

| | Item | Update | Actions and recommendations | Who |
|----|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----|
| 1. | Attendees and apologies | | | |
| | Present: | Cllr Bridget Wayman – Wiltshire Council (BW) – Chair Cllr Pauline Church – Wiltshire Council (PCH) Cllr Nick Errington – Wiltshire Council (NW) Cllr Nabil Najjar – Wiltshire Council (NN) Cllr George Jeans – Wiltshire Council (GJ) Dickie Winchester – Compton Chamberlayne Parish Council (DW) Anna Southern – Dinton Parish Council (AS) Tony Phillips – Fovant Parish Council (TP) Frank Freeman – Hindon Parish Council (FF) Ken Taylor – Quidhampton Parish Council (KT) Steven Black – South Newton & Stoford Parish Council (STB) Steve Banas – Swallowcliffe Parish Council (SB) Richard Blamey – Teffont Parish Council (RB) Sandra Harry – Tisbury Parish Council – (SH) Clare Churchill – Wilton Town Council – (CC) David Button – Wiltshire Council (DB) Paul Shaddock – Wiltshire Council (PS) | | |
| | Apologies: | Ansty Parish Council, Donhead St. Andrew Parish Council, Kilmington Parish Council, Mere Parish Council, Sutton Mandeville Parish Council, Zeals Parish Council | | |



| 2. | Notes of last meeting | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------|
| | | The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed at the South West Wiltshire meeting on the 30 th June 2021. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| | | The South West Wiltshire Area Board minutes can be found at: | | |
| | | https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cld=169&M ld=13916&Ver=4 | | |
| 3. | Financial Position | | | |
| | | There is currently £15.397.16 still unallocated. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |



| 4. | General Items | | | |
|----|--|---|---------------------------|---------------|
| a) | HGV's & Sat Nav's | BW advised that both Baroness Scott and John Glen MP are fully aware of the council's concerns around this issue and would seek to pursue this matter at a national level when an opportunity to do so arises. BW stated that this item would be removed from the agenda at future meetings, but committed to providing the group with an update in respect of this matter as and when one was available. | | Area Board |
| 5. | Work Instructed | | | |
| a) | Fovant 20mph Implementation | Meeting held with TP to determine the extent of outstanding 20mph speed limit remedial works. Outstanding works raised with Ringway, who have been instructed to undertake the remedial works as soon as possible. Works to install the additional playground warning signs provisionally programmed to take place during week beginning 27/09/21. | | Area Board |
| b) | 14-20-9 <u>Swallowcliffe</u> C316 Pheasant Copse & Mulberry House, SP3 5PE Village Gateway | Remedial works to reposition the village gate provisionally programmed to take place during week beginning 20/09/21. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |



| 6. | Top 5 Priority Schemes | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---------------|
| a) | Issue <u>6547</u> Quidhampton Lower Road Traffic Calming | The Parish Council (PC) have undertaken consultation with residents on the proposals previously drawn up. KT gave a brief presentation to the group summarising the proposals and the consultation undertaken. A copy of the presentation is attached as Appendix 1 . KT stated that the provision of the painted on carriageway | contribution towards a bid to the Substantive CATG fund from | КТ |
| | | footway would be raised with the Major Maintenance Team and provided alongside the planned Lower Road resurfacing works and therefore the PC would like to submit a bid to the Substantive CATG fund to deliver the central (new footway) and western (raised table) elements of the proposals. | £4,700 towards a bid to the Substantive CATG fund the CATG | Area Board |
| | | PS advised that the estimated cost of the proposed footway was £46,000 and that the estimated cost of the proposed raised table was £32,000, making a total requirement of £78,000. PS stated that one of the key factors in considering bids to the Substantive CATG fund was the deliverability of the proposed scheme. PS advised that there was an element of risk with the deliverability of the raised table as it would impact on private land and without the written agreement of landowners the scheme could not proceed. The works to provide the proposed footway were all located in the public highway so was not affected by landownership issues. Any bid to the Substantive CATG fund for both the proposed footway and raised table would be affected by the deliverability issue outlined above. PS commented that it might be better to consider proceeding with just a bid for the funding to provide the footway. | Substantive CATG fund for the proposed new footway in Quidhampton. (Note: Bid will only be submitted if the PC agree a contribution of £4,700 | PS |



| The group discussed this matter and agreed to proceed with a bid to the Substantive CATG fund for the proposed footway only. KT advised that the PC would be prepared to contribute £2,500 towards a bid to the Substantive CATG fund. PS advised that there is no fixed contribution expected from the CATG/PC when submitting a bid to the Substantive CATG fund but the more funding that can be allocated the greater the chance of the scheme being funded. PS further advised that typically, a CATG would be expected, as a minimum, to match fund any PC contribution when submitting a bid to the Substantive CATG fund. | |
|---|--|
| The group discussed this matter. BW felt that the PC should be seeking to provide a greater contribution towards the bid. BW proposed that if the PC contributed £4,700 towards the bid, she would be happy to propose that the CATG contribute £7,300 towards a bid. This would make a total contribution of £12,000 to the bid to the substantive CATG fund. The group supported BW's proposals in principle. However, KT advised that he would need to discuss this matter with the other Parish Councillors before he could formally agree to that level of contribution. | |



| b) | 14-20-4 <u>Hindon, Stops Hill</u> Various traffic management measures. | Initial meeting held with PC to talk through traffic management report and discuss potential options. Site meeting arranged with PC for 20/08/21. Following site meeting agreed measures will be drawn up and circulated to PC for comment. | | Area Board |
|----|---|---|---|---------------|
| c) | 14-20-5 Tisbury <u>Cove Cottage,</u> <u>Weaveland Road</u> | Meeting to discuss to possible TRO restrictions that could be introduced in Weaveland Road to be arranged with PC. | Arrange meeting with PC to discuss TRO options. | PS/PC |
| d) | 14-21-3 <u>The Avenue, Wilton</u> Speeding Traffic | The CATG have allocated £3000 (CATG contribution £2250 / PC contribution £750) for the provision of white gates to enhance the existing gateway on The Avenue. This will be progressed once the scheme has been made a Top 5 Priority. | That the Area Board approves the allocation of £1,875 to allow a speed limit assessment to be undertaken. | Area Board |
| | | Cllr Church has spoken briefly with Cllr Hocking (the Chair of the Salisbury CATG) who was supportive of the desire to see speeding concerns on The Avenue addressed and said that the Salisbury CATG would be prepared to work in collaboration with the South West Wiltshire CATG on this matter. The first stage in considering a change to the speed limit on The Avenue would be for a formal speed limit assessment to be undertaken. The cost of the assessment would be £2,500 (CATG contribution £1,875 / PC contribution £625). | allocation of £625 to allow a speed limit assessment to be | PC |



| e) | Tisbury 20mph Speed Limit Extension | Speed limit assessment has been ordered with the council consultants Atkins. Awaiting the undertaking of the traffic surveys to allow the speed limit assessment process to be completed. | • | Area Board |
|----|--|--|---|---------------|
| | | The traffic surveys for Tisbury have been ordered through the council's Transport Planning Team under the regional contract for data collection that the council is part of. However, the undertaking of surveys has been complicated due to the regional contractor having recently been retendered and a new contractor appointed, and the backlog of survey work required because of lockdown. The surveys in Tisbury will not be undertaken until September as the earliest. | | |
| | | PS to work with Transport Planning, Neo Traffic Data (the new traffic survey contractor) and Atkins to ensure that the traffic surveys and assessment in Tisbury are undertaken as soon as is possible. | | |



| 7. | Scheme Awaiting Prioritisa | ition | | |
|----|--|--|---------------------------|---------------|
| a) | 14-20-1 <u>C283 Stoford</u> Various | Draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is currently with the TRO Team to complete the legal work and prepare the formal TRO consultation. TRO consultation expected to commence in September. Date that the TRO consultation will commence to be circulated to PC and local elected member once known. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| | | <u>Note:</u> Scheme temporarily removed from Top 5 Priority Schemes until TRO advert period has been completed. | | |
| b) | 14-20-11 <u>Fovant</u> A30/High Street Kerb Realignment | Initial discussion around the requirements of the brief to be supplied to Atkins undertaken with the PC. PC asked to provide an overview to the background to this matter and their objectives for the work to be undertaken by Atkins. Once received brief form will be completed and supplied to the PC for comment before issuing to Atkins for consideration and the submission of a cost estimate. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| c) | 14-21-1 <u>Compton Chamberlayne</u> Sign Decluttering | Potential sign decluttering scheme as you enter the village centre from the A30. As previously advised the cost of removing the signs identified by the PC would be approximately £500. The cost of combining the weight restriction terminal sign and height warning sign onto one sign assembly would be approximately £750. The PC would be required to fund a minimum of 25% of the cost of the works should they decide to progress with the scheme. DW advised that the PC were still considering this matter and he would advise PS of their decision once known. DW further advised that the height warning sign was no longer required due to a local landowner removing the bridge that the sign related to, so this would have minor impact on the works required. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |



| 8. | Other Schemes | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---------------|
| a) | 14-20-13 <u>Tollard Royal</u> Installation of feeder pillar and funding of electricity supply. | Funding to allow installation of electricity supply provided to the PC. Wide base post (feeder pillar) installed on the 12/07/21 and the issue has been closed. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| b) | 14-19-3 <u>Fovant – A30</u> Installation of gateway on eastern approach. | Scheme allocated to the Traffic Signing Team to progress. Initial discussion around the requirements of the scheme undertaken with the PC. Detailed design plans to drawn up and supplied to the PC for comment. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| c) | 14-20-8 <u>Teffont</u> Junction of B3089 & C24 Various Measures | The PC have supplied a document outlining the changes they believe are required. The changes proposed seem acceptable. However, it should be noted that the changes on the A303 will require the consent of Highways England (HE). HE have said that in principle they are happy to consider signage changes subject to seeing the proposed details. The group have agreed to review the EHD direction signs along the A303 and B3089. BW asked that this scheme be passed to the Traffic Signing Team to progress. | Scheme to the Traffic Signing Team to progress. | PS |



| 9. | New Requests / Issues | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---------------|
| a) | 14-21-5Sutton MandevilleRequest for Unsuitable forHGVs sign at the junction of theA30 and Glasses Lane | The estimated cost of the provision of an Unsuitable for HGVs sign at the junction of the A30 and Glasses Lane is £320 (CATG contribution £240 / PC contribution £80). | That the Area Board approves the allocation of £240 to allow this work to be undertaken. | Area Board |
| b) | 14-21-6 <u>Sutton Mandeville</u> Request for Unsuitable for HGVs sign at the junction of the | The estimated cost of the provision of an Unsuitable for HGVs sign at the junction of Lagpond Lane and Sutton Hill is £270 (CATG contribution £202.50 / PC contribution £67.50). It is also noted that there are no street nameplates for Sutton Hill | That the Area Board approves the allocation of £202.50 to allow for the provision of an Unsuitable for HGVs. | Area Board |
| | A30 and Sutton Hill | at its junction with the A30. If the PC wish for street nameplates to be provided at this location, then the estimated cost for the provision of a pair of street nameplates is \pounds 500 (CATG contribution \pounds 375 / PC contribution \pounds 125). | That the Area Board approves the allocation of £375 for the provision of street nameplates | Area Board |
| | | | That the Area Board approves the allocation of £125 for the provision of street nameplates | PC |
| c) | 14-21-7 <u>Swallowcliffe</u> Request for Unsuitable for HGVs sign at the junction of the A30 and Barber's Lane | 1 | | Area Board |



| d) | 14-21-8 <u>Wilton</u> Request for the provision of wooden posts or similar to prevent parking on a grass | a range of wooden posts and plastic bollards that could be used | need for the provision of the | PC |
|----|--|---|-------------------------------|----|
| | verge at St. John's Square. | to address the problem. Costs of supplying and installing the bollards could only be determined once the type of bollard to be installed had been agreed but a ball park figure would be around £100-£120 per bollard. DB advised that if bollards were provided at this location it is likely they would be damaged, particularly if the problem was a result of vehicles overrunning the verge, and their replacement | | |
| | | would only be undertaken on a discretionary basis. BW commented that before the group sought to undertake further work on this issue, she felt additional information about the need for the provision of the bollards was required from the PC. | | |



| 10. | Other Items | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|
| a) | Highway Maintenance Update | DB advised: That following an increase in the volume of works taking place after the ending of lockdown restrictions it was a very busy period for Highways Licensing and Enforcement activities. That verge grass cutting works on minor road had begun and would carry on until the end of September. That Parish Steward, pothole filing and small scale surfacing works were continuing That there was an extremely small budget allocation for white line remarking this financial year, but this work had commenced. DB reminded members of the group that road markings had to be 85% worn before their replacement would be taken forward and that issues with worn road markings should continue to be raised via the MyWiltshire app. | That the update is noted. | Area Board |
| 11. | Date of Next Meeting: | 24 th November 2021 | | |



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 South West Wiltshire 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, the South West Wiltshire Area Board will have a remaining highways funding balance of £4.947.16 in the CATG allocation available for the 2021/2022 financial year.

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

There are no specific safeguarding implications related to this report.