</p>
g)	8-22-8 Ramsbury, B4192/ Crowood Lane	<p>'Unsuitable for HGV's' sign request</p> <p>Ramsbury PC is happy to pay 100% to help push this forward but they still need Highways approval.</p> <p>LHFIG approved and the request can now go to Mark Stansby's signage team.</p>	<p>If prioritised, the PC will only need to pay a contribution</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – SH to progress a request for signage to include Foxfield Road (8-22-16) and Back Lane (8-21-12) warning signs.</p>	<p>Prioritise for 23/24</p>

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

7.	<b>Other potential schemes</b>			
	<p>8-21-5 Footpath between Van Diemans Close and George Lane.</p>	<p>Request to widen footpath to access St Mary's school.</p> <p>Several owners of the land either side of the path. The Rights of Way team would need to be involved.</p> <p>CATG agreed to make this scheme a high priority to show political desire to move this forward but it is recognised that SH will not currently work on this scheme.</p> <p>JD has contacted Perry Holmes, Head of Legal at Wilts Council. The first step is to contact landowners or neighbours to ask permission for use of the land. In light of the new crossing, his recommendation was to wait 1-2 years for landowners to get used to it before approaching them.</p> <p>Town Council to write to landowners.</p>		
	<p>8-19-8 A346 (Cadley – traffic lights on A4) Now - traffic survey and modelling</p>	<p>Traffic modelling for a junction would be required. JS to pursue this with area board and town councillors. AJ discussed with Dave Thomas who initiated discussions with Atkins.</p> <p>Brief agreed in discussion with JD and CT</p> <p>Quote for traffic survey and modelling received for c£48,000. WC have agreed to contribute (as they have with Bradford on Avon)</p>	<p>Wider traffic plan and need for a detailed survey and modelling is being taken forward by MTC as not an LHFIG item.</p> <p>Detailed proposals may be made at a later date so retain in the list</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>8-20-8 Ramsbury – speed limit consideration- C6 east of village</p>	<p>PC to test via Metrocount to decide whether to progress with speed limit review</p> <p>Whilst a full speed limit review cost £2,500, a Metrocount is free of charge. It was recommended SG tests vehicle speed via a Metrocount before committing to the full speed limit review. Request submitted by PC.</p> <p>SG reported that Ramsbury PC now has the Metrocount results and asked that this request be postponed until later.</p>	<p>Metro Count – 85% at around 60mph</p>	
<p>8-21-13 Marlborough – St Martins to Tin Pit</p>	<p>Request for footpath improvements and speed calming measures.</p> <p>Metrocount required to check speeds within the 30mph limit requested – request remains outstanding</p>	<p>RSW noted Metro counts are on hold due to issues with the contractor</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> - SH to check out what the issues are</p>	
<p>8-22-4 Marlborough A346</p>	<p>Pedestrian crossing between The Acres and The Common across the A346</p> <p>SH said that a pedestrian count would cost a fixed rate of £2,500. SH can send to MTC the eligibility criteria for a new crossing so they can assess if this will be successful.</p> <p>The Metrocount from November '21 was mentioned and how it showed that 85% of vehicles were speeding and these figures present a dangerous location for people looking to cross to The Common, especially children. Because of the high speeds seen here, this location is eligible for police speed checks to be carried out.</p>	<p>CT noted the 'impasse' we seem to have – dangerous 5-way junction with metro count indicating 85% of vehicles are speeding at a point where pedestrians need to cross from a residential housing area to The Common but the Police Speed watch team suggest it's too dangerous for enforcement.</p> <p>A pole for a SID is being looked at by MTC.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> - JD/CT/JS to follow up previous enquires with PW, the PCC, and possibly organise a visit.</p>	

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		The speeds are too fast for Community speed watch and apparently the Police had risked assessed it as unsafe for officers to use for their speed checks.		
8-22-5 Marlborough, Cherry Orchard	Handrails for steps on steep banks  SH has not worked on designs like this before and will need to call on colleagues for help here to understand more about the implementation.	MC noted the steps were put in as part of social housing in the 40s when it was a route to the railway station. They were installed to meet standards of the time and those standards still apply even though we would build them very differently today.  <b>ACTION</b> - SH to continue enquiries before group consider prioritising. We don't know how the steps are constructed/how feasible adding hand rails might be  Options seem to be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> <li>• Add rails</li> <li>• Remove steps</li> </ul> JD flagged that a handrail encourages use (which is dangerous); could be left to personal judgement		
8-22-10 New Pavement at Chilton Foliat	New raised pavement for Chilton Foliat	No PC representative to discuss  SH initial view is that it doesn't look feasible.		

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<b>8.</b>	<b>New Requests / Issues not yet reviewed</b>			
a)	8-22-11 Manton, Downs Lane	To be removed as already part of Manton A4 work		
b)	8-22-12 Crooked Soley (nr Chilton Foliat)	Footpath signpost replacements (maintenance issue)		
c)	8-22-13 Marlborough – Tin Pit	Improved parking provision request. There are 11 cottages along the lane, none of which have parking provision but all have vehicles (at least one, if not two or three). There are some large houses on Tin Pit with their own drives, however poor parking impinges access. Residents of the neighbouring Poulton Crescent have limited parking and so overspill into Tin Pit.		
d)	8-22-14 A346 Ogbourne St George to County Boundary north	Review of two bus stops along the A346 with a plan to make them more accessible and safer for residents.		
e)	8-22-15 Aldbourn, Castle Street	Request for 20mph assessment There is no footway along Castle Street, Aldbourne. It is not suitable for a virtual footway. Request to reduce traffic speed by introducing 20mph.		

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

f)	8-22-16 Ramsbury – Froxfield Road	Request for 'walkers in road' sign	Remove as separate item - to be considered as part of Ramsbury Unsuitable for HGVs request above	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Other items</b>			
a)	March LHFIG	Review Priority order of 23/24 items to assist SH with planning his time.		
<b>9.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> Thursday 2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2023 10.00am Court Room, Marlborough Town Hall.			

### Completed Work

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

<p>8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.</p>	<p>Improvements for pedestrians including traffic calming requested. Site meeting undertaken. Low-cost option includes warning signs and road markings to enhance the gateway. Footway and bus stop can be reconsidered and time can be given to this if agreed through the CATG. Design developed for low cost scheme, estimated &lt;£2k. PC contribution 25%.</p> <p>Signing installed. Road markings to be implemented under the ad hoc process during the summer.</p> <p>Road markings still not complete.</p>	<p>Complete</p>	<p>22/23</p>
<p>8-19-2</p>	<p>Request for a sign at the entrance to Manton Hollow (at the junction with Downs Lane) advising 'No Through Road' as it appears on many maps and sat-navs as a through road resulting in cars and HGVs attempting to turn in the very restricted turning area at western end of the southern arm of Manton Hollow. This has resulted in damage to the two houses that front on to the turning area.</p> <p>A 'No through road' sign' is already installed at junction of Downs Lane with A4.</p> <p>MTC did not support a sign at junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow preferring to replace the sign at the junction of Downs Lane with the A4.</p> <p>Cost estimate £175. MTC 25% agreed</p> <p>Sign installed</p>	<p>Complete</p>	<p>22/23</p>

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	8-22-7 Mildenhall, Woodlands Rd	Unsuitable for HGV sign To be funded by Mildenhall PC  Approved through LHFIG for ad hoc signing. Sign implemented.	Complete	
	8-21-11 Clench Common - speeding	Request to review speed limit, add signing, introduce gates. Speed limit change considered unlikely. Possible warning signs. Community to discuss. PC are prepared to pay 100% for white gates, locations to be established. Appropriate warning signs also to be considered. Savernake PC working with Martin Cook on white gates. Have landowners' permission and will update at the next meeting.	Gates bought and installation being progressed on Martinsell side where the village road is NSL while main road is 50mph	NFA

### Marlborough Local Highway and Footway Improvement Group

#### Highways Officer – Steve Hind

#### 1. Environmental & Community Implications

1.1. Environmental and community implications were considered by the LHFIG 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 Marlborough Area Board.

2.2. If funding is allocated in line with LHFIG recommendations outlined in this report, and all relevant 3<sup>rd</sup> party contributions are confirmed, Marlborough Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of **£1483**

#### 3. Legal Implications

3.1. There are no specific legal implications related to this report.

## COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

### **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**