

Date: 8June, 2011
Time: 10:00 – 12:00 noon
Venue: St Barbe Meeting Room, Bourne Hill, Salisbury
Attendees: Mary Douglas (MD) Chair, Sally Barnett (SB), Annie Child (AC), Cllr Chris Cochrane (CC), SCC Cllr John Collier (JC), Jane Davies (JD), Marianna Dodd (M), Spencer Drinkwater (SD), SCC Cllr John English (JE), Patricia Fagan (PF), Tom Gardner (TG), Cllr Cheryl Hill (CH), David Law (DL), Pam Rouquette (PR), Margaret Willmot (MW), Steve Wilson (SW),
Apologies: Debrah Biggs (SCCAP), Peter Durnan, COGS, Winnie Manning (WM), Helen Rowe (Age UK)

	Subject	Action
1.0	<p>Welcome, Introductions & Apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and acknowledged the apologies received, as stated above.</p>	
2.0	<p>Update on the development of CATG priority schemes (Tom Gardner)</p> <p>TG gave a presentation of the chosen scheme, Harnham Road, Salisbury. This presentation highlighted the 3 options chosen and the pros and cons of each option. TG put forward his recommendation to the group for a puffin crossing followed by an unofficial crossing point.</p> <p>A discussion followed between group members and officers which included the following questions and answers:</p> <p>Q. What could be done to reduce the speed on the Harnham crossing, as this was within a 30 mph limit? A. There are concerns about the speed coming down hill to the Harnham gyratory – 85% suitable for east bound not west bound perspective. Having a crossing there could be a psychological factor.</p> <p>Q. Could we consider traffic calming? A. A physical speeding device would not be considered on a traffic route like this and a vertical reflection is not suitable. Options include looking at pinch points – a simple road narrowing or we could enclose the space or look at the vegetation lining the side of the road.</p> <p>Q. Could you put rumble strips? A. This might be noisy.</p> <p>Q. Vehicle reflective strips might be effective? A. These have been used in a past study on effectiveness of signs which showed there was a good initial impact, i.e., a 4 mile reduction in speed which creeps back up.</p> <p>Q. If there is hatching in the middle of the road it can increase the speed, if it is removed, there might be a drop in speed? A. There needs to be some hatching – but you do not have to have this.</p>	
3.0	<p>Funding for 2011/12</p> <p>The Chair summed up, that there were 3 options to choose from, which were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A puffin crossing• A zebra crossing	

- A pedestrian refuge crossing

The budget would be the same as last year, that is, £14,758 to spend on a solution.

SD advised that the Board has £29, 200 in the budget to date but would check this figure. This would not cover the cost of a puffin crossing.

SD also advised that this year there would be an additional share of a £100k pot and each Area Board will be able to bid for a proportion of this to top up. This needs to be signed off by Cabinet.

4.0 Review of scheme requests (including any new schemes) and Area Board Transport Issues

It was agreed that any new scheme requests would be put through the Issues Log and referred to Highways.

5.0 Selection of schemes for funding in 2011/12

The Chair requested that each individual in the group put forward their thoughts and for officers to comment where appropriate.

MD expressed interest in a zebra crossing.

JC commented that if speeds were in excess of 35mph, it would not qualify for zebra crossing.

JE suggested having a zebra crossing with vehicle reflective signs.

MD asked what would be the cost of a vehicle reflective sign.

TG replied that general ball part figures were:

- vehicle reflective sign - £8k
- zebra - £25k
- drop kerbs, poles etc cost about £30k to include narrowing

CH felt that a pedestrian refuge was not acceptable as there was no space for prams.

MW asked if the existing pedestrian refuge would stay put.

TG said that this had not been costed for removal.

PF stated that unless the pedestrian refuge was made safe for wheelchairs, she would opt for a puffin crossing and that a refuge falls short on the requirements of those people who are vision impaired.

AC concurred with PF for a puffin crossing.

MW thought that a puffin crossing would be a better option.

TG advised that a puffin crossing was a good option as it reacts to the pedestrian, has vehicle alerts overhead and follows the pedestrian across the crossing.

MD checked to see if anyone in the group wanted the pedestrian refuge option. No-one wanted this.

CC asked that a message go back, that the budget was unrealistic.

Questions were raised about the potential of moving the bus stop which SW agreed was well used. TG said that this had not been considered and would involve a lot of kerbing work and landscaping. It also depended on how far the bus stop should be moved. It would not be possible to use the bus stop west bound, it would sit within the carriageway not the lay by. JC said there was no room to move the bus stop.

The reason we needed a pedestrian crossing was because of the accidents. JC continued that the group needed to be aware of the economic realities, i.e., that a puffin costing £60k was not in our radar. He suggested going for an uncontrolled crossing with a potential for an upgrade when more money became available.

MD stated that the group had two lots of £14,758, that is £29,516 to spend on its top priority and suggested that the money is pooled and a bid submitted for £30k. If this was not successful, the group could reconsider.

SD stated that we should aim for a decision by July, 2011.

MD reiterated her questions about putting in a zebra. TG said that pinch points may be the best way to reduce traffic speed. SD advised that the introduction of a zebra would need to take place in 2 stages: 1) reduce traffic speed sufficiently to within the criteria for a zebra 2) put in the zebra. The risk was that, if traffic speed could not be reduced sufficiently, no zebra could be put in, and CATG would have no crossing to show for the money it had spent. This would cost around £35k in total. MD asked TG to look at this and provide a report to the next CATG as a fall-back option if the bid for money for the puffin crossing should fail.

Action: Tom Gardner

MD suggested the group put forward its preferences to TG's team, what we could do and what it would cost.

MD asked the group to confirm that they wanted to pool 2 years on the puffin crossing with a bid to the £100k pot; and if the bid failed, to ask TG to produce a report on a zebra crossing plus measures to reduce traffic speed. All agreed

MW said that some of the cycling schemes were not on this list and that this should be reviewed. MD asked M to send out the list of schemes to members asking that they canvass others to add any further schemes to the current list. SW added that any amendments and the nature of the problem should also be considered.

Action: Marianna Dodd

MD asked how the larger pot of funding was allocated. SD said that there were three parts to this pot and that the Area Boards' allocation is 10%, with the remainder allocated to strategic items. The list of requests from the public did not fit into other schemes. Cllr Tonge made decisions on area transport plans, road safety budgets etc to the tune of £2.5m which is ring fenced.

A discussion followed about being informed about the bigger strategic picture, however, SD reminded the group that this was not the remit of the CATG.

MD reminded the group that it was looking at 2 years of CATG funding and requested that they look again at the list of schemes and state what they would prioritise if they had the choice.

MD asked the group to confirm that you want to give 2 years on the Harnham scheme. All agreed.

CC suggested that the group take a 4 year view but roll forward on current allocations pressing planners to give information over the 4 year period.

MD said that this was something that she and CC would need to talk to Dick Tonge about.

TG

M

MD

Action: MD

6.0 Other highway issues

None were raised.

7.0 Any Other Business

SW alerted the group that the Highways Information document was available on the website. It provided information about the highways service, for instance, information on the major maintenance schemes in Salisbury. There are 4 at the current time, 1 at Harcourt Bridge, 3 major resurfacing schemes within Salisbury 1) Rawlins Road, to be done in school holidays 2) Milford Mill Road 3) The Friary Road. The budget has been agreed with additional funding for winter damage works.

SD also advised that the May issue of the Parish Newsletter informed that there would be no additional grit bin allocation this year but there was an opportunity for the City Council to identify any grit bins not currently used and that these could be relocated to more suitable sites.

JE would like CATG to think about pot hole filling and speed watch.

MD compared this to the Business Improvement District approach, where local businesses contribute financially to an improvement of the street scene over and above that which would be expected from the local authority. She asked for the option for local people to fill potholes in their own area to be considered at the next CATG.

MW would like to see better disabled access, i.e., higher kerbs at bus stops. MD advised that all issues should be put through the Issues Log.

PR would like to see safe routes to school raised if there a different pot of funding for this. SD responded that there is a £150k pot of funding and that Salisbury could have an opportunity to bid from this pot. However, there is no money available this year. MD advised that there were two routes to address this, that is to raise an issue in 1) School Travel Plan and 2) Issues log.

MD advised that at the next meeting, the option for local people to fill potholes in their own area would be discussed.

Action: Marianna Dodd

8.0 Date of Next & Future Meetings

24 August, 2011 10 – 12noon in St Barbe Meeting Room, Bourne Hill
28 November, 2011 10 – 12noon venue to be advised
08 February, 2011 10 – 12noon in St Barbe Meeting Room, Bourne Hill

M