

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

	Item	Update	Actions and recommendations	Priority A, B or C
	Marlborough Community Area Transport Group			
	Date of meeting: Thursday 27th May 2021			
1.	Attendees and apologies			
	Present:	Cllr James Sheppard (Chair), Cllr Caroline Thomas, Cllr Jane Davies, Steve Hind, Martin Cook, Andrew Jack (Wiltshire Council); Cllr Jill Turner (Kennet Valley PC); Cllr Richard Allen (Marlborough TC); Cllr Vanya Body (Froxfield PC); Cllr Steve Campbell (Chilton Foliat PC); Cllr Sheila Glass (Ramsbury PC); Cllr John Hetherington (Ogbourne St Andrew PC); Cllr Peter Morgan (Preshute PC); Lucy Kirkpatrick, Sue Hine (Mildenhall PC)		
	Apologies:	Cllr Sarah Chidgey (Baydon PC)		
2.	Notes of last meeting			
		The minutes of the previous CATG meeting held were agreed at the Marlborough Area Board meeting on the 16 th March 2021 <i>Link can be found at</i> https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=165&MId=13143&Ver=4		
3.	Financial Position			
		Finance sheet to be presented.	SH said that the funding allocation to Marlborough CATG	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			has reduced for 2021/22 due the boundary review and Froxfield, Broad Hinton and Winterbourne Bassett no longer being in the community area. The sheet as presented has errors and the amount remaining for 2021/22 is £11,534	
4.	New process for logging requests for highway improvement schemes			
	Wiltshire Council has now closed the online Issues system that was previously used to request new schemes for consideration by CATG and for Metrocounts. There are now new forms on the Wiltshire Council website. http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council-democracy-area-boards Once completed and agreed by the local town or parish council, new Highways request forms are to be sent to CATGRequests@wiltshire.gov.uk			
5.	Top 5 Priority Schemes Following discussion of all projects currently being developed, the priority of remaining schemes was allocated. The letter given here reflects the new priority. SH stressed the need for the group to prioritise five projects to allow focus of limited time on those the group wants taking forward.			
a)	Froxfield's Village Traffic Plan	Construction of the western gateway completed June 2020. Commitment from the CATG to also progressing with the design of the eastern gateway. Froxfield PC have agreed 25% contribution. Construction is currently programmed for 17 th May.	SH confirmed this work had been started on 17 th May and was due to be completed on 27 th . VB confirms that work on the ground looks good and as if it is finished. She has had positive responses from residents about the work. She said this may need to be followed by Metrocounts at the straight section of road by The College. It was agreed this can be removed from the list.	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

b)	<p>Issue 6874 Request for safety measures on A4361 near Winterbourne Bassett + Issue 7023 safety on the A4361 county boundary to Beckhampton.</p>	<p>Accidents on A4361 at Winterbourne Bassett mostly due to speeding and inadequate road markings. Parish council would like present white lines on section from Winterbourne Bassett towards Broad Hinton changed from single to double. Also stretch of road either side of the Winterbourne Bassett turning be reduced to 50mph This has been combined with 7023 to cover the A4361 from the county boundary through to Beckhampton roundabout.</p> <p>Atkins have completed the Speed limit review of the A4361 from the County boundary to Beckhampton. The report has been submitted for consideration. Once supported by the Parish Councils, the proposal can be formally advertised. The cost estimate for implementation including the advert for traffic order will be approx. £13k and this is too high for the current financial year. Agreement to proceed through CATG required before advert. PC contributions to be agreed.</p> <p>CATG have agreed to proceed with the speed limit. Costs for the advert process will be £3k.</p> <p>12.5% contribution from Avebury PC and 12.5% from BB&WM PC.</p> <p>TRO details for the Schedule are being prepared for advert.</p>	<p>SH stated the TRO has gone to the team and will be advertised very soon. Any objections raised then will have to be dealt with and a Cabinet member report produced. If no objections, then the work can be packaged for Ringway for implementation. Following the boundary review, Broad Hinton and Winterbourne Bassett parishes have moved to Royal Wootton Bassett & Cricklade area. SH confirms they are not involved in this work anymore.</p>	A
c)	<p>8-19-10 Marlborough, Frees Avenue Traffic speed and pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>Site meeting undertaken.</p> <p>Request to increase the length of the speed limit. However, for this to be achieved a further speed limit review will have to be undertaken as part of the justification process. Cost of speed limit review £2500.</p>	<p>SH said that Atkins are still not carrying out speed limit reviews due to the need for their staff to share cars. He did not have a date when they will start again.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Marlborough TC support for a further speed limit review. Contribution of £625 agreed.</p> <p>£1875 Area Board contribution agreed.</p> <p>Survey request sent to Atkins. Issues with the Covid-19 restrictions are causing delay with progress. This work will not progress until car sharing is allowed.</p>	<p>RA asks SH to let him know when this begins again.</p>	
d)	<p>Issue 7027 New double yellow lining on B4003</p>	<p>Construction improvement to lay-by unlikely to take place soon due to construction issues and costs. Waiting restrictions could be extended to edge of existing lay-by and then reviewed when improvements have been undertaken. Costs if this is undertaken through CATG would be around £2500 including the advert procedure.</p> <p>The TRO for extension to the waiting restrictions will be around 34m and will allow parking for 4-5 vehicles. The intention is for this to be advertised and implemented to enable enforcement to be undertaken on vehicles parking outside this area until the new layby is constructed.</p> <p>SS felt the layby needed to hold just 3 car lengths.</p> <p>'Primrose' yellow lines required within the World Heritage site agreed to be implemented initially.</p> <p>SS agreed it best to hold another site meeting and the include all parties, inc. National Trust and the new WHS officer with Wiltshire Council to discuss the layby details. Once the new layby is constructed, the waiting restrictions can be revised</p>	<p>SH stated how difficult this scheme is. He has decided to put down new double yellows up to the layby. The TRO for this will be advertised and any objections dealt with. Then parking enforcement can take place until the new layby can be properly constructed. This way the verge / archaeology can be protected. JD asked for another site visit along with the National Trust.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>again but until this achieved, the interim waiting restrictions will help to reduce further damage to the existing verge with the excessive parking.</p> <p>TRO schedule issued to Traffic Orders Team.</p>		
e)	8-20-6 Ogbourne Maizey- 20mph speed limit assessment	<p>PC funded 100%</p> <p>This is on a list of 20mph limit schemes to be assessed by Atkins.</p>	<p>SH confirmed this has gone on a list of schemes for Atkins to deal with. There are no updates yet but this should be programmed. SH felt this should be straightforward.</p>	A
f)	8-19-6 Right of Way PRES12 at junction with A4 at Clatford – request for barrier	<p>Site meeting undertaken.</p> <p>It was agreed that because this is a byway and open to all traffic, a barrier would not be appropriate. A proposal for a Give Way sign and crossroads warning signs on the A4 is being developed.</p>	<p>SH said that the site visit had gone ahead. A barrier is not suitable as the path is a byway, so open to all traffic and cannot be shut off. Give way signage at the junction can be used to warn traffic from the byway of the A4. To be legal, this will need to be supplemented by ground markings but the surface is so broken up, it will need to be re-surfaced to allow the markings to go down.</p> <p>PM said that a colleague from PPC attended and agreed with this solution. Also that contacting Steve Leonard in Rights of Way to look at other ways of slowing the traffic coming down the</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>byway. PPC has not done this yet. SH will liaise with Steve Leonard and asked PPC to do so too.</p> <p>SH will need to look at ownership of the land for the re-surfacing and also at tree growth to not obscure the new signage.</p>	
g)	<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 not been able to make progress.</p>	A
6.	Other Priority schemes			
a)	<p>8-19-1 Request for new pedestrian crossing at Marlborough High St.</p>	<p>Marlborough Town Council supports and endorses the petition requesting a pedestrian crossing in Marlborough High Street and will seek further expert advice in order to make supporting recommendations.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to possible formal crossings in Kingsbury St by Patten Alley and across the High St by the White Horse bookshop. Both of these locations are unsuitable for a formal crossing.</p> <p>Site meeting undertaken. Consideration to be given to an informal crossing enhancement across Kingsbury St towards the steps at the front of the Town Hall.</p>	<p>RA described this crossing as due to go in from the bulge at Whitehorse Bookshop to the front steps of the town hall.</p> <p>SH pointed out this work has been paused until the social distancing barriers at Kingsbury St have been removed. Also that this will be an informal crossing marked by a different surface. He mentioned a number of options but recommended against coloured, high-grip texture. He</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>Scheme details, including design and costs, to be proposed to Town Council and implementation costs including traffic management required. This is removed from priority list until temporary social distancing schemes are no longer necessary.</p> <p>Crossing to be looked at in conjunction with the town wide traffic strategy.</p>	<p>asked MTC to think about the type of surface and the exact location of the crossing.</p> <p>RA described this as part of a wider look at disabled access to the town hall, which has always been difficult. A satisfactory way to cross roads to the front entrance is needed.</p> <p>JS mentioned the temporary 1-way system about to go in and this is an opportunity to look at the whole flow of traffic around the town hall. This needs to go back to MTC.</p>	
b)	<p>Issue 5190 Request for safety works at London Rd, Marlborough.</p>	<p>Further to resurfacing the climbing lane has been removed and the de acceleration lane for the turning into the hospital increased.</p> <p>Overtaking issues have improved, however there are problems with getting in and out of the hospital junction. A topo survey would cost around £1500 -£2000. MH to discuss acceptable contribution with Marlborough TC and Savernake PC for survey. Savernake PC are prepared to contribute 25% for a topo survey.</p> <p>Group site meeting undertaken. Issues were concerned with reducing the speed limit. There is nothing that can be achieved by changing the junction layout and therefore a topo survey is not required, although £1500 has been allocated from the Area Board.</p>	<p>A site meeting has taken place. SH felt that uphill traffic is not the issue. Cars from the east travel too fast entering the 50mph limit and the junction to the hospital. He felt that a speed limit review is necessary and that a lower limit could be suitable. He did not feel the junction was at fault. CT wanted the review to go ahead.</p> <p>SH mentioned the £1,500 allocated from area board funding towards the topo survey which is no longer needed. This could be put towards the speed limit review.</p>	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			JS put this to the vote and CATG agreed to use that funding towards the review instead.	
c)	6614 Request for No Parking measures on A4 at Fyfield	Vehicles, including HGVs, park on both sides of the road on the A4 at the filling station at Fyfield. This causes an obstruction and can be dangerous when other vehicles try to pass them on the opposite side of the road. The PC would like new markings to stop vehicles parking at the sides the A4. JT is liaising with Jamie Mundy. It may be possible to combine this with the work on the B4003.	JT confirmed she is in touch with Jamie Mundy but this has not been prioritised by his team. She did not have a timescale for this.	
d)	Issue 6784 Request for new signage location for new SID	<p>Marlborough TC is keen to reduce speeding in the town and are looking at buying SIDs to deploy on a rotational basis. There are no suitable columns on Kingsbury St to install a SID. It has been suggested that if a new warning sign is installed at a location on Kingsbury St, it could also be suitable for the SID. CATG agrees to wait until new 20mph limit is installed in case a new post for a repeater sign become available.</p> <p>SH has given details of the suitable lighting column to Marlborough TC Clerk. Marlborough TC needs to speak with nearby homeowner to get approval. MH confirms this is in hand.</p>	<p>SH had identified a light column on Kingsbury St and given details to the town Clerk, but not heard back. RA was not aware of any news.</p> <p>MC said that the light column was wrong and that he is in touch with the assistant Clerk about installing a new post further down that will hold the SID. MTC would fund 100%</p>	
e)	8-19-2 Place a sign(s) at the entrance to Manton Hollow advising 'No Through Road'.	Manton Hollow is a no through road that appears on many maps and sat-navs as a through road. It is a regular occurrence that cars and HGVs attempt 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>SH had not heard if MTC is prepared to fund this 100%. If so, it can come off the CATG list and go to the signage team.</p> <p>MTC will need to confirm willingness to fund before a quote can be issued.</p> <p>SH will send details directly to the Clerk.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		<p>A 'No through road' sign' is already installed at junction of Downs Lane with A4. PC have requested another sign is installed at the junction of Downs Lane and Manton Hollow.</p> <p>This can be progressed as a signing request if fully funded by the Town Council and the principle is agreed through CATG.</p> <p>MH to confirm if Marlborough TC will pay around £300 and then SH will get a formal quote.</p>		
f)	8-19-4 Speed limit review at western end of Chilton Foliat (changed from 'Relocate 30mph limit at western end of Chilton Foliat').	<p>This request does not meet the criteria for a 30mph limit which requires 3 frontages/ 100m. A speed limit review costing £2500 would give further information on whether a 40 or 50mph limit would be appropriate.</p> <p>PC have agreed 25% of costs for speed limit review when prioritised, with anticipation of a 40 or 50mph limit in advance of the existing 30mph limit.</p>	<p>SH said this scheme needs to be prioritised by CATG before further work can begin.</p> <p>SC confirmed CFPC's contribution and the need for the speed limit review.</p>	A
g)	8-19-7 A346 Cadley – request for speed limit review, signing and gates.	<p>Detailed cost for signs £713.92</p> <p>MP confirmed that the cost is acceptable to the PC and that the PC are identifying positions for the signs.</p>	<p>There was no one from SPC present to discuss this.</p> <p>CT offered to contact SPC about confirming location. MC said that SPC has been in touch with an officer but had not agreed a location for the new signage.</p> <p>It was confirmed that new white gates at the entrances to Cadley on the A346 have been installed.</p>	
h)	8-19-8 A346 Cadley – traffic lights on A4	<p>Traffic modelling for junction would be required.</p> <p>CATG have approved in principle traffic modelling for Marlborough.</p>	<p>JS said that due to the election, he had not been able to make progress on moving forward the wider review of traffic in the area.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

		JS to pursue this with area board and town councillors.	There discussion about this request and the need for better traffic control in Marlborough to aid traffic flow and stop the long tail backs going up Postern Hill towards Cadley.	
i)	8-19-9 Pedestrian crossing signs on C6 Ramsbury	Detailed cost for signs £568.53 Complete	SG confirmed the sign is in position and the issue is complete. It was agreed this can be removed from the list.	
j)	8-19-11 Aldbourne, request for virtual footway	To be prioritised.	No one from APC was present so this request was not discussed.	
k)	8-20-1 Lockeridge, pedestrian safety Eckhard(Ivy) Lane	To be prioritised JT to liaise with SH	JT said she is now liaising with MC on a different idea. Now thinking of models or images of children in the road to encourage drivers to slow down.	
l)	8-20-2 Ogbourne St George, Request for historic signs	Not discussed as there was no representation at the meeting	There was no one present, so this request was not discussed.	
m)	8-20-7 A4 Manton to Beckhampton safety audit	JT confirmed that Preshute, Kennet Valley, East Kennet and Avebury parishes have come together to look at this jointly and are looking at a substantive scheme bid for this work. SH points out that funding from the Substantive scheme fund is not suitable for this type of project.	SH felt this is not for CATG due to the group's small budget and the amount of work needed and should be progressed separately. JS wanted to take this through at the Cabinet level but has not been able to try doing so yet. JD mentioned a meeting taking place soon in Avebury with Danny	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>Kruger MP and Wiltshire Cabinet members for Highways and Heritage. This will touch on access and roads, including initiatives such as Great West Way.</p> <p>JS asked JD to provide a written report from this meeting back to CATG</p> <p>It was agreed this can be removed from the list.</p>	
n)	<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.</p> <p>SG will submit this via the correct form.</p>	
o)	<p>8-21-2 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for Traffic Island</p>	<p>Request for traffic island on A4 at Manton/ Marlborough boundary</p>	<p>RA was not up to speed yet on this and the other 2 issues below. He offered to liaise with Manton residents and PM on this.</p> <p>JS asked MTC for a whole scheme for the A4 here.</p> <p>JD pointed out the request to move the 40mph sign further west has been omitted.</p>	
p)	<p>8-21-3 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Rd, Manton – request for transverse yellow markings</p>	<p>Request for transverse yellow road markings on western approach to zebra crossing, plus solution between crossing and turning to Bridge Street.</p>	<p>See above.</p>	

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

q)	8-21-4 Related to 8-20-4 A4 Bath Road, Manton – request for sign.	Request for sign indicating Bridge St turn westbound between the Pelican Crossing and Bridge St.	See above.	
7.	New Requests / Issues			
a)	8-21-6 Speed of traffic entering Mildenhall from the east.	Improvements for pedestrians including traffic calming requested.	LK described the situation at the eastern end of the village with the speed of vehicles in both directions. There is no pavement, but the road is used by pedestrians, including parents with young children and secondary school students waiting for buses. MPC would like advice on the most suitable solution to reduce vehicle speed and protect pedestrians. She mentioned a virtual footway, like other villages have, which focuses drivers on there being people in the road. SH mentioned the previous plans to build a pavement, but which was too expensive. LK agreed but did not want this to be the reason for no action here. MPC is looking for something cheaper.	A

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

			<p>SP pointed out Ramsbury's virtual footway was 100% funded by RPC. In Lockeridge, JD said they fundraised locally to pay for the virtual footway there.</p> <p>SH said that to do any work in Minal, this request would need to be prioritised.</p> <p>SHine confirmed MPC has agreed this request and that they need professional input to know what's most appropriate.</p>	
b)				
8.	Other items			
a)		<p>JS led extensive discussion on which requests to give A priority to. Only one high priority slot had been freed up. SH agreed he could take on speed limit reviews on the A4 east of the junction to Savernake Hospital (ref. 5190) and at Chilton Foliat (ref. 8-19-4). JS asked for a vote and CATG agreed to add them to the high priority list.</p> <p>JS suggested the request from Mildenhall PC (ref. 8-21-6) be given high priority and there was discussion around this. SG requested that speed on the C6 (ref. 8-20-8) also be considered. JS asked for another vote and CATG agreed to add the Mildenhall PC request to the high priority list. SG asked that it be noted she objected strongly to the way the vote was carried out which allowed the Mildenhall PC request to be prioritised.</p>		
9.	<p>Date of Next Meeting: The date of the next CATG meeting will be Thursday 16th September.</p>			

COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP ACTION / NOTES LOG

Highways Officer – Steve Hind

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 Marlborough Area Board.

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

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