AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION NOTES

| 03 | Item | Update | Actions and recommendations | Who |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date of MS Teams meeting: $\mathbf{6 6}^{\text {th }}$ February 2021 |  |  |  |
| 1. | Attendees and apologies |  |  |  |
|  | Present: <br> Apologies: | Cllr Mike Hewitt - Wiltshire Council <br> Cllr Robert Yuill - Wiltshire Council <br> Cllr Graham Wright - Wiltshire Council <br> Cllr Kevin Daley - Wiltshire Council <br> Cllr Fred Westmoreland - Wiltshire Council <br> Kate Davey - Wiltshire Council Highways <br> Andy Cole - Wiltshrie Council Highways <br> Myra Orr - Cholderton Parish Meeting <br> Graham Jenkins - Bulford Parish Council <br> Jenny MacDougall - Wylye Parish Council <br> Steven Cocking - Idmiston Parish Council <br> John Ellis - Durrington Parish Council <br> David Hassett - Shrewton Parish Council <br> Richard Harris - Shrewton Parish Council <br> Charles Penn - Winterbourne Parish Council <br> Rae Owen - Woodford Parish Council <br> Richard Soar - Woodford Parish Council <br> Alex Ginn - Woodford Resident <br> Hazel Conway - Woodford Resident <br> Debby Potter - Tilshead Parish Council <br> Cllr John Smale - Wiltshire Council <br> Simon Collins - Chemring Countermeasures Ltd <br> Jacqui Abbott - Wiltshire Council CEM |  |  |


| 2. | Notes of last meeting |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | The notes of the last meeting held on $30^{\text {th }}$ October 2020 were accepted as a true record. | Noted and agreed. |  |
| 3. | Financial Position |  |  |  |
|  |  | See Finance sheet. 2020/21 allocation is $£ 17,731.00$. 2019/20 underspend was $£ 31,462.18$ and the current commitments total $£ 40,340.00$ giving a remaining budget of $£ 17,688.18$. | Noted and agreed. |  |
| 4. | Top 5 Priority Schemes |  |  |  |
| a) | 1-19-6 <br> Wylye village - Request for 20mph speed limit. | Wylye PC have raised concerns over the speed of traffic through the village where the roads are narrow with no footways so pedestrians are forced to walk in the carriageway to access the village facilities. There are also a number of cyclists as the C 10 is a designated cycle route. Request for 20 mph speed limit assessment to be undertaken at a cost of $£ 2500$. Group agreed to fund the asseesment. Wylye PC has confirmed $25 \%$ contribution of $£ 625$. <br> Wylye PC have asked that the proposed village gate at the eastern end of the village to be removed. New estimate $£ 9,000$ (CATG $£ 6,750$ $(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 2,250)$. Group agreed to fund installation. Wylye PC agreed contribution. <br> TRO consulation period: 28 January - 22 February 2021. Waiting for confirmation whether any comments have been received. | ACTION <br> Objection to consultation received therefore a report to the Cabinet Member will be written for consideration. | KD |


| b) | 1-19-10 <br> Orchard End/MilstonRoad/Bulford Drove, Bulford - horse \& rider warning signs | Concerns raised over safety of horse riders in the village of Bulford. Request for installation of warning signs where leaving the roundabout at Orchard End heading toward Bulford Camp/Milston Road and one in Bulford Droveway approaching the village from Bulford Camp. <br> Please see attached to agenda a proposal plan. Cost estimate is in the region of $£ 1,000(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 250)$. Group agreed funding. Bulford PC agreed contribution via email on 08/11/20. <br> Works to be ordered ready for installation in new financial year. | ACTION <br> Arrange for scheme to be installed. | KD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c) | 1-20-1 <br> Village gates, Cholderton | Request for white gates at each entrance into Cholderton village and information on process for purchasing/installing a SID in the village. <br> Site meeting undertaken to investigate village gates at the requested locations. Please see attached to end of agenda a proposal plan. The cost estimate for each location is set out below: <br> Location $A=$ Grateley Road $-£ 2,100(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 525)$. <br> Location B = A338 south $-£ 3,400(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 850)$. <br> Location C = Amesbury Road $-£ 3,300$ ( $25 \%$ contribution $=£ 825$ ). <br> Location D = A338 north - £2,600 ( $25 \%$ contribution = £650). <br> Total estimate $=£ 11,400(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 2,850)$ <br> Group agreed to fund locations B and D. Cholderton PC have now confirmed contribution towards the entire scheme at all four sites. Group to discuss implementing all 4 sites as only agreed upon 2 locations at the last meeting. | DISCUSSION <br> Group agreed to fund all four locations after Cholderton confirmed contribution for all sites. <br> ACTION <br> Finalise designs and arrange for implementation. | KD |


| d) | 1-19-11 <br> Footpath that connects the upper back-way to the Methodists Church on the high street, Shrewton. (SHRE22) | During the winter months the route to the village shop/school/ doctors/ bus stop along the back-way becomes very muddy and not user friendly for elderly people with shopping trollies and walking aids and mothers with baby buggies etc and those using electric scooters, all of whom struggle at times to mount the kerb in question either on their way to or back from the village with their shopping. <br> Vehicles block access to the footpath (SHRE22) by parking across the entrance to the path and thus preventing both residents, who live on the path, and anyone else wishing to use the path from doing so. <br> Request for installation of a dropped kerb at the entrance to the footpath that connects the upper back-way to the Methodists Church on the high street. (SHRE22). <br> DW and AC suggested this issue be resolved when the High Street, Shrewton resurfacing works are completed. However, after further investigation this location is some distance away from High Street and therefore it is not suitable to include it with these works. Therefore, I have kept it on the CATG agenda for investigation. <br> Proposal plan attached to agenda. Cost estimate in the region of $£ 2500(25 \%$ contribution $=£ 625)$. Group agreed to fund scheme. Shrewton PC confirmed contribution via email. Detail design work to be completed and works to be programmed by contractor in new financial year. | ACTION <br> Finish design and arrange for scheme to be installed. | KD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e) | 6543 <br> Church Street, Winterbourne <br> Stoke - request for 20 mph speed limit | Request for 20 mph speed limit for Church Street area in Winterbourne Stoke. Cost of feasibility study for such request is $£ 2.5 \mathrm{k}$. More information required from Winterbourne PC. | ACTION <br> Await outcome of TRO consultation. |  |


|  |  | Winterbourne Stoke PC have confirmed support \& $25 \%$ contribution towards 20 mph speed limit assessment. Also confirmed residents of Brook Close (not public highway) support its inclusion in any recommended outcome. <br> Group agreed funding for implementation as per assessment recommendation. Implementation cost estimate £5,000 (25\% contribution $=£ 1,250$ ). Winterbourne Stoke have confirmed contribution. Residents of Brook Close confirmed agreement to be included in TRO. Group agreed to fund project. <br> TRO consultation period: $25^{\text {th }}$ February - $22^{\text {nd }}$ March 2021. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f) | $1-20-13 / 1-20-14$ <br> Glebe Rd \& School Rd Durrington | Request for signing to inform vehilces there is no entry from Glebe Road to College Road. Especially for delivery vehicles following Satnav. <br> Request for signing to inform vehicles there is no entry to Avon Valley College via School Road and road unsuitable for HGVs. <br> Site visit undertaken by KD. Signing plan proposal attached for discussion at the meeting. Estimate $£ 500$ (CATG $£ 375,25 \%$ contribution £125). | ACTION Re-evaluate signing proposal. <br> Arrange virtual meeting with Cllr Wright, Richard Harris and I to discuss suitable outcome. | KD KD |
| g) | 1-20-15 <br> Durrington 20 mph speed limit assessment | The Roads listed below are without adequate footways and sit within the Conservation Area of the oldest parts of Durrington Village. These areas were never designed for modern traffic volumes and without footways pedestrians are at higher risk than other parts of the village. <br> Roads to be included in 20 mph assessment are: Hackthorne Road (full length) which leads to Church Street (full length) which leads to The Ham (no through rd). The north end of Bulford | ACTION <br> Amend plan for extent of 20 mph speed limit to be assessed and progress when Covid-19 restrictions allow. | KD |


|  |  | Road (from jnctn Church St to Glebe Road to include School Rd which is also a no through rd ). <br> College Rd (full length). High Street from junction of Church Street to Ridgmount. <br> Group agreed to fund 20 mph assessment at $£ 2,500$. Durrington TC agreed $25 \%$ contribution of $£ 625$. <br> Site visit undertaken by KD and traffic survey sites located. No order for the survey work has been placed yet due to Covid-19 lockdown restrictions. This work will be resumed when restrictions are eased. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. | Other Priority schemes |  |  |  |
| a) | $5794$ <br> Telegraph Hill/Salisbury Road, Bulford <br> 7.5t weight restriction | At the bottom of the hill just entering the village it is dangerous if not impossible for 2 heavy vehicles to pass, e.g. double decker bus, articulated lorry, tracked vehicle. <br> No further action can be taken until FAPM process has been reviewed. Group agreed to keep issue open. Refer to freight management update attached to this agenda for more information. <br> Bulford PC requested that the action be with them to supply details to be sent to Spencer Drinkwater. KD chased Spencer Drinkwater for LTP4 completion date April 2020. <br> Due to Covid-19 pandemic resource has been allocated to the response and therefore the LTP4 is currently in the development phase, no formal timescale for completion given yet. | DISCUSSION <br> Cllr Robert Yuill is still waiting for a response to his letter. Bulford PC are also still waiting for a response from the Leader of Wiltshire Council. |  |


|  |  | Cllr Smale and Bulford PC confirmed this is still an issue and is getting increasing worse. Area Board to write to Wiltshire Council for a decision. Area Board chair to provide update at the meeting. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b) | 5795 <br> A3028 from Double Hedges approaching new roundabout No waiting at any time | A new path has been introduced between Bulford and Solstice Park Amesbury. Accordingly the approach pavement at the Bulford end has been widened parking bays marked on the opposite side of the road and a preferred crossing installed. People are now parking half on the kerb adjacent to this crossing vert near to the junction which is particularly dangerous. <br> BPC asked for this scheme to be put on hold until the outcome of discussions with DIO regarding S106 works in the village. <br> Process for requesting waiting restrictions is for the Town/Parish Council to complete request form and submit to Network Management for assessment when next review is completed. Group agreed for this issue to be left open for now. <br> AC confirmed waiting restrictions are not proposed as part of the works. JA invited project manager from DIO to attenda Area Board meeting. Group agreed to leave this on the agenda for now, Bulford PC to resolve at strategic level. <br> KD has resubmitted requests and response received from Network Management Nov 2020 regarding waiting restrictions reviews: <br> As far as a future review, I'm aiming at getting all requests together and designed up if restrictions are considered appropriate by the end of the year, with any consultation in the New Year. But I'll be doing a communication out to Towns/Parishes separately on that. | DISCUSSION <br> AC confirmed double mini roundabout is now public highway. <br> Pedestrian survey to be carried out post lockdown but currently unclear as to who will complete. <br> ACTION <br> Chase Network Management for an update of waiting restrictions review. | KD |


| c) | 1-20-2 <br> Avon Lodge Vets, Flower Lane, Amesbury | Request for direction signs to the veterinary surgery to be erected opposite the junction to Flower Lane to aid the public when trying to find the practice. <br> Amesbury TC have confirmed they withdraw their support for this request via email on $18 / 12 / 20$. Recommend this item is removed from agenda. | DISCUSSION <br> Group agreed to close issue. <br> ACTION <br> Remove from agenda. | KD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1-20-5 } \\ & \text { Stonehenge Road, Amesbury } \end{aligned}$ | The 40 mph zone in Stonehenge Road is dangerous because of the blind bend and crest. Motorists travelling west and cars exiting their drives cannot see each other until it is too late to brake safely. Also, motorists frustrated by the traffic jam on the A303 tend to accelerate up Stonehenge Rd exceeding the speed limits. The 40 mph zone is 600 m long. There are 18 drives directly onto the road. These serve 21 houses with frontage directly onto the road, thus meeting the criteria for a 30 mph speed limit as stated in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/04. <br> Request for the 40 mph zone to be removed, making the whole of the residential section of Stonehenge Road a 30 mph zone, finishing at the current National Speed Limit sign. <br> Amesbury TC have confirmed their support for this issue via email on $18 / 12 / 20$. The cost of a speed limit review is $£ 2,500$. ( $£ 1,875$ CATG and $25 \%$ contribution of $£ 625$ from local council). To be discussed at this meeting. | DISCUSSION <br> Highway officers report this will not meet the criteria for a 30 mph speed limit. Cllr Robert Yuill, Cllr Fred Westmoreland and Cllr Kevin Daley are not supportive of funding a speed limit review. <br> ACTIONS <br> Close issue and remove from agenda. <br> Inform requester. | KD <br> Amesbu <br> ry TC |
| e) | 1-20-3 <br> East Gomeldon Road, Idmiston | Safety concerns for the approach to the railway arch heading south on East Gomeldon Road. Request for road side mirror, traffic signals, reinstatement of give way marking. | ACTION <br> Leave on agenda for progression when space on the top 5 priority list becomes available. | KD |


|  |  | It is accepted that Wiltshire Council policy does not allow mirrors on the public highway. The request form details that traffic signals have been informally explored and not pursued due to expense. <br> Request to reinstate give way marking for vehicles heading south towards the railway arch. <br> Site visit undertaken by KD. Observations are that current signing and road markings are very worn. There is scope to reposition the signing to be more visible to approaching traffic and enhance the road markings if the group wish to make this a top priority. However some of these signs require illumination so there will be electrical costs involved in any amendment to the signing at this location. <br> To be discussed at the meeting. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1-20-4 } \\ & \text { A338 Porton Village, Idmiston } \end{aligned}$ | The speed limit approach the 30 mph limit in both directions is 50 mph , which gives drivers insufficient time to reduce their speed to enter the 30 mph limit at or below 30 mph , thus endangering pedestrians on the narrow pavements, particularly at the Tidworth end of the village. <br> The Parish Council would like the speed limits on the A338 at both these approaches to Porton village to be reviewed, and a staggered reduction in speed limits introduced. For example, by extending the current 40 mph limit which begins at the Earl of Normanton to the 30 mph limit, as it makes little sense for the limit to change from 50 mph to 40 mph to 50 mph to 30 mph . <br> Group not supportive of funding a speed limit review at this location. <br> Site visit undertaken by KD to investigate advance signing options for this location. Unfortunately the regulations do not permit the use of | DISCUSSION <br> PC asked for advice on what else can be done to improve this situation. All considered solution would need to be on a larger scale to widen carriageway and/or footway. This is outside to scope of what the CATG and substantive bid funding can offer. This would need to be investigated at a strategic level. |  |


|  |  | advance signing for speed limit changes. There is no provision of <br> such signs in the TSRGD 2016. The TSM chapter 3 also states <br> 'countdown signs giving advance indication of a speed limit are not <br> prescribed and must not be used'. <br> KD checked visibility requirements to the 30mph speed limit signs <br> which do meet the criteria on both approaches. <br> To be discussed further at the meeting. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| g) | $1-20-6$ <br> High Post Road, Durnford | Speeding traffic from the A345 traffic lights at High Post down to <br> Netton, particularly past the Chemring factory. Employees from the <br> factory and suppliers find exiting and entering the site entrances <br> dangerous due to vehicles speeding. The volume of traffic on this road <br> continues to increase thanks to the residential developments on the <br> outskirts of Salisbury adjacent to the A345 and A360. It will increase <br> even further with the approval of the enlarged salt store and Naish <br> factory planning applications. The speed limit on this road is the <br> national speed limit - 60mph. | DISCUSSION <br> Considered the new <br> development. PC to flag <br> this issue up at the planning <br> stage to see if anything can <br> be incorporated in <br> development funding. |
| Request for a site visit and discussion with Chemring and PC to <br> investigate possibility of traffic calming measures in the vicinity of the <br> factory entrance. <br> Cllr Mike Hewitt agreed to follow this up with the company Chemring. <br> Update to be provided at the meeting. | Still believe the main issue <br> is Chemring employees at <br> finishing time. Rest of the <br> day road is quiet and easy <br> to use. Cllr Yuill has written <br> to company and the police <br> have also spoken with <br> them. |  |  |


| 6. | New Requests / Issues |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a) | $\begin{array}{l}1-20-16 \\ \text { Idmiston Road, Porton }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Concealed entrances at top of hill for drivers travelling from Idmiston } \\ \text { village to Porton village, including an active farm access, village hall } \\ \text { access and residential accesses. } \\ \text { Request for warning sign - "Concealed entrances" located towards the } \\ \text { bottom of the hill facing the oncoming traffic from Idmiston village. } \\ \text { Unfortunately there is no sign of this nature prescribed in the } \\ \text { regulations. }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { DISCUSSION } \\ \text { Request for further } \\ \text { information on any other } \\ \text { warning signs which may be } \\ \text { used. } \\ \text { ACTION }\end{array}$ |  |
| b) | $\begin{array}{l}\text { 1-21-1 } \\ \text { Gomeldon Road, Porton }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Lack of pavement along the length of Gomeldon Road from the } \\ \text { junction with Winterslow Road Porton. Parents with young children can } \\ \text { and do walk along the road to Gomeldon school, and it is particularly } \\ \text { dangerous where the road narrows near the junction with the lower } \\ \text { road leading from the High St, Porton. } \\ \text { repack. }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { ACTION } \\ \text { Request for warning sign - showing an adult holding a child's hand } \\ \text { refer this back to PC for } \\ \text { clarification on issue and } \\ \text { support. }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { KD } \\ \text { located below the "Road Narrows" sign on the Gomeldon Road. }\end{array}$ |
| Idmisto |  |  |  |  |
| n PC |  |  |  |  |$\}$


| d) | $1-21-3$ <br> London Road, Amesbury | Broken bus shelter. The bus shelter was damaged by a vehicle <br> several years ago and remains in a bad state of disrepair, affording no <br> weather protection for anyone who is waiting there and inviting <br> potential acts of vandalism. The worsening condition of the shelter <br> gives a bad impression of the town and of the apparent disregard by <br> the council. <br> The Town Council wishes for the bus shelter to be replaced. | DICUSSION <br> Cllr Westmoreland <br> confirmed shelter was hit <br> some time ago and this <br> issue has been held up for <br> a while. Discussion on <br> whether CATG should fund <br> as removal is maintenance. <br> If enhanced shelter is <br> erected could be <br> considered as new <br> improvement project. To be <br> discussed further after costs <br> are know. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| e) | $1-21-4$ <br> Salisbury Road, Amesbury | Residents concerns over speeding within a 30mph speed limit. Have <br> seen a recent increase in speeding vehicles which is dangerous in a <br> residential area. <br> ACTION |  |
| Request for speed camera. Wiltshire Council policy does not allow for <br> permanent speed cameras to be installed. If a traffic survey request is <br> submitted to our road safety team and the area meets the criteria <br> either SID deployment or Community Speed Watch can be <br> considered. | Cost estimate for removal <br> and replace of shelter to <br> Amesbury TC for review. |  |  |
| DISCUSSION <br> Cllr Westmoreland <br> confirmed this is already a <br> site for SID deployment. |  |  |  |
| KD |  |  |  |


| f) | $1-21-5$ <br> B3083 between A303 and Berwick St James | The southern B3083 runs from the A303 in the north at Winterbourne Stoke and travels in a general southwards direction through Berwick St James and onwards towards Stapleford where it joins the A36. The subject of this letter is the section between Winterbourne Stoke and Berwick St James and, the area either side of the junction between the B3083 and the public footpaths known as WST01/BSJA6. <br> Please refer to item attached to agenda for full details of issues and request for new infrastructure. To be discussed at the meeting. | DISCUSSION <br> Defer to next meeting and request a respresentative is present to discuss the issue further. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| h) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1-21-6 \\ & \text { Bulford Road, Durrington } \end{aligned}$ | To replace the amber flashing lights at the zebra crossing on Bulford Road outside Lloyds chemist and Nisa store. The Wiltshire councillor has received several complaints that they are not bright enough. <br> Replace the bulbs with LED ones. In the first instance this issue should be logged via MyWilts app as an upgrade to existing infrastructure to enable the street lighting team to assess requirements. | ACTION <br> Check with Atkins if this can be easily arranged by them. If not, find out costs and report back. | KD |
| i) | 1-21-7 <br> High Street, Shrewton | This request has been received from a resident as vehicles regularly park on the virtual footway, making it difficult for those with mobility issues, mobility vehicles and pushchairs to enter the Co-op shop. The Parish Council support the request and would like to put it forward for consideration. <br> If there is no possibility of a proper raised footpath at the Co-op, then would it be possible for an alternative colour of tarmac/ surface to be used - similar to that which is used at the entrances and exits to the village on the main highways? <br> That the outer (road edge) of this pathway should have some form of bollards, examples of which can be found at both the Tesco (Amesbury) and Waitrose shops, that mark off the pedestrian areas. | DISCUSSION <br> On resurfacing of High Street in new financial year. Cllr Daley supports issue. AC confirmed not wide enough for physical barrier. <br> ACTION <br> Include request for coloured surfacing for the virtual footway when resurfacing works are completed. | AC |


| j) | $1-21-8$ <br> Redworth Drive, Amesbury | A pedestrian pathway is being used by motor vehicles presenting a risk to pedestrians using the pathway and impacting on the structual integrity of the walls surrounding the path. <br> The path runs along the side of a residential house providing frontdoor access to four houses and also links the Archers Gate development to an older development. Vehicles are now increasingly using the pathway - takeway delivery drivers and property maintenance companies looking after the four houses. <br> The entrance to the pathway has a dropped kerb and is wide enough for a transit van. The dropped kerb would have been put in place to support buggies and disability scooters but unlike other similar pathways on Archers Gate no protection was put in place to stop vehicles using the path. <br> Request for small bollard at the entrance to the pathway would stop vehicles accessing the pathway. Unfortunately, a simple no access sign is likely to be missed or ignored. The bollard would still allow use of the path by pushchairs and disability scooters. | DISCUSSION <br> CIIr Yuill and group as a whole are supportive of this issue. <br> ACTION <br> Leave on agenda for progression when space on the top 5 priority list becomes available. | KD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k) | $1-21-10$ <br> C42 Heale Hill, Upper Woodford | Extreme danger to pedestrians using Heale Hill to travel between Upper and Middle Woodford. The road is narrow, with a blind right hand bend ascending, left hand bend descending, speed limit increased to 40 mph on leaving 30 mph limits in $U$ and $M$ Woodford. <br> There is no footpath. Neither is there the option for pedestrians to move out of harm's way when large vehicles are passing on this narrow road. Traffic through the Woodford Valley increases year on year as more residential developments take place on the outskirts of Salisbury, and the C42 is used as a 'rat run' for employees of Chemring, Porton Down, Boscombe Down, etc. | DISCUSSION <br> On 1-21-10, 1-21-11 and 1-21-12. PC and residents explained concerns over speeding traffic and lack of footways. All agreed to take a holistic approach to combine the Woodford issues and firstly look at speed limit review throughout Woodford |  |


|  |  | Request for the speed limit between U and M Woodford to be reduced from 40 mph to a continuous 30 mph . Request for the undergrowth to be cleared roadside of the railings to make room for a narrow footway, and a white line painted to indicate the width of the footway. | Valley. Group agreed to fund assessment at $£ 2,500$ subject to Woodford PC contribution of $25 \%$, TBC. <br> AC suggested PC instruct parish steward to look at clearing undergrowth by railings. <br> ACTION <br> Arrange site visit with PC for confirm extent of review before brief is sent to consultatant. This will take place once lockdown restrictions are eased. <br> Build evidence document to present with brief to consultant. | KD <br> Woodfo rd PC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 1-21-11 } \\ \text { Lower Woodford } \end{array}$ | Speeding on the C42 in Lower Woodford, and therefore danger to pedestrians. Lower Woodford unfortunately has 5 blind bends, no pavements and the majority of traffic go round those bends at over 30 miles an hour and 40 plus on the straights. They do not slow down when overtaking pedestrians and have forced pedestrians to jump into hedges. The daily commute for children is getting increasingly dangerous as cars attempt to overtake the bus as it stops to collect and drop off. This is making parents in the village extremely nervous. Due to the increased traffic, locals no longer feel safe walking on the | ACTION <br> See above comments. |  |



## Wiltshire Council

## Amesbury Community Area Transport Group

## Highways Officer - Kate Davey

## 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 Amesbury Area Board.
2.2. If funding is allocated in line with CATG recommendations outlined in this report, and all relevant $3^{\text {rd }}$ party contributions are confirmed, Amesbury Area Board will have a remaining Highways funding balance of $£ 17,688.18$.
3. Legal Implications
3.1. There are no specific legal implications related to this report.
4. HR Implications
4.1. There are no specific HR implications related to this report.
5. Equality and Inclusion Implications
5.1 The schemes recommended to the Area Board will improve road safety for all users of the highway.
6. Safeguarding implications
6.1 There are no specific safeguarding implications related to this report.

## Amesbury CATG

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

## BUDGET 20-21

£17,731.00 CATG ALLOCATION 20-21
$£ 31,462.18$ 2019-20 underspend

## Contributions

Winterbourne Stoke PC 20 mph speed limit implementation
Wylye PC for 20 mph speed limit assessment
Shrewton PC - The Packway Horse Warning Signs
Shrewton PC - Rollestone Crossroads Military Vehicle signing Bulford PC - Horse Warning Signs
Shrewton PC - Upper Backway dropped kerbs
Cholderton Parish Meeting - village gates
Wylye PC for 20 mph speed limit implementation
Durrington PC - Glebe Rd/School Rd signing
Durrington PC - 20mph speed limit assessment

## Total Budget

## £58,028.18

£5,000 Estimate
£5,000 Estimat
£2,500 Actual
£340 Actual
£600 Rejected
£1,000 Estimate
£2,500 Estimate
£11,400 Estimate
£9,000 Estimat
$£ 500$ Estimate
£2,500 Estimate



## Highways Improvement Request Form

## Contact Details

| Name: | James Carr | Date: | 22/01/2021 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 1 Cleeve View, Winterbourne Stoke, Salisbury, SP3 4SY |  |  |
| Telephone No: | 07973 366762 |  |  |
| Email Address: | clerk@winterbournestokepc.org.uk |  |  |

## Issue Details

| Location of Issue: | B3083 between the A303 and Berwick St James |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Community Area: | Amesbury |  |
| Parish or Town Council: | Winterbourne Stoke |  |
| Nature of Issue: |  |  |

Narrative provided by Cllr Dr Andrew Shuttleworth
The southern B3083 runs from the A303 in the north at Winterbourne Stoke and travels in a general southwards direction through Berwick St James and onwards towards Stapleford where it joins the A36. The subject of this letter is the section between Winterbourne Stoke and Berwick St James and, the area either side of the junction between the B3083 and the public footpaths known as WST01/BSJA6. Historically, the footpath then continued south westwards into Berwick St James and old mapping makes clear it pre-dates the creation of the B3083 and the start of British road classification in 1913. So that section of the road is now both a footpath and a " $B$ " road.

It is one of two routes south from Winterbourne Stoke to Berwick St James and the most popular of the two when going to and from the Boot Inn and the Farm Shop in Berwick St James. It is frequently used by pedestrians, often unfamiliar with the local area, from the Stonehenge campsite that is at the Northern end of this part of the B3083. The B3083 is also used regularly by cyclists and equestrians.

The problem lies in the section of the B3083 from its intersection with WST01/ BSJA6 round the blind bend to the south-east and a similar distance to the south-west from the apex of the bend. This section of the road is around 4 metres wide and carries a 50 mph speed-limit. What is not apparent from the map are the poor sightlines of the road, the changes in elevation that restrict a motorists vision, the lack of a usable verge (particularly on the western side of the road where the verge is near vertical and goes up above head height) and the adverse camber.

The following series of photos taken from Google Earth show a number of views of the road. Firstly, looking generally south and travelling up-hill towards the road-footpath junction - which is right on the brow of the hill/skyline.


The verges on both sides are Wiltshire Council wild-flower banks. Pretty, but they do interfere with sight-lines for much of the year; especially in summer when footpath usage is greatest. The SLOW road marking and the sharpened sign are immediately adjacent to where a kissing gate (hit and damaged by a vehicle in 2020) from WST01/BSJA6 joins the B3083. The SLOW sign is inappropriately placed to mark the bend and useless to slow the traffic for pedestrians. Stopping distance at 50 mph is 38 metres ( 125 ft ), so you would expect the both the SLOW road markings and the bend advisory sign to be in a position to allow a driver to react safely within their stopping distance. Given the high probability that a pedestrian might step out from the kissing gate, the slow sign needs to be at least $38 \mathrm{~m} / 125 \mathrm{ft}$ north of its current position.

The next photo shows the view at the top of the hill, the adverse camber to the left and the immediacy ${ }^{\text {Ref }} 101-5$ the right hand bend. As they approach the bend uphill, a driver may not see pedestrians even a few metres south of the kissing gate. Few slow for the bend and when they realise pedestrians are there, they are confronted with a sharp bend.


Pedestrians travelling south tend to keep to the eastern side of the road and not face the oncoming traffic because of the obvious danger posed by the high verge, the non-existent sightline and the sharp bend.

The view approaching the same bend from the south (Berwick St James) looks as follows.


The view ahead is quite good and pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians can be seen on both sides of the road. Again, the road section is posted at 50 mph .


Going uphill and approaching the left-hand bend, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians could easily be seen on the eastern side of the road (offside), but the nature of the bend means that very little can be seen on the nearside after the bend starts. Because of the steepness, that is the very point that cyclists and equestrians will be travelling at their slowest. The steepness of the bank (not readily apparent in these photos), means that there is no escape route for slow moving road users to the nearside (west) and so they are very susceptible to being rear-ended by fast-moving vehicular traffic.


Only after the northbound traffic clears the apex of the bend, and the summit close to the kissing gate, do drivers get a clear view of the road ahead.

Please note that in all the previous photos, the viewpoint is that of a camera mounted atop a Google camera car - as shown below. Consequently, the viewpoint is $\mathbf{2}$ to 2.5 times higher, and consequently much better, than would be the case for car drivers!


## The Problem

Over the last couple of years the southern B3083 has become a rat-running route between the A303 and A36. This traffic is likely to increase still further in coming years and may only be relieved if the A303 Stonehenge to Berwick Down Scheme goes ahead.

The traffic that uses the B3083 rarely adheres to the 50 mph speed limit along the section of concern. Villagers are increasingly reporting 'near-misses' on this section of road, with vehicular traffic failing to slow - even to the speed limit, leave reasonable room when passing pedestrians, or passing/over-taking cyclists and equestrians or using signals. All these are requirements of the Highway Code.

The Highway Code makes clear that vehicle drivers should be leaving adequate room (it pictorially indicates a cars width) when passing pedestrians, etc. Proposed changes to the Highway Code seek to enshrine this concept as actual distances. A minimum of 1.5 metres for vehicles travelling at 30 mph or less and a minimum of 2 metres for vehicles travelling at over 30 mph , but under 50 mph . The requirement to slow down and indicate a proposed vehicle movement will remain unchanged.

On the B3083, the current and proposed Rules have a similar consequence, vehicles passing pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists should be doing so with their vehicle entirely in the other carriageway and slowing as they pass. Because of the poor sight-lines, sharp bend, adverse camber, inappropriate road marking and an overly high speed limit, drivers rarely comply and frequently drive at other non-motorised road users.

Equestrians and cyclists have been forced off the road by Wiltshire Red Buses and pedestrians/dog walkers are regularly intimidated by car drivers and taxis - often locals from other nearby villages - professional HGV drivers and campers in camper vans are by far the safest motorised users encountered.

Incidents are being reported to the police, but it is often difficult to get a car number because of the speed of the vehicle involved and equestrians and cyclists are rarely in a position to write something down. The police rarely show interest.

However, pedestrians as well as cyclists and equestrians are increasingly carrying cameras to record incidents. I reported one such incident on the B3083 involving a bus to Wiltshire Reds last year and was assured that action was taken against the driver involved.

How long has it been an issue?
Many years

## What would you like done to resolve this issue?

It should be apparent from all of the above that this stretch of the B3083 is particularly dangerous. Whilst this danger can't be removed entirely, better signage, appropriately situated, could make a considerable difference. A lower speed would also reduce the likelihood of a serious injury or fatality and allow vehicle drivers increased thinking and braking time.

I would suggest the following safety measures should be adopted as a minimum:
The speed limit on the B3083, from the A303 to the 30 mph limit on the northern outskirts of Berwick St James, should be reduced from 50 mph to 40 mph

The southbound side of the B3083 should have a 'pedestrians in road' sign situated 40-50 metres before the kissing gate and a repeater 20-30 metres after the kissing gate.

The southbound SLOW road marking should be moved back to be at the 'pedestrians in road' sign.
It would be desirable to have cyclist and horse warning triangles co-located with the 'pedestrians in road' sign on the south-bound carriageway.

The northbound SLOW road marking and bend signs seem to be in a reasonable place. However, it is essential that cyclist and horse warning triangles are co-located with it.

No 'pedestrians in road' warning triangle is needed on the northbound section of road as walkers are rarely rash enough to walk on this side of the road.

Have you been in touch with your local Wiltshire Councillor? (Yes/No) No

This form needs to be completed and e-mailed or sent to your local Town or Parish Council. Town and Parish contact details are available via the link below:
https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/mgParishCouncilDetails.aspx
Town or Parish Council Comments: (To be completed by Town or Parish Council only)
This issue was discussed at the Parish Council meeting on 12 Jan 21 when it was decided that action should be taken and the CATG approached. The issue was raised by Cllr Dr Andrew Shuttleworth but the issue has been known to all for many years and stories have been told by parishioners over the years of close shaves whilst walking, cycling and on horseback.

