


Public Document Pack



Neuadd y Sir
Y Rhadyr
Brynbuga
NP15 1GA

Dydd Mawrth, 11 Ebrill 2023

Hysbysiad o gyfarfod:

Pwyllgor Craffu Lle

Dydd Mercher, 19eg Ebrill, 2023, 2.00 pm
Neuadd y Sir, Y Rhadyr, Brynbuga, NP15 1GA

Nodwch y cynhelir rhag gyfarfod 30 munud cyn dechrau'r cyfarfod ar gyfer aelodau'r pwyllgor

AGENDA

Item No	Item	Pages
1.	Ymddiheuriadau am absenioldeb.	
2.	Datganiadau o Fuddiant	
3.	Fforwm Agored i'r Cyhoedd. Canllawiau ~ Fforwm Agored Cyhoeddus y Pwyllgor Dethol Mae ein cyfarfodydd Pwyllgor Dethol yn cael eu ffrydio'n fyw a bydd dolen i'r ffrwd fyw ar gael ar dudalen gyfarfod gwefan Cyngor Sir Fynwy Os hoffech rannu eich barn ar unrhyw gynigion sy'n cael eu trafod gan Bwyllgorau Dethol, gallwch gyflwyno eich sylwadau drwy ddefnyddio'r ffurflen hon <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rhannwch eich barn drwy lanlwytho ffeil fideo neu sain (uchafswm o 4 munud); neu• Cyflwynwch sylwadau ysgrifenedig (drwy Microsoft Word, uchafswm o 500 gair) Bydd angen i chi gofrestru ar gyfer cyfrif Fy Sir Fynwy er mwyn cyflwyno'r ymateb neu ddefnyddio eich manylion mewngofnodi os ydych wedi cofrestru o'r blaen. Y dyddiad cau ar gyfer cyflwyno sylwadau i'r Cyngor yw 5pm dri diwrnod gwaith clir cyn y cyfarfod. Os bydd y sylwadau a dderbynnir yn	

fwy na 30 munud, bydd detholiad o'r rhain, yn seiliedig ar thema, yn cael eu rhannu yng nghyfarfod y Pwyllgor Dethol. Bydd yr holl sylwadau a dderbynnir ar gael i gynghorwyr cyn y cyfarfod.

Os hoffech fynychu un o'n cyfarfodydd i siarad dan y Fforwm Agored i'r Cyhoedd, bydd angen i chi roi tri diwrnod o hysbysiad i ni drwy gysylltu â Scrutiny@monmouthshire.gov.uk. Y cadeirydd sy'n penderfynu faint o amser a roddir i bob aelod o'r cyhoedd i siarad, ond i'n galluogi i roi cyfle i nifer o siaradwyr, gofynnwn nad yw cyfraniadau yn hirach na 3 munud.

Os hoffech awgrymu pynciau i un o'n Pwyllgorau Dethol graffu arnynt yn y dyfodol, gwnewch hynny drwy e-bostio Scrutiny@monmouthshire.gov.uk

4.	Deiseb: Bagiau Plastig Untro – Cytuno a ddylid cyfeirio hyn at y Weithrediaeth neu'r Cyngor Llawn ar gyfer gweithredu.	1 - 2
5.	Gorchymyn Diogelu Mannau Agored Cyhoeddus ar gyfer Rheoli Cŵn – Ar gyfer Aelodau fel bod modd llywio'r gwaith o fynd ymlaen i gam nesaf y Gorchymyn drafft.	3 - 30
6.	Dyluniad Stryd Monnow – Craffu'r dyluniad arfaethedig ar gyfer Stryd Monnow ar ôl ymgysylltu ac ymgynghori gyda'r gymuned.	31 - 358
7.	Blaenraglen Waith y Pwyllgor Craffu Lle a'r Rhestr o'r Camau Gweithredu.	359 - 364
8.	Blaenraglen Waith y Cabinet a'r Cyngor.	365 - 374
9.	Cadarnhau'r cofnodion canlynol:	
9.1.	Cyfarfod Arferol o'r Pwyllgor Craffu Lle ar 12fed Ionawr 2023.	375 - 382
9.2.	Cyfarfod Arbennig o'r Pwyllgor Craffu Lle ar 2ail Chwefror 2023.	383 - 396
10.	Cyfarfod Nesaf: Dydd Iau 25ain Mai 2023 am 10.00am.	

Paul Matthews

Prif Weithredwr

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CYNGOR SIR FYNWY

MAE CYFANSODDIAD Y PWYLLGOR FEL A GANLYN:

County Councillor Louise Brown
Shirenewton;
Welsh Conservative Party
County Councillor Emma Bryn
Wyesham;
Independent Group
County Councillor Ben Callard
Llanfoist & Govilon;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru
County Councillor Ian Chandler
Llantilio Crossenny;
Green Party
County Councillor Tomos Dafydd Davies
Llanfoist & Govilon;
Welsh Conservative Party
County Councillor Lisa Dymock
Portskewett;
Welsh Conservative Party
County Councillor Jane Lucas
Osbaston;
Welsh Conservative Party
County Councillor Su McConnel
Croesonen;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru
County Councillor Maria Stevens
Severn;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru
County Councillor Jackie Strong
Caldicot Cross;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru
County Councillor Catrin Maby
Drybridge;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru
County Councillor Paul Griffiths
Chepstow Castle & Larkfield;
Welsh Labour/Llafur Cymru

Gwybodaeth I'r Cyhoedd

Mynediad i gopiâu papur o agendâu ac adroddiadau

Gellir darparu copi o'r agenda hwn ac adroddiadau perthnasol i aelodau'r cyhoedd sy'n mynychu cyfarfod drwy ofyn am gopi gan Gwasanaethau Democraidd ar 01633 644219. Dylid nodi fod yn rhaid i ni dderbyn 24 awr o hysbysiad cyn y cyfarfod er mwyn darparu copi caled o'r agenda hwn i chi.

Edrych ar y cyfarfod ar-lein

Gellir gweld y cyfarfod ar-lein yn fyw neu'n dilyn y cyfarfod drwy fynd i www.monmouthshire.gov.uk neu drwy ymweld â'n tudalen Youtube drwy chwilio am MonmouthshireCC. Drwy fynd i mewn i'r ystafell gyfarfod, fel aelod o'r cyhoedd neu i gymryd rhan yn y cyfarfod, rydych yn caniatáu i gael eich ffilmio ac i ddefnydd posibl y delweddau a'r recordiadau sain hynny gan y Cyngor.

Y Gymraeg Mae'r Cyngor yn croesawu cyfraniadau gan aelodau'r cyhoedd drwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg neu'r Saesneg. Gofynnwn gyda dyledus barch i chi roi 5 diwrnod o hysbysiad cyn y cyfarfod os dymunwch siarad yn Gymraeg fel y gallwn ddarparu ar gyfer eich anghenion.

Nodau a Gwerthoedd Cyngor Sir Fynwy

Cymunedau Cynaliadwy a Chryf

Canlyniadau y gweithiwn i'w cyflawni

Neb yn cael ei adael ar ôl

- Gall pobl hŷn fyw bywyd da
- Pobl â mynediad i dai addas a fforddiadwy
- Pobl â mynediad a symudedd da

Pobl yn hyderus, galluog ac yn cymryd rhan

- Camddefnyddio alcohol a chyffuriau ddim yn effeithio ar fywydau pobl
- Teuluoedd yn cael eu cefnogi
- Pobl yn teimlo'n ddiogel

Ein sir yn ffynnu

- Busnes a menter
- Pobl â mynediad i ddysgu ymarferol a hyblyg
- Pobl yn diogelu ac yn cyfoethogi'r amgylchedd

Ein blaenoriaethau

- Ysgolion
- Diogelu pobl agored i niwed
- Cefnogi busnes a chreu swyddi
- Cynnal gwasanaethau sy'n hygyrch yn lleol

Ein gwerthoedd

- **Bod yn agored:** anelwn fod yn agored ac onest i ddatblygu perthnasoedd ymddiriedus
- **Tegwch:** anelwn ddarparu dewis teg, cyfleoedd a phrofiadau a dod yn sefydliad a adeiladwyd ar barch un at y llall.
- **Hyblygrwydd:** anelwn fod yn hyblyg yn ein syniadau a'n gweithredoedd i ddod yn sefydliad effeithlon ac effeithiol.
- **Gwaith tîm:** anelwn gydweithio i rannu ein llwyddiannau a'n methiannau drwy adeiladu ar ein cryfderau a chefnogi ein gilydd i gyflawni ein nodau.
- **Caredigrwydd** – Byddwn yn dangos caredigrwydd i bawb yr ydym yn gweithio gyda nhw, gan roi pwysigrwydd perthnasoedd a'r cysylltiadau sydd gennym â'n gilydd wrth wraidd pob rhyngweithio.

Canllaw Cwestiynau Craffu Sir Fynwy

1. Pam mae'r Pwyllgor yn craffu ar hyn? (cefndir, materion allweddol)
2. Beth yw rôl y Pwyllgor a pha ganlyniad mae'r Aelodau am ei gyflawni?
3. A oes digon o wybodaeth i gyflawni hyn? Os nad oes, pwy allai ddarparu hyn?
 - Cytuno ar y drefn holi a pha Aelodau fydd yn arwain
 - Cytuno ar gwestiynau i swyddogion a chwestiynau i Aelod y Cabinet

Cwestiynau'r Cyfarfod

Craffu ar Berfformiad

1. Sut mae perfformiad yn cymharu â'r blynyddoedd blaenorol? Ydy e'n well/yn waeth? Pam?
2. Sut mae perfformiad yn cymharu â chynghorau eraill/darparwyr gwasanaethau eraill? Ydy e'n well/yn waeth? Pam?
3. Sut mae perfformiad yn cymharu â thargedau gosodedig? Ydy e'n well/yn waeth? Pam?
4. Sut cafodd targedau perfformiad eu gosod? Ydyn nhw'n ddigon heriol/realistig?
5. Sut mae defnyddwyr gwasanaethau/y cyhoedd/partneriaid yn gweld perfformiad y gwasanaeth?
6. A fu unrhyw awdid ac archwiliadau diweddar? Beth oedd y canfyddiadau?
7. Sut mae'r gwasanaeth yn cyfrannu at wireddu amcanion corfforaethol?
8. A yw gwelliant/dirywiad mewn perfformiad yn gysylltiedig i gynnydd/ostyngiad mewn adnodd?
Pa gapasiti sydd yna i wella?

Craffu ar Bolisi

1. Ar bwy mae'r polisi yn effeithio ~ yn uniongyrchol ac yn anuniongyrchol? Pwy fydd yn elwa fwyaf/leiaf?
2. Beth yw barn defnyddwyr gwasanaeth /rhanddeiliaid? Pa ymgynghoriad gafodd ei gyflawni? A wnaeth y broses ymgynghori gydymffurfio ag Egwyddorion Gunning? A yw rhanddeiliaid yn credu y bydd yn sicrhau'r canlyniad a ddymunir?
3. Beth yw barn y gymuned gyfan – safbwynt y 'trethdalwr'?
4. Pa ddulliau a ddefnyddiwyd i ymgynghori â'r rhanddeiliaid? A oedd y broses yn galluogi pawb â chyfran i ddweud eu dweud?
5. Pa ymarfer ac opsiynau sydd wedi eu hystyried wrth ddatblygu/adolygu'r polisi hwn? Pa dystiolaeth sydd i hysbysu beth sy'n gweithio? A yw'r polisi yn ymwneud â maes lle mae diffyg ymchwil cyhoeddedig neu dystiolaeth arall?
6. A yw'r polisi'n ymwneud â maes lle ceir anghydraddoldebau hysbys?
7. A yw'r polisi hwn yn cyd-fynd â'n hamcanion corfforaethol, fel y'u diffinnir yn ein cynllun corfforaethol? A yw'n cadw at ein Safonau Iaith Gymraeg?
8. A gafodd yr holl ddatblygu cynaliadwy, y goblygiadau cydraddoldeb a diogelu perthnasol eu hystyried?

Er enghraifft, beth yw'r gweithdrefnau sydd angen bod ar waith i amddiffyn plant?

9. Faint fydd y gost hon i'w gweithredu a pha ffynhonnell ariannu sydd wedi'i nodi?

10. Sut fydd perfformiad y polisi yn cael ei weithredu a'r effaith yn cael ei gwerthuso?

Cwestiynau Cyffredinol:

Grymuso Cymunedau

- Sut ydym ni'n cynnwys cymunedau lleol a'u grymuso i ddylunio a darparu gwasanaethau i gyd-fynd ag angen lleol?
- A ydym ni'n cael trafodaethau rheolaidd gyda chymunedau am flaenoriaethau'r gwasanaeth a pha lefel o wasanaeth y gall y cyngor fforddio ei ddarparu yn y dyfodol?
- A yw'r gwasanaeth yn gweithio gyda dinasyddion i egluro rôl gwahanol bartneriaid wrth ddarparu gwasanaeth a rheoli disgwyliadau?
- A oes fframwaith a phroses gymesur ar waith ar gyfer asesu perfformiad ar y cyd, gan gynnwys o safbwynt dinesydd, ac a oes gennych chi drefniadau atebolrwydd i gefnogi hyn?
- A oes Asesiad Effaith Cydraddoldeb wedi'i gynnal? Os felly a all yr Arweinydd a'r Cabinet /Uwch Swyddogion roi copïau i'r Aelodau ac eglurhad manwl o'r Asesiad o'r Effaith ar Gydraddoldeb (EQIA) a gynhaliwyd mewn perthynas â'r cynigion hyn?
- A all yr Arweinydd a'r Cabinet/Uwch Swyddogion sicrhau aelodau bod y cynigion hyn yn cydymffurfio â deddfwriaeth Cydraddoldeb a Hawliau Dynol? A yw'r cynigion yn cydymffurfio â Chynllun Cydraddoldeb Strategol yr Awdurdod Lleol?

Galwadau'r Gwasanaeth

- Sut fydd newid polisi a deddfwriaeth yn effeithio ar y ffordd mae'r cyngor yn gweithredu?
- A ydym ni wedi ystyried demograffeg ein cyngor a sut bydd hyn yn effeithio ar ddarparu gwasanaethau a chyllid yn y dyfodol?
- A ydych chi wedi adnabod ac ystyried y tueddiadau tymor hir a allai effeithio ar eich maes gwasanaeth, pa effaith allai'r tueddiadau hyn ei chael ar eich gwasanaeth/allai eich gwasanaeth ei gael ar y tueddiadau hyn, a beth sy'n cael ei wneud mewn ymateb?

Cynllunio Ariannol

- A oes gennym ni gynlluniau ariannol canolig a hirdymor cadarn yn eu lle?
- A ydym ni'n cysylltu cyllidebau â chynlluniau a chanlyniadau ac adrodd yn effeithiol ar y rhain?

Gwneud arbedion a chynhyrchu incwm

- A oes gennym ni'r strwythurau cywir ar waith i sicrhau bod ein dulliau effeithlonrwydd, gwelliant a thrawsnewid yn gweithio gyda'i gilydd i sicrhau'r arbedion mwyaf posibl?
- Sut ydym ni'n gwneud y mwyaf o incwm? A ydym ni wedi cymharu polisiau eraill y cyngor i sicrhau'r incwm mwyaf posibl ac wedi ystyried yn llawn y goblygiadau ar ddefnyddwyr gwasanaeth?

- A oes gennym ni gynllun gweithlu sy'n ystyried capasiti, costau, a sgiliau'r gweithlu gwirioneddol yn erbyn y gweithlu a ddymunir?

Cwestiynau i'w gofyn o fewn blwyddyn i'r penderfyniad:

- A gafodd canlyniadau arfaethedig y cynnig eu cyflawni neu a oedd canlyniadau eraill?
- A oedd yr effeithiau wedi'u cyfyngu i'r grŵp yr oeddech chi ar y dechrau yn meddwl fyddai wedi cael ei effeithio h.y. pobl hŷn, neu a gafodd eraill eu heffeithio e.e. pobl ag anableddau, rhieni â phlant ifanc?
- A yw'r penderfyniad yn dal i fod y penderfyniad cywir neu a oes angen gwneud addasiadau?

Cwestiynau i'r Pwyllgor ar ddiwedd y cyfarfod ...

A oes gennym ni'r wybodaeth angenrheidiol i ffurfio casgliadau/i wneud argymhellion i'r pwyllgor gwaith, cyngor, partneriaid eraill? Os nad oes, a oes angen i ni:

- (i) Ymchwilio i'r mater yn fwy manwl?
- (ii) Gael rhagor o wybodaeth gan dystion eraill - Aelod o'r Bwrdd Gweithredol, arbenigwr annibynnol, aelodau o'r gymuned, defnyddwyr gwasanaeth, cyrff rheoleiddio...

Cytuno ar gamau pellach sydd i'w cymryd o fewn amserlen/adroddiad monitro yn y dyfodol.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Monmouthshire County Council,

I am a ten-year-old student in year 5 and I would like to say we need to help the polar bears and other endangered species that need our help and I know that changing our recycling bags will change a lot for at least a couple of polar bears. I have made a petition in my school that currently has 31 signatures on it. So please stop using single-use plastic bags for recycling!

From Ffion Maidment Cardens, Osbaston Primary Church in
Wales School

This page is intentionally left blank

SUBJECT: PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER FOR DOG CONTROLS

MEETING: Place Scrutiny Committee

DATE: 19th April 2023

DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: All

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 To scrutinise progress on plans to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order, (PSPO), for dog controls in Monmouthshire under the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Members consider the findings of engagement with relevant stakeholders on dog fouling in public spaces and endorse the proposal for a draft PSPO, when progressed, to include for the offence of a person in charge of a dog which has defecated on any public space in the county failing to remove the faeces from the land, as detailed in paragraph 3.8.
- 2.2 Members consider and decide on the potential inclusion in a draft PSPO of an offence if a person in charge of a dog does not have the appropriate means to pick up any faeces deposited by that dog, as detailed in paragraph 3.11.
- 2.3 Members consider and comment on the Council's current considerations and proposed continued engagement with relevant stakeholders on the potential introduction of Dogs on Leads and Dog Exclusion Areas in a draft PSPO.
- 2.4 That a further report is presented to this Committee, following engagement with relevant stakeholders (as outlined in 2.3 and 3.18), to consider a draft PSPO, if one is considered to be needed and endorse a public consultation on it.
- 2.5 That a report is then provided to this Committee, further to public consultation feedback on the draft PSPO, for pre-decision scrutiny before the Order goes to Cabinet or Individual Cabinet Member, (Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Economy), for decision.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1 As agreed by Strong Communities Select Committee on the 12th March 2020 a public consultation, having initially been delayed by the onset of the Covid pandemic, was undertaken between July and October 2021 on the introduction of a Public Spaces

Protection Order for dog controls, potentially covering fouling, dogs on leads and dog exclusion areas.

- 3.2 The findings of the public consultation, resulting in 1334 responses, were reported to the Stronger Communities Select Committee on the 10th March 2022.
- 3.3 The Committee endorsed the recommendation for a draft PSPO, when progressed, to include for the following offence: **A person in charge of a dog when in a public space in the county failing to put a dog on a lead, of no more than 2 metres length, when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control, or causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance.**
- 3.4 The Committee also endorsed the recommendation for the findings of the public consultation to be shared with relevant stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county, to establish what controls, if any, they considered necessary and to identify any dogs on leads / dog exclusion areas.
- 3.5 **Dog Fouling.** Currently the issue of dog fouling is addressed in the County through the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996. However the offence of failing to remove the faeces only covers certain designated land. Crucially it does not include all public spaces.
- 3.6 As provided in the previous Committee report there was widespread support in the public consultation (87%) of responses, including from the Dogs Trust, on a blanket approach requiring dog owners to remove dog faeces if their dog fouls any land to which the public have access across the county.
- 3.7 However minimal response had been received from the larger private landowners responsible for public spaces. These have therefore been engaged further and positive responses now received from many including Brecon Beacons National Park, National Trust, Woodland Trust, a number of the Housing Associations and Town + Community Councils. No objections have been raised to the proposed provision requiring people to clean up after their dogs if the fouling is in a public space in the county.
- 3.8 It is therefore recommended that when a draft PSPO is progressed and consulted on it includes for the offence of **A person in charge of a dog which has defecated on any public space in the county failing to remove the faeces from the land forthwith unless they can show that:**
(a) they have a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or
(b) the owner, occupier, or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to their failing to do so;
- 3.9 There is a clear need to carefully consider the potential impact of a PSPO on different sections of our communities. Exemptions to the offence will therefore need to be included for persons with certain disabilities who are not being able to pick up dog faeces; and for working dogs such as those used in law enforcement, farm dogs used to drive animals etc.
- 3.10 **Appropriate means for picking up dog faeces.** This was not included in the July to October 2021 public consultation but has since been proposed for consideration following the recent stakeholder consultation.

- 3.11 The offence for consideration in the draft PSPO is **A Person in Charge of a dog must have with them an appropriate means to pick up any faeces deposited by that dog, and must produce this if requested to do so by an Authorised Officer.**
- 3.12 For context, to assist Members considerations, 15 of the 22 Welsh Local Authorities have a PSPO for dog controls and of these 8 make it an offence if a dog owner does not carry an appropriate receptacle / bag.
- 3.13 **Dogs on Leads Areas and Dog Exclusion Areas.** The provision of such areas were considered in the 2021 public consultation. Responses given for agreeing to such areas include owners having more control over their dogs so reducing the amount of uncollected faeces; reduce fouling levels on marked sports pitches / school grounds; and safety of children from out of control dogs. Reasons given in disagreement include dogs can be under control without being on leads and dogs require off lead exercise.
- 3.14 As agreed by Members in the March 2022 report, a summary of the public consultation has been shared and a view sought from relevant stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county, including relevant sections of the council, each Town and Community Council and large private landowners.
- 3.15 **Dog Exclusion Areas.** The Council's Grounds and Cleansing section has proposed that dogs should be excluded from all marked sports pitches and children's play areas in the county. The majority of these will be owned by the county council (circa 10 marked pitches and 99 play areas) but a number are otherwise owned by Town and Community Councils (7 pitches and 13 play areas) and Housing Associations (9 play areas). There are also a number of other exemption areas proposed by stakeholders (8 in total to date).
- 3.16 The Council's Children and Young People and Mon Life Directorates have proposed that dogs should be excluded from all all school and leisure centre fields in the county. There are 34 in total.
- 3.17 **Dogs on Leads Areas.** The Council's Estates section has proposed 5 'open' cemeteries in the county; the Grounds and Cleansing section 4 skate parks and 1 garden (Linda Vista). Again there are also a number of other Leads Areas proposed by other stakeholders (7 to date).
- 3.18 A list of the proposed Dog Exclusion / Leads Areas has been sent to the relevant Town and Community Councils and landowners if privately owned, to seek their agreement or otherwise comment. It is hoped that this will result in an agreed definitive list of areas to be included in a draft PSPO.
- 3.19 There will be a cost for introducing Dog Exclusion / Leads Areas, as each location will need signs to make users aware of the restrictions in place. In addition some locations may need fences or other means for enclosing or otherwise demarcating designated areas.
- 3.20 Detail of costs to be provided with the draft PSPO in the next report if Members agree to progress but initial estimates are that 400 signs are needed (circa £35000). This crosses

Directorate responsibility and so the cost allocation will need consideration, again to be considered in the next report.

4. EQUALITY AND FUTURE GENERATIONS EVALUATION, (includes social justice, safeguarding and corporate parenting):

4.1 The completed 'Equalities & Future Generations Evaluation' form is provided as Appendix One, attached.

4.2 There is a clear need to consider carefully the potential impact of a PSPO on different sections of our communities. Consultation responses include concerns for persons with certain disabilities not being able to pick up dog faeces, and consideration will need to be given to the application of appropriate exemptions in this regard. A PSPO will need to ensure the varied needs of our communities are considered, positively impacting the wellbeing goal of a healthier Wales.

5. OPTIONS APPRAISAL:

5.1 To continue using the Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire) Designation Order (No 1) 1998 with regard to fouling or, as proposed, to further fully consider the legislative tools available in dealing with dog control issues in the county.

5.2 To continue engagement with relevant Town and Community Councils and landowners with responsibility for public spaces to list the areas where Dogs on Leads and Dog Exclusion restrictions are needed.

5.3 To consider the outcomes of the engagement in a further report to Place Scrutiny Committee, and to seek endorsement of a public consultation on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

6.1 A progress report to Place Scrutiny Committee one year after implementation of a PSPO.

6.2 A PSPO can be made for a maximum duration of up to three years, after which it may be extended if certain criteria under the Act are met. This includes that an extension is necessary to prevent activity recurring. Extensions can be repeated, with each lasting for a maximum of three years. A further consultation process is required if a PSPO time period is to be extended.

7. REASONS:

7.1 Despite the efforts of responsible dog owners and collaborative working through initiatives such as the Give Dog Fouling the Red Card group, dog fouling continues to be a problem. Requiring people to clean up after their dogs which foul on any public space in the county, appears to be a justified, proportionate response to the ongoing issue.

- 7.2 To ensure the potential requirement / offence for persons in charge of a dog in a public space to carry a means for collecting dog mess is fully considered.
- 7.3 There will be costs attributable to the introduction of Dogs on Leads / Exclusion Areas so continued Member scrutiny and support is crucial if this is to be progressed.
- 7.4 To enable further scrutiny on the draft PSPO prior to public consultation.
- 7.5 To ensure fair, transparent, efficient and effective discharge of powers available to the Council under the Act.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 Costs of consultation to be absorbed by existing budgets. If a PSPO for dog controls is introduced there will be cost implications including for enclosing or otherwise demarcating designated areas, signage and enforcement, to be considered in later reports.

9. CONSULTEES

Chief Officer Social Care and Health
Head of Public Protection
Estates Development Manager, Landlord Services
Head of Waste & Street Services
Chief Officer People and Governance
Chief Operating Officer for Mon Life
Chief Officer Children and Young People
Environment & Culture Manager
Youth Offending Team Service Manager

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Report to Strong Communities Select Committee 'Public Spaces Protection Order' for Dog Controls, 12th March 2020.

Report to Strong Communities Select Committee 'Public Spaces Protection Order' for Dog Controls, 10th March 2022.

- 11 **AUTHOR:** Huw Owen, Principal Environmental Health Officer

12. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01873 735433
E-mail: huwowen@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix One: Equality & Future Generations Evaluation

This page is intentionally left blank



<p>Name of the Officer completing the evaluation Huw Owen</p> <p>Phone no: 01873 735433 E-mail: huwowen@monmouthshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > To inform Members on the findings of engagement with relevant stakeholders on dog controls being considered in a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in Monmouthshire. > To seek endorsement from Members for a draft PSPO, when progressed, to include the offence of a person in charge of a dog which has defecated on any public space in the county failing to remove the faeces from the land. > Request Members to consider and decide on the potential inclusion in a draft PSPO of an offence if a person in charge of a dog does not have the appropriate means to pick up any faeces deposited by that dog. > to seek endorsement from Members to continue consultation with stakeholders on controls in particular Dog Exclusion and Dogs on Leads Areas.
<p>Name of Service area</p> <p>Public Protection</p>	<p>Date</p> <p>19th April 2023</p>

1. **Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below.

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Age	Young children are most likely to be exposed to dog fouling through their outside play activities and potential health impacts if personal hygiene has not fully developed.	Concern regarding impact of restricting access to parks, playing fields etc may have on elderly dog owners, particularly those with mobility issues.	Implications to be considered by stakeholders responsible for public spaces. For example accessibility of alternative public spaces for dog exercise where Dogs on Leads / Exclusion areas are proposed.
Disability	Wheelchair users particularly affected by dog fouling on streets, pathways etc.	Concerns for persons with disabilities being able to pick up dog faeces.	Application of appropriate exemptions in any draft PSPO
Gender reassignment	None	None	N/A
Marriage or civil partnership	None	None	N/A
Pregnancy or maternity	None	Potential accessibility issues if parks, playing fields etc are designated Dog Exclusion Areas.	For consideration by stakeholders responsible for public spaces if Dogs on Leads / Exclusion areas are proposed.
Race	None	None	N/A
Religion or Belief	None	None	N/A
Sex	None	None	N/A
Sexual Orientation	None	None	N/A
Welsh Language	Future public consultations and PSPO signage will need to be bi lingual	None	N/A





Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Poverty	None	None	N/A


2. **Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below?** Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal. There's no need to put something in every box if it is not relevant!

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<p>A prosperous Wales Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs</p>	Positive: Aim is to ensure the Council uses legislative tools available to be efficient and effective in carrying out its responsibilities to help provide a clean, healthy environment.	N/A
<p>A resilient Wales Maintain and enhance biodiversity and ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g. climate change)</p>	Positive: To help secure a behavioural change so that dog fouling is socially unacceptable and reduce pressure on the county, town and community councils to deal with it. Resources then freed up to deal with other priorities.	N/A
<p>A healthier Wales People's physical and mental wellbeing is maximized and health impacts are understood</p>	Positive: Further appraisal promotes consideration of the best way to deal with dog control issues which negatively affect the community's quality of life, in a proportionate and efficient manner.	N/A
<p>A Wales of cohesive communities</p>	Positive: dog fouling is considered to be the environmental problem which has the greatest	N/A

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Communities are attractive, viable, safe and well connected	impact on the look and feel of a neighbourhood. Further appraisal of options will help guide officers in the best way to help deliver behavioural change.	
A globally responsible Wales Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic and environmental wellbeing	Positive: setting an example for developing communities which are attractive, viable and safe.	N/A
A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language Culture, heritage and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art and recreation	Positive: aim is to ensure sports and play areas in Monmouthshire are free from dog fouling	N/A
A more equal Wales People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances	N/A	N/A

3. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Long Term</p> <p>Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future</p>	<p>The ongoing considerations are aimed at guiding officers / members on the best way to reduce fouling and other dog control issues in public areas both in the short and long term.</p>	<p>To be considered, but will need to include appropriate exemptions.</p>
 <p>Collaboration</p> <p>Working together with other partners to deliver objectives</p>	<p>Ongoing consultation with stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county on the controls needed and locations.</p>	<p>Consultation feedback to be fully considered.</p>
 <p>Involvement</p> <p>Involving those with an interest and seeking their views</p>	<p>Ongoing consultation with stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county on the controls needed and locations.</p>	<p>Consultation feedback to be fully considered.</p>
 <p>Prevention</p> <p>Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse</p>	<p>Intention is to consider and where appropriate use the legislative tools available with the aim of helping to achieve behavioural change in the small percentage of dog owners who are not acting responsibly.</p>	<p>Further consultation feedback to be fully considered in due course.</p>

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Considering impact on all wellbeing goals together and on other bodies</p>	<p>The findings of the wide ranging public consultation and ongoing stakeholder consultation to inform a proportionate, properly considered draft PSPO.</p>	<p>Consultation feedback to be fully considered</p>

4. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions has on the following important responsibilities: Social Justice, Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect any of these responsibilities?

Describe any positive impacts your proposal has	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has	What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Social Justice	Public Spaces Protection Order powers being considered enable a proportionate response / penalty for an offence.	Further consultation feedback to be fully considered in due course.
Safeguarding	Having the legislative powers available helps protect the public health of all age groups.	
Corporate Parenting		

5. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?

Complaints received by Environmental Health, Waste and Street Services and participants in Give Dog Fouling The Red Card Working Group; Public consultation 26th July to 26th October 2022 – 1334 responses; Ongoing stakeholder consultation.

6. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?

Proposals will help consider further the dog control issues in the county and how best to use the legislation available to improve the situation and secure cleaner, healthier public areas.

A further report to Place Scrutiny Committee is proposed with a draft PSPO to be endorsed for public consultation.

Following public consultation on a draft PSPO a report is then provided to Place Scrutiny Committee for pre-decision scrutiny before the Order goes to Cabinet or Individual Cabinet Member, (Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Economy), for decision.

7. ACTIONS: As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.

What are you going to do	When are you going to do it?	Who is responsible
Further consultation with stakeholders responsible for public spaces particularly with regard to Dog Exclusion / Dogs on Leads Areas.	Ongoing. To be completed early May 2023	Huw Owen. Environmental Health; Waste + Street Services section.

Provide a draft PSPO	In readiness for report to Place Scrutiny Committee on the 25 th May 2023.	Huw Owen. Environmental Health; Waste + Street Services section.

8. VERSION CONTROL: The Equality and Future Generations Evaluation should be used at the earliest stage, such as informally within your service, and then further developed throughout the decision making process. It is important to keep a record of this process to demonstrate how you have considered and built in equality and future generations considerations wherever possible.

Version No.	Decision making stage	Date considered	Brief description of any amendments made following consideration
1	Place Scrutiny Committee	19 th April 2023	

SUBJECT: PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER FOR DOG CONTROLS

MEETING: Strong Communities Select Committee

DATE: 12th March 2020

DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: All

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 To seek endorsement from Members to commence public consultation on the introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order for dog controls in Monmouthshire under the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Members consider the proposed approach, comment accordingly and endorse the proposal for public consultation on the introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for dog controls, potentially relating to fouling, exclusion areas and dogs on leads areas.
- 2.2 The findings of the public consultation and appraisal of the options are reported back to Stronger Communities Select Committee, together with recommendations on the merits of making a Public Spaces Protection Order and the detail of controls to be included in such an Order.
- 2.3 Following the second report to Stronger Communities Select Committee a further public consultation is commenced on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order if one is considered to be needed.
- 2.4 In the context of public consultation feedback a third report is then provided to Stronger Communities Select Committee for pre-decision scrutiny before the Order goes to Cabinet or Individual Cabinet Member, (Cabinet Member for Social Justice & Community Development), for decision.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1 Despite the efforts of responsible dog owners and many partners, dog fouling continues to be a problem nationwide. As provided in Keep Wales Tidy 'Litter in Wales Understanding Littering and Litterers Executive Summary Report 2010', the Welsh public considers dog fouling the environmental problem which has the greatest impact on the look and feel of a

neighbourhood. This position is reflected in Monmouthshire with a significant number of complaints to Members and Officers.

- 3.2 A working group has been established in Monmouthshire since early 2015 comprised of a number of Town and Community Councils, (currently 22 involved), working in partnership with Environmental Health and Waste and Street Services. The primary focus of the Group is to raise awareness of the anti-social nature of dog fouling, and help develop a social conscience that dog owners should 'pick up' under the brand **Give Dog Fouling the Red Card**. This collaborative working has helped target 'hot spot' areas, fund signage with consistent messaging, and deliver awareness raising days several times a year in locations where fouling has been highlighted as a problem.
- 3.3 The legislative backdrop to this ongoing work is the **Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire) Designation Order (No 1) 1998** which is provided in Appendix 1. The Order which came into force on the 29th June 1998 designates the areas of land in Monmouthshire, Part 1 by description, Part 2 specifically, to which the provisions of the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 apply. Currently if a dog defecates at any time on designated land in Monmouthshire and a person who is in charge of the dog fails to remove the faeces from the land forthwith, that person is guilty of an offence unless there is a reasonable excuse for failing to do so.
- 3.4 However as with many issues relating to the quality of our local environment, dog fouling continues to prove a complex issue to tackle. Many factors influence whether persons 'pick up' after their dogs such as time of day, weather, footfall, the location, facilities (bags, bins) etc. While there has been a generally improving picture in Monmouthshire, complaint levels to Environmental Health remain substantial:
- 2015 – 120 complaints
2016 – 100 complaints
2017 – 122 complaints
2018 – 90 complaints
2019 – 89 complaints
- 3.5 In addition Keep Wales Tidy carry out an annual All Wales Local Environmental Audit to provide a 'snap shot' of litter, which includes dog fouling, across local authority areas. The 2019 – 20 survey encountered dog fouling on 16.7% of streets across Monmouthshire, (48 streets surveyed), and while no streets were found to have a significant or a severe presence, it is the highest recorded in the county since 2013 – 14 and significantly higher than the national average of 8.8%.
- 3.6 It is clear from research that a holistic approach is needed to help bring about behavioural change and long lasting impact. It is important therefore that collaborative working on a local level continues through initiatives such as the Give Dog Fouling the Red Card group.
- 3.7 It is important as well for the Authority to make full use of the tools provided by legislation. The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 introduced new powers for use by councils to address anti-social behaviour including Public Spaces Protection

Orders (PSPOs). Under the provisions of the Act local authorities must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the activity subject to an Order:

- has, or is likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality.
- is, or is likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature.
- is, or is likely to be, unreasonable.
- justifies the restrictions being imposed.

3.8 When assessing what is 'unreasonable' activity, there is a need to balance the rights of the community to enjoy public spaces, with the civil liberties of individuals and groups who may be affected by any restrictions imposed. Early engagement with our communities is therefore essential in order to fully understand the many views that are likely, consider the evidence of need for a PSPO and what it needs to contain.

3.9 **A 3 month** wide ranging open public consultation is therefore proposed which will include, but not limited to, the Chief of Police, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, elected Members, Council Officers, the general public and external agencies, especially those with a vested interest such as Keep Wales Tidy, Dogs Trust and the Kennel Club. The consultation will explain that the aim is to help ensure there is a balance so that dog owners can enjoy their dogs and ensure their welfare, whilst at the same time others can still enjoy public spaces without interference or impact from dogs and irresponsible dog ownership.

3.10 The consultation will seek views on the need for dog controls such as, but not limited to, the following areas:

Dog Fouling

- To make it an offence to fail to remove dog faeces from any land to which the public have access across the county.

Dog Exclusion Areas

- Such as school grounds, children's play areas and marked sports pitches.

Dogs on Leads Areas

- Specified areas such as cemeteries.
- On any land to which the public have access when directed to do so by an Authorised Officer where a dog is considered to be out of control or causing alarm and distress.

3.11 As is the case with the existing Order, breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence with a fine liable on prosecution in court of up to £1000. Authorised Officers can issue a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) to offer the recipient the opportunity to discharge liability for the offence. FPN levels for breach of a PSPO were agreed by Cabinet on the 7 September 2016 and are £100 payable within 14 days, reduced to £75 if paid within 10 days. This reflects a slight increase for breach of the existing Order of £75 discounted to £50 for early payment.

4. EQUALITY AND FUTURE GENERATIONS EVALUATION, (includes social justice, safeguarding and corporate parenting):

4.1 The completed 'Equalities & Future Generations Evaluation' form is provided as Appendix Two, attached.

4.2 There is a clear need to consider carefully the potential impact of a PSPO on different sections of our communities. For example exemptions for particular groups may be appropriate such as those using assistance dogs, emergency services etc. The public consultation is proposed to ensure the varied needs of our communities are considered fully with any resultant PSPO positively impacting the wellbeing goal of a healthier Wales.

5. OPTIONS APPRAISAL:

5.1 To continue using the Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire) Designation Order (No 1) 1998 or, as proposed, to fully consider the legislative tools available in dealing with dog control issues in the county. The findings of the public consultation will help properly inform the next steps with an appraisal of the options presented in a second report to Stronger Communities Select.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

6.1 A progress report to Stronger Communities Select one year after implementation of a PSPO.

6.2 A PSPO can be made for a maximum duration of up to three years, after which it may be extended if certain criteria under the Act are met. This includes that an extension is necessary to prevent activity recurring. Extensions can be repeated, with each lasting for a maximum of three years. A further consultation process is required if a PSPO time period is to be extended.

7. REASONS:

7.1 To ensure fair, transparent, efficient and effective discharge of powers available to the Council under the Act.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

8.1 Costs of consultation to be absorbed by existing budgets. If a PSPO for dog controls is introduced there will be cost implications including for signage and enforcement, to be considered when appropriate in later reports.

9. CONSULTEES:

Social Care & Health DMT
Strategic Leadership Team

Head of Public Protection
Head of Waste & Street Services
Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services
Chief Operating Officer for Mon Life
Environment & Culture Manager
Head of Governance, Engagement and Improvement
Youth Offending Team Service Manager

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Anti-social behaviour powers
Statutory guidance for frontline professionals. Updated August 2019.

11. AUTHOR:

Huw Owen, Principal Environmental Health Officer

12. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01873 735433
E-mail: huwowen@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix One: Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire)
Designation Order (No 1) 1998
Appendix Two: Equality & Future Generations Evaluation

This page is intentionally left blank

SUBJECT: PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER FOR DOG CONTROLS

MEETING: Strong Communities Select Committee

DATE: 10th March 2022

DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: All

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 To inform Members of the findings of a public consultation on plans to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order, (PSPO), for dog controls in Monmouthshire under the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
- 1.2 To seek endorsement from Members to progress consultation with stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county, including relevant council departments, town and community councils and private landowners, regarding the controls needed (dog fouling, dogs on leads / exemption locations) and areas in the county to be covered in a PSPO by such controls.
- 1.3 To seek endorsement from Members for a draft PSPO, when progressed, to include: an offence for a person in charge of a dog when in a public space in the county failing to put a dog on a lead, of no more than 2 metres length, when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Members consider the findings of the public consultation and comment accordingly on the potential introduction of a PSPO for dog controls relating to fouling, exclusion areas and dogs on leads areas for public spaces in the county.
- 2.2 Environmental Health share the findings of the public consultation on dog fouling and dogs on leads / exemption areas, with relevant stakeholders responsible for public spaces in the county, to establish what controls, if any, they consider are needed and to identify specific locations accordingly.
- 2.3 Members consider, comment on and endorse the proposal for a draft PSPO, when progressed, to include for the following offence: for a person in charge of a dog when in a public space in the county failing to put a dog on a lead, of no more than 2 metres length, when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control, or causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance.

- 2.4 That a third report is presented to this Committee, following engagement with relevant stakeholders (as outlined in 2.2), to endorse a further public consultation on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order, if one is considered to be needed.
- 2.5 That a fourth and final report is then provided to this Committee, further to public consultation feedback on the draft PSPO, for pre-decision scrutiny before the Order goes to Cabinet or Individual Cabinet Member, (Cabinet Member for Social Justice & Community Development), for decision.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1 A report to Members on the 12th March 2020 illustrated that, despite the efforts of responsible dog owners and many partners, dog fouling continues to be a problem in public spaces in the county. Fouling issues are often the trigger for requests for controls to be introduced in public spaces such as dogs on leads or exemption areas. While it is important that collaborative working on a local level continues through initiatives such as the Give Dog Fouling the Red Card group, it is also important that the Authority makes full use of the tools provided by legislation.
- 3.2 The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 introduced new powers for use by Councils to address anti-social behaviour, including Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs). Under the provisions of the Act, local authorities must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the activity subject to an Order:
- has, or is likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality.
 - is, or is likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature.
 - is, or is likely to be, unreasonable.
 - justifies the restrictions being imposed.
- 3.3 The aim is to stop the unreasonable behaviour in public spaces by introducing restrictions on the use of an area. A public space is defined as ***'any place to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission.'***
- 3.4 When assessing what is 'unreasonable' activity, there is a need to balance the rights of the community to enjoy public spaces, with the civil liberties of individuals and groups who may be affected by any restrictions imposed. The March 2020 report recommendation to Members to endorse a public consultation on the introduction of a PSPO for dog controls, was agreed.
- 3.5 The public consultation was delayed by the emergence of Covid 19. A wide ranging 3 month consultation was undertaken from the 26th July to 26th October 2021. This comprised a bilingual introductory note explaining the PSPO considerations and a questionnaire. It was provided on the Council's website for completion online, with a paper copy available on request. Awareness to the survey was raised on the Council's social media accounts and direct messaging including to elected members, local business

groups, dog interest organisations (RSPCA, Dogs Trust, Kennel Club), private landowners with responsibility for public areas and registered sports clubs.

- 3.6 The introductory note and questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1. A total of 1330 were completed online and 4 paper copy returns, the vast majority 1264 (94.8%), marked as completed by residents; 931 (69.8%) of the returns by dog owners.
- 3.7 The consultation sought views on the need for dog controls in a PSPO with regard to fouling, dog exemption areas and dogs on leads. The summary headlines are as follows, with a more detail analysis of the results inserted, for ease of reference, in each relevant section of the questionnaire in Appendix 1.
- 3.8 **Dog Fouling.** Currently the issue of dog fouling is addressed in the County through the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996. However the offence of failing to remove the faeces only covers certain designated land, as detailed in the Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire) Designation Order (No 1) 1998, in Part 1 by general description and Part 2 specifically. It does not include all public spaces.
- 3.9 PSPOs enable a more wide ranging application and may apply to any public place as defined in paragraph 3.3.
- 3.10 The consultation results provide:
- 798 (59.8%) consider dog fouling to be a problem, 536 (40.2%) that it is not.
 - Of the 798 who said fouling is a problem the majority 646 (81%) state they notice uncollected dog waste *Always / Frequently*, while 152 (19%) *Sometimes / Rarely*.
 - Of the 931 dog owners, 470 (50.5%) said that it is a problem, 461 (49.5%) that its not.
 - Of the 403 non dog owners, 328 (81.4%) said that it is a problem, 75 (18.6%) that its not.
 - 795 (59.6%) said they typically see uncollected dog waste on pavements or public footpaths; 158(11.8%) on parkland; 78 (5.8%) on sports pitches; 19 (1.4%) on playgrounds; 6 (0.5%) in cemeteries; 278 (20.8%) other locations.
 - 1163 (87.2%) support a control requiring dog owners to remove dog faeces if their dog fouls any land to which the public have access across the county; 171 (12.8%) do not.
 - A response was received from the Dog's Trust (full response provided in Appendix 2) which included the following:

Dogs Trust consider 'scooping the poop' to be an integral element of responsible dog ownership and would fully support a well-implemented order on fouling. We urge the Council to enforce any such order rigorously. In order to maximise

compliance we urge the Council to consider whether an adequate number of disposal points have been provided for responsible owners to use, to consider providing free disposal bags and to ensure that there is sufficient signage in place.

- 3.11 It is evident from the consultation that the failure to ‘pick up’ after a dog has fouled continues to be an important issue in our environment which has a detrimental effect on the quality of life. This is likely to continue, despite the continuing efforts of responsible dog owners and the ongoing collaborative work with Town and Community Councils.
- 3.12 Therefore a provision in a draft PSPO requiring people to clean up after their dogs, which foul on any public space in the county, appears to be a justified, proportionate response to the ongoing fouling problems. A public space may be privately owned, eg by the Canal and Rivers Trust, Registered Social landlords, Woodland Trust, NRW etc. These and other landowners were included in the consultation but minimal response received. It is therefore recommended that a further approach is made to inform them of the findings of the consultation, and seek their endorsement for all public space to be included in a draft PSPO.
- 3.13 **Dogs on Leads by Direction.** Of those who responded to the consultation 1073 (80.4%) agreed to a new offence for failing to put a dog on a lead, of no more than 2 metres length, when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance. This proposal was ‘*enthusiastically*’ supported by the Dogs Trust in their response:
- We consider that this order is by far the most useful, other than the fouling order, because it allows enforcement officers to target the owners of dogs that are allowing them to cause a nuisance without restricting the responsible owner and their dog. As none of the other orders, less fouling, are likely to be effective without proper enforcement we would be content if the others were dropped in favour of this order.*
- 3.14 In view of this consistent consultation response it is recommended that when a draft PSPO is progressed and consulted on it includes a county wide offence **for failing to put a dog on a lead, of no more than 2 metres length, when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance.** This is a fair, proportionate means of dealing with dog control issues as they occur.
- 3.15 **Dogs on Leads Areas and Dog Exclusion Areas.** These were considered in the consultation in response to concerns regarding fouling, dogs not properly controlled and the need for certain areas to be child or sporting user friendly.
- 3.16 A summary of the consultation responses is provided in the table below:

	Dogs on Leads Areas	Dog Exclusion Areas
Children’s playgrounds	1237 (92.7%) agree / strongly agree.	955 (71.6%) agree / strongly agree.
Marked sports pitches	1000 (75%) agree / strongly agree	743 (55.7%) agree / strongly agree.

School grounds	1239 (92.8%) agree / strongly agree.	897 (67.2%) agree / strongly agree.
Cemeteries	1141 (85.5%) agree / strongly agree.	676 (50.7%) disagree / strongly disagree.

- 3.17 Specifically with regard to Dogs on Leads Areas over 2100 comments were received for the 2 open dialogue questions. Reasons given for agreeing to such areas include owners having more control over their dogs so reducing the amount of uncollected faeces; reduce fouling levels on marked sports pitches / school grounds; and safety of children from out of control dogs. Reasons given for those in disagreement include dogs can be under control without being on leads and dogs require off lead exercise.
- 3.18 Other public spaces are proposed in a number of survey responses for dogs to be kept on a lead including parks, canal tow paths etc as detailed in Appendix 1.
- 3.19 The Dogs Trust accepted that *'there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be kept on a lead'* but *'urge the Council to consider the Animal Welfare Act 2006 section 9 requirements (the 'duty of care') that include the dog's need to exhibit normal behaviour patterns – this includes the need for sufficient exercise including the need to run off lead in appropriate areas'*.
- 3.20 Specifically with regard to Dog Exclusion Areas over 1650 comments were received for the 2 open dialogue questions. Again the main themes for those who agree / disagree and other public spaces proposed are given in Appendix 1.
- 3.21 The Dogs Trust *'accepts that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be excluded, such as children's play areas, however we would recommend that exclusion areas are kept to a minimum and that, for enforcement reasons, they are restricted to enclosed areas'*. The Trust advised *'excluding dogs from all sports pitches for long stretches of the year is unnecessary. In some cases sports pitches may account for a large part of the open space available in a public park, and therefore excluding dogs could significantly reduce available dog walking space for owners'*.
- 3.22 The consultation shows that there are public spaces where the control of dogs can be cause for concern, particularly children's playgrounds and school grounds. However the appropriateness and practicality of such controls needs further detailed consideration. There will be cost implications attributable to controls not least ensuring the areas concerned are properly enclosed or otherwise demarcated, sign posted and other provisions such as 'tying up posts'. Again some of these public spaces will be privately owned, for example by Registered Social landlords, Woodland Trust, NRW etc and there will be an expectation for any costs to be borne by the landowner.
- 3.23 It is therefore recommended that a further approach is made to the stakeholders with responsibility for the areas under consideration, including relevant sections of the council, together with each Town and Community Council, to inform of the findings of the

consultation and seek their view on the need for controls, if any, the nature of such controls and the location(s) concerned.

4. EQUALITY AND FUTURE GENERATIONS EVALUATION, (includes social justice, safeguarding and corporate parenting):

- 4.1 The completed 'Equalities & Future Generations Evaluation' form is provided as Appendix Three, attached.
- 4.2 There is a clear need to consider carefully the potential impact of a PSPO on different sections of our communities. Consultation responses include concerns for persons with certain disabilities not being able to pick up dog faeces, and consideration will need to be given to the application of appropriate exemptions in any draft PSPO. A common theme in the responses was concern regarding the impact of restricting access to parks, playing fields etc may have on persons with mobility issues. Walking dogs in such areas is cited as benefiting both dog and the owner. This will be conveyed to the stakeholders to take account of in their Dogs on Leads / Exclusion Area considerations. Any PSPO will need to ensure the varied needs of our communities are considered, positively impacting the wellbeing goal of a healthier Wales.

5. OPTIONS APPRAISAL:

- 5.1 To continue using the Monmouthshire County Council (Fouling of Land by Dogs) (Monmouthshire) Designation Order (No 1) 1998 or, as proposed, to further fully consider the legislative tools available in dealing with dog control issues in the county.
- 5.2 The findings of the public consultation to help properly inform the next steps. In particular engagement with the sections in the council and other stakeholders responsible for public spaces, together with Town and Community Councils, to list the areas where controls are needed, their nature and reasons why needed. To consider the outcomes of the further engagement in a third report to Stronger Communities Select, and to seek endorsement of a further public consultation on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

- 6.1 A progress report to Stronger Communities Select one year after implementation of a PSPO.
- 6.2 A PSPO can be made for a maximum duration of up to three years, after which it may be extended if certain criteria under the Act are met. This includes that an extension is necessary to prevent activity recurring. Extensions can be repeated, with each lasting for a maximum of three years. A further consultation process is required if a PSPO time period is to be extended.

7. REASONS:

7.1 To ensure fair, transparent, efficient and effective discharge of powers available to the Council under the Act.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

8.1 Costs of consultation to be absorbed by existing budgets. If a PSPO for dog controls is introduced there will be cost implications including for enclosing or otherwise demarcating designated areas, signage and enforcement, to be considered when appropriate in later reports.

9. CONSULTEES

Social Care & Health DMT
Strategic Leadership Team
Head of Public Protection
Head of Commercial, Property, Fleet & Facilities
Head of Waste & Street Services
Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services
Chief Operating Officer for Mon Life
Environment & Culture Manager
Head of Governance, Engagement and Improvement
Youth Offending Team Service Manager

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Anti-social behaviour powers
Statutory guidance for frontline professionals. Updated August 2019.

Report to Strong Communities Select Committee 'Public Spaces Protection Order' for Dog Controls, 12th March 2020.

11 AUTHOR: Huw Owen, Principal Environmental Health Officer

12. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01873 735433
E-mail: huwowen@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix One: Public consultation on plans to introduce a PSPO on dog controls in the county, 26th July to 26th October 2020, including results analysis.

Appendix Two: Consultation response from Dogs Trust dated 13th August 2021.

Appendix Three: Equality & Future Generations Evaluation

This page is intentionally left blank

SUBJECT:	MONNOW STREET PUBLIC REALM AND ACTIVE TRAVEL IMPROVEMENT SCHEME
MEETING:	PLACE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	19 APRIL 2023
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:	MONMOUTH

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE:

- 1.1 Design development and consultation on proposals for public realm and active travel improvements in Monnow Street has been underway since late 2020. A wide range of options was considered and consulted on at the beginning of the process, and a shortlist was presented for consultation in early 2022.
- 1.2 Over the last six months a concept design for a single preferred option has been developed, informed by an extensive consultation and engagement process. The proposed scheme will formalise an amended version of the current temporary layout in Monnow Street and is intended to create a pleasant and safe environment for people on foot or cycle which encourages people to visit and spend more time in Monnow Street while maintaining two-way vehicle traffic.
- 1.3 Public consultation in February and March 2023 showed support for most of the design aspects of the proposals. Targeted business consultation also found strong support for the proposals
- 1.4 The purpose of this report is to brief members and allow them to scrutinise the proposed design for Monnow Street and the process by which it has been developed, prior to the design being considered by Cabinet for approval and delivery, subject to funding.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Scrutiny Committee scrutinises the work undertaken to date to arrive at the proposals for public realm and active travel improvements in Monnow Street, Monmouth, and endorses the scheme for adoption by Cabinet.

3 KEY ISSUES:

Background

- 3.1 Monnow Street is the main high street through the centre of Monmouth and is the towns primary shopping area. Monnow Street and the town centre as whole provide a broad range of facilities and services and fulfil a function as a focus for both the community and public transport.
- 3.2 Although there has been relatively recent investment in the streetscape in other parts of the town centre – notably Agincourt Square, where footways were widened to create more space for pedestrians and high quality surfaces introduced – Monnow Street’s public realm is tired and in places requires repair or renewal. Over time an accrual of street furniture and other items means that it has become cluttered and untidy.
- 3.3 In 2020, temporary measures were put in place in Monnow Street in response to Covid 19, creating more space for social distancing and to allow more outdoor trading for businesses. This was done by removing some parking spaces and narrowing the carriageway to allow temporary widening of pavements and the creation of areas for outdoor seating. Freestanding planters were later introduced for amenity value and to prevent illegal parking on footways.
- 3.4 Various iterations were trialled during 2020, including a one-way system and widening the pedestrian areas with railings, bollards or water-filled barriers. The measures were adjusted in response to feedback before temporary kerbing and tarmac infill areas were introduced in late 2020. These temporary measures were effective in supporting businesses to allow them to continue trading during Covid restrictions, and there is some evidence that they have been popular with users of the town centre: in a survey in October 2021¹, two thirds of respondents said that the measures had had a positive impact on the town centre.
- 3.5 However, the temporary measures have caused or exacerbated issues with drainage and flooding on the footway, and due to the camber of the carriageway have created uneven surfaces which make movement difficult for some people. The changes were not intended or designed to be permanent, and some elements are likely to deteriorate to the point where they require renewal or removal within the next 18 months.
- 3.6 Some degree of change and investment in Monnow Street is therefore likely to be required in the relatively near future, irrespective of any decision on the proposed public realm and active travel improvements set out here.
- 3.7 As part of the early stages of development which led to the current proposal for Monnow Street, the following problems were identified through consultation with stakeholders, on-site observation and analysis of traffic and other data as issues to be tackled through the scheme:

¹ Intercept survey interviews with 44 town centre users, conducted in Monmouth town centre by MCC Active Travel officers, 28 October 2021.

- Accessibility: lack of dedicated provision for walking and cycling, such as crossing facilities and safe connections into nearby routes, discouraging active travel.
- Congestion: reliance on car travel for local journeys causes congestion, negatively impacts air quality and causes nuisance to people visiting, working and living on Monnow Street.
- Economic: the need to enhance the town centre environment to sustain and support local businesses.
- Highway: the highway width varies significantly, encouraging excessive/double parking and increased traffic speeds and modal conflict.
- Road safety: Monnow Street is dominated by traffic and delivery vehicles resulting in actual and perceived safety concerns.
- Social/cultural: historical and archaeological importance of existing infrastructure needs to be protected.

3.8 The visual and functional dominance of cars and other motor vehicles in Monnow Street is a particular issue. Combined with the relative lack of formal places to cross, this makes it difficult and potentially dangerous for pedestrians to move around the street. The width of the carriageway encourages double parking and double loading, the latter currently exacerbated by insufficient provision of loading spaces.

3.9 There is widespread concern among stakeholders about the economic viability of Monnow Street and Monmouth town centre more widely. Many of the challenges which retailers in Monmouth face – increased competition from the internet and out-of-town shopping; changes in shopping behaviour during and since the pandemic; increased business rates and rent; the downturn in the economy and the cost of living crisis – are common to all towns and high streets in Wales and across the UK. However, Monmouth is perceived to be faring less well than other towns in the county, and this is borne out by some data.

3.10 The most visible and frequently cited indicator of Monmouth's economic fragility is the rise in vacant commercial units. As the chart below shows, this issue pre-dates Covid 19 but has continued to worsen during and since the pandemic. More recent analysis by officers in March 2023 found 32 empty units in the town centre, which is a vacancy rate of around 20%. This is the highest in the county and above the average for high streets in Wales of 16.2%. Vacancy rates are constantly changing, and we understand two new businesses are about to open on Monnow Street, which is positive news. However, it is clear that support and intervention is needed and the Regeneration team is working on this.




Figure 1: Vacancy rates over time within the Central Shopping Area

3.11 Data on footfall in Monmouth and other towns in the county is collected in an annual survey which includes pedestrian flow counts at key locations around the town centre, conducted on peak and non-peak days. The data shows considerable fluctuation in pedestrian flows in Monmouth between 2003 and 2021, the most recent year for which data is available. Footfall declined in 2014 and 2015, but then stabilised until 2019, when the survey recorded a sharp increase. Footfall fell again in 2020: this is likely to be due to the impact of the pandemic and associated restrictions and was reflected across all town centres in Monmouthshire. The 2021 footfall survey indicates a modest increase.




Figure 2: Average daily pedestrian flow rates over time

3.12 Anecdotally, some retailers report that footfall remains lower than before the pandemic, and that takings have fallen as a consequence.

3.13 Clearly no single intervention is likely to address all the challenges which a town centre may face, or to solve all the problems – in relation to traffic and active travel as well as

the town centre economy – that have been identified for Monnow Street. Discussions are underway with Monmouth town council on the joint production of a Placemaking Plan for Monmouth, which will provide an opportunity to consider these wider challenges – and opportunities – that the town centre faces and provide an action plan which sets out how the county and town councils and other stakeholders could most effectively intervene. It is expected that the Placemaking Plan will be commissioned in Q1 2023/24. The Placemaking Plan priorities open opportunities for Welsh Government grant funding via the Transforming Towns fund, a report on which came to this Scrutiny Committee on 30 June 2022.

3.14 However, there is a substantial and growing body of evidence that investment in high quality public realm which prioritises active travel modes is not only positive in terms of safety, health and wellbeing, but also delivers economic benefits.

3.15 For example, research carried out for TfL by University College London’s Bartlett School of Planning² compared locations that had benefited from street improvements with comparable locations that had not yet been improved. It found that investment in the public realm in high streets and town centres brought “substantial benefits to the everyday users of streets, and to the occupiers of space and investors in surrounding property in multiple ways”. This included:

- 96% rise in “static street behaviours” (e.g. standing, waiting, and sitting) and a 93% increase in active (e.g. walking) street behaviours in improved over unimproved areas
- 216% increase in “leisure based static activities” (e.g. stopping at a café or sitting at a bench) driven by improved quality of environment
- “Very strong perceptions amongst both everyday street users and local property occupiers that street improvement schemes significantly enhance street character, walkability, ease of crossing, opportunities for sitting, and general street vibrancy.”
- 17% per annum difference in vacancy rates between improved and unimproved street environments

3.16 A 2018 study published by Living Streets³ looked at the impact of “investment in better streets and places” and in particular “in the public realm and walkability”. Taking data from case studies around the world, it found:

- A £10m investment in Piccadilly, Stoke-on-Trent to make the area more walkable led to 30% more footfall.
- If more space is given for walking and cycling and less to cars, the absence of customers arriving by car is more than compensated by people arriving on foot or by bike. A scheme which reassigned highway space to pedestrians in San Francisco increased pedestrian traffic on weeknights by 37%. A similar scheme in London increased takings in an adjacent shop by 20%.

² <https://content.tfl.gov.uk/street-appeal.pdf>

³ <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/3890/pedestrian-pound-2018.pdf>

- A review of a number of academic studies found that retail footfall increases by around a third and retail turnover by an average of 17% as a direct result of improvements to the pedestrian environment.
- The study found that there is “strong evidence” that pedestrians and cyclists spend more than people arriving by car.

The Proposed Design

3.17 A concept plan of the proposed design for Monnow Street, along with CGI before and after images, is provided at Appendix 1. A full design report which provides more detail about the proposal and its evolution as informed by consultation is provided at Appendix 2 Key elements of the design include:

- Extended pavements creating more space for pedestrians
- Areas for “dwell” creating places for pause and spending time in the street
- Space for businesses to spill out into the street
- More pedestrian crossings, located strategically to serve the whole street
- Trees and landscaping – for amenity as well as drainage and biodiversity
- Dedicated loading bays spread evenly along the street
- Short stay and disabled parking conveniently located along the street
- Seasonal café seating areas which can provide additional parking in winter
- Bike parking for a range of bikes, including those with buggies or carts attached
- Two-way vehicle traffic is maintained

3.18 The proposed design is the result of a process of scheme development and consultation which has been underway since late 2020. The process has followed the Welsh Government’s WelTAG framework for developing and appraising transport proposals and is described below.

WelTAG Stage 1: Longlist of Options

3.19 The first stage of options appraisal and consultation, WelTAG 1, was done in late 2020. It sought to assess the key issues of concern, explore the context for the scheme, and to consider a longlist of possible options for Monnow Street.

3.20 Capita were appointed as consultants to carry out the WelTAG 1 study. Through on-site observation, consultation with stakeholders and the public as well as desk-based research they made an assessment of the problems to be addressed and identified the following objectives for the scheme:

- To enable Monmouth to thrive as a vibrant destination place by creating a safe environment for all road users to stimulate the local economy;
- To encourage pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users (Active Travel modes) to use Monnow Street by reducing barriers to modal shift;

- To improve connectivity and accessibility to trip attractors by Active Travel modes from the existing local active travel routes.
- To increase levels of physical activity, encourage healthier lifestyles and improve well-being for residents and visitors to Monmouth; and
- To contribute to the carbon reduction agenda by reducing emissions from transport and improving air quality in Monmouth town centre.

3.21 Seven potential options for Monnow Street were identified to be considered at this stage. These were:

- **Do minimum:** Improve condition of carriageway and footway with no changes to layout
- **One way system options:**
 - One-way traffic in the southwest bound direction only; segregated cycleway for cyclists travelling northeast bound; widened footways
 - As above with additional alternative cycleway and footway from Monnow Street through Chippenham Fields to Chippenhamgate Street
- **Two way system options:**
 - Maintain two-way traffic flow; segregated cycleway for cyclists travelling northeast; widened footways
 - As above with additional alternative cycleway and footway from Monnow Street through Chippenham Fields to Chippenhamgate Street
 - As above with one-way loop at pinch point (one-way northbound on Monnow Street between St John's Street and Agincourt Street, and one-way carriageway on Agincourt Street/St John's Street)
- **Pedestrianisation:** Pedestrianise Monnow Street from St John's Street to Monnow Keep exit, with limited northbound only access to deliveries, buses and taxis before 10am and after 4pm. Allow 'right turn only' movement for vehicles exiting St John's Street.

3.22 These options were assessed against the objectives and goals of key national and local strategies and plans, as well against the identified problems and the objectives agreed for the scheme. The options appraisal also considered the deliverability of each option, in terms of feasibility, likely public and stakeholder acceptability, timescales and risk.

3.23 Following this initial options appraisal, five potential schemes were taken to public consultation. Because of concerns about deliverability and likely public and stakeholder acceptability, the two-way option with a one-way loop at the pinch point and the pedestrianisation option were not carried forward to the public consultation.

3.24 The public consultation therefore sought respondents' views on a "do minimum" scheme and four options that would bring change and in particular improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.

- 3.25 The consultation was carried out via online survey, made available on the Council's website and promoted via social media channels in November and December 2020. Covid restrictions at the time prevented any in-person consultation.
- 3.26 561 people completed the online questionnaire. Respondents were invited to choose their favourite and least favourite of the five options.
- 3.27 56% of respondents chose as their preferred option one of the four potential proposals delivering change and improvement for pedestrians and cyclists. 32% chose one of the two-way options as their favourite, and 24% chose one of the one-way options.
- 3.28 The remaining 44% of respondents chose the "do minimum" as their favourite option. However, at the time of the survey, the temporary Covid measures on Monnow Street – including widened footways and a reduction in parking – had recently been put in place. The survey did not explain whether the baseline for the proposed "do minimum" option, described in the survey as "*Improve the condition of footway and carriageway with no changes to the layout.*", was the pre-Covid layout or the temporary arrangement. It is therefore unclear whether respondents who chose this option were expressing support for a formalisation of the temporary layout that was in place at the time or for a reversion to the pre-Covid layout.
- 3.29 When asked about their least favourite option, the one-way options were the most commonly chosen proposals: 62% selected one of the one-way options as their least favourite.
- 3.30 Based on the Weltag 1 options appraisal as well as stakeholder and public consultation, three options were shortlisted to be taken forward for further appraisal at WelTAG stage 2:
- **Do minimum:** improve condition of carriageway and footway with no changes to layout (now explicitly described as reversion back to the pre-Covid layout).
 - **One way system:** one-way traffic in the southwest bound direction only; segregated cycleway for cyclists travelling northeast bound; widened footways.
 - **Two way system:** maintain two-way traffic flow; segregated cycleway for cyclists travelling northeast; widened footways
- 3.31 The variants on the one- and two-way systems which included an alternative cycleway and footway across Chippenham fields were not eligible for Welsh Government Active Travel, so these options were not taken forward for consider at Weltag 2 so as to avoid any delay to the changes on Monnow Street being implemented.

WelTAG stage 2: shortlist of options

- 3.32 Capita were reappointed as consultants to support the Council in the second stage of the WelTAG process for Monnow Street, which entailed further analysis of the shortlisted options as set out at 3.30 above, as well as further stakeholder and public consultation. Separate consultation of businesses was also introduced at this stage.


- 3.33 MCC highway design officers developed the two-way system options in greater detail at this stage, in response to public and stakeholder comments received during the first round of consultation. The following sub-options were proposed:
- Two-way option A: formalisation of temporary Covid measures.
 - Two-way option B: as option A but with a segregated cycle lane incorporated within the footway width on the north-western side of the road, accommodating cyclists travelling in the northeast bound direction.
 - Two-way option C: retain only loading and disabled parking along Monnow Street, allowing more space for pedestrians and cyclists to provide either shared space or a segregated cycle lane on the north-western side of the road.
 - Two-way option D: as Option A, but with shared space for pedestrians and cyclists on the north-western side of the road. Cyclists would be able to choose whether to travel on road with traffic or to use the footway.
- 3.34 As at WelTAG stage 1, the shortlisted options (including the various two-way proposals) were assessed against the objectives and goals of key national and local strategies and plans, against the identified problems and the objectives agreed for the scheme, and in terms of deliverability.
- 3.35 Two-way option C (retain only loading and disabled parking) scored the highest in this process, followed by two-way option B (segregated cycle lane), two-way option D (shared space) and two-way option A (formalisation of Covid layout).
- 3.36 The one-way system and reversion to the pre-Covid layout both scored poorly in the stage 2 options appraisal.
- 3.37 On the basis of this analysis and considering the negative response both to the one-way option in consultation at stage 1 and when a one-way system was trialled in 2020, the public and business consultation at WelTAG stage 2 focused on the four two-way system options.
- 3.38 Public consultation at this stage ran for six weeks from January to March 2022. As at stage 1, a questionnaire was made available on the Council's website and was promoted via its social media channels.
- 3.39 435 people completed the stage 2 questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rank the four options in order of preference.
- 3.40 43% of respondents chose two-way option A, formalisation of the existing Covid layout, as their first preference. Option C, retaining only loading and disabled parking, was the next most popular first choice, selected by 26% of respondents.
- 3.41 12% of respondents chose option B, with a segregated cycle lane, as their first preference. Only 4% of respondents identified option D, shared space, as their first preference.

- 3.42 In addition, a separate business consultation questionnaire was made available online on MCC's website. A Capita representative visited businesses in Monnow Street and Agincourt Square to notify them of the consultation.
- 3.43 27 responses were received to the online business questionnaire. The relatively small sample size means that results from this element of the consultation should be treated with caution.
- 3.44 Among business respondents, the top two options in terms of first preferences were the same as in the wider public consultation: 67% of business respondents chose option A, formalisation of the existing Covid layout, as their first preference, and 22% chose option C, retaining only loading and disabled parking. 7% chose option D, shared space, and 4% chose with option B, segregated cycle lane.
- 3.45 Option A, formalisation of the existing Covid layout, was therefore the most popular of the options in both the public and business consultation. A stakeholder workshop attended by MCC officers and members, representatives of disability groups, representatives from local schools and the Chamber of Commerce identified Option C, retaining only loading and disabled parking as the preferred option for that group.
- 3.46 Options A and C were taken forward for further consideration at the next stage of scheme development, having been selected as the preferred options by both the public and business consultation.

WelTAG 3: Development of Preferred Option

- 3.47 The third WelTAG stage of design development was undertaken from October 2022 to March 2023. Roberts Limbrick Architects and Urban Designers were appointed to develop the design principles established through previous WelTAG stages and consultation into a concept design.
- 3.48 The objective of this part of the process was “to reach consensus on a place-based design that is focussed on a two-way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”
- 3.49 An extensive programme of engagement and consultation was central to this stage of process, to ensure that the final design was based on a clear understanding of the needs and preferences of the widest range of stakeholders and with the aim of building a consensus around the proposed scheme. This process was co-designed with the ward member and relevant Cabinet Members. The consultation process and its findings are described in detail in the Report of Consultation provided at Appendix 3. It included:
- A series of design workshops with stakeholders
 - Two rounds of one-to-one consultation with businesses on Monnow Street and elsewhere in the town centre
 - Public consultation with drop-sessions, a design exhibition, and a survey available online and at locations in Monmouth

- Targeted consultation with the Chamber of Commerce, school pupils, and other community and stakeholder groups
- 3.50 Three design workshops were held with invited stakeholders, including county and town councillors, the Chamber of Commerce, local businesses, and community and interest groups. The first workshop, in early November 2022, focused on reviewing and agreeing core design principles. These were:
- Improving the quality of the environment for people walking and accessing Monnow Street
 - Accommodating cycling through the street
 - Maintaining a two-way street for vehicles
 - Accommodating loading/unloading
 - Provision for disabled parking
 - Consideration of on-street short stay parking
- 3.51 A number of design considerations and wider issues were identified through discussion in the first workshop, which informed the initial design. Stakeholders gave feedback on the initial design at a second workshop in late November 2022.
- 3.52 In parallel with the first two workshops, officers and representatives from the consultant team made a series of one-to-one visits to businesses in Monnow Street and elsewhere in the town centre. This engagement was in two phases:
- Phase one, November 2022: understanding specific business requirements such as loading/unloading, type of customer (popping in or longer stay), outdoor licensing needs and other requirements.
 - Phase two, December 2022/January 2023: sharing the draft design proposal with businesses to get feedback and make changes.
- 3.53 The team successfully engaged with 75 Monnow Street businesses (89%) in phase one and 65 (77%) in phase two, as well as other businesses in the town centre. Multiple visits were made to businesses to maximise the response rate, and among Monnow Street businesses those who did not engage were either too busy or otherwise unavailable. 55 Monnow Street businesses gave detailed feedback on the initial design. As well as providing individual qualitative feedback, businesses were asked to rate the proposal on five core aspects of the design. The chart below shows the numbers of businesses who agreed (in blue) or disagreed that the proposal would improve Monnow Street for each element of the design.



- 3.54 67% of businesses agreed that the proposals would make Monnow Street a better place for parking, 82% agreed with the landscaping and greening, and 93% agreed that the scheme would create a better place for people.
- 3.55 Following the first two workshops and the engagement with businesses, the initial design was revised to reflect feedback received. This revised design was presented at a third stakeholder workshop, as well as at an additional workshop with the Chamber of Commerce held at their request. After each workshop a note of the key issues discussed and points raised was circulated to invitees.

February/March 2023 Community Survey Results

- 3.56 After further revisions in response to feedback at the final workshops, the design was presented for public consultation in February and March 2023. Two face to face consultation events were held in a vacant shop in Monmouth town centre, attended by 484 people in total. The design was then displayed in a 19 day exhibition at Monmouth Community Hub. The design was also available to view on the Council's website.
- 3.57 A survey was made available via the Council's website, with paper copies and a post box for completed surveys provided at the Community Hub, Shire Hall and Monmouth Leisure centre.
- 3.58 521 people completed the survey. The full results of the consultation are provided in the Consultation Report at Appendix 3.
- 3.59 65% of respondents live in Monmouth, with a further 21% living in the Monmouth area. 9% of respondents work in town, 3% own a business in Monnow Street and 4% own a

business elsewhere in the town centre. (These and other figures presented here may add up to more than 100%, as for several questions respondents were asked to select all options that applied to them. Full details are available in the Consultation Report.)


3.60 Respondents were asked how they travel to Monnow Street.:

- 84% travel by car
- 61% walk
- 14% cycle
- 8% use public transport

3.61 46% of respondents visit Monnow Street daily, and a further 43% visit at least once a week.

3.62 The most common reasons for visiting Monnow Street were a top-up/basket food shop (67%), meeting family and friends for a coffee (54%), spending a few hours shopping (44%), doing the main weekly food shop (42%) and having a meal out (39%).

3.63 Respondents were asked their opinion of the proposal in relation to a number of elements of the design and its impacts. The chart below summarises the responses.




3.64 When rating the design proposal:

- 51% totally agree or agree that it provides a better place to spend time in, compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 62% totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre, compared to 25% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 46% totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload, compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 53% totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change, compared to 35% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 42% totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term parking, cycle parking and dropping off, compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;

- 39% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination, compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 3.65 Positive responses to most of these questions therefore outweigh negative responses by a significant margin (approx. 60% to 40%).
- 3.66 The responses to the question on parking are evenly balanced, with 42% positive and 43% negative. Discussions at the drop-in consultation events and open text comments on the survey suggest that some respondents would prefer to see no parking at all in Monnow Street other than disabled parking and loading, while there are clearly also those who would prefer more parking to be available. It is likely that both groups are represented among the negative respondents on this question.
- 3.67 For the final question in this group, on the extent to which the proposal supports Monmouth as a market town destination, responses are more negative. This may reflect the view expressed by a number of attendees in the stakeholder workshops and the public consultations sessions, that public realm and active travel improvements in Monnow Street will not in themselves tackle all the challenges that Monmouth faces. This is not disputed, and officers agree that the public realm improvements alone will not solve the problems affecting Monnow Street. The forthcoming Placemaking Plan will provide an opportunity to consider these wider challenges and the interventions that may address them, and this Plan opens opportunities for accessing Welsh Government Transforming Towns funding. Other wider proposals remain under development for the town, including relocating an improved and modernised museum offer in Shire Hall, repurposing and refurbishing the indoor market building, and refreshing and progressing proposals for a visitor centre and café as an arrival point to Monmouth at Blestium Street. In combination, these proposals together with the Monnow Street public realm improvements and Transforming Town grant opportunities present the opportunity for impactful and positive change to revive the vitality and attractiveness of this important market town to the benefit of businesses, residents and visitors.
- 3.68 Local businesses have been an important stakeholder in this project, and paragraphs 3.50 to 3.55 summarise some of the ways the project team and Elected Members have sought to engage with businesses and the Chamber of Commerce.
- 3.69 In addition to that engagement, businesses were invited to complete the survey. The response from businesses to the survey was relatively small: 18 businesses in Monnow Street completed some part of the survey, and only 15 responded to the questions about the design and its impacts. This may be because most Monnow Street businesses had already given detailed information on their needs and expectations for Monnow Street, as well as their feedback on a slightly earlier version of proposed design, in the one-to-one business consultation described above in paragraphs 3.52 - 3.55.

3.70 The chart below shows Monnow Street businesses' responses to the questions on the design and its impacts. The small sample size means that the results should be treated with caution.



3.71 The businesses' responses to the questions on opportunities to cross the street and on facilities for loading and unloading were positive: 67% strongly agreed or agreed that the proposed design brings improvement on crossings, and 60% on loading and unloading. Difficulties with loading in the current layout were raised by numerous businesses as an issue.

3.72 Businesses' views on whether the proposal provides a better place for people to spend time in the town centre were also positive but more evenly balanced, with 46% strongly agreeing or agreeing with the statement against 40% disagree or strongly disagreeing.

3.73 Business responses to the questions on parking, and on the benefits for Monmouth as a market town destination, were more negative. For parking, 33% agreed or strongly agreed that the proposals provide a balanced approach, against 40% who disagreed or strongly disagreed. More than a quarter of business respondents – 27% – neither agreed nor disagreed on this question. 60% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the proposal supports Monmouth as a market town destination.


3.74 The feedback from the 15 businesses that responded to the key questions in the community survey was therefore mixed. This is in contrast with the very positive response to the proposals in one-to-one consultation with businesses, described in paragraphs 3.52 - 3.55, which had a significantly larger sample size.

- 3.75 Monmouth Chamber of Commerce have been consistently opposed to the proposals and seem to favour a return to the pre-Covid layout. Officers and the consultant team have sought to engage with the Chamber of Commerce positively throughout the process and particularly in the most recent stage of design development, including the addition at their request of a specific business workshop as an extra to the wider stakeholder workshops. At a meeting with officers and the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Economy in July 2022, the Chamber of Commerce set out their “red lines” for the scheme: road closure or pedestrianisation; a one-way system; and a dedicated cycle lane. None of these now form part of the proposals.
- 3.76 The Chamber of Commerce advises that its opposition to the proposals reflects feedback from its membership. The 12 businesses who attended the Chamber of Commerce workshop event were predominantly opposed to the proposed changes. However, the feedback from the 15 Monnow Street businesses who responded to the community survey’s questions about the design (outlined above) was relatively balanced, albeit with a small sample size. As noted in paragraphs 3.50 - 3.55, there was a very positive response to the proposals in the one-to-one consultation in December 2022 and January 2023, which reached three quarters of businesses in Monnow Street, with further adjustments made to the proposals in response to feedback received.


Analysis by Mode of Transport

- 3.77 Among other groups of respondents there were some notable variations in responses. The charts below show responses to the core design questions from respondents who said they used various modes of transports. People who walk, cycle or use public transport to travel to Monnow Street were more positive about the proposed changes than those who drive:


Drive




Walk



Cycle



Public Transport




- 3.78 On the first question, for example, about whether the proposals would make Monnow Street “a better place for people to spend time”, 47% of drivers agreed or strongly agreed, compared to 51% of people who use public transport, 59% of people who walk and 76% of cyclists.
- 3.79 For the parking question, 37% of drivers agreed that the proposal “provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term parking, cycle parking and dropping off”, against 51% of people who walk, 58% of cyclists and 59% of public transport users.


Analysis by Age and Gender

3.80 The analysis shows no significant differences in responses by gender. However, there was also significant variation in responses by age (although there were small sample sizes for some age groups, particularly 16-25 year olds). The chart below shows responses by age group to the first question. 96% of respondents under 16, 67% of 16-25 year olds and 55% of 46-55 year olds agreed or strongly agreed that the proposal “provides a better place for people to spend time”. This compares to 48% of people aged 65 and over, 44% of people aged 56-65 and 42% of people aged 36-45.

It provides a better place for people to spend time in and enjoy the town centre.



3.81 Respondents were also asked their views on the longer-term outcomes of the scheme in terms of its effect on their own use of the town centre. Answers to these questions are shown in the chart below.



- 3.82 Responses to these questions are more negative than those on specific design elements shown above. Between 45% and 49% disagree or totally disagree on each question, and the numbers who neither agree nor disagree are higher than for the design-specific questions.
- 3.83 This is at odds with the generally positive responses to the questions about elements of the design. This may reflect the fact that 89% of respondents already visit Monnow Street either daily or at least once a week: given that respondents' visits are already very frequent, it may be unlikely that any changes to Monnow Street would attract them to spend more time there or use it more extensively. This is particularly the case for the first two questions ("I would visit Monmouth town centre more" and "I would spend longer in the town centre").
- 3.84 These responses may also reflect the wider concerns referenced above, about the challenges which Monnow Street faces and the limitations of public realm and active travel improvements in addressing these challenges. As noted, the forthcoming Placemaking Plan will offer a mechanism to consider these issues.

4 EQUALITY AND FUTURE GENERATIONS EVALUATION (INCLUDES SOCIAL JUSTICE, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING):

- 4.1 An Integrated Impact Assessment (incorporating equalities, future generations, Welsh language and socio-economic duty) is attached at Appendix 4.
- 4.2 The main impacts of the proposal identified in this impact assessment are:
- Positive impacts on the protected characteristics of age, disability, and pregnancy/maternity arising from the proposed improvements to the public realm in Monnow Street
 - Positive impacts in relation to socio-economic duty and social justice relating to the role public realm improvements which support walking can play in increasing inclusion and reducing inequality.
 - Positive impacts on all the well-being goals.
 - The development of the proposal meets the sustainable development principles.
 - No impact on safeguarding or corporate parenting.

5 OPTIONS APPRAISAL:

5.1 The table below provides an options appraisal for the proposal.

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments/mitigation
Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No implementation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be opposed by some stakeholders. Identified problems would not be addressed. Scheme objectives would not be met. Existing issues with temporary arrangement (eg in relation to drainage, uneven surfaces) will persist. The existing temporary measures have a limited lifespan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not likely to be sustainable beyond the short term.
Revert to pre-Covid layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower implementation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be opposed by some stakeholders Identified problems would not be addressed and would be likely to be exacerbated compared to current layout. Scheme objectives would not be met. No grant funding likely to be available for implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although some stakeholders would support this position, there is no evidence that it would address any of the identified issues and significant evidence from elsewhere to the contrary.
Develop alternative design solution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be possible to develop stronger consensus on proposals by restarting design process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be opposed by some stakeholders. No funding available for design. Active Travel funding not likely to be available. Current proposal has been subject 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear that an alternative proposal would in reality attract greater support.

		<p>of extensive consultation – risk of consultation fatigue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process would need to begin again – 2-3 years until design complete. 	
<p>Adopt the proposed design as recommended in this report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses the problems and meets the objectives identified through the Weltag process • In line with community consultation which shows support for most design aspects of the proposals, and with business consultation which was strongly supportive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to be opposed by some stakeholders. • Significant funding required for implementation. • Longer construction period than doing nothing or reverting to pre-Covid layout, with some disruption for businesses and others who use Monnow Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential funding for implementation will be considered in a future report to Cabinet on regeneration priorities. See also section 7. • Programme will be carefully managed to minimise disruption.

6 REASONS:

- 6.1 The reasons for developing the proposed public realm and active travel improvements for Monnow Street, and for recommending their adoption as the Council's preferred scheme for Monnow Street, are set out in section 3.
- 6.2 It is acknowledged that public realm improvements in Monnow Street will not in themselves address all the challenges that Monmouth faces. The forthcoming Placemaking Plan will provide an opportunity to consider these wider challenges and the interventions that may address them, and this Plan opens up opportunities for accessing Welsh Government Transforming Towns grant funding. Other wider proposals remain under development for the town, including relocating an improved and modernised museum offer in Shire Hall, repurposing and refurbishing the indoor market building, and refreshing proposals for a visitor centre and café as an arrival point to Monmouth at Blestium Street. In combination, these proposals together with the Monnow Street public realm improvements and Transforming Town grant opportunities present the opportunity for impactful and positive change to revive the vitality and attractiveness of this important market town to the benefit of businesses, residents and visitors. The Monnow Street public realm works form an important and urgently needed intervention and it is therefore recommended that Scrutiny Committee endorses the proposals for Cabinet to proceed, subject to funding being identified.

7 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 Significant funding would be required to implement the proposal. High level cost estimates for a broadly similar scheme, prepared to inform the Council's Round 2 Levelling Up bid, suggested construction costs of £6.1m. It is considered that this investment would improve Monmouth's attractiveness as a key market town to both residents from Monmouth town and its hinterland and tourists, helping to make Monnow Street an attractive place to dwell, supporting vitality, footfall and local businesses.
- 7.2 There is potential to secure funding to support the delivery of this scheme from the Welsh Government's Transforming Towns programme and/or from Round 3 of the UK Government's Levelling Up Fund. Welsh Government Active Travel funding may also offer some potential funding although this is likely to be limited relative to the total construction cost. Most grant funding streams require an element of match funding, which would be a financial implication for MCC. Project delivery would be led by existing staff resources within the Regeneration team.
- 7.3 Most grant funding streams require an element of match funding, which would be a financial implication for MCC, requiring approval as a capital expenditure commitment. A report considering regeneration funding and priorities across the county is expected to be presented to Cabinet on 7 June 2023.
- 7.4 Project delivery would be led by existing staff resources within the Regeneration team.

8 CONSULTEES:

- 8.1 There has been extensive public and stakeholder consultation throughout the three stages of project development for the Monnow Street proposals. This is described in section 3.
- 8.2 In addition, the following have been consulted:
- Cabinet
 - County councillors in Monmouth and adjacent wards
 - Monmouth Town Council
 - Officers in Active Travel, Highways Management, Highway Operations, Planning/Heritage/Urban Design, Transport Planning & Policy, Passenger Transport, Civil Enforcement, Green Infrastructure.

9 BACKGROUND PAPERS:

- 9.1 Monnow Street Weltag Stage 1 Study: Final Report, January 2021
- 9.2 Monnow Street Weltag Stage 2 Study: Final Report, April 2022

10 AUTHOR:

Daniel Fordham, Regeneration Manager

11 CONTACT DETAILS:

danielfordham@monmouthshire.gov.uk, 07890 024489

Appendix 1: Monnow Street proposed concept design and artists' impressions

Appendix 2: Monnow Street design report

Appendix 3: Report of consultation (WeITAG stage 3)

Appendices:

- a) Community survey & exhibition results
- b) Stakeholder co production workshop notes
- c) Comprehensive School & Social Circles workshop notes

Appendix 4: Integrated Impact Assessment (incorporating equalities, future generations, Welsh language, and socio-economic duty)

This page is intentionally left blank

MONNOW STREET IMPROVEMENT

Page 55
PLANS AND CGIs



monmouthshire
sir fynwy



Roberts Limbrick



Monnow Street Improvements

This Design Document has been created by:



chris jones

Roberts Limbrick Architects
The Estates Office
25-26 Gold Tops
Newport,
NP20 4PG

On behalf of:



Date: 04-April-2023

Job Number: 10605


Version: 2

Copyright ©
The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part. The Copyright rests with the client. All plans are reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with permission of the Controller of HMSO. Crown copyright Reserved.

Contents


- 01** Concept plan
- 02** Proposal elements
- 03** Artists impressions

1. Monnow Street concept plan




Page 57

2. Proposal elements




- 01. Tactile blister paving at junctions to announce road crossings / junctions
- 02. Carriageway narrows here in alignment with the street. This pinch point only allows single file traffic at one time. Two way traffic is permitted here
- 03. Footway has been standardised and cycle stands have been included to serve this section of the street
- 04. Disabled parking bay here
- 05. Loading bay located outside the post office and beside a crossing point for easy access
- 06. Crossing point located here to allow movement between east and west side of the street




- 01. Flexi spaces have been included which can be transformed into useful spaces during the summer and then reverted to car parking during the winter months
- 02. Another loading bay has been located here, on the west side of the road
- 03. Cycle stands have been designed to accommodate a range of bicycles, scooters and mobility / accessible bicycles
- 04. Junction planting frames the crossing point here
- 05. Rain gardens and low level planting located here which will help promote sustainable drainage within the street

2. Proposal elements



- 01. Raised table here to slow traffic and promote pedestrian movement across the street
- 02. Loading bays have been included here to serve the central shops within the street
- 03. Feature rain gardens here to promote sustainable urban drainage
- 04. Trees to feature here to add character to the street and create a central zone
- 05. Surface material to change

- 06. Spill out spaces included where the street naturally widens to serve businesses



- 01. Main access to the street from the south, this gateway creates an arrival space
- 02. Two loading bays located here
- 03. Opportunity for cycle parking incorporated beside the loading bay to serve this part of the street
- 04. Footways widened and the carriageway is rationalised
- 05. Raised table slows cars at the gateway to the street
- 06. Crossing points funnel

- 07. Opportunity for a crossing point here to encourage movement from the car park

3. Artist Impressions

Page 60



Artist Impressions:
View south from the Post Office



Artist Impressions:
View south over rain garden from Boots



Artist Impressions:
Spill out space, central zone



Artist Impressions:
North from Robin Hood corner



Artist Impressions:
North bird's eye view of street



Artist Impressions:
Raised table at Robin Hood (A)




Artist Impressions:
Raised table at Robin Hood (B)



Roberts Limbrick Architects

The Estates Office
26 Gold Tops
Newport , Wales
NP204PG

03333 405 500
mail@robertslimbrick.com
robertslimbrick.com



MONNOW STREET IMPROVEMENT

Page 65



monmouthshire
sir fynwy



Roberts Limbrick



Monnow Street Improvements

This Design Document has been created by:



Roberts Limbrick Architects
The Estates Office
25-26 Gold Tops
Newport,
NP20 4PG

On behalf of:



Date: 04-April-2023

Job Number: 10605

Version: 3

Copyright ©
The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part. The Copyright rests with the client. All plans are reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with permission of the Controller of HMSO. Crown copyright Reserved.

**chris
jones**

Contents

01	Introduction	07	Concept vision
02	WelTAG options	08	Concept layers
03	Context setting	09	Concept plan
04	Consultation	10	Design elements
05	Business consultation	11	Proposal elements
06	Public consultation	12	Artists impressions

1. Introduction

In conjunction with Monmouthshire County Council Roberts Limbrick Architects have been working on proposals to re-imagine how Monnow Street can work to create an vibrant street scape, to solve the loading and disabled parking issues within the street and furthermore to create an attractive and robust street. This needs to work for the shops and local businesses while putting a focus on the pedestrians and primary users of the street.

It is hoped this transformation will create a green and vibrant street where people are encouraged to dwell and to create a positive place for pedestrians to be in and to use while shopping, whilst still accommodating short term on street parking for 'popping in shopping' and for those that need it. The street, in its current form, is not an inviting place for town centre users and it is hoped this redesign will catapult the primary user - the pedestrian - to the top of the movement hierarchy giving them confidence to use the street and to dwell here. Pedestrians, as the main users, will have the ability to cross the street in a safe and controlled way. They will have use of benches alongside a suite of public realm improvements with a robust lighting strategy and access to bins creating a pleasant place for users and limited parking will encourage more pedestrians to the street.

These public realm improvements will be accompanied by a robust sustainable urban drainage scheme (SUDS) which will boost biodiversity in the street and also mitigate against any flooding events and help treat rainfall at the source. This will be along the stretch of the street in strategic rain gardens and swales which will not only attenuate and water at the source, but also act as a habitat for water loving, absorbing plants which will add character and interest to the street.

The changes to Monnow Street are outlined with the intention of promoting these objectives:

- ✓ Stronger linkage for residents creating a quieter and calmer street which is not the focus of through traffic.

- ✓ Active travel, promoting walking and cycling along the route by minimising the importance and dominance of cars .
- ✓ Improved 'walkability' and 'cyclability' of the street through the inclusion of appropriately, and wider sized footpaths and a narrower, less car dominated highway. **The road (highway) will be designed to highway authority standards and will accommodate a number of users allowing cars, HGV's and cyclists to pass in a safe and controlled manner*
- ✓ Improved accessibility for all ages and levels of physical ability alike with a particular emphasis on visually impaired users through the inclusion of a significant tactile strip which will be uninterrupted along both sides of the entire road.
- ✓ A wider footway which will allow some businesses to 'spill out' onto the street, which will create a vibrant and active place to be (appropriate licences will need to be sought). This will allow more room for pedestrians on the street itself. This will in turn aid safety in the street.
- ✓ Allowance for cycle parking which will encourage this as a mode of transport within the town centre. These will be located strategically along the street allowing convenient parking for users.
- ✓ Optimal traffic flow for users, with allowances made in strategic locations for loading bays which will serve the businesses at the top, middle and bottom of Monnow Street.
- ✓ Green-blue infrastructure for sustainable urban drainage purposes, pollution filtering, public realm greening and general well-being.
- ✓ Improved/rationalised signage, more efficient street lighting, designing out unnecessary yellow lines/bollards/railings.



2. Previous WelTAG options





A WelTAG report has been conducted in order to achieve a shortlist of options moving on to detailed design. This scheme connects Monnow St, Monnow Bridge, ending before the roundabout on Drybridge Street.

Monnow Street remains a critical route for Active Travel (AT) not only to access services in the town but as route through to other services e.g. Monmouth Comprehensive School and Osbaston Primary School. The WelTAG 1 clearly demonstrated the need for intervention. It is a clear AT route for walking to services in the town, to the secondary school and leisure centre. Current Covid temporary arrangements and also the Active Travel consultation has polarised opinions for cycling and therefore more work is needed.

Consultation demonstrated the need for a deeper understanding of traffic movements, cycling and walking movements and to also re-visit the long list of Active travel potential routes before any final schemes can be agreed. There is a need for the Covid temporary measures to be fully assessed before a final AT design can be agreed.

As a result of the WelTAG process, the following options were identified:

01. Do Minimum. This approach would involve a carriageway and a footway along each edge of Monnow Street.
02. One Way Traffic. This would involve traffic being allowed to travel one-way in a southwest bound direction only. A segregated cycleway would also be included to accommodate cyclists travelling in a northeast direction. Footways would be widened and the carriageway would be rationalised.
03. Two Way Traffic. This would maintain two way traffic in both directions along the street. A segregated cycleway would also be included in a northeast bound direction. Footways would be widened.
04. One way system with Chippenham Fields active travel link. This active







travel link would connect the southern end of Monnow Street with Chippenham Fields, east of Monnow Street. Traffic would be permitted in a southwest direction.

05. Two way system with Chippenham Fields active travel link. This active travel link would connect the southern end of Monnow Street with Chippenham Fields, east of Monnow Street. Traffic would be permitted in a southwest direction as well as a northeast direction.
06. Pedestrianise Monnow Street from St John's Street to Monnow Keep exit allowing limited northbound only access to deliveries, buses and taxis before 10:00 and after 16:00. Monnow Street here would be pedestrianised from St John's Street to Monnow Keep.
07. Two way system with one way loop at pinch point using Agincourt Street and St John's St. This scenario releases pressure on the pinch point / bottleneck in the northern reaches of Monnow street where the street and carriageway narrow. This plan utilises Agincourt Street and St John's Street as a one way route for traffic. Northeast bound traffic will use Monnow Street up to Agincourt Square whereas southwest bound traffic will flow down through Agincourt Street and St John's Street before rejoining Monnow Street and flowing southwest here.

Preferred Option

Through the WELTAG consultation process, it was agreed to take forward **Option 3**, two way traffic with the option of including a cycle way, subject to space and the next level of design.



Building Exterior Line	[]
Footpath	[]
One-Way Cycle Route	[]
Pedestrianised street	[]
One-Way Access for deliveries, buses and taxis before 10:00 and after 16:00	[]
One-Way Traffic	[]
Two-Way Traffic	[]
Link to Chippenham Fields	[]



3. Context Setting


Monnow Street is the main high street serving Monmouth town and is around 500m long stretching from Monnow Bridge in the south west to Agincourt Square in the north east.

The road is thought to have been established pre Roman times and has evolved through the years as a typical market street which will have served the town in a number of uses. Historically the street was gated at either end and the central area used for trading livestock and for market stalls. It is this use which required space and as such developed the street as a wide thoroughfare which we know today.

Notable buildings include Cornwall House, The Vine Tree and the Robin Hood Inn which sits at the entrance to our study area towards the southern end of Monnow Street.



Satellite view of Monnow Street ←



John Speed's town map of 1610, showing "Monmouth Street" (marked C)

4. Consultation

Over the course of the design development, a series of stakeholder and public consultation events were held. These are fully detailed, under separate cover, in the 'Report of Consultation' document. The following is a summary of the consultation process undertaken:

- 3 hands on Stakeholder workshops
- 2 door to door direct business consultations
- An open and manned public consultation with the town centre over 2 days, and a static display for two weeks in the Community Hub in Whitecross Street
- A survey consultation both on and off line.

Following each Stakeholder and door to door business consultation, the design proposals were evolved to consider comments received, in the context of the WELTAG preferred option and the projects vision and ambition.

A similar review was undertaken following the public consultation and survey before arriving at a final design concept for Monnow Street.



Monnow Street Public Realm Improvements

Stakeholder Workshop 1

- To introduce the design process
- To agree the design principles related to the recommended two way street scheme
- To understand from local groups some of the challenges and opportunities within the street that the design should respond to
- To consider how Monnow Street relates to other town centre streets, car parks, pedestrian linkages, etc

Stakeholder Workshop 2

- To share the emerging street design sketch proposal
- To explain the layered approach to creating a place based street for people, crossing, loading, planting and parking
- To receive feedback and areas for improvement and also agreement

Stakeholder Workshop 3

- To show how the design has responded to feedback from the second workshop and from the individual business discussions
- To explain the next steps in the process


5. Summary of door to door business consultation

In addition to the stakeholder process, which the Chamber of Commerce was represented at, the County Council and consultancy team also prioritised the need to speak to businesses in Monnow Street, as well as to raise awareness of the design proposal with businesses in the upper end of the town centre close to Agincourt Square and Church Street. This engagement was broken down into two phases:

- Phase 1 – to understand specific businesses such as loading/unloading, their type of customer (popping in or longer stay), outdoor licensing needs and other requirements.
- Phase 2 – to share with businesses the draft design proposal to gain feedback and make changes where required.

Page 70

The full results and feedback from the direct business consultations are set out in the Report of Consultation. Below is a chart showing feedback relating to specific topics and some recurring feedback themes. These were considered during the evolution of design proposals.



Like the extra loading bays but they need to be enforced	Need to ensure linkages to main carparks	Need to manage balance of loading and parking	It would be good if the street can be adapted for events
The improvements need to get visitors up into Agincourt Square and Church Street	Busses need to be able to turn out of Monnow Keep onto the street	Like the additional opportunities to cross the street	Short stay parking needs to be policed as it is open to abuse
The planting needs to be maintained	Cycle stands are as important as other facilities	If we are reducing the carriageway width, two large vehicles need be able to pass at the same time	Ensure space is flexible and can adapt in the future
Great to see extra areas for seating	Love the extra opportunities to cross the street	Loading bays will need management	

6. Public consultation

Following stakeholder and direct business consultation, a wider public consultation was held which included a manned exhibition and an on and off line survey. The full results and feedback are set out in the Report of Consultation. Below is a general summary of the feedback.

Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (29%), meet family and friends for a coffee (22%), shopping for non-food items (19%), undertake a mainly weekly food shop (18%), enjoy a meal out (17%) or take part in a leisure or entertainment activity (12%);

When rating the design proposal:

- 51% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better places to spend time in compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 62% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 25% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 46% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 53% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 35% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 42% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 39% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;

When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:

- 29% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 34% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 38% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 25% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 49% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 32% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective:
 - pedestrians rated 3.3/5
 - cyclists 3/5,
 - someone with a disability or impairment 2.8/5
 - someone who needs to drive through the street 2.3/5;

In reviewing the project aim of "To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town., respondents scored this on average as 2.88/5.






7. Concept vision

Based on the WeITAG information, and our indepth analysis of the street, we have created a concept plan for Monnow Street as a two way carriageway that has ample footways either side, room for loading, parking, cafes and cycles to all work cohesively together.

The Manual for Streets and Highway authority guidance details how wide the carriageway can be for the improvement of existing streets and outlines how the functions of the street, and the type, density and character of the development factor into the necessary width. We have factored the volume of vehicular traffic and pedestrian activity; the traffic composition; the demarcation, between the carriageway and footway; parking and design speed and determined this street will follow Welsh standard guidance and will have a design speed of 20mph.

Page 71



8. Concept layers

When considering the design of a place like Monnow Street, many uses need to be factored into the scheme as a whole to create a unified and cohesive space that is fit for varied uses and users alike.



To begin with, we have considered the carriageway along the central spine of the street. This has been designed to highway standards and in accordance with the Manual for Streets. The width of the street will comfortably allow two Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to pass each other within the carriageway itself.

With this being said, a street width of 6.5m has been deemed appropriate for the length of the street. As there will be several informal traffic calming measures within Monnow Street, we will not be introducing any horizontal or vertical traffic calming measures along the stretch.

The carriageway has been allocated space within the street and the remainder has been marked for pedestrian use here. In this example, the footway varies between 2m and 6m wide. Guidance on this stipulates the footway minimum throughout is no less than 2m.

As we consider the other uses and users that impact the street, we can add layers on top of this to create a fully-fledged concept. Crossing points have been added onto this layer in strategic places to allow these pedestrians to easily move between the east and western

sides of Monnow Street. These points have been designed to be priority junctions for pedestrians furthermore putting them at the top of the hierarchy rather than car and vehicle users.

Pedestrian crossing points will carry the footway material across the crossing and carriageway and will be marked by tactile paving to accommodate many types of user.




Pedestrian crossings will be marked with contrasting bands of material to emulate zebra crossings. These will automatically divert priority to the pedestrian causing vehicles to slow down and give way to pedestrian users.

Cyclists have been factored into the scheme as the next layer on top of pedestrian zones, crossing points and the carriageway itself.


Cycle stands have been designed and positioned to serve the lower, middle and upper stretches of Monnow Street. These ought to be convenient and accessible for all aspects of the street to encourage cyclists and sustainable modes of travel within the wider region.

As the street will have a design speed of <20mph, the cyclist will be encouraged to use the carriageway itself. The cycle stands will be secure and in well lit, active areas to promote passive surveillance and security for cyclists.

8. Concept layers



The next layer on the plan will be space for car parking spaces. Parking, although an important factor for the street, is not a primary concern due to the number of external car parks within 400m of the street centre. There are 5 car parks alongside Monnow Street with a combined 436+ car parking spaces. M&S and Waitrose also have dedicated car parks for their customers.



Carparks within 200m of Monnow Street	Car Parking Spaces
Rockfield Road	103
Cinderfield St	41
Cattle Market	188
Chippenham	35
Cornwall House	46
Monnow St	41
Glendower St	134
Total	588




Parking has been considered within the street for the users that need to park within a few metres of their desired destination for a short period of time. We have allocated space for 32 cars to park within the street itself. This allocation will be split between disabled parking bays and general parking bays.

Loading is the next layer to be added to the concept plan for the street. Loading currently poses a real concern for Monnow Street and currently there is one allocated bay for loading which is located at the northern end of the street. This results in informal, illegal delivery/loading parking on the carriageway which causes issues for pedestrians using the space, cars wishing to pass and further backing traffic up the street.

We have allocated six places for loading along the stretch of Monnow Street, two spaces located at the southern end, two in the central zone and two in the northern reaches of the street. The loading bays have been appropriately sized for a 6.5-tonne lorry although most of the units use 6.5m vans for their deliveries. These have been strategically positioned to conveniently serve as many units and businesses as possible across the street.

We have conveniently located these loading bays alongside crossing points to facilitate easy movement of goods from loading locations to the unit.




Lastly, but not least, we have allocated space for landscaping, biodiversity and sustainable urban drainage within the scheme. Rain gardens and planters will be incorporated into strategic areas to help attenuate water and reduce the impact that excess water will have on the surrounding drainage system.

SUDS and gullies will channel water to the rain gardens which will be planted with water absorbing plants and grasses. Sedges and ferns will intercept runoff which percolates into the soil reducing the load on combined sewers and local water courses and further filters pollutants. Rain gardens will be located along the street serving as a wider sustainable drainage scheme. In this case, the planters will frame the junction and also inhibit parking over the access lane here.

Within the central area, we will incorporate a number of feature trees and planting to create a real 'space' within the street. These trees will be an appropriate scale and type for the street but will act as a focal point. Views from Monnow Bridge to St Mary's Church.




9. Monnow Street concept plan



Page 73



10. Design Elements



Raised Table

- ✓ Raised tables will feature at two key points along the street, the gateway outside Robin Hood and the central core zone
- ✓ This area will include a ramp up to a level surface which will include crossing points further slowing cars which will be entering the street
- ✓ A crossing will be added from the Robin Hood corner towards Monnow Bridge which will promote the movement of pedestrians to this area
- ✓ Raised tables will help to slow down traffic and

- create a pedestrian focused environment
- ✓ These will be buffered by kerbs and corduroy paving to mark the level change
- ✓ These will be marked for cars within the street and appropriately designed for the 20mph street
- ✓ This is the southern entrance to Monnow Street and as such we have created a raised table here to act as a gateway
- ✓ Another will be positioned as a raised crossing at the corner of Cattle Market car park which is a convenient location for users of the street to park

Art

- ✓ We can easily incorporate art into the design of the street and do this in a creative, place specific way
- ✓ This can be in the footway, or through paving design, pedestrian crossings or through other innovative means
- ✓ The public can be involved in this to create a scene of ownership of the street
- ✓ Street art will add a distinctive sense of place to the area and will call on local cues to create a locally characteristic place

- ✓ Branding can be included within this to create a 'brand' for Monmouth and Monnow Street

Loading Bays

- ✓ Loading bays have been located strategically along the street to serve as many of the businesses as conveniently as possible
- ✓ These will be designed in such a way that car parking will not be permitted in these
- ✓ There will be a half kerb separating these from the main carriageway
- ✓ The loading bays will be designed with another material which will further prevent illegal parking here

- ✓ There will be 6 loading bays located within the street which is a big improvement from the current situation where there is only one legal space for loading on the entire street


Key Junction Planting

- ✓ Planting will be included at key junctions to act as a gateway framing the crossing
- ✓ This will serve to support the SUDS within the scheme
- ✓ This will also prevent illegal parking and blocking junctions as cars will have no space to park here
- ✓ This not only adds to the drainage aspect of our scheme and creates an attractive place to be
- ✓ The footway material will continue over the junction

- marked by blister paving to push home the priority of the pedestrian



10. Design Elements



Page 75

Spill Out Space

- ✓ Spaces designed into the scheme to accommodate a range of uses
- ✓ Here, cafes and businesses can open up onto the street through seating, cafe spaces and stalls or outdoors displays
- ✓ This will help animate the street and encourage people to dwell here which increases time spent within the town
- ✓ Studies have shown that opportunity to dwell, places to sit and places like this that animate the street improves customer spend

- ✓ Users are more likely to travel to Monnow Street and use the spill out areas
- ✓ Businesses will have the opportunity to apply for licences to use these spaces which will increase their floor area allowing more trade
- ✓ Opportunity for flower stalls or outdoors displays

Crossing Points

- ✓ Crossing points located frequently and conveniently along the street
- ✓ Framed by planting in some instances to mark the junction
- ✓ Design to be determined at a detailed stage although there are examples of crossings which incorporate artwork and imaginative designs
- ✓ Crossing points will span the entire road and will not need a central island in the middle for pedestrians

- ✓ These junctions will not be lit but rather cars will give way to pedestrians and allow them to have priority

Bins / Recycling


- ✓ Bins to be located in convenient locations
- ✓ Will be out of the way of the footway and not a trip hazard
- ✓ Maintenance strategy will be set up by Monmouthshire Council MCC to ensure waste is disposed of recycling happens and bins are cleaned regularly
- ✓ Design of the bins will encourage recycling

Bicycle Parking

- ✓ Designed to be more convenient than car parking as pedestrians and cyclists sit higher up the movement hierarchy
- ✓ Convenient locations which will be overlooked by pedestrians and businesses to promote passive surveillance
- ✓ Designed in accordance with standards to provide secure cycle parking
- ✓ Sheffield stands will be able to accommodate approximately 50 bikes along the street

- ✓ Stands in strategic locations will be designed to accommodate longer bicycles, those with trailers/baskets and buggies attached
- ✓ The design of these can add interest to the street and act as small scale 'artworks'
- ✓ Certain stands have been sized and spaced specifically to be accessible to all bike types including disabled and mobility bicycles. Transport for London (TfL) are leading the way on this and recommend a distance of 1200-1500mm between stands to allow for dismounting and manoeuvring

10. Design Elements



Rain Gardens

- ✓ SUDS and gullies will channel water to the rain gardens which will be planted with water absorbing plants and grasses
- ✓ Sedges and ferns will intercept runoff which percolates into the soil reducing the load on combined sewers and local water courses and further filters pollutants
- ✓ Rain gardens will be located along the street serving as a wider sustainable drainage scheme
- ✓ Planters will frame junctions and

- also inhibit parking over access lanes
- ✓ Rain gardens will 'green' the street and create an attractive place to be which will further encourage people into the street promoting dwell and spend time
- ✓ Rain gardens will have gaps in the kerb to allow water to flow in





Bollards

- ✓ Bollards are to be included within the northern end of the street outside Salt & Pepper and Pizza Express
- ✓ These will be available for use by the businesses during the summer and cafe licences can be applied
- ✓ During the winter months, these bollards can be removed and the spaces will be given up to car parking

Flexi Spaces

- ✓ These spaces are flexible in use and can be changed depending on the time of year or the need of the street
- ✓ The flexi space is the same size as a car parking space but can be closed off using bollards to serve as spill out café space or a number of other 'flexible' uses
- ✓ These have the opportunity to be opened to parking during the winter months and used as spill out zones during warmer months
- ✓ Flexi Spaces will be marked in a different paving material to show this differentiation
- ✓ Opportunity to use the space for many more uses than just car parking
- ✓ Creates a vibrant and active street and place

10. Design Elements



Signage



Lighting

- ✓ Lighting can be incorporated to add dimension and interest to the street
- ✓ As well as promoting safety, lighting will also add interest and style to the scheme
- ✓ Tree ring lights for example in the central rain gardens can up-light feature trees creating an attractive focal point
- ✓ Lighting can also be included into crossings and seating to easily mark these spaces and objects




Parking bays

- ✓ Parking bays are included along the stretch of the street
- ✓ These are designed to accommodate a range of car types and will be marked out as such
- ✓ Parking will be buffered from the footway by kerbs
- ✓ Disabled bays are also included
- ✓ 32 bays in total (including 6 disabled bays)



Seating


- ✓ Incorporated into the design from the beginning
- ✓ Provide enough for people to be able to sit within the street scape and increase dwell time
- ✓ Incorporated within tree planting, SUDS and build outs




Paving



11. Proposal Elements




- 01. Tactile blister paving at junctions to announce road crossings / junctions
- 02. Carriageway narrows here in alignment with the street. This pinch point only allows single file traffic at one time. Two way traffic is permitted here
- 03. Footway has been standardised and cycle stands have been included to serve this section of the street
- 04. Disabled parking bay here
- 05. Loading bay located outside the post office and beside a crossing point for easy access
- 06. Crossing point located here to allow movement between east and west side of the street




- 01. Flexi spaces have been included which can be transformed into useful spaces during the summer and then reverted to car parking during the winter months
- 02. Another loading bay has been located here, on the west side of the road
- 03. Cycle stands have been designed to accommodate a range of bicycles, scooters and mobility / accessible bicycles
- 04. Junction planting frames the crossing point here
- 05. Rain gardens and low level planting located here which will help promote sustainable drainage within the street

11. Proposal Elements



- 01. Raised table here to slow traffic and promote pedestrian movement across the street
- 02. Loading bays have been included here to serve the central shops within the street
- 03. Feature rain gardens here to promote sustainable urban drainage
- 04. Trees to feature here to add character to the street and create a central zone
- 05. Surface material to change here to mark the central zone
- 06. Spill out spaces included where the street naturally widens to serve businesses



- 01. Main access to the street from the south, this gateway creates an arrival space
- 02. Two loading bays located here
- 03. Opportunity for cycle parking incorporated beside the loading bay to serve this part of the street
- 04. Footways widened and the carriageway is rationalised
- 05. Raised table slows cars at the gateway to the street
- 06. Crossing points funnel pedestrians to Monnow Bridge pedestrianised area
- 07. Opportunity for a crossing point here to encourage movement from the car park

12. Artist Impressions



Artist Impressions:
View south from the Post Office



Artist Impressions:
View south over rain garden from Boots



Page 8

Artist Impressions:
Spill out space, central zone



Artist Impressions:
North from Robin Hood corner



Artist Impressions:
North bird's eye view of street



Artist Impressions:
Raised table at Robin Hood (A)



Artist Impressions:
Raised table at Robin Hood (B)



Roberts Limbrick Architects

The Estates Office
26 Gold Tops
Newport , Wales
NP204PG

03333 405 500
mail@robertslimbrick.com
robertslimbrick.com





View Monnow Street Designs

View Proposal and Survey:
www.monmouthshire.gov.uk/monnow-street-consultation-2023/



Monnow Street Project – Report of Consultation

March 2023

1) Key Facts from the Monnow Street Design Consultation

- 10 town stakeholder groups and organisations
- 65 town centre businesses located within Monnow Street and 15 other businesses located in Agincourt Square, Agincourt Street, St John’s Street, Beaufort Arcade, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street
- 25 pupils through the Leadership Academy at Monmouth Comprehensive School
- 3 co-production stakeholder workshops on the on the 7th November, 29th November 2022 and 24th January 2023
- 1 Chamber of Commerce workshop on the 25th January
- 484 people at face to face consultation on Saturday, 11th February and Wednesday, 15th February which was held in 22 Agincourt Square, Monmouth town centre;
- A static exhibition was displayed at Monmouth Community Hub in Whitecross Street from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March
- Paper copies and a post box was provided at Monmouth Leisure Centre and at the Shire Hall from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March.
- Online survey through Monmouthshire’s website with accompanying link to the proposed design.
- 546 people completed the feedback survey.

Who We Engaged With?



What are the Key Consultation Messages?

Who Responded?



- 65% Monmouth town resident
- 21% live within the rural catchment
- 9% work in the town
- 3% own a business in Monnow Street
- 4% own a business in other town centre locations

- 84% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street
- 61% walk
- 14% cycle and
- 8% use public transport



- 46% of respondents make daily trip to Monnow Street
- 43% visiting at least once a week, and
- 5% at least once every fortnight;

- 67% undertake a top up food shopping
- 54% meet family and friends for a coffee
- 44% shop for non-food items
- 42% undertake a mainly weekly food shop
- 39% enjoy a meal out
- 27% take part in a leisure or entertainment activity



Rating the Design Proposal

51% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better places to spend time in compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree


62% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 25% who disagree or totally disagree;

46% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;

53% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 35% who disagree or totally disagree;

42% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;

39% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;



Rating The Impact If Completed

29% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to **45%** who disagree or totally disagree;

34% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to **47%** who disagree or totally disagree;

38% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to **45%** who disagree or totally disagree;

25% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to **49%** who disagree or totally disagree;

32% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to **47%** who disagree or totally disagree;

Rating The Proposal From a Mode of Travel Perspective

When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, respondents rated the proposal as follows:


- pedestrians **3.3/5**
- cyclists **3/5**
- for someone with a disability/impairment **2.8/5**
- for someone who needs to drive through the street **2.3/5**;

In reviewing the project aim of “To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town, respondents scored this on average **2.88/5**



2) The Consultation Process

Page 90



3) The Co-Production Design Process

Workshop 1



7th November
Priory Centre
Agreeing Design Principles

Workshop 2



29th November
The Shire Hall
Responding to the Initial Design

Workshop 3



26th January
The Shire Hall
Refining the Draft Design

Workshop 1

The first workshop was held in Monmouth Priory, Priory Street on Monday, 7th November between the hours of 6pm to 8pm.

The County Council invited stakeholders to the workshop through an email invitation. Types of groups and organisations included:

- County and Town Councillors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Local Businesses
- Interest groups

Format

The main hall of the Priory building was split into breakout sessions with stakeholders shared across the four separate areas.

The Cabinet Member for Equalities & Engagement and local ward member for Monmouth Town Ward welcomed people to the workshop and set out what she wants to achieve from a collaborative and co-produced process. The workshop then provided some initial context to the project and some information on previous studies and where the project has progressed to.

1. Why We Are Here
2. The Process So Far
3. The Principles of The Monnow Street Proposal
4. Workshop Sessions
5. Collective Feedback
6. Next Steps

Some key messages that were shared with the workshop are outlined here.

Aim of the Monnow Street Design Project

To reach consensus on a place-based design that is focused on a two-way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.

The Physical Scope

The physical extent of the project is from the junction of Monnow Street with Blestium Street at the southwestern edge through the “pinch point” with St John’s Street to the northeast. Whilst this is the physical design area, the County Council recognises the need to understand how Monnow Street relates to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street so that a cohesive experience is achieved.

Process to Date

The workshop was informed of:

- Previous studies and works – pre Covid such as in Agincourt Square and in the “pinch point”
- The response to the Covid pandemic – one way and temporary measures
- Coming out of Covid
- 2020-22 Active Travel studies into Monnow Street
- Consultation
 - Late 2020 on broad range of options
 - Early 2022 – two-way street with various options
- Need to move the design process forward

Design Principles

As a starting point for this stage of the design process, the following design principles were presented:

- Ways to improve the environmental quality for people walking and accessing Monnow Street
- Ways to accommodate cycling through the Street

- Maintaining a two way street for vehicles
- Accommodating loading/unloading
- Provision for disabled parking
- Consideration of on-street short stay parking

The need to also include public transport provision within the design was identified by a stakeholder, with the need to understand how the bus stops in Monnow Keep relate to Monnow Street and whether additional stages need to be considered as well as how buses move through Monnow Street as a public place.

The Workshop Feedback

From reviewing the four-breakout sessions, we have identified some common issues, thinking and items that need to be considered as we move onto the next stage of the design development process. We have grouped them into design related and wider project/scheme considerations.



Wider Considerations

- Arrival management
- Parking supply, management and pedestrian linkages to and from Monnow Street
- How the bus station relates to the street
- Relationship to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street – exploration, linkage, signage, events and activities

Design Considerations

- A two-way street
- Positioning of loading, disabled and short-term parking
- Sloping pavements
- Drain covers and accessibility
- Uncontrolled crossings along the whole street
- Pedestrians crossing at corner of Robin Hood pub
- Can the street accommodate the principles of a shared space?
- Kerb height and detail
- Swept path detail from bus station onto Monnow Street
- Spaces being agile and adaptable, future proofing
- How greening, trees can complement and work for the street
- How can the town's story be told through place-based design?

Workshop 2

The second workshop was held in the Community Room at the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square on Tuesday, 29th November between the hours of 5pm and 6-30pm. The County Council invited those stakeholders that attended the first workshop, in addition to those that couldn't attend.

Format

The Community Room was split into two separate areas with the main speakers positioned towards the front of the workshop.

The Cabinet Member for Equalities & Engagement and local ward member for Monmouth Town Ward welcomed people to the workshop and thanked people for attending the last workshop and welcomed some new faces to the Monnow Street co-production design process.

The workshop structure was as follows:

- Page 94
33
1. Why We Are Here
 2. The Last 3 Weeks
 3. Workshop 1 – Main Messages
 4. Our Design Response
 5. Breakouts - Discussion
 6. Collective Feedback
 7. Next Steps – 5 Mins

The County Council's Regeneration Manager provided attendees with an update as what activities had been undertaken since the first workshop.

These included:

- Received letters and emails re-enforcing views and adding more to the discussion
- The preparation and issue of workshop note 1
- County Council officers' workshop – briefing and understanding their views on design principles
- Reading what people have contributed to the design process and preparing our response




Bringing the Layers Together

The following plan was shared which brings together all of the layers into a single design response. Some artists impressions were also shared from various locations and views within Monnow Street.

Figure 1 - The Design Concept Proposal



Figure 2 - The Design Concept Proposal



Source: Roberts Limbrick

The Workshop Feedback (summary)

A Place for People

- Like wider pavements.
- Need to consider disabled and visually impaired and other people using pavements.
- Please de-clutter pavements.
- Loss of previous and ongoing investment in outside space by Salt & Pepper.
- Provision of corduroy paving for visually impaired along the kerb and along the whole route.
- More benches and places to sit.
- Maintenance of the town cleaning of the pavements is poor and needs more manpower, with one man is not sufficient.
- Two-metre-wide pavements are not as viable when you have A boards on pavements.
- Pedestrian signage to car parks and other parts of town e.g., Church Street (2).
- It would be a shame to take the area outside Salt & Pepper away – this bit works well now.
- By widening pavements, will vehicles be able to pass within the carriageway?
- Introduce a 20mph speed limit.
- What is the width of the carriageway – can too large vehicles pass at the same time?
- The visuals for the corner of Robin Hood pub show extra “stuff” which may make it harder for drivers.
- Why have extended tables and chairs space outside those food and drink establishments when they have rear garden space already? Coffi Lab has a large outdoor space behind the main interior area. Same issue at the Robin Hood.

- There are more impediments to people with sight impairment and whilst it provides protection from cars parking it only has an aesthetic relevance.
- Greater flexibility to the space “over the years” as the High Street evolves (or declines). It would be served better by a blank canvas with moveable furniture to adapt to the changing environment.

A Place for Crossing

- The crossing by the Robin Hood corner needs to be considered. Is it diagonal to the DIY store or linked straight across to toilet block?
- Like zebra crossings as courtesy crossings
- Can we change the give way priority at the bend by the toilet block, so cars have to stop and enter Monnow Street. This may help with pedestrian crossing point.
- There are too many crossings; can we monitor pedestrian activity to observe desire lines and crossing points and be more targeted?
- Provide a crossing at Salt & Pepper.

A Place for Loading

- What if we have rear access, do we need a loading bay?
- Our charity shop cannot get clothes collected!
- Policing and management of loading bays.
- Loading and short stay parking outside the post office. (3)
- Can we look at a loading bay close to Boots as they have no rear access?
- We need more central loading bays that are on the edges

A Place for Planting

- No trees, more parking.
- If plants are included, they need to be maintained after installation.

- Like the Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme planting – would like more instead of some parking spaces.
- I am not sure that the ground level green spaces will work – dogs mess, litter will be a problem.
- Too much greenery will take up parking (2).
- Green spaces – installation of trees and planters means additional maintenance (and cost) and isn't conclusive with hard environments which gather leaves, moss and lichen which if not maintained will become a hazard.
- With local knowledge I can tell you that we (Monmouth) will lose between 6 to 10 more businesses before this is implemented because of more important factors than landscaping.
- The viability of the High Street is not going to be affected by landscaping, the community needs vibrant healthy businesses to attract locals and visitors alike.
- Concerns of trees, specifically canopies and vehicles and roots damaging pavement.
- The installation of green planters and trees detracts from the historical nature of Monnow Street.

Page 97

A Place for Parking

- Disabled parking space needed near Specsavers.
- Now less on street parking. Retailers want more, not less.
- Parking from 38 to 22?
- Could disabled parking also be a drop off zone?
- Most parking should be disabled.
- Create a central drop off zone.
- Parking only for disabled, taxis and deliveries.
- Have fewer parking spaces.
- We have lost 14 parking spaces in this proposal compared to the existing situation.
- There seems to be no parking spaces at the top end of town.

- Can you look at herringbone parking rather than longitudinal? Will you get in more spaces?
- Provide a free car park in Monmouth (like in Abergavenny) apart from Tuesdays.
- Look at parking spaces outside post office.
- Disabled spaces outside key stores e.g., Boots and the other pharmacy.
- More parking – fewer crossings.
- Any disabled bays should be a maximum of one hour.

Cyclists

- The proposal looks safe for cyclists.
- Bike parking provision.
- Bike parking should be more convenient than cars Parking for bicycles. (2)
- Implement chippy fields cycle path.

General

- Need to track buses through the scheme and their access and exit from the bus station.
- Identity a rear access from car parks into High Street.
- Please consult with children and young people.
- Develop a town wide parking strategy.
- We need to look at the feasibility of a new pedestrian access from Monnow Street car park onto Monnow Street.
- Get rid of the pinch point. Why is this pinch point staying? It is dangerous and causes traffic to stack up.
- We need to still understand the relationship of the town centre to the A40?
- Worries over construction works and disruption to business. How will this be managed, specifically ways to reduce business disruption and loss of trade?

- If you are making it nicer for shops to put stuff outside, are you going to try and bring back a fee on boards and street furniture, and the need for insurance. It was a nightmare last time it was tried to implement.
- There is an existing problem for buses exiting from Monmouth Keep onto Monnow Street. This needs to be resolved.
- Trees on the other side and tables on the other will make it harder for buses to exit bus station.
- If we are doing all of this, please can we have more car parking (preferably free) on the edges of town and signage please.
- Without improving access/out via A40 (reduce speed) and free car parking, town prosperity will not improve.
- Good businesses, and a variety are what will make people and tourists come to Monmouth (not trees).

Proposed

Workshop 3

The third workshop was held in the Town Council Chamber Room at the Store Hall, Agincourt Square on Tuesday, 26th January between the hours of 6pm and 8pm. The County Council invited those stakeholders that attended the second workshop, which included any businesses that couldn't attend the Chamber of Commerce workshop on the evening of the 27th of January.

- County and Town Councillors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Local Businesses
- Interest groups

Format

This third and final workshop in the design process did not involve any breakout sessions with the main purpose to share the proposed design that would go forward to wider community consultation.

The Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Economy welcomed people to the workshop and thanked people for attending the last workshop and re-enforced the spirit and values of being involved in the co-production design process. He also raised the disappointing news that the County Council had been unsuccessful with its Levelling Up Fund bid to UK Government. He stated that the Council was reviewing whether it would apply through round three of the Fund, but projects like Monnow Street still require development and need to be designed, costed and ready for implementation.

The meeting structure was as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Purpose
3. LUF Bid Results
4. Direct Business Consultations
5. (Round 2)
6. Other Activities
7. Design Evolution
8. Next Steps

The County Council's Regeneration Manager provided an update as what activities had been undertaken since the first workshop, with supplementary information related to the UK Government's decision that the County Council had been unsuccessful with its Levelling Up Fund application. Other key points made included:

These included:

- A further wave of consultation had been held with Monnow Street businesses during December with their comments fed into the design process; other town centre businesses in the top end of the town were also engaged with;

- The County Council and Town Council are making progress on the Place Making Plan and hope to start this process over the coming months;
- Handling direct email correspondence on the project and the process;
- A second County Council officers’ workshop is to be held to receive technical feedback on the proposed design.

Main Design Action Points

1. To organise a meeting with a local wheelchair user to understand current experiences within Monnow Street and consider how the proposed street design can respond in relation to pavement material, drainage channels, dropped kerbs and other design features.
2. To review proposed courtesy crossings in terms of frequency, specifically near to Salt and Pepper and Estero Lounge.
3. To consider provision for cycle trailers within cycle stand provision.
4. To extend design area to include a section of Blestium Street, in order to better announce Monnow Street to vehicles and provide enhanced crossings prior to the Robin Hood public house corner and to create a courtesy crossing to the toilet block island.
5. A number of items that are not within the physical design scope will be picked up through the County Council’s Placemaking Plan process.

4) Business Engagement

In addition to the stakeholder process, which the Chamber of Commerce was represented at, the County Council and consultancy team also prioritized the need to speak to those businesses in Monnow Street, as well as to raise awareness of the design proposal with businesses in the upper end of the town centre close to Agincourt Square and Church Street. This engagement was broken down into two phases:

- **Phase 1** – to understand specific businesses such as loading/unloading, their type of customer (popping in or longer stay), outdoor licensing needs and other requirements.
- **Phase 2** – to share with businesses the draft design proposal to gain feedback and make changes where required.

Phase 1

During November 2022, visits to Monnow Street businesses were made over a number of weeks to try to meet as many business owners and managers as possible. Using a feedback card, interviews helped to understand:

- The location of deliveries – front of rear;
- The size of vehicle deliveries and frequency;
- Any existing pavement licenses and any future needs for outdoor displays and uses;
- To understand the businesses’ customer type so that the street can respond to their needs such as short stay parking, disabled parking or whether they are longer stay visitors and want more space to dwell and explore, etc.;
- The interviews also provided opportunities to talk to other concerns such as business rates, vacant premises and other issues.

Monnow Street Business Feedback Card

Name of business:
 Address:
 Owner/manager:
 Email address:
 Phone number:

Deliveries:	Front <input type="checkbox"/>		Rear <input type="checkbox"/>	
Vehicle Type:	Light goods vehicle	Smaller rigid 3.5 to 7.5 tonnes	Bigger rigid 7.5 to 18 tonnes	Multi axle lorry – 18 tonnes – artic/rigid
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Frequency				
Current pavement licensing	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Specifics:		
What is your perception of your customer on time spent in the town centre?	Popping into town <input type="checkbox"/> A longer shop (between 2 to 3 hours) <input type="checkbox"/> Having a day out in Monmouth <input type="checkbox"/> Any specifics:			
How do you see Monnow Street in future years if the right improvements are made?				

Date: Time:

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Feedback

Of those premises in Monnow Street, 75 of them actively gave us their feedback. Those that did not engage were either i) too busy ii) weren't available or iii) the premise was unoccupied or vacant.

The feedback was qualitative with some of the following common themes shared with the County Council and design team members:

- The lack of loading/unloading provision across the whole street, specifically the number and distribution that meets a wide range of vehicle sizes;
- Condition of existing pavements and problems with water ponding;
- Areas of the street where pavements are too narrow and need to be improved;
- Range of views related to on street parking in terms of customers needs e.g. popping, disabled users, elderly customers and drop off zones;
- Varied discussions on the role and function of Monmouth town centre and how the design should respond, specifically some businesses wanted it to go back to pre-covid days, whilst a larger number wanted a more destination-based approach with improved public space;
- The state and performance of Monnow Street and the wider town centre and the need for a co-ordinated approach that addresses parking, vacant properties, destination management and signage and events and activities.

These comments were fed into the design process, which influenced the draft design proposal during late November 2022.

Phase 2

Once a draft design was developed, the County Council and design team members returned to those town centre businesses that were engaged with during November. This took place from the 5th of December with the engagement running upto the 22nd of December. Dependent on the availability of the business owner or manager, a team member shared with them an A2 size plan of the proposal, talked them through and sought feedback using the themes that were used at the 29th of November stakeholder workshop.

The team engaged with approximately 65 businesses (77%) in Monnow Street with the intent to also share the emerging design with businesses in Church Street, White Swan Court and Agincourt Square and other neighbouring streets. Due to the Christmas holiday period, the County Council continued some of the discussions into early January to ensure everyone has the opportunity to comment. 55 of these businesses were happy to complete the feedback form.



Source: Roberts Limbrick

On sharing the design, a feedback form was used to collect comments and to rate the level of agreement/disagreement with the design proposal. These centred on:

Place for people:

- Movement
- Dwell
- Rest
- Leisure: eat, drink
- Inclusive

Place for safe crossing opportunities:

- Often and convenient
- Safe
- Pedestrian priority
- Inclusive
- Courtesy / zebra type: not necessarily with all the associated paraphernalia

Place for loading and deliveries:

- Often and convenient
- Even spread
- Legible
- Practical


Place for landscape and greening:

- Amenity: colour
- Enclosure and space creation / separation
- Rain gardens: Drainage and flooding
- Pollution control
- Bio-diversity
- Clear of pedestrian space and movement

Place for parking:

- Convenient
- Evenly spread

- Disabled
- Non dominating
- Integrated from the outset




Source: Roberts Limbrick

Our Workshop note 3 provides a more comprehensive note on the feedback with the following items relate to design changes.

1. Landscape maintenance: needs to have a robust maintenance strategy in place.
2. Crossing Points: positive response and like the fact that these have been included. Are, however, there too many?
3. Southern loading bay: can this be moved slightly?
4. Parking: is there potential to include some to the southern end of the street?
5. Parking: How many disabled bays will there be?
6. Buses: footway run over when entering Monnow Street from the bus station?

Page 103

When rating the design proposal against the key headings, the chart below shows the agreement/disagreement ratings.



Source: Roberts Limbrick

Based on percentages, the feedback is rated as follows:

- 93% of businesses agree with people based benefits
- 95% of businesses agree with the improved crossings
- 93% of businesses agree with improved loading provision
- 82% of businesses agree with the landscaping and greening
- 67% of businesses agree with the parking proposals

Chamber of Commerce Workshop

This workshop was held from 6pm to 8pm on Wednesday, 27th January in the Town Council Chamber Room at the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square. The session was in addition to the stakeholder workshop on the previous evening of the 26th of January, with businesses invited to both dependent on availability. It was co-hosted by Monmouthshire County Council and the Chamber of Commerce. The meeting followed the same format as the previous evening's stakeholder workshop, with an open questions and answers session on the proposed design.

A full note of the Chamber of Commerce workshop can be found in workshop note 3.

Page 104 Main Design Action Points

1. To extend design area to include a section of Blestium Street, in order to better announce Monnow Street to vehicles and provide enhanced crossings prior to the Robin Hood public house corner and to create a courtesy crossing to the toilet block island.
2. To consider the traffic regulation orders for the loading bays to transfer to short stay parking outside specific hours.
3. To provide an additional disabled or short stay parking space opposite the One Stop/Post Office.
4. To develop the flexi-parking approach outside Pizza Express and Salt and Pepper that would provide approximately 4no. spaces.
5. To remove the proposed cycle stand outside WH Smiths and replace with a short stay parking space.

5) The Community Survey

This section provides a summary of the analysis of the community results. You can view the full survey results in a separate document titled Community Survey Results and Analysis. The survey was the main form of feedback that people could use to provide comments on the proposed design for Monnow Street in Monmouth town centre.

Survey Promotion and Availability

The survey was made available from Friday, the 10th of February upto midnight on Sunday, the 5th of March. It was made available through a number of ways:

- Online survey through Monmouthshire’s website with accompanying link to the proposed design;
- At face to face consultation on Saturday, 11th February and Wednesday, 15th February which was held in 22 Agincourt Square, Monmouth town centre; paper copies and online survey cards were provided over these two days;
- A static exhibition was displayed at Monmouth Community Hub in Whitecross Street from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March; paper copies and online survey cards were provided;
- Paper copies and a post box was provided at Monmouth Leisure Centre and at the Shire Hall from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March.


The Response

The survey received 546 touchpoints with 521 completed responses (24 dropped out having not viewed the design proposal). 409 online responses were received, with 137 hard copies received. 544 were submitted in English and 2 in the

medium of Welsh. The County Council also received 20 emails through its MCC Regeneration or through direct officer email accounts.

View Monnow Street Proposal

To find out more please email
Mccregeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk
 or phone Claire Sullivan on 07714 325276




Source: Roberts Limbrick

The Results


The following charts represent the analysis of the total responses received.

About You


Please indicate which of the following best applies to you.




How do you currently travel to Monnow Street (tick all that apply)?



How often do you visit Monnow Street?




What are the main reasons you visit Monnow Street? (tick all that apply)




The Proposed Design

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=497



To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=495

To what extent do you rate the proposal as i) a pedestrian ii) a cyclist iii) someone with a disability or impairment and iv) as someone who needs to drive through the street?

To what extent do you agree that the design proposal meets the project aim?
 “To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=493

Summary of Overall Survey Results


- 355 of the 546 respondents identified that were a Monmouth town resident (65%), with 116 respondents living within the rural catchment (21%), and 50 working in the town (9%); 19 business owners in Monnow Street completed the survey with an additional 20 respondents either owning a business in other town centre locations or in the wider town;
- 84% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street, 60% walk, 14% cycle and 8% use public transport;
- 46% of respondents make daily trip to Monnow Street, with 43% visiting at least once a week, and 5% at least once every fortnight;
- Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (67%), meet family and friends for a coffee (54%), shopping for non-food items (44%), undertake a mainly weekly food shop (42%), enjoy a meal out (39%) or take part in a leisure or entertainment activity (27%);
- When rating the design proposal:
 - 51% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better places to spend time in compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 62% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 25% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 46% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 53% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 35% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 42% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 39% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;

- When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:
 - 29% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 34% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 38% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 25% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 49% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 32% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, respondents rated the proposal pedestrians rated 3.3/5, for cyclists 3/5, 2.8/5 for someone with a disability or impairment and 2.3/5 for someone who needs to drive through the street;
- In reviewing the project aim of “To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town., respondents scored this on average as 2.88/5.


Other Results by Mode of Transport and Age

Mode of Transport


Drive




Walk



Cycle




Public Transport




By Age - To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?


Under 16




16 - 25




26 - 35




36-45




46-55




56-65



65 plus



I'd rather not say






Age - To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?


16 - 25

26 - 35


Under 16




36-45




46-55




56-65



65 plus



I'd rather not say



DRAFT

DRAFT



monmouthshire
sir fynwy



monmouthshire
sir fynwy

Monnow Street Project – Report of Consultation Appendices

Community Exhibition Comments

Community Survey Results Analysis

March 2023

Contents

1) Introduction	1
2) Survey Promotion and Availability	1
3) The Response	1
4) Community Exhibition – Comments.....	3
5) Community Survey Results – Overall.....	7
6) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Monmouth Resident.....	20
7) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Resident Who Lives Outside the Town e.g. Dingestow	29
8) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Monnow Street Business	38
9) Survey Results – By Mode of Transport	47
10) Survey Results – By Gender	50
11) Survey Results – By Age	52
12) Are there are any other comments you wish to make on the proposal?.....	56
13) Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Employment and Disability	126

1) Introduction

This document provides the analysis of the results from the completed community survey that was made available as part of the Monnow Street project design and consultation process that has taken place between October 2022 and March 2023.

It also presents comments made during the face to face consultation on the 11th and 15th February.

2) Survey Promotion and Availability

The survey was the main form of feedback that people could use to provide comments on the proposed design for Monnow Street in Monmouth town centre. The survey was made available from Friday, the 10th of February upto midnight on Sunday, the 5th of March. It was made available through a number of mediums:

- Online survey through Monmouthshire’s website with accompanying link to the proposed design;
- At face to face consultation on Saturday, 11th February and Wednesday, 15th February which was held in 22 Agincourt Square, Monmouth town centre; paper copies and online survey cards were provided over these two days;
- A static exhibition was displayed at Monmouth Community Hub in Whitecross Street from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March; paper copies and online survey cards were provided;
- Paper copies and a post box was provided at Monmouth Leisure Centre and at the Shire Hall from Friday, 17th of February upto Saturday, the 4th of March.

The consultation opportunity was promoted by:

- A press release distributed to local and regional media;
- The use of outdoor correx posters at key sites across the town centre;
- Use of County Council social media accounts, specifically Facebook and Twitter;
- The opportunities to engage was emailed out to local stakeholder groups, town centre businesses, town and community councils, was emailed out to contacts generated through the design process.

3) The Response

The survey received 546 touchpoints with 522 completed responses (24 dropped out having not viewed the design proposal). 409 online responses were received, with 137 hard copies received. 544 were submitted in English and 2 in the medium of Welsh. The County Council also received 20 emails through its MCC Regeneration and officer email accounts.

Image 1 - Consultation Promotion



View Monnow Street Proposal

10am to 5pm Saturday, 11th February
10am to 7pm Wednesday/Thursday 15th - 16th February
22 Agincourt Square, Monmouth Town Centre

Come along and view our proposed design for Monnow Street
Meet Councillors, Officers and Design Team - Have Your Say

17th to the 3rd March - Window Display 22 Agincourt Square
View Proposal at www.monmouthshire.gov.uk
Have Your Say www.surveymonkey/link
Consultation Closes - Friday, 3rd March

To find out more please email McCreGeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk or phone Claire Sullivan on 07714 325276

Eich barn chi - y Camau Nesaf 14 Have Your Say - Next Steps

Eich Barn Chi:
Dioch am gymryd yr amser i weld y cynigion dylunio llyn ar gyfer Stryd Mynwy yn Nlledfynwy. Gallwch gyflwyno'ch sylwadau mewn sawl ffordd:

- Yn bersonol gydag aelod o'r tîm dylunio neu swyddog Cynghor Sir yn yr arddangosfa gyhoeddus
- Trwy gwblhau fersiwn brintiedig o'r arolwg y gellir ei adael yn yr arddangosfa ar 11 a 15 Chwefror neu yn llyfrgell, Canolfan Hamdden neu Neuadd Sir Trefynwy
- Edrych ar y cynigion yng nghyntedd Canolfan Gymunedol Trefynwy, Whitecross Street rhwng 17 Chwefror a 4 Mawrth
- Cwblhau'r arolwg ar-lein trwy glicio ar y ddolen ar ein gweddalen
- Os oes gennych unrhyw sylw penodol na ellir ei gymwys yn yr arolwg, e-bostwch ni ar McCreGeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk neu ffonwch Claire Sullivan ar 07870 489158

Have Your Say:
Thank you for taking the time to view these design proposals for Monnow Street in Monmouth. You can feedback your comments in a number of ways:

- In person with a member of the design team or County Council officer at the public exhibition
- By completing a printed version of the feedback survey which can be handed in at the exhibition on the 11th and 15th February or at Monmouth library, Leisure Centre or Shine Hall
- By completing the on-line survey by clicking on the link on our website page
- If you have a specific comment that cannot be included in the survey, please email us at McCreGeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk or phone Claire Sullivan on 07870 489158

Y Camau Nesaf...
Ar ôl y cyfnod ymgynghori byddwn yn:

- Darlennu a dadnoddodi eich ymateb
- Cyhoeddi adroddiad llawn o'r ymgynghoriad
- Dweddiari'r Cynghor Sir ar y broses ddiylunio
- Rhoi gwybod i'r gymuned leol a sefydliadau rhanddeiliaid ar ganlyniad proses ddiylunio Stryd Mynwy

Next Steps...
After the consultation period has finished we will:

- Read and analyse your feedback
- Publish a full report of consultation
- Update the County Council on the design process
- Inform the local community and stakeholder organisations on the outcome of the Monnow Street design process

Monmouthshire County Council:
McCreGeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Proiect Stryd Mynwy Monnow Street Project

4) Community Exhibition – Comments

During the face to face consultation on the 11th and 15th February, members of the public were directed to complete the feedback survey, but in addition some made comments on post it notes around the large plan on display. These were the themes and comments made.

- These plans look great – we need to prioritise pedestrians over traffic
- All very well to cater for the summer with outdoor cafes, winters are wet here – go back to option 1
- We need people to live in town centres and this plans looks like a good place to live. Great scheme!
- Why can't you leave our town's main street alone. Stop the waste of money on this – return it to normal
- Really good. More space = more people. Well done.
- I feel the scheme will force more traffic onto the A40
- As pretty as this looks if there are not shops to visit, why will people either shop or visit?
- Thanks for the consultation
- What a stupid idea. Plus its not very practical. The Council obviously have money to waste.
- The day after Welsh Gov announced a ban on new road projects – what? Climate change – get people out of cars.
- Please go back to pre-covid design. Many older people have temporary mobility issues can cannot get blue badge so not able to use disabled parking.
- You have made a wholly mess of Monnow Street. None of your proposals is sensible one of putting it back to what it was in 2019. The last thing Monmouth needs is a cycle lane. We constantly do need a one way system which is accident waiting to happen – put it back!!

Page 121

- For the older and infirm – the fewer the cars the better – some of us cant drive and park outside the shops we want. The smooth pavement in Agincourt Square are great.
- Prioritise the retailer interest and restore the street to its former historic layout which was much wider
- Very disappointed that this is the first public consultation. Seems a fait accompli. Cannot see if parking spaces are wider than the new design can accommodate the same number of spaces
- Put it back the ways it was driving through town, sorry put it back as the street is a mess
- I love the new look, so fed up of the “moaners”. Would they prefer a clogged-up, fume ridden street? Have they been to Abergavenny lately?
- Put in back to what it was – leave it alone

Pedestrianisation

- Pedestrianize please – at least one way and cycle lane, if not
- Full pedestrianisation – no pollution, safety.
- 2 open electrical vehicles (as in National Trust properties) would link car parks and travel up and down Monnow Street allowing a 1 way system or pedestrianisation – i.e. far fewer cars
- Could we install telescopic bollards to adapt Monnow Street to future demands (summer pedestrianisation for example)
- People first, then cycling. Our environment is suffering due to too much car use. Better public transport for all. Our children need a future.

Crossings

- There are too many crossings which will cause cars to stop and start -keep 4 and eliminate 2
- Looks a not like a zebra town
- We do not need all these crossings
- St Johns Street pedestrian crossing goes onto road

- More crossings are great
- This plan is not possible with the 6 zebra crossings, more exhaust fumes from the stop start. Shops closing. If it was new town it would be possible. Look after our heritage.
- 10 dedicated crossing points unnecessary and will cause more pollution from stationary traffic
- Please consider crossings areas at the top in the vicinity of the Punch House public houses
- Dangerous zebra crossing by Robin Hood

Accessibility

- Let's have some wheelchair users involved in the planning and consultation
- Please widen and flatten pedestrian areas – for easier wheelchair access
- Please improve wheelchair access
- These are great. My daughter uses a wheelchair and at last we will have a Monmouth which is accessible
- Ensure edge from pavement to road is clear and visible – avoid problems from Hereford City
- Too many tables and chairs restricting walking

Linkages

- We need access from the furthest car parks that is beyond the M&S car park straight through into Monnow Street then it would be used much more and relieve Monnow Street
- Please include on drawings pedestrian access to car parks behind Hancocks. We can and should have more links to the top end of town via No. 10 Monnow Street.

Loading and Parking

- More free parking required
- We need to make sure parking and loading restrictions are policed
- Unloading bays – we have always needed them

- Some loading bays appear excessive in some places because the call for them is less. For example two outside Mon Fabrics when probably only one is required.
- Radius to parking bay edges
- Motorhome parking is needed in the town
- Parking and loading needs to be enforced
- What about improving access for loading at the back of Monnow Street
- What about restricted times for loading
- No parking for tourists, pay and display prevents visitors spending time in upper part of the town
- Not enough parking, pavements are too wide
- Loading and unloading use restricted times

Planting

- Use bronze coud in rain gardens
- Love the rain gardens and wider pavements
- Who is going to look after them – handy place for fag ends
- Remove added greenery on south side to improve both parking and traffic flow
- Will there be a contract in place to maintain the plants
- Who will prune and weed the green spaces?
- Ensure appropriate trees and shrubs are planted, consult in-hose arboriculturist at MCC
- Too many trees and other obstructions
- Upkeep of green planting and more consultation on what is suitable
- Good to see trees and gardens to improve what was a grey and rundown looking street – we need to encourage visitors to a bright and welcoming high street.

Cycling

- Improve access for cyclists would be appreciated
- Extra width or priority would be beneficial – narrowing of street has potential risk of car doors opening onto cyclists

Image 2 - Photos from 2 Day Face to Face Consultation



Page 123

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Public Transport

- Could a more suitable bus station be included in the plans?
- These plans take no consideration of the bus routes to and from the bus station. The emphasis has been solely on appearance without taking into account how this town operates.

Young People

- Could you share these plans in the comp – young people need to be involved?

Cost

- Can we as residents know the cost before an agreement is reached?
- The tourist don't pay our excessive Council tax! What about the locals
- Funding – where is the it coming from and how much will it cost. The consultancy team don't seem to have an idea of cost. Temporarily with no funding – return to as it was
- What is cost?

Other

- If the central road could be lighter coloured material instead of tarmac it would life the whole scheme and make the road look wider
- Road looks narrow in places almost single vehicle passing
- More outdoor seating if possible
- Disabled parking at the museum - not reduced kerbs
- Renditions do not show enough cars – sadly Monmouth is not this quiet
- Salt and pepper coffee stalls outside very dangerous with hot tea and coffee being carried across a narrow public pavement
- Is there any possibility to either remove or radically adjust the public toilet building , it's a real eye sore!

- Current planters look messy and how much did they cost?
- The pinch point causes lines of traffic coming up the road
- You ned to lower business rates to encourage trade, no amount of tarting up will compensate if not enough shops are open
- Pavements are flooded with new design – tatty planters – totally out of place in historic town
- Kings Heath in Birmingham ran an interesting project, with changes to traffic and parking which led to lower pollution and increased business

5) Community Survey Results – Overall

About You


Please indicate which of the following best applies to you.



Page 125

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=546

How do you currently travel to Monnow Street (tick all that apply)?




Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=546

Others


- Motorised disability scooter
- Car to the car park opposite Bridges, then walk.
- There is no public transport where I live
- Park in a car park not on Monnow Street - no need or any car to park on Monnow Street
- Van
- Scooter
- Have to walk, can't park the car anywhere

How often do you visit Monnow Street?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=546

What are the main reasons you visit Monnow Street? (tick all that apply)



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=546

Other

- Medical appointments
- Drive through on way back from leisure centre
- Passing through briefly for food and non food shopping
- To visit Leisure Centre Gym
- I spend time there with my friends on the way somewhere
- To hang out with my friends and catch up


- I walk to school
- I go to school here
- I want to use the post office, then shop. It is so user unfriendly now I use the post office in Redbrook and the town has lost my shopping money
- I drop into Monmouth very frequently to take our children to school and back and to children's sporting activities
- Past business owner for over 20 years
- Cinema
- Necessary short visits: Bank, Post Office, Chemist and Hair Dresser
- move goods from Bridges Charity shop
- I do a big food shop
- Until retiring in 2021, I spent nearly 40 years working professionally in Monmouth as an architect.
- Buy newspaper
- I live in Monnow Keep
- Visiting St Mary's Priory Church
- To visit my building society
- As part of a walk
- I go out for my break from work
- Cycle destination from s yat
- Take elderly residents I care for into Monmouth as their only trip outside their house.
- Visit the library & Leisure Centre
- Time out occasionally
- Doctors

- I visit to check on my property Hebron Hall just off Monnow Street and also to collect our children from school in Monmouth.
- I pass through Monnow Street on my way to / from home
- I volunteer in a charity shop
- Specific non-food shopping e.g. Chemist when needed.
- Visit to Post Office
- Business related visit
- Medical visit
- Exercise (walking)
- Live in Monnow Street
- I travel through the town to get to work on the Wonastow industrial estate
- I walk through the town to other areas, particularly the leisure centre
- School Run, After School activities.
- Visit a public house
- Short Non-food shop
- Collect Grandchildren from school
- Visit to pharmacy, doctor's etc
- Cycle commuting
- Walking
- Doctors, pharmacy, opticians, Bank, post office
- Baby groups
- Walk the dog and pass through on way to gym
- Kids clubs

- Sewing class once a week
- Pass through to take kids to Osbaston school
- Just to take my disabled husband out we never manage to park and end up going elsewhere.
- Home bargains shopping
- The Savoy
- Car for relative in Monnow Keep
- Pick up prescription
- I come to look after our elderly parents, run errands for them and drive them to appointments etc
- School Run
- Medical appointments
- Visit the Savoy
- Visiting post office
- Live in the street
- My children are at school in Monmouth

The Proposed Design


To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?



Page 132


Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=497

To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=495


To what extent do you rate the proposal as i) a pedestrian ii) a cyclist iii) someone with a disability or impairment and iv) as someone who needs to drive through the street?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=493

To what extent do you agree that the design proposal meets the project aim?

“To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=449

Summary of Overall Survey Results


- 355 of the 546 respondents identified that were a Monmouth town resident (65%), with 116 respondents living within the rural catchment (21%), and 50 working in the town (9%); 19 business owners in Monnow Street completed the survey with an additional 20 respondents either owning a business in other town centre locations or in the wider town;
- 84% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street, 60% walk, 14% cycle and 8% use public transport;
- 46% of respondents make daily trip to Monnow Street, with 43% visiting at least once a week, and 5% at least once every fortnight;
- Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (67%), meet family and friends for a coffee (54%), shopping for non-food items (44%), undertake a mainly weekly food shop (42%), enjoy a meal out (39%) or take part in a leisure or entertainment activity (27%);
- When rating the design proposal:
 - 51% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better place to spend time in compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 62% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 25% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 46% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 53% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 35% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 42% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 39% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:

- 29% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 34% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 38% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 25% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 49% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 32% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, respondents rated the proposal as follows:
 - pedestrians rated 3.3/5
 - cyclists 3/5
 - someone with a disability or impairment 2.8/5 and
 - for someone who needs to drive through the street 2.3/5
- In reviewing the project aim of “*To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town*”, respondents scored this on average as 2.88/5.

6) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Monmouth Resident

About You


How do you currently travel to Monnow Street (tick all that apply)?



Page 138

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=354


How often do you visit Monnow Street?



Page 139

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=354

What are the main reasons you visit Monnow Street? (Tick all that apply)




Page 140

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=355

The Proposed Design


To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?



Page 141

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=327


To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?



Page 142

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=327

To what extent do you rate the proposal as i) a pedestrian ii) a cyclist iii) someone with a disability or impairment and iv) as someone who needs to drive through the street?




Page 143

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=327

To what extent do you agree that the design proposal meets the project aim?

“To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=327

Summary of Monmouth Resident Survey Results


- 79% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street, 82% walk, 18% cycle and 9% use public transport;
- 51% of respondents make daily trip to Monnow Street, with 42% visiting at least once a week, and 4% at least once every fortnight;
- Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (73%), meet family and friends for a coffee (56%), undertake a mainly weekly food shop (47%), shopping for non-food items (46%), enjoy a meal out (42%) or take part in a leisure or entertainment activity (29%);
- When rating the design proposal:
 - 52% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better place to spend time in compared to 36% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 62% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 23% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 47% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 33% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 56% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 32% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 42% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 41% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 40% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 44% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:
 - 29% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 44% who disagree or totally disagree;

- 32% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 43% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 41% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 47% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 25% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 48% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 35% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 45% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, rated the proposal as follows:
 - pedestrians rated 3.3/5
 - cyclists 3/5, 2.8/5
 - someone with a disability or impairment 2.8/5
 - for someone who needs to drive through the street 2.3/5
- In reviewing the project aim of “*To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town*” respondents scored this on average as 2.90/5.

7) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Resident Who Lives Outside the Town e.g. Dingestow

About You


How do you currently travel to Monnow Street (tick all that apply)?



Page 147

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=116


How often do you visit Monnow Street?



Page 148

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=116

What are the main reasons you visit Monnow Street? (Tick all that apply)




Page 149

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=116


The Proposed Design

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=106


To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?



Page 151

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=106

To what extent do you rate the proposal as i) a pedestrian ii) a cyclist iii) someone with a disability or impairment and iv) as someone who needs to drive through the street?




Page 152

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=106

To what extent do you agree that the design proposal meets the project aim?

“To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=96

Summary of Residents Who Live Outside the Town e.g. Dingestow


- 98% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street, 23% walk, 8% cycle and 7% use public transport;
- 38% of respondents make daily trip to Monnow Street, with 54% visiting at least once a week, and 3% at least once every fortnight;
- Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (72%), meet family and friends for a coffee (55%), undertake a mainly weekly food shop (47%), shopping for non-food items (49%), enjoy a meal out (37%) or take part in a leisure or entertainment activity (30%);
- When rating the design proposal:
 - 33% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better place to spend time in compared to 44% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 58% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 31% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 41% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 33% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 46% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 44% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 32% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 50% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 31% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 55% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:
 - 24% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 49% who disagree or totally disagree;

- 31% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 50% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 29% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 53% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 19% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 59% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 19% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 57% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, respondents rated the proposal as follows:
 - Pedestrians rated 3.2/5
 - Cyclists 3/5
 - Someone with a disability or impairment 2.6/5
 - Someone who needs to drive through the street 2.2/5
- In reviewing the project aim of “*To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town*” respondents scored this on average as 2.68/5.

8) Survey Results – By Respondent Type – a Monnow Street Business

About You


How do you currently travel to Monnow Street (tick all that apply)?



Page 156

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=18

How often do you visit Monnow Street?



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=18

What are the main reasons you visit Monnow Street? (Tick all that apply)




Page 158

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=19

The Proposed Design


To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?



Page 159

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=15


To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?



Page 160

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=15

To what extent do you rate the proposal as i) a pedestrian ii) a cyclist iii) someone with a disability or impairment and iv) as someone who needs to drive through the street?




Page 161

Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=15

To what extent do you agree that the design proposal meets the project aim?

“To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.”



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n=14


Summary of Monnow Street Businesses Responses

- 83% of respondents use a car to travel to Monnow Street, 28% walk and 17% cycle;
- Some of the main reasons to visit Monnow Street are to undertake a top up food shopping (37%) and shopping for non-food items (21%);
- When rating the design proposal:
 - 46% either totally agree or agree that it provides a better place to spend time in compared to 40% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 67% either totally agree or agree that provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre compared to 13% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 60% either totally agree or agree that it provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload compared to 20% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 34% either totally agree or agree that it improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change compared to 53% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 33% either totally agree or agree that it provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking and dropping off compared to 40% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 26% either totally agree or agree that it supports Monmouth as a market town destination compared to 60% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal if it was to be completed:
 - 20% either totally agree or agree that they would visit Monmouth town centre more compared to 60% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 20% either totally agree or agree that they would spend longer in the town centre compared to 60% who disagree or totally disagree;
 - 20% either totally agree or agree that they sit out in the public space more compared to 60% who disagree or totally disagree;


- 20% either totally agree or agree that they would explore the other parts of the town more compared to 67% who disagree or totally disagree;
- 20% either totally agree or agree that they would feel more confident about visiting Monmouth town centre compared to 60% who disagree or totally disagree;
- When rating the proposal from a specific perspective, respondents rated the following:
 - proposal pedestrians rated 2.6/5, for cyclists 2.6/5, 2.8/5 for someone with a disability or impairment and 2.3/5 for someone who needs to drive through the street;
 - In reviewing the project aim of “To reach consensus on a place based design that is focussed on a two way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town., respondents scored this on average as 2.3/5

9) Survey Results – By Mode of Transport


Drive



Walk




Cycle




Public Transport




Drive




Walk




Page 166
Cycle




Public Transport




Drive




Walk



Page 167



Public Transport






10) Survey Results – By Gender

It provides a better place for people to spend time in and enjoy the town centre

It provides more opportunities to cross the street and explore the town centre




It provides improved facilities for businesses to load and unload




It improves the visual attractiveness of the street with the planting of trees and greenery and helps climate change

It provides a balanced approach to disabled parking, short term stay parking, cycle parking, dropping people off and loading/unloading in the town centre


It supports Mornmouth as a market town destination




I would visit Marmouth town centre more




I would spend longer in the town centre




I would want to sit out in the public space more



I would explore the other parts of the town more




I would feel more confident about visiting Marmouth town centre




11) Survey Results – By Age

By Age - To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the design proposal?


Under 16



16-25




26-35




Page 17 of 36-45


46-55




56-65



65 plus



I'd rather not say






Age- To what extent do you agree with the following statements if such a proposal was completed?

Under 16

16-25




26-35



36-45


46-55

56-65



65 plus

I'd rather not say



12) Are there are any other comments you wish to make on the proposal?

Against the Proposal

It would be better if the powers that be asked the people who live and work in Monmouth what would be best for the town, before they waste money on schemes that nobody likes or wants - please listen to the shop keepers.

"Still too many obstructions for disabled people.

Too many crossings. Traffic will be at even more of a standstill, resulting in frustration and more pollution for pedestrians/cyclists.

Greenery areas all very well, but costly to upkeep and horrid if they are not."

This is a vanity project of no use to the town - a complete waste of money from the start. The project is presented as an attempt with little chance of funding ever. Remove all the 2020 works and reinstate herringbone parking.

This plan is out of order, you do not consider residents (the tax payer i might remind you) we live here. As for shopping you have made it impossible for decent shops to stay - we have 30 plus closed shops.

The Monnow street road is too narrow, it is now and will be more dangerous for cyclists. If you have been lucky enough to park in Monnow street you take your life in your hands in opening the car door. There is no need for such wide pavements(after all it is not oxford street). Ridiculous to have so many crossings, such a loss of car parking will adversely affect trade.

All the crossings may cause more traffic

I think it may cause more traffic

Less space for cars

It was better as it was before wasting our money on boxes and trees, Trees yes but eating hubs NO. Monmouth isn't a interesting place to visit any more-tackle the empty shops.

I go to Monmouth to do my shopping. If I want to sit out I don't go to town I go to the country to enjoy open spaces

Ridiculous reduction in parking and vehicular access. Will kill off shops and businesses. Waste of money just resurface all pavements and roads to pre covid design.

Many people have to drive into town and/or can't cycle, the prominence given to a cycle way is ridiculous. Also, the proposal with shared cycle and pedestrian section is dangerous. The current set up is users unfriendly, hard to cross uneven pavement, planters everywhere ~ why not have planters and trees by the Monnow and make that nicer.

"We are no longer a market town. so don't call Monmouth that. It gives a false impression of the town.

The wide street was a historic sign of a market town which has disappeared. What a shame.

If you go ahead with this you need more car parks as people won't stop this they can't park. In a rural county people have to travel by car and especially when doing the main shop. The bus service is a joke if you expect people to use it for work and shopping. I suspect that everyone involved in this doesn't live, work or use Monmouth for Dr's etc. So they just like the pretty pictures that have drawn by expensive consultants. Reality is there will always be large amount of cars lorries etc using Monnow Street so you need to accommodate this or provide inexpensive alternatives. Not sure there is any alternatives for lorries unloading for shops on the street

2 hours minimum parking is strange to say the least. The whole thing seems a anti car vendetta. This is a rural area not sure what you think we alternatives we got. Is this a push to get us to shop online and destroy the local shops.

Remember Even those people who are pedestrians probably drove to the town before going shopping. "

Monnow Street has difficulties because the only other way around is the dangerous dual carriageway. The covid measures totally ruined the town and many businesses has since closed leaving the high street withdrawn. There are better routes for cyclists around Chippenham rather than Monnow Street. Green areas are not needed, we are surrounded by countryside so use this space better for more disabled and loading spaces. Use a camera to trap these people blocking loading bays and double parking. A walkway bridge from the car park by Drybridge House would be beneficial, also more signs for it. The new car park by the Queens pub will be suicidal for people turning left from the dual carriageway, lorries thunder along and if you can't quickly turn left it is dangerous. All it takes is someone stopping to consider parking and the cars pile up behind and left with traffic speeding

behind them. Town is awful at the moment and the new proposal will not solve these issues. What's the point in putting money into this when majority of shops/businesses are closing? Short sighted and designed by people who do not know or visit the town at all times of day and night. Ask the local people what they want? We are the ones living here after all and paying taxes. Put the street back as it was. There are too many outdoor seating areas and too many crossings. Get rid is the greenery it won't be maintained. Re widen the road, add seats reduce amount of cycle parking and put the parking back. Most importantly stop ruining our town centre.

Many visitors to Monmouth (including my family) have children at the schools in town. They visit town to shop, collect and drop children, and carry out their weekly needs in the town. Whilst it is wonderful to have the green spaces in the high street, short term parking on Monnow Street is getting less and less and this stops people using Monmouth as opposed to Ross or Abergavenny, The planters take up too much space and many normal (i.e. non-disabled, non-loading) spaces have been sacrificed in recent years. Trees use less space than planters so are a better choice. Too many of the pavements have been widened, losing parking spaces. Lack of parking is a problem in the whole town, which is one of the reasons that so many shops are vacant. And not everyone is able to cycle or walk. We all have busy lives, need vehicles to carry children and bags, sports equipment, dogs, items for our employment etc, As electric vehicles become more common, pollution will reduce. There should be EV charging points available for this which could also be introduced in Monnow Street.

I agree that the street should be two way, as sometimes the dual carriageway gets grid-locked due to an accident. But two way also limits the length of people's journey which is clearly beneficial.

The number of pedestrian crossings proposed seems excessive.

It is important to look after the people who run businesses in town (not only shops), as these are what keep the town vibrant. Tourism is obviously important too, but most tourists also have a car, and provision needs to be made for them."

"Prior to the introduction of the current scheme the vacancy rate within Monmouth was exceptionally low, and I believe that the current scheme has contributed significantly to the current, much higher vacancy rate.

prior to the current interventions, the vacancy rate was much lower than Ross or Abergavenny, whereas it is now much higher. This cannot be entirely blamed on Covid, and the only explanation that I can think of for this change is the current scheme.

I have needed to think hard about this for professional reasons.

public transport in the area can never be adequate and can never transport more than a very small number of customers into Monmouth. Consequently, the ONLY option to providing adequate parking would be the complete death of the town.

Given the age demographic and topography of Monmouthshire neither walking or cycling are viable alternatives to using private vehicles

In addition, I believe that Monnow Street has had a very hard urban character for 1000 years, and that the introduction of street trees would cause serious harm to that character, and i would object to that.

The best interests of the town would be to scrap the whole scheme. The really poor quality interventions of the past few years should be removed, and the street restored to its previous appearance, including the previous number of free short term parking bays. Whilst new paving materials would enhance the environment, I remain unconvinced that these can be justified on financial grounds.

I am professional involved in re generating urban environments myself, and am seriously concerned that this scheme would result in a large amount of capital expenditure which would reduce, rather than enhance the local economy. "

Concerned about the proposal to reduce the carriageway width thereby making the roadway narrower which I can concede would benefit cyclists, but have doubt of how many cyclists would use it. I am against a separate cycle way. Servicing the shops with the proposed plan will cause great difficulty in functioning. We will end up with only coffee shops and lots of empty units with this proposal. There is already a problem with sufficient parking facilities and this proposal will make the problem worse. It fails to deal with all age groups of the residents and concentrates on cyclists and visitors coming to the town for coffee but fail to support other retailers. Whilst visitors are necessary and welcome, it is the residents who keep the town alive. There appears to be a lack of forethought for future development. What has happened to the river bank of the Monnow and replacement and

development of the toilet block which is an eyesore? Once again a great amount of money has been spent on consultancy fees and we see no implementation of the suggestions.

The pinch point at the top of Monnow Street has served no purpose whatsoever and has only reduced footfall in that area. I am totally against this proposal and trust that Mon CC will take note of the strong objections made by residents and traders. I request that you do not ignore the views of residents, which in my opinion and having spoken to many of them, are against this proposal. If Monnow Street is to be changed at such great expense and in my opinion a waste of money, a longer term plan for the town to include the abattoir in Priory Street, linking Vauxhall fields to Rockfield Road, accommodating more parking facilities and access to the town, development of the river bank as mentioned and listening to traders for their requirements to keep the town vibrant in trade are vital.

It does not matter how ""pretty"" a town looks, accessibility is very important, especially as Monmouth is a tourist town.

As a pedestrian I feel vulnerable with dropped kerbs. I regularly see cars driving through Agincourt Square cross over the textured paving onto the pedestrian area as they allow traffic coming from the opposite direction to pass them.

I do not believe the proposal reflects the needs of disabled people and those visually impaired, street litter (tables and chairs, a frames that cross half the pavement and the tables and plants outside Bayliss hairdressing) having to dodge these items that are put out and brought in at different times of days, and months of the year, would cause distress and never being fully confident with the layout of the pavement. Walk up the street just once, fully concentrating on how it would feel to navigate as someone disabled/visually impaired and you may just see things you never have before. Areas should be designed for the disabled and visually impaired as the priority, everyone else can easily slot into that world with ease, but the other way around is difficult and unfair. The crossings are great, and a fab addition, it is just the street being prioritised for businesses to expand at the expense of pedestrians with additional needs.

Monmouth is a town with an above average proportion of elderly population. It is a great town to retire to and has limited employment opportunities. The use of a car is essential particularly in a rural area with limited transport alternatives. Further

narrowing of Monnow Street will cause more congestion than we have now. Monnow Street is used by buses, vans and lorries and there are times when the dual carriageway is gridlocked due to accidents.

From a retail business point of view our concerns are the loss of on-street parking due to the increase of loading bays. I have never seen more than 2 lorries unloading in Monnow Street - 4 loading bays is sufficient. All our customers want is more on-street quick turnover parking.

We are seriously concerned with the time it will take to implement these changes. Chepstow was thriving prior to the High Street ""facelift"" which took far too long, frightening the customers away and they never came back. Monmouth is teetering on the edge of the same precipice, more and more shops are closing in recent times. If your proposals take more than a month to implement you won't have a high street left. It seems, having viewed your original plans in the Shire Hall meeting and placed post-it suggestions on that plan, that the present plan has not noticeably changed and most of the retail businesses suggest when asked that they have not been listened to. You seem hell-bent on your original ideas and that the consultation process has not yielded any change. "

"Nothing really changes. The proposal merely tidied up the mess created by the temporary pedestrian areas created during COVID.

The artists impression do not account for the current high volume of traffic and congestion. This scheme does nothing to reduce the traffic flow.

Parking in Monnow Street is a disaster currently. With fewer bays and narrower roads, following the increased pedestrianisation during pandemic, has created delivery vans pulling over in the Main Street, lazy residents abandoning their cars on 4 way flashers. The hazards are routinely accepted and prolific.

Further pedestrianisation and cycle ways will reduce the space and congestion further.

No accounting for Air Quality - no data shared in the consultation. This is now enshrined in the human Rights Act.

This kind of capital investment is an opportunity to completely overhaul the whole system. Look at places like Saas Fe in Switzerland. No cars in the Town Centre - electric shuttle buses and electric golf buggy style vehicles. Electric scooters. Why are we not doing this?

Too much consultation with Businesses in the Concept stage and not enough with residents - the local businesses thrive because we residents buy from them. Deliveries etc can be undertaken at night - the supply chain is 24/7/365 these days.

Remove all fossil fuel traffic from the Town Centre, except deliveries overnight. Pedestrianise the whole of Monnow Street. Build proper car parks at each end and use EVs on a rental basis or free of charge to ferry into town and back. Encourage walking and cycling as a healthy lifestyle. No cars - be radical and think outside the box. Think about the climate crisis!

This scheme achieves very little of the critical and much needed objectives. Stop it during consultation and rethink urgently. You are not changing anything and wasting money. The impressions do make the congestion seem irrelevant - it is too busy on Monnow Street every hour of every day. You have failed to address this."

The pictures / artist impression make it appear that Monnow street will be less busy. I don't believe there will be any change. I believe the street needs to be one way or pedestrianised to enable a better quality to visiting Monmouth. This proposal is all business needs focused. You need to really consider what the people want who use the street.

"Concerned that the greenery by the crossings will obscure the vision of drivers to people wanting to cross the road.

Parking at top of town e.g. Priors Street only 1hr which doesn't leave much time to walk down and back to and from the shops on Monnow Street e.g. Bank etc - Should be 2hrs if you're reducing parking on the high street.

There is no car parks at the top of town for those coming in from the A466 or A40 you have to drive down Monnow Street to access the car parks at the bottom of town, adding to the traffic"

Seems very little change after a lot of consultation time and research. It is already 2 way traffic with areas to park/unload and no safe separate cycle lanes. The pictures largely look like the pavements have been replaced with new paving slabs, and a CGI cyclist added (who in reality won't be any more likely to use the street as it still has no cycle lanes) that's about it. Abergavenny centre is far far better as you can wander around without breathing in car fumes / can relax without car noise in the near vicinity, +

there's plenty of space for a pram. None of these changes will improve these aspects on Monmouth Main Street and this they won't make us more keen to spend time in Monmouth. Unless you're going to do option 7 or at least option 2, then I think this money could likely be much better spent on other projects.

Is this the right way to invest in the town right now? With so many shop units empty could MCC better spend their money with schemes that encourage people to rent empty units. Council tax reductions, free rent for a year, buy up empty units and use them for social enterprise. There is no point planting flower beds if there are no shops or restaurants for people to visit.

As a business who requires transport to deliver goods to and from their premises and somewhere to park during business hours. Can there not be scheme where business workers can buy a discounted parking for long hours so they can work at the top end of town. After I have dropped my clients work off at the shop I have to spend half an hour trying to find a space that will allow me to park at the top end of town. The bottom end has two free carparks. The top end only has on tiny free carpark and short stay spaces. Can there not be a system where those who work on the high street and require their own transport to carry out there business could get a permit allowing them to stay longer in the short carpark or build a large free parking carpark at the top end to support business's from Queen Street, swan centre and those set around Agincourt square.

the two way street caveat is too constraining and highlights the need to take a more holistic approach

"I used to visit Monmouth twice a week to shop. Since, the pavements were widened it is not a pleasant experience and I now go elsewhere: Ross or Coleford usually.

I don't like what's proposed, the road is far too narrow as it is now. There isn't enough on street parking. Too much credence is given to cycling and yet I can't cycle from where I live and carry the shopping I need back home.

Why are there trees and plants in the high street we have plenty of that all around us. We need parking not planting.

There are too many crossings included in this the traffic won't be able to flow freely. I would return to Monmouth more frequently if the road was put back to how it was. I am unlikely too with what I've seen in the plans."

Why is there such a focus on what the area looks like when shops are closing down in town? We need focus on opening shops on the high street, that is what attracts people to Monmouth, there was nothing wrong with the street years ago but you decided to

change it which made it less appealing, the new proposal will not help businesses, also the works will affect business just like it did the first time it was done as it was difficult to access Monmouth, which we found the first time around it was incredibly hard to gain access to our car park because of the work going on!

I bought my shop to Monmouth because of the charming town I drove through one day with it's on street parking and lovely wide high street. The work carried out in the Town over the past few years has been totally detrimental to my business my trading figures are significantly down. I don't believe this scheme fits the bill of securing the future of my business in fact if installed it is more likely to close me down. Why you ask, because it will lose the charm and character of this charming town. Footfall is notably down since parking was removed in Monnow Street and the pavements have been widened. This new plan will just making trading worse. If it goes ahead I will not be renewing my lease and will close, to go to a different town that has character and good footfall. It is very sad to see what a mess has been made of this Town since I opened. The best thing you could do to help Town businesses is put the road back to how it was, including reinstating lost parking. Definitely get rid of the outdoor cafe areas. The only plus from the documentation I've seen is the additional loading bays.

This is not fit for purpose, it completely takes away the character of Monmouth. Don't understand why you can get away with making these changes to the carriageway shape when that was how the Town grew around it. We don't need trees in the Town Centre. i hate this proposal, put it back as it was with a wide street and all the parking.

The street needs to revert back to how it was before covid. Bring back as much 30 mins street parking as possible. The street needs to have all the clutter removed e.g. planters, shop signs, etc. Hanging baskets could be provided by the council outside each shop at a cost to the shop keepers to create a more vibrant welcoming town. The proposals have clearly been produced by non locals.

You need to give Monmouth residents what is required by them.

More street parking, remove most planters as an eyesore, too many crossings 50% to go. Pavements too wide, should have left as was. Lower Business Rates, would make a massive help.

Nothing wrong with the town as always seems to have plenty of visitors. Pavements always been wide enough it is a small Welsh town not London.

"I am not prepared to answer the questions about the proposed design numbers 6 - 9. I explain why on the sheet i have attached. In short i fundamentally disagree with your ""preferred proposal"". However, one comment. There are not enough loading bays in the central and northern section of Monnow Street.

Separate sheet....

The fundamental problem with Monnow Street is that it currently carries too much traffic. I am emphatically not in favour of making the street an exclusively pedestrian area. Most of the traffic that goes up and down Monnow Street is going from one end of the town to the other - it is effectively through traffic. The reason that Monnow Street is such an unhealthy and unpleasant place is because of the unacceptably high level of traffic. This also affects deliveries to the shops. From my shop i watch traffic wardens constantly giving penalty notices to delivery drivers who can't find anywhere to stop and upload. The current proposals certainly do not provide sufficient loading bays for deliveries in the central and northern sections of Monnow Street. No wonder the street has so many empty shops. The obvious answer is to stop through traffic going through town (except at peak periods and exceptional circumstance such as emergencies or if the dual carriageway is blocked) by means of retractable bollards placed at the pinch point at the top of Monnow Street where it meets Agincourt Square, and at the end of St Johns Street where it meets Monnow Street."

When parking a car avoid boxes close to kerb making car door opening & access difficult. On a mobility scooter you need space to park on pavement outside shops. Smooth pavements. If the Welsh gov are not allowing road works then is a pointless costly exercise.

No way better than the original Monmouth.

Complete waste of money, leave it as it is please.

Reverse all of Monnow Street to be put back as it was before Covid. Remove all containers and seating areas.

"Put the street back to wide roadway, pedestrians, cyclists and people can make this work. Put the car parking spaces back in the street with loading bays. Get rid of outdoor cafe areas especially green carpet that have been added. Repave the pavements, add an extra crossing near the post office, (there are too many included in the plan now). No green areas they will not stay as you plan them to, will get parked on, dogs will use them as a toilet, plants will be vandalised, rubbish will be dropped into them. This is an ideal world scheme and sadly we don't live in an ideal world scheme. What looks pretty on the scheme falls short when implemented you only have to look at other things that have been done in the town.

The money would be better spent on new tables, bins and facilities by Monnow Bridge the grassed area would be enhanced by using the planting you propose for the high street here. "

Get rid of the green tree areas and the outdoor seating and use that space to create more car parking spaces. Consider reverting to herring bone parking patterns.

The design photos are naive. The current ones should have been taken when there was more traffic, van/cars doubled parked as is usually the case. Putting in grass verges is silly and impractical. People will walk over them and they will soon deteriorate. There isn't the room for trees in tubs. In Alcester there are hanging baskets on poles, plumbed into a water supply for automatic watering. These look wonderful and don't impede pedestrians. How about more parking on Vauxhall and little bridges through to Monnow St? The dilapidated building next to Lloyds Bank could be demolished and a walkway through to the car park. This would be ideal for a large number of disabled spaces, with access to the upper part of Monnow St. We also urgently need our own traffic warden who can tackle the massive parking problems on a daily basis. The consultants you have engaged have done a poor job using little imagination and not really addressing the problems those of us who have lived here for many years could have outlined. As a council tax payer, perhaps you should be asking for our money back. We could have come up with better proposals ourselves.

Council and designers do not seem to understand the topology of surroundings. Public transport lamentable (I lived in Manchester with 5 minute service not 5 times a day). Population is ageing so town, if it is to survive, needs to recognise that car reliance likely to increase nut decrease

"at a time when council tax bills are going up alarmingly it seems somewhat irresponsible to spend money on a project like this with uncertain benefits in the short and probably the long term?

I know young people who would prefer to see the money spent on housing them!

"Inadequate parking outside shops for dropping off goods (such as to charity shops) and loading cars with shopping. Only visitors to the town for long periods will tend to use the long term car parks. People driving in from the country to do shopping will not bother going to car parks. If town centre parking isn't available they will go elsewhere. This is already happening with a big impact on the viability of Monnow Street (and Church Street) shops. As less and less people shop in Monnow Street, more shops will close and eventually the town will become a ghost town that nobody will want to visit. Please base your planning on what the shopkeepers of Monmouth tell you. Far more attention should be paid to them as Monmouth will only be regenerated by thriving businesses in the town centre. The walkers and cyclists will do little to stimulate town centre business activity, but of course need to be catered for as well those actually bringing business to the town.

Please put the road parking back in with the wide historical street

Put it how it was pre pandemic.

The narrowing of Monnow Street has already caused problems, this plan is likely to cause more, especially when there is an accident on the Dual carriageway. Why do we need trees we have the Monnow, Vauxhall and Chippenham a short walk from the Town Centre for anyone looking for a peaceful green space to unwind. There are too many crossing points you just need an additional one to what is already available, at the top near the Post Office. Put the original parking back this has always been a plus for Monmouth. When I don't have my bike with me, I like to just be able to pop in during the week, I'll happily park in the car parks on a weekend to do a big shop and spend more time. There is already sufficient cycle parking, I never struggle to find a space. Good to see seats included for the elderly but you could do this in certain areas and put the wide street back to how it used to be. Cycling can be a problem with the narrow road at the top by Agincourt Square this was safer before it was changed. Crossing by the Robin Hood is an accident waiting to happen, it's already a problem now!

Please just put the street back as it was before Covid

Completely inaccessible currently to disabled people who need to be parked/dropped off close to a shop they need to access, - usually several trips up and down the street to find, if lucky, an appropriate parking space (either disabled access or not). Even less total parking with proposal. Even if all parking was for disabled, longer distances to walk to specific shops. No reinstatement of a refuge crossing point which was lost, together with several parking spaces, for extra seating outside Salt and pepper cafe. This was the safest and easiest point to cross at the upper end of Monnow Street as only traffic from one direction to negotiate at a time, vital to those who have sight impairments or slower mobility. This loss alone significantly impacted many, and this crossing point no longer at all viable with solid boundary to seating area. Also, no visibility splays for traffic in/out of Nailers lane so both vehicles and pedestrians actually in road to see Monnow St traffic.

How come the majority of the buildings in Monnow Street are listed to stop people altering the rich history of the Town. Yet, our high street with it's wide featured road with historic provenance is allowed to be vandalised by your plans? The trees don't add anything to this and you are loosing the character of our high street. I've lived in Monmouth for over 50 years and what you are doing is a travesty: wanton vandalism. Put it back to how it was.

The worst part of Monmouth is Agincourt Square now that the road has been narrows two cars cannot pass. This isn't even part of the proposal. Two many crossings the two near the bus station are dangerous, a bus can't pull out fully before it has to stop if someone decides to cross. Not enough parking spaces, older people need to park near shops and may not be disabled. Blind people & wheelchair users need a clear footpath free of obstacles. Historic wide Monnow Street has been lost forever - what a shame!

Monmouth has been spoilt by the changes to Monnow Street, it needs to be put back to it's original condition. People are going out of town to do their shopping. Councillors should be sat in wheelchairs to see how uncomfortable the pavements are.

Needs more parking - probably near Monnow street

Monmouth has a historic wide street which is unique in my experience. If it was a building it would have listed status. The current temporary street narrowing does not work, it causes traffic jams, pollution and limits parking.

What a complete waste of funding - much more important things to spend money on! There is nothing wrong with Monnow Street as it is.

we don't want it

This will not encourage people to visit Monmouth, far too many empty shops. Cars will always be needed to shop as impossible to carry shopping with a cycle or walking.

Return to its previous condition, remove planters

This is a disastrous scheme, both for Monmouth residents and for the shops and other businesses here. The proliferation of pedestrian crossings is ridiculous. I have no trouble in crossing Monnow St. now although I am in my 70s. If MCC are determined to install more pedestrian crossings then one at the top of the street and one at the bottom would suffice. The ramps and unnecessary narrowing of the street just obstruct traffic and serve no useful purpose. MCC should be aware that we live within 20 minutes drive of Ross, with its supermarkets and other shops. That is where a good part of Monmouth's current shoppers are likely to go if this scheme is installed. In place of this, Monnow Street and Agincourt Square should be returned to their original layout of 10 years ago, plus levelled pavements, features to assist the disabled and, important for any scheme, parking enforcement.

Way off what Monmouth should be. Do not need social distancing, massive pavements, wooden boxes. Reinstate it as it was.

Please return to historic wide street to pre covid plan, no planters more parking

How much is it costing, what have you got against Monmouth and its business. What is it going to cost, who is benefiting financially from the proposals. If you really wanted to help Monmouth, you would put it back to how it was 30 years ago.

How much was spent on Monmouth 2 years ago and now they want to waste more on a town that has gone backwards as someone who has lived in Monmouth all their life.

It is such a shame that this lovely historic town is being changed into a bland facsimile of other towns up and down the Country.

This scheme rapes our history for what? Just to be able to sit outside and have a coffee, to be continental, when we voted to leave Europe. Look at other areas of the town such as the Monnow Street area to put your trees and seating to attract visitors

who may then decide to use wander and shop. This would do far more to get people to 'linger' to give a feeling of 'wellbeing' and 'community'. We don't need planting in Monnow Street we are surrounded by beautiful scenery. The pavements didn't flood until the pavements were widened. Please put our town back.

The pinch points are a nightmare. They should be removed.

Spend more time attracting businesses and shops and spend less time messing around with removing parking...the attraction of Monmouth is nothing without the shops and businesses to sustain it

Just put the street back to how it used to be and save the money.

Please stop ignoring what the people of the town want. We do not want the road narrowed - it's not suitable for our town due to the unique nature of it having only one main route through the town and many stores are unable to take deliveries from rear entrances. We do not want the pavements further cluttered with unnecessary pots, planters, or unsightly seating areas. Take away the temporary measures, smarten up the pavements but leave our beautiful, accessible high street alone. You are destroying our town with lack of understanding of its unique nature.

"1) The proposals are poorly thought out. You cannot undertake a design without basic base line information including a topographical survey and knowing precisely the service / utility runs;

2) The carriageway width for two-way vehicular traffic should be the MINIMUM required creating easier crossing for pedestrians and helping to reduce traffic speeds. A width of 6.3m is excessive and counter productive

3) There should be no ability for car parking on Monnow Street - ONLY loading & unloading bays

4) Public seating / spaces should be designed around the most important historic buildings and spaces not merely where cafes currently are (cafes come and go and buildings change their uses).

5) Surfacing material is critical to indicate pedestrian / cycle priority and to reduce traffic speed. At the consultation the Architects suggested much will be black tarmac. That is inappropriate

6) The narrow pavement besides Timpsons / Suits 4 U and St Johns Street is not addressed at all. Those exiting St Johns Street have no visibility and this presents a major hazard to pedestrian safety - this is not addressed at all;

7) The street trees should be Tilia cordata Greenspire

(Small Leaved Lime Greenspire) Correct species choice is critical

8) The proposed pedestrian crossing points (especially southernmost one) needs to be safety audited.

9) Its all very well holding a consultation Monmouth but its to those people you want to attract. You want to retain them but you also want to attract back those who or example live in Skenfrith or Raglan and now choose to shop in Abergavenny as its more pleasant for pedestrians

8) Do not fall for the mantra that Monmouth lacks parking for shoppers. I have lived in the area for approx 20 yrs and can always find a space in a public car park - especially the one beyond the M& S one. Every trader says that in every Town but its a nonsense. Do a car parking survey and base decisions on EVIDENCE"

The pictures don't show a busy high street they show a few cars parked the odd person or cyclist I thought you expected the town to be busy? I moved from Chepstow to the area because Monmouth was charming and had a lovely high street: you've ruined it just like you did Chepstow and this scheme takes any remaining charm away. Put it back, put it back, put it back to a wide street.

The design has reduced a street with parking and smoothly flowing traffic to one that does the complete opposite. Traffic jams are frequent as there is a lot of double parking, particularly at peak time in the morning.

While the pictures look pretty they aren't real life. People will park on the low growing green areas. There is now far too much cycle parking, you need to be supporting motorists more given the hills around Monmouth I know from experience you can't safely cycle and do a decent shop. The town is so uninviting now I drive to Morrisons in Ross or go to Coleford far more pleasant atmospheres in both instances. I hate what the Council has done to the town and more importantly what it's proposing in this scheme.

Put the Town Centre back to how it was with narrow pavements, a wide street, greater parking. Stop trying to ruin our lovely town.

As it is not stated what the comparison in question 6 refers to, e.g. 'It provides better..' I have based my answers as a comparison to the pre-covid structure.

The high street was much more vibrant before these changes began, revert to how it used to be. We are surrounded by beautiful countryside, we don't need trees down the high street. Great for inner cities but not for us.

We would prefer to see Monnow Street restored to its pre-covid layout e.g. the historical wide layout which worked very well for traders and visitors alike. Diagonal parking should be considered.

Town will become even more gridlocked and will turn people away from the town, as not inviting due to potential traffic issues.

Town is already extremely busy at all times of the day.

The design seems to want to narrow the road even more, the amount of zebra crossings will make it gridlocked in town. Try getting through town at 8-30am every morning, it takes nearly 30 minutes to get through.

Keep Monnow Street as it was previously. If there was 30 minute free parking in the town car parks then maybe it would relieve people needing to park when all they need is to pick up e.g. a prescription. Currently minimum parking to pay for is 2 hours.

AS NO FUNDING EXISTS OR INSUFFICIENT FUNDING AVAILABLE THEN THE TEMPORARY LAYOUT SHOULD BE RETURNED TO PRE-COVID STATUS IMMEDIATELY.

Waste of time and money, we need jobs in Monmouth and more businesses but rates are too high. Feels like Monmouth is forgotten about in the eyes of Welsh assembly. More police presence too. Leave Monmouth alone.

"This survey is designed to prevent proper dialogue in my view so the answers will not really help.

The layout as it was pre-covid - worked. Now it does not and the new layout is very much the same as the current one. Especially not for walkers, cyclists, the elderly, the disabled; it is discriminatory in terms of the people of Monmouth."

the temporary changes have been detrimental to the town already and the proposed changes will only damage it further. Put the street back to the way it was pre covid.

A complete waste of money that does nothing to improve the local businesses. At least it is not full pedestrianization that kills any high street and turns it into an urban wasteland.

Remove the obstruction, increase parking and return the street to its classic layout. No need for cookie cutter design that adds nothing at the expense of local business and ratepayers.

Why is the financial success of local business one of the key requirements of the proposals with so many empty shops. He claimed 90% of business supported the proposals but this only includes the limited numbers willing to talk to the survey company. I was told by the architect of the scheme that we need to accept it because this is happening all over the country, why do we need to be like every other high street when we could return to the classic market town high street. He admitted the trees and planting would need on going costly maintenance and that the reason we need the trees was to reduce CO2 emissions, a token effort if ever there was one.

"I am very disappointed with this design for the following reasons:

Monnow Street is unique because of its width. Where else in Wales can you walk /drive down a grand expanse of road amongst historic buildings? The narrowing of the road due to Covid neither helped traffic or pedestrians and took away the beautiful uniqueness that is the width of Monnow Street. In this plan I see you've made the road even narrower. This will reduce the status and feel of grandeur of the street. It will be like any other town.

when we look for what brings tourists into our lovely town it's grandeur and feeling of space and wealth. Your plan removes this altogether reducing Monmouth to any other narrow shopping precinct.

At present I take my car towards town park and walk about to shop how is this scheme going to make me or anyone more active? We already walk about to shop?

This scheme will create standstill traffic. There are no lights on the crossings so whenever a pedestrian chooses to cross the now very narrow street they can. There are many visitors to Monmouth in the summer and on weekends so I can't actually see that you would get very far in a car down the high street. There would be permanent traffic grid lock. No deliveries, difficultly for

emergency services and when the dual carriageway closes as is frequently the case, gridlock. All this so that pedestrians can actively cross the now narrow road in multiple places!

There are not enough short stay parking bays instead you give us trees. Lovely but we need to park cars. There are so many places that trees would enhance the town (river sides) but not in the car bays.

The trees prevent walking cycling and driving i.e. stop active travel.

I want to see the pavement back to precovid width. No wooden boxed plants so that shoppers can shop freely drivers can drive through the town or park as they wish. The narrow road is a hazard now because when you get out of your car the door is opened into the traffic and you have to step out into traffic. Previously there was enough room to have no effect on traffic flow. This is a hazard for mums with children and the elderly people of Monmouth..the very people that can't be as active and need to park. We do t need these extra wide pavements the street cafes are useless in the winter when it's raining and they look unsightly and not in keeping with the architecture.

I suggest that you use the money to put a Victorian glass arcade like those in Cardiff or west cliff Bournemouth etc over church street and create a 12 month useable cafe culture out of the rain.

I do not agree that this plan will create anymore active travel than is already going on but create fewer visitors because of the inability to park on the high street and inability to drive through.

Please reconsider!

Very concerned resident

Need wider road, better pavements, no extra trees as Monmouth is surrounded by trees and woodlands. More parking with a time limit. Monnow St was not designed to be a narrow st.

I think it does nothing to enhance Monmouth. The artist impressions look great, but so did those for Agincourt Square which has proved to be a disaster for the top of town since it was developed. The ideas spoil the historic high street and turn it into a plastic copy of so many others that have not improved business or experience.

"Will this proposal rejuvenated Monmouth fortunes, make it a designation to visit and shop, create jobs and provide a return on MCC's investment? The simple answer is NO!

MCC are failing to address the larger issue of rejuvenating the whole area from the Monnow Bridge through to St Marys Church. Compulsory purchase of all vacant properties, conversion to shop units with accommodation and a Tramshed style / Entrepreneur / startup office space. The look and feel should be as close to The Shambles, York.

This current proposal of changing Monnow Street should be aborted.

The proposal appears to work to a template and does not respect the heritage of the town and what attracts people to visit and, often, relocate. The emphasis on reducing vehicles ignores the fact that Monmouth is the most convenient place for many surrounding communities to do their shopping, but to do that they invariably need to use a car; public transport is infrequent and inconvenient. Adding trees and rain gardens is simply a cosmetic exercise since the town is well provided for in green recreational spaces and surrounded by natural, rural landscape. The town seemed to operate comfortably pre-COVID so it is difficult to see any great benefits from the proposal.

I find the proposals wholly unacceptable. The design itself will further hinder an already flawed design and exacerbate the existing issues with traffic flow. The whole town needs a rethink to ensure shops start to turn round from vacant properties.

Monmouth is rapidly becoming a ghost town

I've lived in Monmouth all of my life I think Monnow street looks awful, it's dirty and scruffy please get of the covid restrictions that would help with parking issues

Firstly I would like to know who initiated the proposals ? Why where Monnow street alterations brought in under the guise of covid and still remain as ug seems that there are people who have already made the decision ? And finally what are the results of previous consultations as Monnow street is absolutely dire sg present and the designs will indeed encourage more pedestrians but unfortunately the vast majority of monmouthians font want it.

"The proposal does not solve the current problem of delivery vehicles double parking and blocking the street, despite there being more designated places for delivery vehicles to park. Cars will park in those places. Or the space for delivery vehicles will not be close enough to where a delivery driver needs to deliver to.

There will be more traffic queues in the street because of so many pedestrian crossing points. Leading to more air pollution. Monnow Street is the only highway for people driving from one side of Monmouth to the other without joining the A40. It needs to ensure easy passage.

A bypass from Hereford Road traffic lights, across Vauxhall fields to the old ambulance station is the only sensible solution, but this is outside the current exercise.

I therefore recommend that the proposed redesign is abandoned, and Monnow Street returned to its pre COVID state. "

"Planters, seated areas and other obstructions on the street are unnecessary and cause congestion issues especially for disabled, wheelchair users and pushchairs etc. which is even more problematic when vehicles are parked near planters with doors open, meaning less space on the pavements for people to pass by one another.

Greenery is not an issue and not required as there are vast green spaces and parks surrounding Monmouth with easier access than Monnow street for people to enjoy.

I also think the layout near to the post office with the 'spill out' space is a complete obstruction to the two way traffic when the loading bay is in use. Seated areas are completely pointless and take up so much space on the pavements, they look cheap and scruffy.

There needs to be more spaces for short stay parking through the length of the high street. The pinch point at the top of town needs better design and management of traffic flow. Cars drive straight up to the pinch point not leaving enough room for cars going down through town to get by and having to mount the extremely high kerbs. Cars coming down also do not stop prior to the junction opposite the Kings Head meaning cars coming up and wanting to turn right get stuck, thus causing a blockage through town and up to priory street - again especially if lorries are unloading by Iceland etc, which also causes a problem going

down through town by the post office and the unnecessary narrow road due to the pointless seated area, planters and loading bay! Total chaos!

Getting rid of the single cycle bay and planters at the top of town opposite salt and pepper, card zone and the cook shop would allow to make room for more parking (which is desperately needed at the top of town) and a slightly wider road. The flow of traffic in this section of the high street is an absolute nightmare every day.

If you allowed better short stay, quick stop, parking more people would use the town centre on a regular basis. We need to encourage less coffee shops and more affordable high street stores where you can buy clothing, footwear and other necessary items for living. "

pointless form ,pointless exercise ,there will be no business' who will be able to operate whist this folly goes ahead (as it will!!) well done MCC for destroying our town

I dislike this proposal as I feel the priorities for the town should be focused on addressing the derelict/empty buildings that are a public eyesore. Enforcement orders should be issued to force landlords to either sell up or renovate. You need to reduce business rates to encourage businesses to come here. Also, instead of wasting money on this unnecessarily scheme, money should be used to police the town. We need CCTV to discourage antisocial behaviour and to make the streets safer. And, if you want people to shop here, consider free car parking, especially as on-street parking is being eroded. Generally these plans feel flimsy, a waste of time and lacking any sense of the wider problems our town faces. For example where is the mention of a budget for more enforcement to stop People illegally parking/double parking etc. Disappointing. Please do better!

Why was this waste f money contemplated in the first place the once pretty town with its fan outs broad high street has been ruined. Empty run down building ugly outside seating causing a littering problem. I grew up in Monmouth and now am ashamed of the appearance of the dirty run down high street. Put it back to what it was a unique vibrate traditional market town. Stop wasting my taxes on the stupid ill thought out changes

I am pleased that there has been no proposal to pedestrianise the street (of course it is needed as a through road). Although this is superficially attractive, I believe it detracts from a town centre. It reduces the vibrancy and leads to a lot of loitering which makes for a rather 'scruffy' appearance.

We need the town back to how it was before covid. You are killing the trade. No where to park so people are not coming to the shops. Trees and pretty places to sit will not encourage people into the town to shop when they cannot park you are killing our trade over and over again

The attraction of Monmouth is that it is a market town. By changing the look of the main street, you are losing the historical look of the street that has existed for nearly 1000 years. Market towns such as Brecon, are managing to maintain their open street perspective, which is so attractive, rather than obscuring it behind trees and furniture. Other areas of the town should be adjusted, but why spoil the look of the, wide market street. Currently there are many empty shops, this is not attractive, there will be little reason for people to want to visit Monmouth soon. When many people visit, parking is extremely challenging, the car parks behind the Nelson garden appear mostly empty, but have no direct access to Monnow Street. You are making Monmouth accessible to a few regular users who are lucky enough to be able to cycle to access the area, but surely we want to attract visitors from further afield. From other countries who would like to see a quaint border market town.

Put it back how it was

The proposed high street is ridiculous. Perhaps look at how many empty shops they are and concentrate on that!! Return the street to how it was prior to covid. Those tree planters are now an eyesore, as is that fake grass area outside coffee one. Full of dog pee and probably drunk people pee. Actually LISTEN to the people and shop owners of Monmouth instead of these stupid ideas and wasting more money. There are issues that need urgent attention! This is not one of them.

This is not needed. We had a lovely town before. The money should be spend on the Monnow bridge riverside area and just wide in slightly, a few pavement areas as needed.

The Main Street looks too busy on this proposal and because of reduced parking precludes people from dropping off disabled for appointments such as eye tests, dentist etc. it's not as nice a view up the street as it was pre pandemic. Don't know why it has to be change£

What high street?? Never seen Monmouth looking so shabby...long gone are the days when Monnow Street was buzzing....the empty shops look awful 😞very rarely walk into town now as can't afford the high end retailers...who can? Can't even buy a pair of socks unless you're prepared to pay stupid prices...it's nuts! We need the old Monmouth back...Dorothy Perkins, New Look....Peacocks....shops that Joe Public can afford to shop in.....lived here all my life and feel gutted to see it so run down 😞....need to fill the empty shops before spending money on the street...or it will be a total waste of money 😞🙄

"A design created to match a brief for a pot of funding with specific criteria and not necessarily based on what local stakeholders think would work.

Monmouth already has green space at it's heart why add trees?

Concerned how much narrower the street will be. Top end of town (near Iceland) is a real bottle neck frustrating pedestrians and drivers. The sweep / generosity of Monnow Street is at it's heart, or was.

Yes to:

having wider pavements.

more pedestrian crossings;

Loading bays appropriately positioned (at least as many as there were before covid);

Appropriate entrance / exit space for the buses either side of Estero;

Maintain as many on street parking spaces.

i believe the proposal will not make the town more attractive to visitors. The cafe culture of sitting on a busy street with pedestrians back and forth in front of you and also the fumes and noise of the traffic is unappealing to me. It is also a health hazard. I feel it is all an unnecessary cost the money could be better spent. For instance on our health service which is in dire straights!!!!

"Unnecessary.

Narrows Road too much.

Too expensive. (We will all end up paying for it)

Put it back as it used to be pre-covid and then leave it alone."

People will continue to park wherever they want and will ignore loading bays which means the double parking situation will actually get worse as the road is narrower than it is now and significantly narrower than it was pre "temporary" changes. It looks like Monmouth will become a poor carbon copy of so many other towns and cities around the UK which have all lost their heart. The number of crossing points is excessive. Traffic will be stop/start leading to higher levels of pollution for anyone daft enough to want to sit outside.

If this scheme is introduced, it will be a travesty for Monmouth. This has lost all the character of our historic town.

"The aim as stated above is inconsistent with the original aims to improve active travel in Monnow Street. It seems to have been turned into a Monnow Street regeneration project which requires much more than a fancy highway.

My two-star rating for how well the proposal meets the project aim is based on the limited scope of the project. To create a vibrant environment, MCC needs to address the factors which drive vibrancy and these are more to do with the quality of what the facilities have to offer, their accessibility and the quality of parking facilities available than with the layout of Monnow Street. It looks like 50% of the available kerb space is still dominated by vehicles on the highway but I have to admit it is far better than the present layout of Monnow Street and I do like the concession made to convert on-street parking spaces to accommodate summertime seating but no one like to be sitting in a gutter so consideration should be given to raising the level at these locations.

What is missing are cross section views to reveal drainage and services because there may be hidden obstacles preventing implementation of this design along the whole of Monnow Street."

The Deputy Minister's recent announcement on the road programme in Wales focussed on its halting and the rationale for that halting. Climate Change. An ambitious proposal. I don't see the same ambition here. A focus on climate change would adjust the model as would a focus on pollution levels.

This proposal will destroy Monmouth town centre. We do not need narrow roads for cars and 5 pedestrian crossing. It will create traffic chaos, make pollution ten times worse and stop people popping to the shops. The investment should be making the bus station look attractive (its horrible), improve bus links from Monmouth to surrounding villages and other towns, enhance areas around Chippenham and the old bridge. The empty shops show that there is nothing worth going into Monmouth for. I am not disabled but have impaired movement, being able to park in the main street is a necessity, before you barely noticed the traffic. The council should stop trying to force/blackmail people into not using their cars, it is a rural county and its not going to happen! the only reason I go into Monmouth is to the Savoy in an evening and the gym. The already current trees look awful so I don't see how others are going to be maintained.

"I think Monnow street was fine back how it was before covid.

think money need to be spent on putting back to how it used to be and to make the pavements to better conditions as they are very uneven. Also the lack of parking just makes want to avoid Monmouth "

Should be put back the way it was the Main Street is ruined and it will be worse the more shops that close I don't even go for coffee I go out of town to a garden centre. The gambling establishment has ruined the top end of town everyone objected yet it still happened this survey is after the horse has bolted we were in lockdown when all the barriers were put up been a disaster ever since . I was unfortunate enough as the cater who fell in the street because of the metal holes looking after my husband and getting him out of the car at the disabled bay I parked in my door could not open wide as you would knock the tree planter stepped back and my foot slid in the metal step I soon wrote to the highways and told them what to do they had metal grids over these by the following week they were dangerous and the whole thing looks cheap

Why the need for all the greenery, we are surrounded by it! Sacrifice the greenery for a couple more parking spaces. Surely you want more parking spaces in the summer when tourists visit so scrap the salt and pepper, pizza express outside seating. Why so

many pedestrian crossings, I understand the need for more but surely a couple less than proposed would be fine. Hopefully the road width will be generous as the re-design at Agincourt square has been made very tight!

A busy thoroughfare is not conducive with a calm and attractive shopping experience. I have seen this road blocked on so many occasions whilst with lorries attempting to unload in the face of traffic.

I think this prioritises cars over people and cyclists - there is a token suggestion of tree planting but the space is overwhelmingly 'car' focused - I think that if you want more people to use the town centre it should be pedestrian and people friendly. It works in other places, I don't understand why it's been dismissed here - what this seems to be is pretty much the same as it is now, which means that there is not enough space for pedestrians and it is dangerous as there are times you have to walk in the road, or are so close the edge of the pavement while walking that car mirrors actually hit you as a pedestrian walking on the pavement.

"If parking is reduced and people are pushed into paid parking , given our high rates of council tax make public car parks free for Monmouth residents ,

A much stronger attitude must be taken to shops falling in to disrepair, think on the lines of broken window system in Brooklyn just because they are empty does not justify eyesores. In most cases of regeneration I have seen we need to encourage creatives to take on shops , Soho, Covent Garden , Clerkenwell, Spitalfields Hoxton all market areas that lost their mojo creatives moved in empty spaces and boom regeneration young people the life blood of cities and towns . March forward or die !!"

the proposal should be addressing the lack of parking spaces, more disabled spaces are needed; sidewalks are still too cluttered; water garden may block visibility of traffic leaving the bus station area. Planter on the pavement are inappropriate and hinder easy flow of pedestrians. Monmouth has a high % of elderly people the may find it difficult to negotiate all the obstacles along the way.

Waste of money . All these plants and pavements are unsafe for disabled and partially sighted . Cutting off town the old and physically disabled . Already can't get into town , this will make it worse . Spend the money elsewhere to make Monmouth active . Like Chippenham park or the duck pond make a route of pathway over the river so people could access this space .

return the street to the wide lovely avenue we had before

"Totally unnecessary and will likely put people off visiting Monmouth.

These proposals are not improvements, but designed to choke off anything but pedestrians and cyclists. How many people from more than a few hundred yards away really cycle or walk into town?

This will be the death knell for many small, independent businesses and not do anything to make Monmouth more vibrant and prosperous. "

Put it back as it was , also take the pinch point out & put this plan to similar, of Monnow street , like early 2005 etc

Do not repeat do not follow the Chepstow town design, as this will kill off Monmouth tow. Centre, which now a joy to visit!

I understand because of previous complaints you feel the need to keep two way traffic, but personally I think it is a shame and would love the street to be pedestrianised. I think this design still gives too much emphasis to car drivers, but it is an improvement over what we have now for pedestrians so maybe a necessary compromise. I think the extra sitting out areas should be year round not just summer, there are often warm days in winter/spring/autumn when people would prefer to sit outside.

This is a huge waste of money .

I see no point in this proposal at all. So much money wasted when it could be spent elsewhere encouraging more shops to open.

So many empty shops in Monmouth. I haven't spoken to anyone that thinks this is a good idea. STOP WASTING OUR MONEY!!!

Does anyone listen to our views or have the pockets already been lined?

Please take it back to pre covid, the wider pavements are a nightmare. People still park where they like and it has made it much more challenging. Sometimes all you want is to pop in for a few bits. Don't want to pay for parking will just push people to other areas e.g. Ross on wye.or Abergavenny

I work out of town and would like to be able to pop into town on my way home but that is becoming increasingly difficult with these measures so I just avoid it as much as I can now and shop elsewhere

You key aims do not include having any viable business left on the street. Trader feed back on current and proposals has been negative but ignored by the council. Stick to a classic market high st, not generic bland town planning by committee. Remove the cars and you remove profitability for traders.

Ditch the 20mph speed limit, widen the street as there is plenty of room to make the pavements narrower and improve parking along the street

If the town gets pedestrianised how are people including disabled/elderly supposed to get to shops. My nan is 84 and i drop her right outside the opticians when she has an appointment

A typical example of the cart before the horse. Why spend all this money with empty shops derelict buildings. Pointless window dressing exercise. How about some joined up thinking? How about a complete strategy involving business, shops property owners and the town council?!

This is crazy seating on busy nasty corners where people have to sit eat food with fumes of cars an lorry's an buses, dangerous for families with children and even more dangerous for people with poor eye sight, this proposal is totally crazy from start to finish! Do one side of the street Herron bone parking, have time zones for delivery's so lorry's are not in and out of the town daily. And planting trees is brilliant but not in a town where roots grow and then destroy pavements in a few years time and then people trip an fall and the council will then neglect and not sort out costing more money! Totally rethink the wide pavements and all the signs and crap that's already on the pavements people aren't able to walk up the streets of the town as it is let alone adding more crap and vandals in the town will have a field day with it all destroying it like they do now! Go to the primary schools and ask the 4 year olds to design the street u may get some better pond drawn up then! Some of the design is nice but on the whole it just won't work in this town. And please sort out all the confusing 20/30/40 limits no one can follow the speed limit start putting it on the roads so people are more aware of the speeds their supposed to be doing now it's so confusing for many drivers. Sort the actual roads out so we can actually drive them and not burst our tyres and bugger the suspensions before doing anything else to this town.

The design has met the brief BUT it is not what Monmouth needs. The town needs revitalising by filling the empty shops meaning that people would have a reason to stop, shop, socialise and enjoy a more appealing Monnow Street. The pinch point by Suits you, needs clear marking and a designated right of way. Parking needs to be addressed, as someone who live out of the town I want to be able to nip into shops not spend my whole day walking to and from a car park far from the street. Waitrose will get fed up with people abusing their free hour parking. Was herringbone parking considered in Monnow street? The question is what was so bad prior to Covid?

The whole thing, lovely as it is, is a TOTAL waste of money while high street businesses are closing down and/or leaving in droves. Sort out the landlords, lower the rates, give business grants, support them to bring the town back to life.

"The design was drafted without any consultation with shoppers and Monmouth residents and I'm confused why the planners say the businesses were consulted and agreed but heard the Chamber of Commerce doesn't? Having worked a lifetime managing big projects all major stakeholders should be consulted and their requirements noted before any design stage. Are shoppers and residents not stakeholders? The architects say the total cost of the project is not within their remit but surely any project has to work within financial constraints up front. They did agree the Council thought they could finance this from levelling up funding which they didn't get so where is the money to come from when the Council are looking to save millions of pounds this year? Apparently even though the design gives loading only bays and extra width for each car space the number of car parking spaces will not be reduced. This doesn't add up? Would it not have been better in the interim to have spent money on returning the street design to pre Covid to return additional parking instead of spending thousands on drafting a design for which there is no money available to carry out. I would like to know how this consultation and design was funded in the first place and how much it cost."

The town is falling apart as rates are too expensive and shops are empty. I choose to drive away from Monmouth to have more choice of shops. Instead on constantly wasting our money on changing the layout, reduce business rates so businesses choose to come here.

"Too much emphasis on leisure cyclist is given by MCC who drive into to the area to cycle around. Most locals have to use a car, so why favour non environmental cyclist over local people. The town is dying due to a lack of basic clothing shops etc, cyclist do not bring in hard cash

These artist's impressions are totally misleading. Nothing like the usual number of cars wanting to park or pedestrians failing to be able to see cars coming when they want to cross. We don't need trees, we have Wye Valley and Forest of Dean on our doorstep!

As a pedestrian, I find Monnow Street absolutely fine, apart from those daft, massive planters that do nothing but get in the way when you're walking. We live in the Wye Valley, we have greenery growing everywhere...we don't need dead plants and weeds in boxes to pretty the place up (in fact the bunting that goes across the road does a lot more for making the place look attractive imo!). As a driver, the road is a nightmare. The road situation outside Iceland is ridiculous (bus stop opposite a loading bay...nice one), lorries have nowhere to deliver so they block the road, and pedestrians frequently emerge to cross the road with those planters and random cars stopping impairing visibility. It isn't feasible to make Monnow Street pedestrian only as we have no alternative route should the dual carriageway be shut or blocked. It was better pre pandemic.

It's one small high street in the countryside. Planters and garden areas are unnecessary as we are surrounded by green space. Surrounding crossings with them is un safe as it restricts the view of pedestrians and traffic. There are plenty of areas where people can sit out and have coffee i.e. church street, why clutter the high street with this? Put the parking and loading bays back in the street and get rid of all the pointless street clutter. Spend the money on re surfacing pavements and roads and stop making it so un accessible to cars. This is what is killing Monmouth. We want ease of access and a no nonsense high street which we can navigate easily.

Access to short term parking is still an issue. For a quick visit (10-30 minutes) the costs for parking when walking is not an option (crutches or fatigue) are ridiculous. Parking in Waitrose or home bargains is the only option as the high street parking is minimal now, and the costs for the main car parks are minimum 2 hours. With the change in parking, a different tariff starting at 30

minutes would be much more sensible. The new parking meters make this a possibility and would likely make more people use them if there was a reduced fee for parking for short times. Thereby increasing the money raised through Parking charges. not enough carparking spaces, to many zebra crossings. What happens when you need to take your elderly parents to the doctors and you can't park.no loading bay outside the post office for deliveries many of the residents of Monmouth are elderly they can't walk long distances and they certainly don't ride bikes .i hope you are going to level the footpath outside coffee 1 as it now slopes and some elderly people have fallen over having to work on the uneven surface were the drain is People cross the high street wherever they so please on busier days. The trees will make for reduced sight lines for drivers who may now not see people suddenly entering the road. Even with more crossings, people regularly flout these, for example the zebra crossing by Waitrose going to the public toilets, many people choose to cross on the much more dangerous bend a few yards down by Handman House. The trees will become a hazard for pedestrians.

Just spend the money on fixing the current roads and taking away the pandemic obstructions.

"The scheme proposed is inadequate because it does not provide a holistic vision or proposals for regenerating Monmouth and providing a sustainable development for current or future communities' needs as a retail and service centre that draws on a wide population from three counties and two countries.

The scheme as proposed has some interesting ideas but highlights that it is just a short term fix that proposes short term solutions to the visual decay of a small section of the town. This will be seen as a sticking plaster that does not solve the crisis that faces retail businesses aiming for a sustainable future in the town. This project as it is presented is unlikely to increase footfall to the town and is likely to deter many existing consumers / residents from visiting as frequently owing to inconvenience from reduced parking spaces.

The scheme does not fully address the delivery needs of businesses and places planting schemes in front of retailers who rely on drop-offs and collection by customers on short trips(pharmacies/ hairdressers).

There appears to be a failure of consultation where many businesses who have provided comments to local people feel they have not been consulted , haven't had a chance to state their needs and ideas and now feel that their concerns have not been addressed to date.

There is nothing in the proposals which explains funding sources to be used to deliver the scheme , cost of maintenance or ongoing responsibility for cost and maintenance of the changes to infrastructure and planting .

More significantly no consideration has been given to connecting the scheme to the adjoining areas of the town such as the market, Monnow Bridge or the existing under- invested, underutilised green spaces in the connecting areas of the town.

Residents and businesses alike are rightly concerned that the scheme lacks ambition and vision and appears to have minimal support from businesses and residents.

There is no data provided on existing footfall, traffic and no analysis of the medium and long term challenges affecting the long term sustainability of Monmouth as a retail and service destination.

Where is the cost benefit analysis and what are the targets for measuring the scheme's success against the vague objectives

Where is the consideration for introducing green infrastructure including electric fast charge spaces, free parking , secure cycle storage and provision for encouraging new sme's to base themselves in the town.

In the absence of a fully costed plan to increase footfall and regenerate / re- purpose the empty retail and housing stock these plans should be scrapped and a more comprehensive grassroots led consultation using central government levelling up funds should inform a future plan which is more ambitious and which has the support of the whole community .

In the meantime the pre- covid status quo should be restored , drainage improved and pavements made safe and level .

Retention of outdoor seating for food premises and planters adopted by sponsors who keep them well maintained.

A future Monmouth plan should be developed in consultation with all in the local area to cover regeneration of business activity including a hub for sme's and hybrid workers , new residential activity / townhouse developments , accessible green spaces, infrastructure for electric vehicles , free parking...to name but a few

It is vital that future regeneration is driven by the community, local decision makers should ask the right questions and involve local experts not national consultancies like Capita who use formulaic schemes and sell them across the country to local authorities. The knowledge and talent is available locally in the community who know best what will regenerate the town. "

Put it back to how it was pre pandemic

The lack of short term free parking has already altered my schedule and I now visit local shops and post office in local villages. I'm sure it will be very attractive for local pedestrians but I can't see a non local or tourist benefit because of the poor car parking and congestion

Awful

Monmouth used to be a vibrant market town with lots of tourists . Now it is a sad untidy town that has become a second citizen to other local towns because of the unnecessary changes that have been implemented by MCC recently.

It's ridiculous, we live in the wye valley we don't need these trees and green areas where cars and people can be. Lack of parking is ridiculous. And the congestion this causes is dangerous. Its also harder to cross now the road is narrow it was so easy before as you could see cars coming and they could see you. Put the street back!

I believe there is disproportionate amount of effort focusing on cyclists visiting the town. Monmouth is a rural town and many people are unable to cycle to and from their house. I feel that you have not considered how many people actually cycle within the town. I also feel strongly that money needs to be spent on developing the riverside next to the Monnow Bridge, it is currently quite unattractive, but has the potential to be made into a buzzing place with local eateries and independent shops.

Sharing space with cyclists as a pedestrian does not encourage me to use the town

Put it back to the way it is meant to be ! A market town with parking and through traffic.

STOP RUINING OUR HIGH STREET. PRIORITIES US CAR DRIVERS.

Two at most stay because the surrounding do not cope! This was proven during the one way system. The town needs more variety of shops and doing the paving is not going to attract any more shop keepers. Taking away parking in the street reduces the number of people who like to call in on their way to work or on their way home

Its claustrophobic.

The town doesn't need trees down the street, it's a town not an Avenue. There's plenty of trees over chippy, the town is for shopping

I do not want this change and want it put back to how it was before the pandemic when it worked for all. It was safer as both a pedestrian car driver and cyclist. what a waste of money and devastating for businesses. WHY WON'T YOU LISTEN?

Waste of money !

That the businesses and public on several previous surveys have said that they want Monnow Street put back to how it was but Monmouthshire County Council won't accept that proposal. After 2 years of Covid the businesses need as much help as possible. Several businesses that survived covid have since closed and the changes already made to Monnow Street by MCC have played a part in those closures. Just because this layout worked in Abergavenny doesn't mean it will work or is suitable for Monmouth! The number of empty shops is increasing daily. Monmouth rates are the highest in Monmouthshire despite the fact our high street has been a mess for 2+ years. The standard of the work done 2 years ago (against the wishes of the majority of people and businesses of Monmouth) is shoddy, very poor and not what was promised at the consultations (MCC ran out of money!) Unlike Abergavenny & Chepstow we have no train station. Unlike Abergavenny we have no council buses, let alone electric ones! We don't have enough car parking spaces but MCC are happy to reduce the number of spaces on Monnow Street. We are fighting to keep our emergency response team in Monmouth and even with them we know that someone suffering a heart attack will be dead before an ambulance arrives (averaging 7 hours for an ambulance to attend), or someone with a stroke will suffer irreversible damage before an ambulance attended. The infrastructure wasn't sufficient a couple of years ago and yet you've continued to give planning permission for new builds without providing another Gp practice or primary school. Monmouth is the county town and yet it feels like the poor relation constantly overlooked whilst other towns especially Abergavenny seem to be favoured. The proposed changes to Monnow Street are just another example of MCC not listening to the town or caring enough about Monmouth to do what's right! This is the 3rd / 4th consultation and each time figures are massaged so that MCC's

proposed plans are shown to have the support of the town. Many people will not respond because they've replied to previous consultations and MCC haven't listened!

"Leave Monmouth alone help the shop owners we are turning into a ghost town

Shops closing down because they can't afford the rates

Work on getting shops back open "

Put it back to pre covid, totally disgusting that salt and pepper can keep their ugly unkept monstrosity in the street

Whilst I appreciate the extra crossing areas will definitely help pedestrians, I think the planters and seating already make the town look chaotic. I much preferred the way it was before the existing changes were made. The short term parking was much better for workers popping into town to pick up lunch or a coffee. Let's be realistic here... you can pour money into making the high street look pretty but there are so many empty shops in Monnow Street, Agincourt Square and Swan Court that the town has become an embarrassment as the gateway to Wales. If we didn't have the beautiful buildings and landmarks there wouldn't be anything else to visit. MCC desperately need to make a huge effort to attract businesses to Monmouth. Many people now shop elsewhere and the lack of parking really adds to the problem.

Return it to how it was and leave Monnow Street alone. You've taken the town away as it is and as you want the proposal to be like

Put Monnow street back to it was before covid and spend the money elsewhere. There is no parking in Monmouth and not many shops which are open .people who do travel here usually can't park so there go on to Abergavenny

The plan is a waste of money. The council should concentrate on reducing council tax and business rates for people. There is no way for people to maintain a business and make a profit. Look at how many empty shops are in the town!! One must travel to Newport or Hereford for good shops.

Support for the Proposal

The designs look excellent and brings Monmouth in to the 21st Century. Please don't be discouraged by the very vocal minority and stick to what you know is the right thing to do to support the future of our high street.

Maximum liaison with wider planning so that improvements to Monmouth could take place soon.

One has to compromise but my view has not changed since i wrote the accompanying verse sometime before the pinch point was widened for pedestrians.

Please get this proposal through! Town is starting to feel like a ghost town and we are supposed to be the heart of Monmouthshire. This will attract more visitors

As a visitor to the town i would like to see more seating areas that are not attached to a coffee shop, somewhere for visitors to sit in town or by the river for ice cream and for takeaway coffees etc.

The proposal looks beautiful and well thought through, so in principal /ideally it should work really well, but I have major doubts:

1. Who is going to maintain the plants? Any amazing looking shrubs/trees can become a mess if nobody looks after them. The council is struggling with available money for everything, how can they make sure they will have the cash for maintenance?

2.The increased number of loading bays are a great idea but I can not see large delivery lorries wanting to use them when they are further away from the shops where they deliver to, than parking just in front of them.

Who is going to police that they use the bay and won't just choose to park on the road and then just block and hinder the flow of traffic?

3. Even though the plan looks great and vibrant, a town centre that has more and more empty shops will not necessarily attract more visitors and more shoppers. A major town design update may not solve the dying high street problem although I may just think differently then the general public. Or maybe we just need to attract more independent shops to our town centre before we are too bothered by its looks(?).

I love all the zebra crossings. Great for pedestrians.

As a person with a disability I welcome ways of accessing the town to shop. Parking near shops is essential if we are buying goods so that shopping can be loaded into cars. I believe the town plans meet the needs of all kinds of people and will provide a pleasant and inviting urban environment.

Fully pedestrianised would be lovely but this is a good compromise given the limitations of Monmouth road layout .

There has been a thorough consultation and the plans could revitalise the high street.

I think the proposals are excellent. I know they won't solve every problem we have in the high street, but I think this makes a really good start. We also need better public transport and to convince landlords to reduce their rents!

There has been a thorough process

The proposals strike a good balance between the different activities that take place on Monnow street. A walkable and attractive and visually uncluttered environment will be a great improvement. Much of the consultation responses from shops has been disproportionately focused on car parking, neglecting the fact that the majority people in Monmouth live within a short walking distance, and the street should principally be a place for people not cars.

"It is excellent that there are more crossing points. A courtesy crossing point, however, does not give either pedestrian or road user right of way. This can cause confusion unless there are signs that say give priority to pedestrians. The only lighted crossing currently in existence seems to have lost the lights in the “how the town could look” graphics. There are two very worrying issues regarding safety. At the upper end of the street, the pavements either side of where St John Street joins Monnow Street are extremely narrow. This is not marked as problematic on the “how the street works now” plan. It is, however, the narrowest pavement anywhere along the street. For the road to remain two way at that point the pavement on the other side of the road (the north western side) would have to be narrowed. This problem is totally unaddressed.

The other worrying issue is visibility around the courtesy crossings at the lower end of the street. To have a loading bay immediately next to a crossing point means that drivers coming up the hill would not be able to see people waiting to cross from the left-hand side if the loading bay was being used. Likewise, pedestrians waiting to cross would have to crane around a truck or van in order to see if traffic is coming from the right.

Other crossings have their waiting areas immediately next to rain gardens and these would block visibility to pedestrians and road users, especially if the trees are of the size that the graphics suggest.

Visible and regular parking enforcement would make an enormous difference to the success of these plans. In terms of people who plan to use the car parks and then visit the street on foot, links between the car parks and the high street would benefit from being more clearly signed, and in the case of the alleyway that runs alongside number 20a Monnow Street, actually being opened.

The street and town would benefit from being motorised vehicle free with the exception of vehicles for the disabled and vehicles loading. Surely it would be a much nicer place to be if it was all pedestrianised. Cars have no place in town centres.

We need Monmouth to look, and to be, as green as possible. We have taken every option available to us to mitigate climate change. This should inform every decision, and this behaviour of itself will make Monmouth an attractive place to live, work and visit.

These proposals are helpful in improving the town centre however the far greater issue of vacant high street premises is not being addressed. There should be 12 months free of business taxes for start ups occupying empty premises and reduced business rates for 12 months to help existing premises stay open. This is what would influence me to visit Monmouth more often. The town is dying currently and these proposals will not change this.

Comments on the Monnow Street Proposals

Proposals to improve the layout and resurfacing of Monnow Street are welcome, particularly to remove the now totally inappropriate changes brought in during the pandemic. The intention to make temporary alterations in response to the pandemic was sound, but the decision to widen the pavements and then to largely destroy that improvement by placing numerous planting boxes on the widened parts was nonsensical, cancelling out the benefit of having the wider paving. It will also be good to see the removal of the extremely unsightly seating enclosures that are completely out of keeping with their locations.

The Design Principles for a two-way system with the inclusion of the factors mentioned in ‘Item 4: Process so far’, seem sensible, particularly to provide a reasonable degree of street parking, disabled parking spaces, loading bays, improved pedestrian crossings and cycle stands, but some of the proposals definitely need to be considered further.

A major concern that I have with the proposals is that the historic wide open nature of Monnow Street will be compromised. The road is thought to have existed at least from Roman times and in the Middle Ages the Great Causey, later to become Monnow Street, was an ancient trade route to the west, with the wider area in the middle used for the trading of livestock and market stalls (Ref: K. Kissack: The Lordship, Parish and Borough of Monmouth; K. Kissack: Monmouth and its Buildings). John Speeds map of 1610, shows it as Monmeth Stret a wide open street in it’s present form, with plots reflecting the much older burgage plots set out in the C11th. John Newman (The Buildings of Wales: Gwent/Monmouthshire) states that it is a pleasing continuous array of C18 and C19 shops and houses.

Whilst the form of the buildings on either side are not changed by these proposals, the wide open nature of the street in the heart of the Conservation Area will be detrimentally affected by:

Introducing an unnecessary snaking to the road, part of the way up the street, which detracts from the historic fairly straight and open vista of the street.

The tree planting that is proposed, also detracts from the open character of the street and there is no precedent for such planting in Monnow Street in the past. This would seem to have very little impact in offsetting climate change and any advantage could be equally and more satisfactorily achieved by introducing improved green landscaping in the area of the old cattle market car parking area, without compromising the parking.

Looking at the proposals in detail, I would also mention the follow:

Road / Pavement / Parking / Crossings

I question the snaking of the road, as mentioned above. Also why is a pinch point to the pavement being created unnecessary outside M & Co and couldn’t at least one more parking space be created here.

The number of pedestrian crossings at the southern end of the street seems excessive and the parking in this area could be improved, either by omitting the crossing in front of the Robin Hood, which seems unnecessary, given that there are two other crossings slightly to the north, or alternatively, the one in front of the Robin Hood could be omitted and the next one outside Waitrose could be repositioned to the southern end of the loading bays. Either way it should then be possible to add a couple of parking spaces in this area.

Cycles

Whilst the provision of cycle stands is clearly good, why are there so many small facilities scattered along the street. Can't cyclist also be encouraged to walk up and down the street once they have parked their cycle. Surely the provision of a number of stands in Agincourt Square, somewhere at the bottom of the street and one or two locations half way up the street would be more sympathetic, rather than having numerous ones scattered throughout the length of the street. Also the ones by the loading bays at the bottom of the street, would be safer if repositioned around the corner by the new crossing from the car park; this would also be more convenient for the toilets.

Planting

Whilst the provision of some sympathetic planting/raingardens is welcome, obviously a detailed landscaping plan, plant specification and a realistic management regime is required. However, as mentioned, I do question the provision of trees, the number and exactly what they will be, how mature when planted, maintenance, leaf fall, etc. and particularly their impact on the historic wide open vista of the street, which has remained in that form for centuries. If they are to be provided, then perhaps a straightening of the road and a more aligned layout of the trees would be more appropriate to keep the rhythm of the street.

Seating

What measures will be in place to approve the provision and location of seating areas on the payments, so that it does not get out of control? Allowing seating directly against the road edges does not seem safe, but if it is proposed, there should not be enclosures, such as those in place at the moment, that are both unsightly and obstruct visibility.

I appreciate that Salt & Pepper have an important presence in the town, but the provision of such a large area of seating directly outside their shops, where the street is quite narrow, is not an ideal location. Those outside Pizza Express also seem unnecessary. I don't see any need for seating outside the Estero Lounge and the Robin Hood Inn, as both have external seating areas at the rear of their properties. The seating in front of the Estero Lounge is particularly inappropriate, as it is right next to the busy entrance and exit roads to the bus station and Monnow Keep Road, with a lot of traffic fumes and it will probably impede visibility at the exit. Generally umbrella shading to seating, particularly adjacent to the road kerbs, does not seem sensible as it could easily blow over.

Toilet Block

It is a great shame that the proposals aren't being expanded to incorporate the replacement of the ugly toilet block at the southern end of the street, which has detracted from the setting of the historic Monnow Bridge for many years. It seems an ideal opportunity to replace or relocate this with a much more sympathetic building, perhaps combined with a visitor centre, something that has been discussed on numerous occasions in the past.

The Plan is really excellent from a short term point of view and will undoubtedly make the centre of the town a more attractive and functional space. However it is behind the curve in the sense that we ought to be planning to cut down car use and not to facilitate it.

The needs of businesses in Agincourt Square, Church Street and Priory Street need to be taken into account."

I love the idea of having more plants and trees in the town as it really stands out and makes it look like a nice place to be in. I like the idea of having more crossings instead of only having a couple of places to cross safely.

I hope the trees are as mature as shown in the illustration! Please sort out the uneven surfaces and drainage in the pedestrian areas.

The design proposals solves a multitude of problems that need urgent attention.

"There has been a lot of negativity about this proposal however it seems naïve and without the offer of viable alternatives, certainly based upon the resources that are available.

I believe that there is no diamond bullet or one quick fix to improving Monnow high street. I do believe that as the start of a continued commitment to finding ways to improve our town, these proposals will add value. "

I think some seating would be lovely

"Pleased that there are wider pavements, and a narrower carriageway. Motor vehicle traffic, if it has to be on Monnow Street, should be moving slowly, and be the lowest priority in terms of Monnow Street users.

Not sure how well the proposals will benefit cyclists. We have four out of twelve employees that cycle regularly from Wyesham to our business on Drybridge Street.

There does seem to be an improvement for pedestrians. The raised areas will hopefully slow motor vehicles and enable safe and timely crossings.

The planting scheme looks good, as much of it as possible please.

Better signage and links to available car parking, not on Monnow Street, is needed."

I would hope that although we all use the town in different ways and for different reasons, I would hope that the business section of Monmouth would be very receptive and fully back the proposals. The town needs to be attractive but the vibrancy and variety of our businesses is paramount so their views should be considered very strongly during these difficult times.

"The sharing of the two-way traffic with cyclists as priority is not sufficiently made clear even though new expensive bridge encourages them here.

I cannot see why able-bodied visitors should allowed to park at all. Why can't they use the car parks? And i don't agree that the street should be cluttered with extra cars in the winter

I hope that every opportunity has been taken to widen pavements for people to pass and not have to weave in and out of those awful planters

The new highway code lists priority to pedestrians above cyclists above cars and van and all around are Active links - is this sufficiently signed and coherent? The Wyesham Active link project completely ignored Hadnock rd the very dangerous mini roundabout or any signage for often cyclists with small children as to they try to find and reach the town centre. Three well

meaning but classic examples of unjoined up thinking. And what is so special about Wyesham? Many more cyclists pass house on hadnock rd every day than i have ever seen in Wyesham!

I hope that "

A good thing about this is getting rid of the wooden shelter places in the town. its' also good that it looks like you will put new slabs down on the walkway. I hope the pavements won't slope like the wide bits do now and like Agincourt Sq that's awful to walk on. keep parking in town we need plenty. Hope you aren't going to narrow the road any further it's dangerous as it is. would prefer it to go back as it was, with new slabs on walkways.

The design layout creating more pedestrian space is great as is the extra greenery. Street needs to be built with better materials but is a great idea.

Thank you for a comprehensive, well thought out inclusive plan

Monnow Street badly needs this regeneration, its really tired currently! Abergavenny's town centre regeneration has been a big success and so will Monmouth. Better links needed from car parks, Howells Place is too narrow and its difficult to navigate.

There has been a lot of negativity about loss of on street parking but increasingly in modern shopping areas there are more pedestrianised areas. Shopping is more pleasant in such areas. There does need to be car parks close to shopping area with a short stay free of charge option. People don't like change and often don't see the benefits.

"Regeneration of Monnow Street and the wider town centre is welcomed and vital to attract investment into the town.

Monmouth town centre should represent the stature of the town in the county and currently this is not the case.

The proposed scheme is very attractive and makes the town so much more appealing to the residents, and visitors alike.

Car Park links to Monnow Street need to be improved as Howells Place is too narrow and therefore does not serve its purpose well especially for the disabled.

Abergavenny town centre regeneration has been a huge success although was not particularly popular initially and this was a full pedestrianisation.

I sincerely hope this project is approved for the all the reasons stated."

It makes Monnow Street much more manageable for everyone. Reduces vehicle traffic scrum and allows people to walk more safely and confidently through the street. The whole street looks more attractive and therefore enhances the look of the businesses. It's far better for our health and the environment too.

Improving the visual appearance of the town must be of a high priority because tourist engagement is very important to the town economy. I feel that this proposal meets that requirement

Very exciting to see more permanent trees/SUDs, please make the edges hard to drive over because we have a lot of big 'all terrain' vehicles and people need physical restrictions from parking in flower beds.

The pavements are currently uneven, so huge puddles form when it rains. They are a mish mash of tarmac, slabs and small blocks. They look awful and not good for the elderly or disabled. I don't think the street layout will have an adverse effect on businesses, they are mostly kept away by high rents from out of town landlords.

Please introduce layout asap

Very well thought through and developed with lots of consultation. An excellent scheme which will make a huge improvement to Monmouth.

Its a good balance of the needs of shoppers, tourists and businesses. I love the planting and extra crossings.

I completely support the traffic calming effects e.g. the zebra crossings. I am confident the investment will bring additional businesses into the town, as well as visitors.

Positive design, feels that would be best to effectively shut Monnow Street to through traffic during work days by stopping traffic from St John's Street to square during the day. Parking in Monnow Street is always going to be limited.

It's a challenge to reach a consensus with a shared space such as Monnow Street. I don't think that any one design can meet all elements of the project aim, but this is a reasonable attempt at doing so. All of the design elements however are reliant on enforcement of loading, parking and maintenance of amenities which require long term commitment from all parties.

I think that this is an excellent proposal for the high street. However where will the traffic go or how will you reduce the need to drive to town? Is the intent for all traffic to pass up and down the dual carriageway? What additional public transport proposals

are there to allow local people to visit the town without a car. Would you start creating proper independent cycle routes that are car free etc.

I think this will be a great improvement on the cluttered, car choked Monnow st we have now. Space for EVERYONE! I think the designers have done a good job trying to take into account everyone's views. I'd like to see a more radical approach to reduce car usage in town but understand a compromise is needed and this seems like a really good compromise.

I am delighted to see the proposed improvements to the town centre. It will be a much improved area for us all to enjoy, make it much safer for crossing of road, very important to me with young grandchildren growing up in the town. I am delighted that Monmouth will hopefully attract more people to the town and hopefully more businesses to open too.

"Great design but heavily focused on pedestrians, which i understand is the overall aim. Although the traffic through the town will be heavily restricted with the number of pedestrians crossings, making it difficult to travel through.

Personally, I would suggest investigating options for relief roads from the bottom of Monmouth the top, avoiding Monnow street. As this would reduce the amount of traffic through the town, whilst ensuring a smooth flow of traffic if the dual carriageway is blocked by a vehicle breakdown or accident.

My main concern is the upkeep of this proposed area. Since the widening of pavements in Monmouth has taken place as a temporary covid measure, the streets have remained that way with trip hazards and poor surface quality. The current planters and seating areas have been vandalised multiple times and now look horrendous. If the design is implemented and not controlled/monitored after completion, then it is pointless continuing with this project. As I expect no one would want to sit drinking coffee in the high street with broken trees/planters and seating areas with no windows & vial language carved into all the Perspex and wood around them. "

Fabulous idea!

Improved seating and green spaces will enable much better engagement. Increased crossing places are much needed over current situation. Enlarged pavements will be much more pleasant and less car dominated. Would prefer dedicated cycle lanes where there is space. Remember cycle racks and tools need incorporating.

It's a huge improvement on what is there now and would bring in more visitors and locals to stay in the town longer. I particularly like the fact that there will be plenty of places to cross the road, unlike now, and that there will be plenty of greenery in the road, but it won't be cluttered like it is now.

Overall, I think new design an improvement, especially with permanent greenery but feel street should be one way (down only) for traffic.

"I think the crossing location by the Robin Hood pub is ideal, and the raised areas will hopefully slow down the traffic. More safe opportunities for pedestrians to cross Monnow Street is a welcome addition.

It would have been great to have put more emphasis on infrastructure for pedestrians, mobility scooters and bicycles, however I understand the need for compromise with those who feel that cars are a priority.

I would also like to have seen more trees to be used as natural shade during the summer."

"1. Good work. Whatever we eventually settle, let us first recognise that this will be the last throw of the dice, spend the money, create the new street, then stop arguing and move on.

2. Realistically, the design only works to the extent we all accept that Monnow Street will never meet the requirements made of it at peak times where chaos is created by too many vehicles trying to find parking, unloading and loading or just passing through + cyclists+ school buses + pedestrians.

3. The design will only work as devised if designated parking bays for delivery and disabled are not abused, and double parking, ignoring double yellow lines and the like is actively discouraged rather than totally ignored by inconsiderate drivers.

4. Compliance will be best achieved by the addition of a traffic warden to the mix.

"Personally I am very positive about the project but have witnessed traffic issues in Monnow Street with all the changes. The majority of these are due to motorists not following the Highway Code and proceeding even when their exit isn't clear (the pinch point and going around delivery lorries clear examples) . There are issues with deliveries to stores and I would prefer it if Monnow Street was dedicated to loading and disabled parking only. Able-bodied people should be encouraged to use the car parks available with incentives such as free parking for 30 minutes in all Council car parks and a pedestrian bridge from the skate

park car park over the river to come into town near Home Bargains. There is a need for more parking in town and if land becomes available should be considered, for example, long stay car parking where the Dixton Roundabout Development was proposed.

People seemed to have forgotten that a small amount of walking is an option, they may well spend in other stores whilst walking to their destination from car parks and we are in the middle of an obesity crisis - walking should be encouraged! Sadly many Monmouthians are against change but Monmouth needs to move forward. "

Don't give in to the many parking moaners. They are mainly retailers parking all day from 8-9am. Towns that go completely pedestrianised do best. There are plenty of car parks.

We need a shift so that pedestrians rather than cars have priority in Monnow St. Any publicity to emphasise this with the launch of the scheme would be helpful.

"The scheme is a step forward in terms of adapting Monmouth to future living, but it is at serious risk of being a missed opportunity. The proposals still cater to the vocal car-loving minority by focussing too much on car parking when there is ample car parking around the fringes of the town. We should be encouraging people to walk, cycle, and use public transport. People who park on the high street tend not to be high-value consumers, they often speed and park inconsiderately to "pick something up" rather than dwelling in the town and contributing to Monmouth as a vibrant place to live and work. These people tend to be over-represented in consultations and I hope this is reflected in analyses of consultation responses.

Notwithstanding the above, and as somebody who walks/cycles to town several days a week, the scheme would be a considerable improvement on the streetscape. More crossings are a welcome improvement, with raised areas and road curvature making for sensible traffic calming. The high street is currently full of cars making it dangerous and unpleasant for pedestrians. "Spill-outs", bike facilities, dedicated loading bays for businesses, planting are all to be welcomed. I would have preferred a dedicated cycle path to allow my children to cycle happily and confidently up the high street, but this now seems unlikely. However, I would not want cycle provision to be at the expense of footway.

The main issue with the proposal is with over-provision of private car parking. Parking on the high street should be discouraged – it is one of the aspects making Monmouth relatively unpleasant to dwell, and I worry for my children’s safety. A local exemplar is Abergavenny, with much greater vibrancy and pedestrian use. I disagree with the statement that people “need” to drive through the high street, except for essential business purposes, or special needs and disabilities. The car parking spaces should be limited to an absolute minimum, be discrete from loading bays (where existing provision means cars “spill out” and park onto existing loading bays) – and preferably be disabled only. The “winter parking” is a novel idea, if we must have parking why not roll this out for ALL spaces (excepting disabled) to make Monmouth a pleasant place on a summer’s day, where traffic fumes on warm days are otherwise intoxicating?

A final point is that the footway opposite Robin Hood pub still looks like it will remain far too narrow (outside Ladbrokes betting shop). The same applies to footway at the junction of St. Johns Street. These are severe impediments to e.g. families with young children, pushchairs, mobility scooters etc. and these become bottlenecks for pedestrians. This generates disconnect to the northern and southern parts of town. Please reconsider the designs here."

I would like to see even less traffic on Monnow St (perhaps with deliveries restricted to early morning and evenings, with other vehicular access kept to a minimum?

The proposals seem to strike a balance for visitors/businesses /alternative travel modes. A new vision is needed to support declining high streets, which need to reinvent themselves to continue to be relevant and the heart of local communities. The proposals will provide an attractive and welcoming environment to support the future of Monnow Street.

I can’t wait for these designs to be implemented. The town centre will be a much nicer space to spend time and shop.

I understand why you cannot pedestrianise the street but it is a pity - Abergavenny have a great pedestrian area. A relief road to the North of the Monnow would solve it but probably not a possibility. But the design team have done well with the restrictions in place.

if you only do one thing to transform Monnow street, PLEASE make the pavements wider, to walk from one end to the other i frequently have to walk in the road simple because there is too little pavement provision

I think the re-development of the high street is complicated and it is impossible to please everyone. I feel that the design has been very well developed and thought through and offers the best solution to all. I hope this attracts more visitors to the town and keeps our high street flourishing.

I like the planting areas and majority of extra crossings (but would remove the one on the bend by the Robin Hood pub because it is too dangerous - cars coming down Monnow St and turning can't see pedestrians crossing here (often see people crossing here currently and many times witnessing near misses). I also feel that the pavements have been over widened and the potential traffic gridlock on the Main Street will be too great as a result. I think short stay spaces should be maximised (not sure there are enough) to allow for 'popping in' to get essentials and keep the shops alive - and also for dropping off young/old or disabled people in safety (not possible as the current layout stands). Finally I would respite the bike park to an area in the cattle market car park rather than making it central to Monnow St.

The proposal is all very well and good but it is the lack of varied shops/businesses and the dire market that is the issue.

The changes need to happen asap as Monmouth is looking very sad at the moment with all the empty shops etc.

"Excellent plans - looks amazing - we'll done the design team. Don't be beaten down by a bunch of dinosaur petrol heads that are too lazy to walk into town - there's ample parking behind the Main Street and a short walk to the shops.

All power to your arm! 😊"

Just hurry up and do it! So much time and money is being wasted on all this administration, which is money that could be better spent improving the town.

The plan will slow traffic flow through the town centre. When there is a problem in the dual carriageway Monmouth will be 2 lanes of solid traffic. The planting scheme is an improvement. The space for pedestrians is excellent but traffic flow will be slowed and more traffic is likely to build up. Today -Saturday 10th Feb there were long lines of cars on Monnow Street. The artist impression gives an artificial impression of space. Has anyone monitored pollution levels in Monnow Street at different times and traffic densities? Would you eat al fresco with loads of cats stuck in Monnow Street?

The proposals meet a good middle ground to suit pedestrians, cyclists, cars and commercial. All attempts need to be made to encourage sharing of the space for all parties as Monmouth should be a space for all and some compromises have to be made. My current concerns are about commercial deliveries, loading and unloading so dedicated space to keep the highways clear for through traffic is important. Perhaps business could be incentivised to promote deliveries outside 8am to 6pm?

"The proposed design makes the town center a more attractive and functional place to socialise, visit and shop. I like to entertain guests locally and after they have driven to see out family, it's nice to then stay in the town as much as possible. We need the town to look and feel like a nice place to be. When the environment works, people are less stressed and more collaborative when using it. This is the environment that the proposed design will help deliver. This is because of the curved road that slows the traffic naturally, the sensitive planting that provides green without the 'closed-in' feeling that raised planters can impose. people of all ages, arguably particularly the young really value the seating that we currently have. It's great to see community seating maintained.

I noticed that the plan had no ""double-yellows"". I assume there will be other signage to say parking only in designated bays etc. " A brilliant balance. Should really help make Monmouth into a destination

Although anti car and pro pedestrian/cyclist and would love to see Monnow Street pedestrianised for most of the day, I'm realistic enough to realise this would never be agreed. These proposals are a compromise that may be achievable- let's hope so anyway!

I am very pleased with proposed scenario and believe it will benefit my business as it makes the area more attractive to residents and visitors

It looks very attractive, without the road dominating, yet allowing good access for all road users. I also think the more seating and the more greenery (trees, plants) the better to make it a pleasant place to spend time. Please extend this to Blestium Street, as the area around the public loos is a under-used, waste space that could benefit from this approach

"I have two comments:

1. It would be good as a second phase to carry this scheme on into Agincourt square. I think the concept of the central raised area at Agincourt could be really transformative if accommodated into the scheme to create a real square which could easily be used for public events more often during the day at key times (e.g. festival, Christmas shopping Saturdays, market days?).

2. It would be good to launch the update aligned to (or after) an introduction of free parking in the Cattle Market Car Park for a short period (1 hour?). As there will be reduced on street parking this would encourage the use of that car park for car users.

The opening of the new long term car park to coincide with or be ready would also be ideal."

The idea of increasing the paving area for pedestrians is a really good idea and much needed, however I have concerns about the paving that will be provided - will it be at a higher level to the road? Other areas of the town where paving has been re-laid has resulted in the paving and road being at the same level and subsequently looking like one surface. I appreciate colouring and finishing may be different to identify the separate surfaces, however if someone is unaware of the layout of the town, they could easily drive onto the pedestrianised areas thinking its a continuation of the road. Please can consideration be placed to ensuring the paving is at a higher level to the road, with a very clear kerb.

Suggested Improvements

There are far too few people to enforce parking laws.

feel the pinch point does not achieve what it was designed for and is being abused.

For older residents who are fit but need the car due to the topography of the town (hills) over 70's find cycling impossible due to hills and walking distance not easy. Public transport not often enough. All the crossings coupled with 20mph make driving dangerous and reduce the older citizens independence.

Plant trees in the ground like they do abroad or like dry bridge street / Wyesham avenue. Get rid of the awful boxes, get rid of that awful artificial grass.

While the layout is certainly better for pedestrians, i would prefer the reinstatement of the pre-covid layout. Flowers could be displayed in hanging baskets or through in front of shops rather than narrowing the road and taking up valuable parking spaces. (i write as one who usually cycles!) I don't need a special side lane in Monnow St providing cars and lorries are respectful and considerate to us. Parking spaces are essential for attracting people to shop in Monmouth high street.

The excessive number of pedestrian crossings will make it impossible to drive up or down Monnow Street, creating traffic congestion and increased pollution. The trees are a good idea but appear to block drivers and pedestrians views at the crossings creating more danger to pedestrians

Why i personally think on street short term parking is adequate, i am amazed by how intolerant people are of having to walk.

Maybe offer free 30 mins parking in car parks to help with this! I never take car in to town so maybe i shouldn't be commenting.

Is the zebra crossing below the bus station necessary if this is at the Robin Hood.

"We need better access from car parks esp. at No 20 Monnow Street.

No need for crossing from Robin Hood to MonTeas"

"I feel that the main issue for Monmouth town centre is traffic from the point of view of safety and pollution. My husband and I travel to Abergavenny as we find the town safe and vibrant with street musicians. Perhaps a shuttle train as seen on seafronts could ferry people from one side of the town to the other?"

Could parking in the town be purely for the disabled"

Would need to be combined with frequent patrols by a warden / police between 7am - 6pm. This to prevent double parking at Greggs in the morning and pizza pick ups in the evening. Something to encourage cyclists to dismount and use pavements up through the pinch point.

Six crossings are too many, 4 would be sensible. Being surrounded by trees / rivers/ fields do we really need trees down Monnow Street? I moved to Monmouth 52 years ago so have seen many changes to the town, the recent ones have been a disaster especially for our retailers. So can someone understand that it is the history and old world charm that made Monmouth a thriving market town and has attracted visitors from far and wide for decades.

I think there are too many pedestrian crossings. I am afraid they will impede the progress of traffic through the town, causing a lot of stopping and starting, which might result in more exhaust fumes and traffic jams, also assurance is needed that the proposed vegetation is looked after properly - who is going to do that?

Edge town parking capacity needs to be increased; cars are a necessity in a semi rural town like Monmouth. Parking in Monnow Street for elderly / infirm could be increased (e.g. removing crossing near w h smiths). Scheme looks attractive on a computer screen almost Mediterranean. How many hours of senior managers actually spent in Monnow Street - weekday and weekend?

Before this is done, Monmouth needs shops that people can afford to shop in to allow people to shop local.

Four crossings would be better and no lights on existing pelican crossing (not phased with pinch point) improve existing street lighting which is poor. Remember the sun sets in the West so driving down Monnow Street is difficult towards sunset or winter low sun.

"At present parking regulations are abused how can that be prevented in the future.

Pinch point near St Johns Street needs pedestrian safety measures"

"- Short term / disabled parking / loading / unloading regulations would need to be enforced

- I find the pinch point dangerous for pedestrians and i have been hit by a wing mirror there and vehicles often encroach on the pavement. Bollards would be welcomed"

Remove the planters. Roads still need to give enough space for traffic and cars to park safely to get out of their vehicles.

Get better shops

Better shops for teenagers like Primark, subway or Starbucks

Would like to see more cctv especially looking at the bike shelters

I would like more nature because it will make the town good and not rundown

The town needs to offer a facility to pop into the town for a quick shop and parking along the street is vital for this. The town worked well before covid and has actually created more hazards, with boxes for trees, varying kerbs and differing widths of pavement. The narrower the street for traffic, the more hazardous it is. It is also the only way through Monmouth if there is an issue with the dual carriageway, which regularly happens through the summer and the plan hasn't considered this at all. In all, it should be returned to its previous condition, with the added facility of a couple of crossings.

"I try to walk to town as much as I can when not working as I'm a taxi chauffeur driver.

I still see reason to pedestrian the whole street from bus station to kings head The traffic can go around ... just don't do one way again Also I've always wanted Albion traffic lights taken away with a mini roundabout !!"

Where the street is at its widest, there is a missed opportunity for greening and something other than kerbside parallel parking Not ambitious enough. Probably not worth the cost.

"Too many pedestrian crossings

Remove outdoor seating booths

Need more short parking spaces"

Making the approach into Monnow St from the river end more attractive as its the first area people see when coming to Monmouth

I'm not absolutely certain where the new loading bays are to be located from the plans but we run a charity shop near to the crossing, next to Coffee #1. The parking space outside the shop was removed in the covid re-design and this has caused a catalogue of difficulties in terms of donations being brought to us and recycling being picked up. Our recycling company won't pick up from Monnow Street due to the amount of parking tickets they've received so we rely on goodwill of volunteers to move recycling to our community centre in the evening for it to be picked up from there. A loading bay or parking spot where the picnic tables are currently located would solve a lot of problems

I am 82 with a severe disability and have a blue badge, i can only walk about 10 metres in minimum pain. All parking seems to be for able bodied in the centre. I've had to change optician to the bottom of town and my chemist. Cant even use double yellow lines as yellow kerb marks have been put everywhere esp. by the old museum in Priory Street.

As a resident in Monnow Keep, pulling out on to Monnow Street may be difficult as 2 x pedestrian crossings are close by. I would like to see dedicated cycling lane for local residents. Also a lot of workers in Monmouth park illegally in Monnow Keep so this may increase.

Appears to be a clear lack of bins and places to sit that are not associated with a business. Hope plants are maintained.

I would have preferred a one way system, making pedestrians a priority.

I walk through Church Street, Agincourt Square daily. I realise it's not Monnow Street but it badly needs consideration. So many empty shops, building desperately needing renovation, really hard for traders but beautiful part of town

The proposals do not address the fundamental problem that Monmouth needs an alternative route through the town. Without this Monnow Street will remain badly congested and, sadly, the benefits of the proposals will be lost. It is noticeable that none of the images used to illustrate the proposal reflect vehicles unloading, double parking, and the daily traffic issues that blight the street (plus no sign of a traffic warden!). Improving Monmouth as a place to live, work and visit is a worthy aspiration.

Disappointingly, this proposal is flawed because it fails to understand and address the underlying problem.

I am struggling to see how there is more consideration for disabled, sight impaired or pedestrians with these current proposals. All this is going to do is encourage more able bodied people to double park everywhere as they do now instead of using a car park.

The plants need maintaining and parking needs enforcement.

We really think that the street should not be two way, ideally it should be at least partially pedestrianised. It is never that pleasant to sit outside with cars driving by. There are so many examples of pedestrianisation all over the world - even half of Monnow Street reserved for pedestrians would be a huge improvement. There are more than enough people to fill it. The in person info and consultation is fantastic, thank you.

Can a route be found for cyclists up Blestium Street to avoid the town centre

Proposed Cafe area outside Salt & Pepper and Pizza Express to be used for parking in the winter

"Seating for s&p in summer and parking in the winter.

& Pizza Express & any other cafes"

Huge relief to see the planters and coffee shelters gone, they are a real eyesore. There are too many crossing points, this will cause too many problems for motorists. Rates in the town need to drop it is putting people out of business.

Even though I don't have any disabilities, I appreciate how difficult it is for blue badge drivers. I think we should have even more disabled places (abled bodied people, like myself, are more than capable of walking from the car parks) and better policing/ checking of the designated areas.

Still extremely difficult to park to shop in the town. Car parks are always full, cannot stop to quickly pick something up. No room to get past vehicles unloading or stopping in the street, and too many seating areas for people - Wouldn't want to sit next to traffic driving past anyway, and access for vehicles to drive through is essential for getting to work and visit places around Monmouth. The dual carriageway often clogged up and the town always queued up with traffic as cannot easily drive through now. More crossings would mean more no, dips, taking even longer to drive through. Pedestrians are always able to cross

anywhere due to slow moving traffic and a narrower street. The planters take up so much of the pedestrian space too although I do like to see greenery.

"My husband and I visit Monmouth, our local town, most days. I am disabled, he uses a wheelchair. We shop little and often so I can manage shopping bags and wheelchair! We can only complete our shopping and coffee break if we can park in the street - we have a blue badge.

Often parking is not available and we have to return home. If disabled parking bays are reduced, this would be so difficult. This is already our only useable local shopping trip.

There is space for 4 disabled vehicles outside FatFace, but as the bays are not individually marked, quite often only 3 cars access the bay. Also non blue badge holders and delivery vans use the bay, as the signage is inadequate.

The aims of the changes to high street are great, but please while trying to attract more visitors, give the street a garden atmosphere, allow more outside seating, safer cycling etc., please, please, please don't forget those of us who depend on easy access to disabled parking on the middle and lower areas of Monnow Street!

The wide pavement by the bus station makes life difficult for drivers to come out of their. Y do we need trees in the high street we've scenery all around us. Put the Town centre back to how it was.

Not enough parking either in Monnow Street or surrounds and should be cheaper or free. Business vehicles need to unload and that is difficult..need more spaces and less leisure spaces on street as could utilise Agincourt Square and Blestium Street Park more.

"The trees idea seems attractive but I am concerned that trees are easily broken and destroyed by vandals.

Some of the questions are confusing in that presumably they rate improvements as with now as opposed to the way the street was prior to the multitude of relatively uncared for and already deteriorating planters and uneven pathways."

People will not visit Monmouth unless it has a good, vibrant selection of shops to visit. Does the design team recognise that Monmouth is a market town serving the surrounding countryside rather than an urban centre. I continually hear the comment from friends who live outside the town that unlike in the past they seldom come to Monmouth as it now has so little to offer

compared to other centres such as Ross and Abergavenny. People walking or cycling into Monmouth will largely only spend money in coffee shops rather than actively shopping. Also, the great majority of those adults likely to spend money in Monnow Street from Monday to Friday are retired people who will only use a car to travel to Monnow Street and the shops cannot survive on weekend trade only. It is very apparent that the design is driven largely with walkers and cyclists in mind rather than accepting the fact that in order to provide good business for the Monnow Street shops, there needs to be plenty of short term parking in and around Monnow Street. I understand that the new design accommodates parking for only 29 cars as opposed to the pre covid figure of 40. This must be changed. The weekend cyclists, walkers and tourists won't come to Monmouth if the town centre is full of empty and boarded up shops. Please listen to the shopkeepers in Monnow Street who will know what is best for their business.

"The proposals must maximise pedestrian surface area with good wide and, if possible, level footways. The proposals should have considered a shared surface design solution, with an imaginative segregation between vehicles and pedestrians.

The proposals should remove obstacles from pedestrian circulation areas such as timber planters, café seating, billboards – all hazards, there is no point in creating wider footways and then filling them with clutter.

The proposals should minimize car use and parking along Monnow Street; there are a number of car parks with easy access to Monnow Street.

The focus should be on making Monmouth, (Monnow Street), a destination town; a desirable and people friendly place for shopping and relaxing, and unique from other similar towns.

The proposals must ensure the use of quality hard landscape materials for paving and street furniture, which will stand the test of time. Semi-mature tree planting is welcomed but are 'rain-gardens' really appropriate in this sort of location?

Trees restrict view by pedestrian and cars

Its all about the shops and restaurants. If they're rubbish, nothing will work. If they are great - anything can work.

The footpaths need addressing first. They are uneven, dangerous and full of puddles in wet weather. They need to be level (and stay level) and need sloping away from the shop frontages to the road.

Emphasise the importance of having level, well drained pavements.

"There has appears to be no consideration for cyclists at the pinch point. There are numerous times, almost once or twice a week I have to push my way back up through the pinch point as cars will not give way. When you are successful at getting through cars waiting to go through the pinch point block the entrance to Agincourt street making it difficult to turn right. Perhaps the inclusion of a yellow box just before the entrance and a sign stating cyclists have priority.

It is a shame there is no provision for an alternative cycle route around the town. Whilst I can see the benefits of the multiple pedestrian crossings. As a cyclist it's going to be very stop start journey if you have to stop at 5 or more crossings. I use the town to commute between Wyesham and Wonastow industrial estate. I don't wish to add more time to my commute. I would consider going back to using my car daily instead as I can use the dual carriageway and avoid the town altogether. An official safe cycle route through Chippenham to the leisure centre would be ideal."

"1. the idea we have that many cyclists is false

2. planting near crossing points looks good but with the passage of time and spending costs could mean line-of-sight obstructed

3. there are NOT enough car parking space provided (should be point 1)

"The council wouldn't keep trees alive in the town centre. They cut trees down and killed them in other parts off Monmouth. For instance on Hereford road.

I think this scheme is a total waste of tax payers money, and to continue with it would be an even bigger waste of the money already wasted. Look at Ledbury, a town I frequent regularly to shop. They have traffic moving through the town in both directs. But the reason people are attracted there and why it's rated one of the best shopping towns in Europe is because of the shops they have to offer and the historic aspects of the town people travel to see. I suggest the council focus on revitalising the historic elements of Monmouth. I think focusing efforts and funds not on the high street but on the area around the old bridge, if cafes and restaurants were situated there over looking the river, it would be a nice place for people to sit and sure to attract people. " Given the lack of car parking in Monmouth it's difficult to see the town attracting new businesses to enhance it as a destination. Is the town centre too large?

"Introduce free bus transport for all ages, then you are onto a winner. Until bus is cheaper than car travel, it will not be prioritised - we need to change this.

Also to add that in Abergavenny there is more space to move for pedestrians and the space is used for fun as well as boring walking. Would love to see more laughter and space to move freely in Monmouth town"

"I am concerned about trees and types of trees planted directly in the ground. Having been brought up in a leafy suburb I know it is only a matter of time before the roots disrupt the pavements and the leaves create a slimy slip hazard in the autumn/winter. Who is going to maintain these trees? Will they be evergreen? Will they be safe in gales? Will they be slow growing? Will they interfere with visibility? This happened when supermarkets were built in Monmouth i.e. Waitrose and Lidl where rogue branches interfered with visibility when leaving the parking areas.

Pharmacies must have adequate parking directly outside for drug deliveries. Those delivering are instructed to park directly outside - one guy was fined as it was double yellow lines but his instructions were to park as close as possible to avoid drug theft from his vehicle.

As a pedestrian I like the crossings and the pinch point . There is no excuse for regularly driving in Monnow Street. I live on the Wyesham side of the River Wye. I cannot carry heavy goods. I visit the charity shops on foot using my shopping trolley. If I am purchasing anything really heavy I drive but since the introduction of the pinch point I have avoided Monnow Street as a driver and realise that avoiding it is no big deal - hence if the pedestrian crossings proposed are objected to on the grounds of causing road blocks of traffic I find this a ridiculous argument. If traffic is discouraged from using Monnow Street then there would be no traffic jams.

Footfall in Monnow Street businesses is nothing to do with parking or the town layout. Increased rents and businesses that no one wants is the cause of reduced footfall. Monmouth has been heaving with people recently but many shops were without customers because they are selling things that no one wants. We have to go out of town for school uniforms, for gym shoes etc yet we have 2 mountaineering shops.

Please do not go back to herringbone parking as when that was available it was dangerous with drivers reversing blind into oncoming traffic.

Overall I like the new proposals especially if a through way to Monnow Street can be achieved from the carparks.

So address the tree situation - and discourage traffic from Monnow Street.

If 20mph is enforced in Monnow Street there is no need for a separate cycle lane. I was once a cyclist in Monmouth so I have an idea what it is like. When a separate lane was introduced temporarily I found crossing the road as a pedestrian very dangerous and had a number of near miss collisions. Cyclists can travel with the cars if the speed of motor vehicles is properly enforced. Pavements should be left wide where possible and exclusively for pedestrians and buggies. and mobility scooters.

I feel that there is too much planting near the pedestrian crossings which could mean that the car drivers cannot see pedestrians waiting to cross and vice versa. There should be no planting other than very low level planting by the pedestrian crossings, No solution to significant parking issues in Monmouth - I would rather shop in Bristol/ Hereford as I can always find parking spaces close to shops

"In order to make Monmouth a “destination” perhaps it would be politic to address the present failings.

The town looks shabby and run down - hardly a place anyone would choose to visit when Abergavenny has a “buzz” about it.

Walking down the street from the open day on Saturday there is empty shop after empty shop with nowhere to buy children’s clothes or shoes for school age children. We appear to be a town of coffee shops, hairdressers and opticians - hardly a place to spend the day and shop.

The loading bays this morning were full of parked cars and at 7.45 in the morning the street is almost impassable due to the double parked vans and cars picking up their takeaway coffee/breakfast.

Monmouth serves a rural community with non existent public transport so car use is the only way for those people to access Monmouth for shopping. Taking away the on-street parking adds to the stress of a visit to Monmouth when the town is busy.

I do applaud the extra crossing at the top end of town - something that has been missing since the island was removed but the pavements are a disgrace and dangerous if you aren't steady on your feet. The planters look unkempt and seem to be used as rubbish bins.

All in all I think the planners need to have a re think as we have an elderly population who's needs haven't been addressed at all. Not everyone can walk or ride a bike and in any case the cyclists disappear if the weather is unfavourable as can be seen around the primary schools when it is raining."

"The existing planters are an absolute eyesore and completely unnecessary - we live in the middle of the countryside surrounded by greenery, parks, and natural habitat. It clutters the already unsightly pavements and they look old and scruffy. The street parking does not look to be increased from the existing layout and it's not clear where the space is coming from to create additional loading bays. However, I still don't believe there will be enough loading bays, nor is the road wide enough to cope with the amount of lorries/vans that need to unload at the same time during the day. The pinch points also create issues with people being too concerned about when they can move forward in their own vehicle, and not giving consideration to keeping the traffic ahead and behind them flowing. The current kerbs at the pinch point are far too high and is not clear in the proposals whether these will be lowered. All this money being spent on stuff which is not needed. The money should be invested into the current state of the roads in and around Monmouth, rates should be reduced for business owners and investment should be made on getting new and more affordable shops/businesses into the town. The town centre looks completely run down, scruffy, tired and the empty premises do nothing to encourage new visitors or traders to Monmouth. Investment should be made to help existing businesses stay in the town (perhaps less coffee shops though!)

Consideration should be given to the recent comments made by the Monmouth Chamber of Commerce as many extremely valid points are being made. "

"Priority should be given to encouraging new businesses to fill empty properties and action on derelict properties. Double parking, difficulty parking with random planters, poor design of parking spaces and lack of unloading spaces make using Monnow street for shops and access difficult and not encouraging people to visit town.

"

The town needs to become a safer and pleasant environment for people to shop , enjoy and live in

I can see that the consultants have been accommodating in changes requested by businesses and compromises have been made especially close to the Post Office. However, personally I don't feel there is any place for the rain gardens, these will sadly be misused by people. low growing areas will be used as additional parking. We have plenty of lovely green spaces close to the Town centre for people to enjoy. I feel there are too many crossings three would be adequate. There doesn't appear to be allowance for the postal vans to stop at the Post Office to collect mail, they would have to stop on the crossing point. Too much cycle parking. Esteros, Coffee Lab and Robin Hood all have rear seating areas so do not need the area in front of their premises, especially given the charges that are now being levied on businesses. The crossing from the corner at Robin Hood crossing towards the Blestium Street toilets is an accident waiting to happen, given the blind corner cars come around.

Please make it greener ... more planning

How can we prevent unlawful parking on double yellow lines? There are regular offenders that obstruct traffic and pedestrian crossing places.

In my opinion there are now too many crossings three would be adequate. The planting is out of place. Crossing between the Robin Hood and Blestium Street toilets is in a dangerous position. Why is seating shown outside the Robin Hood, Esteros and Coffee Lab they all have rear gardens, this is unnecessary, just cluttering pavements. Road should be wider than it is currently not reduced. Parking should be reinstated to pre covid levels.

More focus needs to be given to create a better town centre environment

"Do we really need 8 yes 8 pedestrian crossings! The town is usually so quiet that you can cross at any time. Cars constantly stopping and starting is going to cause a huge amount of pollution.

What Monmouth Council needs to do is not spend money on useless plans like this but use it to regenerate the town itself! So many empty shops! The only area worth visiting is Church Street and how many people walk from the Cattle Market car park to Church Street. If you don't know Monmouth when you get to the pinch point you would turn back because all you can see is

empty shops! Come on Monmouth Council pull your socks up and visit Abergavenny which has turned itself into a vibrant market town which Monmouth could also become with a little thought."

Please maintain the planting areas properly

Will there be infrastructure "future proofing" against further works? E.g. EV charging, alignment of services and drainage.

The pedestrian crossings need to remain as signalled crossing

"In my opinion, nobody should park on Monnow Street unless they are disabled or delivering. The one exception might be those without blue badges who cannot walk far, although it is difficult to see how this might be administered - maybe with socially-responsible ""Do you really really need to park here?"" signs?

I think that all Monmouth car parks should offer the first 30 minutes for free. If you have to pay to park to simply buy a birthday card, pop into the Post Office or pick up a meal at Marks, then Monmouth will become a ghost town."

To encourage people to come to Monmouth as a destination the main priority must be to encourage shops. Get rid of the public loos by the Norman bridge and get rid of the gaming arcade, it should never have been given planning permission. Go back to the herringbone parking, Monmouth has lost its beautiful wide Monnow Street. It doesn't need greenery for vandals to wreck which has happened to the planters, why plant trees in planters which need lots of water and feed.

there needs to be a physical pedestrian link between car parking behind Monnow St (Chippenham area) and Monnow St itself.

Design needs to be integrated with changes to Blestium at one end and Agincourt and Church Street at the other. Signage to facilities, amenities, places of interest needs improving. Planning for mixed use of buildings needs promoting

A few less trees, we already have a park close by. So a few more parking spaces with EV quick charge points

This does nothing to improve the air quality. Fumes from vehicles dominate the atmosphere along the whole street.

"I don't agree with so many planted tree areas. If the pavement and drainage is done properly there's no need for such permanent fixtures that long term will damage the roads and buildings with their rootage. To add greenery suggest volunteering groups to supply hanging baskets as done previously and mcc to fund watering. Parking needs enforcing.

Cycle path to be via Chippenham green.

People pens currently in residue an absolute eyesore and to be removed. Seating area outside salt and pepper a huge danger for visibility in regards to access to nailors lane.

The widened useless pavement in the square forcing the bus stop opposite a loading bay for one of the most used food shops in town (Iceland) and total joke! Absolute ridiculous idea it needs to be accepted that Monnow street is a car used area and the main focus of town is ensuring there is adequate and SAFE road space. As a pedestrian and driver i have never had so many near misses as i have since the adjustments to Monnow street and iv lived here almost 40 years. Monnow street may have all these adjustments made but until rates are lowered, its a pointless plan as soon there wont be any businesses here!"

I think the Chamber of Commerce needs to back up its claims with statistics.

"Dear Monmouthshire Council.

Please make sure there are more opportunities for short stay parking to attract new people to the market and shopping. The plan seems fine for winter when people don't want to sit outside but make sure people can park easily in the summer when more people are out and about and when we have tourists!

Please flatten some of the prevents for those with mobility issues and fill up those potholes.

There are too many empty shops! Maybe rent out the museum or some empty buildings? Less chains and more independent businesses to bring something different to this lovely town.

I live and work in Monmouth.

Biggest thing is to make sure you leave the one way system in the past!

Regards, Elizabeth "

Bring back more parking. You're not taking into account disabled or elderly people. You have ruined Monmouth already and this is going to make it even worse. We don't live in a Mediterranean climate so there is no necessity for outdoor places to eat and drink. Lack of parking makes it impossible for pop in pop out shoppers, I can't even drop off my elderly father-in-law to the opticians without double parking, it's a shambles. No consideration whatsoever. Stop wasting tax payers money. There's 29 empty shops in Monmouth, concentrate on filling these by reducing business rates.

The wider pavements & pots need to go, bring back more parking, It used to be so handy to pull up & pop to few shops. Now I don't bother as I cannot park on the high street

With the move to electric cars by 2030, the pollution argument goes away and it is vital the town centre is not killed in the short term. The pictures are very misleading unless it is planned to level the road. The current camber on the widened pavements is a nightmare

The focus needs to be on Monmouthshire council lowering business rates and actually getting all the empty shops filled first, rather than spending all the money on redoing the high street now

Reduce town Monnow Street parking as much as possible and favour disabled and loading - should be drop off only (15 min for charity drop off, prescription collection etc). There is plenty of parking for shoppers

As a disabled pedestrian please do not combine pavement with a cycle path

More not less disabled parking is needed and if not, then the spaces NEED to be regulated. They should not be used for loading or for non-disabled yet they are on almost a daily basis.

I think it should be pedestrianised personally, except for loading and disabled drivers, but plan C if that can't happen. There's car park at top and bottom, no need to drive up street.

"I think the design really needs to consider who they are trying to attract to the town - residents or tourists. As a Monmouth resident - I am only popping into town for small shops and the occasional coffee/meal with friends. Therefore, the 'state' of the high street layout isn't a big concern (I don't like its current state but it isn't going to stop me from going to town). I would like the lack of businesses and state of the empty shops to be addressed. Also the antisocial behaviour that is often observed. As a resident - I would like to see increased and better parking layouts that would allow me to pop into shops quickly.

With that said, looking at the plans as a 'non-resident' then I think they are welcoming to tourists especially in the summer months.

The green areas are attractive BUT only for as long as they are maintained and not abused. My biggest concerns with these areas are - will these be maintained? If so, by whom? Where will the costs for this come from?

With regards to the crossings - I do feel that a light-controlled crossing either the proposed one by the Robin Hood or cattle market would help reduce the risk of potential accidents. It will help to slow the traffic in this area more than 'raised areas' in the road would.

I have noticed that there is a lack of electrical car charging points for disabled users. Disabled users are allowed to park for up to 3 hours on the street. To promote a 'green town' or help climate change - one or two points maybe a good idea.

I think there are a lot of issues with Monnow Street that are not just based on the current layout. The 'mess' created by the 'COVID additions' does need to be addressed as trying to traverse the street at present is very difficult and unwelcoming. I feel the proposed layout does start to address these issues, but more is needed for town regeneration.

"Too many additional crossings. I agree we need more but why not just turn existing crossings by the Robin Hood and pizza express into pedestrian crossings? Traffic will be a nightmare if there are several crossings.

Really like the additional greenery/ opportunities for restaurants and cafes to maximise outdoor space but that will only do so much for appeal when there are so many vacant shops. I'd be more interested to know what is being done to encourage businesses to move onto the High Street. I would be more motivated to come into the town centre if there were new independent businesses as opposed to more pedestrian opportunities.

As previously stated, motor traffic should be restricted to one way traffic, only disabled on street parking. loading only before 9.00am

It is too complicated and lacks versatility. I would appreciate a simplified design that could change with the seasons. Movable divisions and seating areas that could be put away in winter giving an open and uncluttered appearance. I would also prefer the old style of diagonal parking, which would provide space for more vehicles to park for short times.

Addressing the condition of many of the buildings would be significant in the renewal project, reproducing Abergavenny deigns important for businesses as well and may attract some more quality eating establishments

The plans are only in Welsh therefore cannot be read or understood by English speakers, i.e. the majority of the town. Sneaky.

"I feel it is important to still have benches for public to gather and sit and eat their own food and drink, being able to face each other and enjoy the surroundings.

Some additions to make taking a dog into the town easier, water, dog bins

A water fountain where you can refill a bottle

Not enough parking space. The town going to be crowded.

"Two way street with current traffic levels isn't conducive to sitting outside due to noise and pollution.

Did the study look at dwell time of vehicles? Most cars appear to transit though the town not spending money. How can we discourage through traffic and encourage people to spend more time on the street?

Fear areas of seating given over to parking in winter will not be given back.

All loading, disabled and parking needs to be strictly enforced constantly."

"Though I understand its without the scope of the proposal, the most obvious solution to the town centre is to fully pedestrianised it. This would require a major rethink of the traffic around the town.

The fact that any parking other than for disabled drivers is included is a major disappointment. There is plenty of parking in and around town, make this free and remove all parking from the town all together would be the best option, there is no need for anyone to park along Monnow Street.

The fact this is just focused on a small part of the town is also a disappointment, the only way you can solve the issues highlighted is to develop a plan for the whole town in one go, stop trying to do it piecemeal, this just leads to the unjoined up chaos we currently have, why was this scheme and the Agincourt Square not considered together?

It's good to encourage people to 'dwell' in town, but you need something to attract them, currently there are far to many empty premises to make Monmouth an attractive place to visit."

Please involve young people in this consultation

I would have liked to see herringbone parking. Love the greenery and shared space principles

The main Street needs more parking as it used to be to help the survival of our shops that are under huge pressure to survive.

They are fighting to survive against too high business rates, online shopping and a lack of street parking.

I am disabled and this will mean I will not visit the town. I will travel elsewhere.

Parking bays and disabled will need policing. Likewise, people stopping in the carriageway like they do, that needs to be prevented

Herring bone parking on one side of the street to include more disabled parking

"The double parking of deliveries is unsafe. Van double parked in the morning and popping into Greggs means traffic through town is blocked - I see this at least twice a week at 7:45am


Until the high street has pleasant and welcoming shops Monmouth will never be a destination to visit. Empty stores and crumbling facades are unsightly. I would rather travel to the Market Place in Hereford to go shopping and have a meal because there are no options in Monmouth. I can also park more easily there.

The greenery is nice but it needs to be maintained and I have seen no evidence of this in the planters that are currently there that gives any hope that the new ones will be too.

Fix the high street offering as Monmouth should be the must be place to visit in Monmouthshire but it isn't. Stop penalising people who drive. “


13) Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Employment and Disability

Age




Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n = 473

Gender




Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n = 473

Ethnicity




Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n = 466

Employment



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n = 444

Reasons for Not Being in Employment



Source: Monnow Street Community Survey n =200



monmouthshire
sir fynwy

Monnow Street Project – Report of Consultation Appendices

Stakeholder Co-Production Workshop Notes

Workshops 1, 2 and 3 including additional

Chamber of Commerce Workshop

March 2023

Purpose

This note has been prepared from the first workshop session held on the evening of Monday, 7th November as part of the Monnow Street Design Project.

The Design Project is building on previous work undertaken between 2020 and 2022 through Active Travel funding that has looked at options on how to improve Monnow Street so that it performs better as a place within the town centre.

Roberts Limbrick Architects and Urban Designers are supporting Monmouthshire County Council with the next stage of design development between October 2022 and February 2023.



Stakeholder Workshop 1

The first workshop was held in Monmouth Priory, Priory Street on Monday, 7th November between the hours of 6pm to 8pm.

The County Council invited stakeholders to the workshop through an email invitation. Types of groups and organisations included:

- County and Town Councillors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Local Businesses
- Interest groups

Format

The main hall of the Priory building was split into breakout sessions with stakeholders shared across the four separate areas.

The Cabinet Member for Equalities & Engagement and local ward member for Monmouth Town Ward welcomed people to the workshop and set out what she wants to achieve from a collaborative and co-produced process.

The workshop then provided some initial context to the project and some information on previous studies and where the project has progressed to.

1. Why We Are Here
2. The Process So Far
3. The Principles of The Monnow Street Proposal
4. Workshop Sessions
5. Collective Feedback
6. Next Steps

Some key messages that were shared with the workshop are outlined below.

Aim of the Monnow Street Design Project

To reach consensus on a place-based design that is focussed on a two-way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.

The Physical Scope

The physical extent of the project is from the junction of Monnow Street with Blestium Street at the southwestern edge through the “pinch point” with St John’s Street to the northeast. Whilst this is the physical design area, the County Council recognises the need to understand how Monnow Street relates to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street so that a cohesive experience is achieved.





Process to Date

The workshop was informed of:

- Previous studies and works – pre Covid such as in Agincourt Square and in the “pinch point”
- The response to the Covid pandemic – one way and temporary measures
- Coming out of Covid
- 2020-22 Active Travel studies into Monnow Street
- Consultation
 - Late 2020 on broad range of options
 - Early 2022 – two-way street with various options
- Need to move the design process forward

Design Principles

As a starting point for this stage of the design process, the following design principles were presented:

- ✓ Ways to improve the **environmental quality** for people walking and accessing Monnow Street
- ✓ Ways to accommodate **cycling** through the Street
- ✓ Maintaining a **two way street** for vehicles
- ✓ Accommodating **loading/unloading**
- ✓ Provision for **disabled parking**
- ✓ Consideration of on-street **short stay parking**

The need to also include **public transport provision** within the design was identified by a stakeholder, with the need to understand how the bus stops in Monnow Keep relate to Monnow Street and whether additional stages need to be considered as well as how buses move through Monnow Street as a public place.

Understanding Monnow Street

Roberts Limbrick showed a series of historical images of Monnow Street that illustrated Monnow Street from the 1800s through to the current day. The images clearly demonstrated the differences in how the use of the street has changed overtime. The early images showed horse and cart transport with people gathering in the ‘carriageway’ and generally crossing the road with ease. As the images neared the current time, they clearly demonstrated what the increase in the use of the motor car has done both physically and visually to the street:

- Cars visually dominant
- Only car borne activity in the street itself
- Difficult to cross
- Double parking
- Double loading
- Difficult to cross as a pedestrian

The photographs shown demonstrated that the above issues were not as a result of the ‘covid works’ which have recently been undertaken, as photographs from 2018 clearly showed.

Another important and telling fact that the series of images showed was the lack of physical change to the street itself over the years. The historic street consisted of a wide carriageway and a narrow footway to each side. In 2018 this, despite the significant change in how the street is used, remained the same. This demonstrated that the fabric of the street has not (sufficiently) evolved to suit the changing ways in which it is used. This fact will need to be a key focus for the

project in designing a street that is fit for its modern purpose...but which also looks towards the future.

A series of precedent designs and images were also shown that modern street design needs to embrace many different aspects. It is no longer simply about highway standards and geometry. It is about:

- Placemaking
- People
- Pedestrians
- Cyclists
- Experience
- Both commercial and social activity
- Flooding and drainage
- Landscape
- Biodiversity
- Air quality


In addition to the above, street design also has to deal with the more technical deliverables that help to make the place function such as:

- Vehicle movement
- Parking
- Deliveries
- Emergency access

All these elements need to be brought forward together but with the technical elements being in the background: necessary and functional but not dominant.

The Workshop Sessions


Before moving into the workshop session, stakeholders were informed of the design process and how the workshops would receive, shape and inform the final designs. The diagram below provides information on the key workshops with the process leading to a community exhibition in late January 2023.



Workshop 1 - Key Questions

Before breaking out into the individual sessions, the following questions were shared and explained.

Each breakout area had a large plan of Monnow Street, post-it notes, pens and paper to help bring together thoughts and feedback.



The feedback is shown overleaf.

Breakout Sessions

Summary - Key Messages from Workshops

<p>1. What are the key things you want to see from Monnow Street?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A balanced space - human ▪ More permeable – cross the street and town ▪ A friendly, safe and social space ▪ A place that is for daytime and evening ▪ More structure with loading, disabled parking ▪ Some want carriageway widened, others want a shared space approach ▪ Improve mobility ▪ Parking – supply, design and management ▪ Role of street leading to other parts of town centre – destination and exploration ▪ A healthier and safer space ▪ Balance of shared space and drop off and deliveries and parking ▪ Feel safe on foot and bike – movement and crossing ▪ Disabled friendly ▪ Remove obstructions ▪ Signage ▪ Deliveries managed ▪ Trees and planting ▪ A diverse offer and experience ▪ Quality streetscape – story of town history ▪ Social and safe space 	<p>2. Are these being met now? What is the current experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of management and a strategy for loading, parking ▪ Feels lawless and needs some structure ▪ Consider how the street works after 5pm ▪ Lack of crossings and permeability ▪ Not a healthy street ▪ Parking strategy ▪ Better integrated design approach ▪ Think of wider destination ▪ Gradients and slopes ▪ Delivery bays ▪ Wide pavements pleasant but issues with drains ▪ Pinch points and cars mounting pavements ▪ Lack of integrated design so far ▪ Some features aren't needed when looking at rebalancing hierarchy of users ▪ Poor environmental quality 	<p>3. What needs to be our focus across Monnow Street?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changing the hierarchy but keeping an eye on the Commercial Heart ▪ Look at wider context – parking supply, linkages, role of A40 ▪ Placing and distributing loading and parking at strategic locations ▪ Changing the psychology of the street in terms of users ▪ Parking strategy ▪ Better integrated design approach: Parking and deliveries design in but not dominant ▪ Shared or civilised space to aid ease of pedestrian movement ▪ Social spaces and seating ▪ More landscaping but at ground level e.g., rain gardens ▪ Think of wider destination ▪ Reduce pavement clutter ▪ Lighting ▪ Vehicle access – balance parking and car user needs ▪ Attract specialist independent shops
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Make it a destination▪ Improve flow of shoppers▪ Make most of Monmouth's heritage▪ Greener and more trees – but need to look after them▪ Visually attractive – seating/greenery/pleasant▪ Parking▪ Pavement quality▪ Managing the project, change and communication▪ Links into Agincourt Square▪ Town context and its story▪ Shared space concept▪ Planting and trees to provide structure▪ Materials are key to defining space within spaces
--	--	--

Group A

1. What are the key things you want to see from Monnow Street?

- The car as the guest – make drivers cautious and aware of their surroundings
- A playful street
- A child friendly place – tactile sculptures, benches, fountains
- Not just a car space – a space for humans
- An enjoyable place for all
- The “Commercial Heart” of Monmouth
- Safe and ambient street lighting
- Signage that is informative, directional and integrated
- A diverse offer
- A permeable place – exploration – cross town movement – car parks that feel hidden
- Pedestrian friendly
- Dining out area
- Better pavements and drainage
- Designated loading bays
- More crossings – controlled one which has a very slow onset is off-putting
- 1-hour Free parking
- Safer paths
- Informal zebra crossings at intervals across the street
- Social daytime and evening
- 15 to 20 mph speed limit

- Free parking for the disabled
- Better on street parking strategy – length, charging, role of off-street
- Kerbs that are as gentle and non-hostile as in the pic from the 1950s
- Where needed - outdoor dining – licensing
- Adaptable spaces – seasons, day and evening
- Discussion on whether Agincourt Sq and Church St is café quarter – debate over zoning or ensure a diverse offer?
- A place where you can stop for a conversation and continue that conversation as you cross the road
- A place where you come to shop, enjoy time, safe, paths, variety of shops and establishments

Key Messages

- A balanced space - human
- More permeable – cross the street and town
- A friendly, safe and social space
- A place that is for daytime and evening
- More structure with loading, disabled parking

2. Are these being met now? What is the current experience?

- × Must be two way. We tried one way – didn't work. Led to blockages and dependency on A40
- × Air and noise pollution
- × A lack of management, enforcement and policing – capacity of MCC is limited
- × Crossings are formalised
- × Lawless
- × Too much traffic
- × Not playful
- × Poor levels and drainage
- × Drivers are lazy – nearest space often not for the right purchase or length of stay
- × Through traffic that are not directly using shops and services
- × Pelican crossing not helpful with the timings and people informally crossing the road
- × Lack of loading bays at bottom end of town
- × Lack of a night life atmosphere
- × Slow down the A40 speeds so it feels safe to use as local bypass
- × Car parks are behind the high street, but they are inaccessible due to closed alleyways
- × You cannot cross by the Robin Hood corner and up by the top end
- × Traffic and queues at peak time
- × Buses turning out onto Monnow Street from bus station - overrun

Key Messages

- Lack of management and a strategy for loading, parking
- Feels lawless and needs some structure
- Consider how the street works after 5pm
- Lack of crossings and permeability
- Not a healthy street

3. What needs to be our focus across Monnow Street?

Challenges

- × Ensuring clean air and greenery, well-being
- × Respect for riding up and down the high street on a bike
- × Not to sit amongst traffic
- × Balancing all needs
- × The levels across the pavements

Opportunities

- ✓ Reduce traffic – make alternative through routes attractive and safe, so people do not use it to travel through
- ✓ Last mile delivery – cargo bikes?
- ✓ Developing a diverse and adaptable environment
- ✓ Use Blestium Street for parking, maximise spaces more
- ✓ Direct people to off-street car parks more – realise Wye Bridge car park – under construction?
- ✓ Create:
 - 4 no loading bay areas
 - 4 no disabled parking bay areas
 - 4 no zebra crossings
 - Width for 2-way traffic as well as above bays

Key Messages

- Changing the hierarchy but keeping an eye on the Commercial Heart
- Look at wider context – parking supply, linkages, role of A40
- Placing and distributing loading and parking at strategic locations
- Changing the psychology of the street in terms of users



Group B

1. What are the key things you want to see from Monnow Street?

- Vibrant green space
- Independent shops
- Choice of shops thriving
- Safe space for kids and older people
- Cafes to sit outside
- Keep our independent shops
- More coach parking
- Carriageway rewidened
- More parking
- More loading
- Better designed parking
- Change flower boxes to improve disability access
- More benches
- Cycle path through Chippenham Fields
- Leads to a Market in Agincourt Square
- Improved safety and mobility
- Sharing space and circulation onwards so that it is joined up with Agincourt Square and Church Street
- Create an experience
- Develop a shared space
- Improve mobility
- Placemaking approach – users of Monnow Street's health – including traffic fumes
- Favour of a shared space to include all users – pedestrians, cyclists, cars, lorries, prams, wheelchairs

- Free 30 minutes parking as in Welsh Street car park, Chepstow.
- How many parking spaces for a similar size town?

Key Messages

- Some want carriageway rewidened, others want a shared space approach
- Improve mobility
- Parking – supply, design and management
- Role of street leading to other parts of town centre – destination and exploration
- A healthier and safer space

2. Are these being met now? What is the current experience?

- × Parking supply, management and signage
- × Poor health of the street environment
- × Better design of spaces for loading and parking
- × Lack of places to seat
- × Road too narrow to allow for double parking deliveries
- × Address flower boxes
- × Does not feel safe or child friendly
- × No linkage to top end of town due to empty shops and poor public realm

Key Messages

- Parking strategy
- Better integrated design approach
- Think of wider destination

4. What needs to be our focus across Monnow Street?

Challenges

- x Parking
- x Deliveries
- x Buses and coaches


Opportunities

- ✓ Signage
- ✓ Events that are town centre wide that Monnow Street provides the connecting space
- ✓ Use of rain gardens to deal with rainwater run off
- ✓ Shared space ideas
- ✓ Safer cycling on the street
- ✓ More on street parking now but less than pre Covid
- ✓ Integrated parking and deliveries

Key Messages

- Parking strategy
- Better integrated design approach: Parking and deliveries design in but not dominant
- Shared or civilised space to aid ease of pedestrian movement
- Social spaces and seating
- More landscaping but at ground level e.g., rain gardens
- Think of wider destination

Page 262



Group C

1. What are the key things you want to see from Monnow Street?

- Seating and green spaces
- Clear drop off zones and delivery spaces
- Disability and senior citizens user friendly
- Public bus disability access
- No formal crossing at top of town and bottom of town
- Need to attract businesses and people
- Sort out A40 junction so Monnow Street isn't used as a bypass
- Signage from the bottom of town to the top directing people to Church Street and Shire Hall
- Good quality finish (drains, surfaces, kerbs, planting, seating)
- Reinstatement of traffic island by Salt and Pepper
- Easy and safe movement of traffic
- More obvious crossing points for pedestrians
- Signage to push people to the top of town
- Pavements that aren't lakes of water!
- Parking? More on the outskirts to free up centre of town
- Feel safe travelling up and down it on foot and by bike
- Easy routes to cross from one side to the other
- Better organised delivery spaces
- Better structured soft landscaping
- Remove the flower boxes and bring the street in keeping with a market town

- We want Monnow Street back to how it was before they put in all these obstructions
- We would like a town where there are individual shops and shopkeepers take pride in their shop fronts with flowers, etc.
- Adopt a holistic approach – much is made of “shared space” and that should be the main consideration. For Monmouth to remain a “viable” town it has to function smoothly. We must find a harmonious solution – Monmouth has a unique topography and cannot be likened to other towns.
- Its vital that the emergency services are consulted. The fire in Peacocks gave the brigade huge problems -not sure why there are no representatives in this meeting. Monnow Street is the only route so over-radical changes will damage and not benefit high street businesses

Key Messages

- Balance of shared space and drop off and deliveries and parking
- Feel safe on foot and bike – movement and crossing
- Disabled friendly
- Remove obstructions
- Signage

2. Are these being met now? What is the current experience?

- ✗ Temporary footpaths and planting that is inadequate, detracting from better pedestrian environment
- ✗ Traffic lights in centre of town are brilliant when actually used
- ✗ Town still looks like it gives car priority, should look like more pedestrian friendly
- ✗ Its nice having trees but they are not well sited or looked after
- ✗ Gradients and obstacles in current surfaces
- ✓ “Pinch point” at top of Monnow Street works when both drivers know the road
- ✗ Empty shops detract from street. Can we wrap them whilst empty?
- ✗ No nothing has changed since the alterations – so it’s a bit too soon to make comments
- ✗ Current planting and parklets need improving
- ✗ Nothing has changed. Dangerous pavements and drains
- ✗ Wide pavements are pleasant, but slopes make walking/wheeling difficult, as does pavement drains which catch wheels
- ✗ Footpath gradients and drainage plates are poor
- ✓ Pinch point makes crossing and accessing top of town easier for pedestrians but car still mounting pavements
- ✗ Delivery bays need to be reconsidered. Current positions aren’t always logical. We hear mixed responses to current regime. Some visitors believe the town has been ruined; some long-term residents are

shopping elsewhere, notably Ross. With the exception of Salt and Pepper, the parklets are a disaster.

- ✗ If the pavements are to be kept at the current width, need to find a way of eradicating slopes. People with pushchairs avoid them, as do those who are less secure in their mobility. Not sure we need more greening.

Key Messages

- Gradients and slopes
- Delivery bays
- Wide pavements pleasant but issues with drains
- Pinch points and cars mounting pavements

3. What needs to be our focus across Monnow Street?

Challenges

- ✗ Public lighting is totally inadequate – not a nice environment at night
- ✗ Street lighting – xmas lights?
- ✗ Improve access to public transport
- ✗ Why does disabled priority finish at 5pm and on Sundays
- ✗ Will need a big mindset shift of locals who want to “pop” to shops on lunch break to walk not drive – not always possible.
- ✗ To give shops confidence to invest in Monmouth. We ideally need to attract more specialist independents and only selectively introduce more multiples.
- ✗ Our focus needs to be on encouraging people to come to Monmouth to shop and spend their money and for the experience to be enjoyable.
- ✗ Reduce pavement clutter.
- ✗ Creating a scheme that people largely support and talk about positively.
- ✗ It will be hard to be prescriptive to delivery drivers who are following pre-planned routes and drop off schedules,
- ✗ Balancing vehicular access with pedestrian and cycle friendliness. We can't afford to demonise car users. Desperately need more car parking to ease congestion in Monnow Street and better signage.

Key Messages

- Reduce pavement clutter
- Lighting
- Vehicle access – balance parking and car user needs
- Attract specialist independent shops

Opportunities

- ✓ Retain what has been learnt about better pedestrian place with traffic combined
- ✓ If nicer for visitors, then more will eventually follow
- ✓ Positive experience on Monnow Street will get surrounding areas to up their game
- ✓ Improving the flow of shoppers moving up and down and across Monnow Street. Making it attractive to shoppers of all ages.
- ✓ Make Monnow Street visually attractive – seating, greenery, sculptures, murals – a pleasant place to be
- ✓ Make it a destination to attract shoppers and tourists
- ✓ Its really nice to think that town will look a bit greener – it will hide how tired the shops look
- ✓ Maximise Monmouth's heritage – it has always been the town's USP and attracted visitors since 18th Century. Task this rare opportunity to ensure that changes are reasonably future proof

Key Messages

- Make it a destination
- Improve flow of shoppers
- Make most of Monmouth's heritage
- Greener and more trees – but need to look after them
- Visually attractive – seating/greenery/pleasant

QUESTION 2

temporary footpaths
& planting is
inadequate ~~at~~
detracting from
better pedestrian
environment.

GRADIANTS &
OBSTACLES IN
CURRENT SURFACES

No nothing
has changed since
the alterations - so
it is a bit soon to
make any comments

Nothing has
changed.
Jagged curb
pavements &
kerb in outside

fast path
gradients &
drainage plates
are poor.

TRAFFIC lights
in centre of turn
are brilliant when
actually used!



'Pinch point' at
top of Monnow St
works when both
drives know the road.

② Delivery bays need to be
reconsidered - current positions
aren't always logical. Hear
mixed responses to current regime
- some visitors believe the town
has been ruined; some long-term
residents are now shopping
elsewhere - notably Ross.
With the exception of Salt & Peppor
parakelets are a disaster!

Wide pavements
pleasant but slopes
makes walking/
wheeling difficult,
as does pavement
drains which catch
wheels.

Pinch point
makes crossing
& accessing top of
turn easier for
ped, but cars still
mounting pavements

Town still looks
like it gives cars
priority - it should
look more
pedestrian friendly

empty shops
detract from street
Can we wrap
them? whilst
empty.

Current planting
at parakelets
need improving.

- Gradients + slopes
- Delivery bays
- Wide pavements pleasant
but issues with drains
- Pinch points + cars mounting pavements

they're not well
sited or looked
after.

need to find a way of
eradicating slopes. People
with pushchairs avoid them,
as do those who are less
secure in their mobility.
Not sure we need more

Group D

1. What are the key things you want to see from Monnow Street?

- Cycle friendly
- Free flowing traffic
- Wider pavements
- Planting schemes
- Trees
- Pedestrian crossings
- Inclusively safe for pedestrians and cyclists
- Delivery access either limited by time or preferably at rear where possible
- Waste collections from the rear
- 20 mph speed limit
- A weight limit? Would this work?
- Café culture or not?
- To enhance the range of shops and cafes, pubs and community facilities
- Widen pavements – they must be even and level
- Friendly and easy to stop and chat, being quiet enough
- A meeting place – event place
- Quality buildings and environment
- Quality shops – browsing and destination
- Like to see school kids walking and cycling through with enough space to mix comfortably with everyone else
- Can Monnow Street accommodate everything that people collectively aspire to?

Key Messages

- Deliveries managed
- Trees and planting
- A diverse offer and experience
- Quality streetscape – story of town history
- Social and safe space

2. Are these being met now? What is the current experience?

- The pinch point is dangerous
- No holistic design - needs an overall scheme
- Pelican crossing not needed
- Poor pavement slopes and levels
- Narrow pavements
- Traffic dominant

Key Messages

- Lack of integrated design so far
- Some features aren't needed when looking at rebalancing hierarchy of users
- Poor environmental quality

3. What needs to be our focus across Monnow Street?

Challenges

- × Narrow pavements to be expanded
- × The pinch point
- × Parking reduction
- × Overcoming apathy and objections to change
- × Changes in slope of carriageway

Key Messages

- Parking
- Pavement quality
- Managing the project, change and communication
- Links into Agincourt Square

Opportunities

- ✓ Wider aspect of historic buildings

- ✓ Beautiful landscape
- ✓ Architectural interest
- ✓ Archaeology to refer to within design
- ✓ Easy crossing spaces – use surfacing materials as easy to use
- ✓ Vegetated SUDs scheme if possible
- ✓ Shared space – pedestrian dictated rather than cars
- ✓ Use of planting especially trees to add to biodiversity
- ✓ Attractive appearance from surfacing material as well as directing flow of traffic and delineating spaces

Key Messages

- Town context and its story
- Shared space concept
- Planting and trees to provide structure
- Materials are key to defining space within spaces





Collective Comments

From reviewing the four-breakout session, we have identified some common issues, thinking and items that need to be considered as we move onto the next stage of the design development process. We have grouped them into design related and wider project/scheme considerations.

Wider Considerations

- **Arrival management**
- **Parking supply, management and pedestrian linkages to and from Monnow Street**
- **How the bus station relates to the street**
- **Relationship to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street – exploration, linkage, signage, events and activities**

Design Considerations


- **A two-way street**
- **Positioning of loading, disabled and short-term parking**
- **Sloping pavements**
- **Drain covers and accessibility**
- **Uncontrolled crossings along the whole street**
- **Pedestrians crossing at corner of Robin Hood pub**
- **Can the street accommodate the principles of a shared space?**
- **Kerb height and detail**
- **Swept path detail from bus station onto Monnow Street**
- **Spaces being agile and adaptable, future proofing**
- **How greening, trees can complement and work for the street**
- **How can the town's story be told through place-based design?**

Purpose

This note has been prepared from the second workshop session held on the evening of Tuesday, 29th November as part of the Monnow Street Design Project.

The Design Project is building on previous work undertaken between 2020 and 2022 through Active Travel funding that has looked at options on how to improve Monnow Street so that it performs better as a place within the town centre.

Roberts Limbrick Architects and Urban Designers are supporting Monmouthshire County Council with the next stage of design development between October 2022 and February 2023.



Stakeholder Workshop 2

The second first workshop was held in the Community Room at the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square on Tuesday, 29th November between the hours of 5pm and 6-30pm.

The County Council invited those stakeholders that attended the first workshop, in addition to those that couldn't attend.

- County and Town Councillors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Local Businesses
- Interest groups

Format

The Community Room was split into two separate areas with the main speakers positioned towards the front of the workshop.

The Cabinet Member for Equalities & Engagement and local ward member for Monmouth Town Ward welcomed people to the workshop and thanked people for attending the last workshop and welcomed some new faces to the Monnow Street co-production design process.

The workshop structure was as follows:

7. Why We Are Here
8. The Last 3 Weeks
9. Workshop 1 – Main Messages
10. Our Design Response
11. Breakouts - Discussion
12. Collective Feedback
13. Next Steps – 5 Mins

The County Council's Regeneration Manager reminded people of the Monnow Street Design Project Aim, which is

To reach consensus on a place-based design that is focussed on a two-way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.

The responsible officer continued, with an update as what activities had been undertaken since the first workshop. These included:

- Received letters and emails re-enforcing views and adding more to the discussion
- The preparation and issue of workshop note 1
- County Council officers' workshop – briefing and understanding their views on design principles
- Reading what people have contributed to the design process and preparing our response

The Physical Scope


For those that did not attend workshop1, the physical extent of the project is from the junction of Monnow Street with


Blestium Street at the southwestern edge through the “pinch point” with St John’s Street to the northeast. Whilst this is the physical design area, the County Council recognises the need to understand how Monnow Street relates to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street so that a cohesive experience is achieved.

The Workshop Sessions

Before moving into the workshop session, stakeholders were informed of the design process and how the workshops would receive, shape and inform the final designs. The diagram below provides information on the key workshops with the process leading to a community exhibition in late January 2023.

Page 274







Workshop 1 Main Messages

The County Council's Regeneration Manager handed over to the lead designer at Roberts Limbrick who reminded workshop attendees of the key messages and considerations from workshop 1. These are:

Wider Context

- Arrival management
- Parking supply, management and pedestrian linkages to and from Monnow Street
- How the bus station relates to the street
- Role and function of the Street
- Relationship to Agincourt Square, Priors Street, White Swan Court and Church Street – exploration, linkage, signage, events and activities

Design Considerations

- A two-way street
- Positioning of loading, disabled and short-term parking
- Uncontrolled crossings along the whole street
- Pedestrians crossing at corner of Robin Hood pub
- Can the street accommodate the principles of a shared space?
- Sloping pavements and drainage
- Spaces being agile and adaptable, future proofing
- How greening, trees can complement and work for the street
- How can the town's story be told through place-based design?
- Details
 - Drain covers and accessibility

- Kerb height and detail
- Swept path detail from bus station onto Monnow Street


Our Design Response

The Lead Designer introduced the design response through an overarching place based approach but layered around a number of themes that were generated from workshop 1. These are i) A Place for People 2) A Place for Crossing 3) A Place for Loading 4) A Place for Planting and 5) A Place for Parking. The following layers set out the design process of integrating the above themes into an overarching design solution.

A Place for People

- Movement
- Dwell
- Rest
- Leisure: eat, drink
- Inclusive

Figure 1 - A Place for People:




Source: Roberts Limbrick

A Place for Crossing

- Often and convenient

- Safe
- Pedestrian priority
- Inclusive

Figure 2 - A Place for Crossing



Page 279


Source: Roberts Limbrick

A Place for Loading and Deliveries

- Often and convenient
- Even spread
- Legible

- Practical

Figure 3 - A Place for Crossing




Page 280

Source: Roberts Limbrick

A Place for Planting

- Amenity: colour
- Enclosure and space creation / separation
- Rain gardens: Drainage and flooding
- Pollution control

- Biodiversity
 - Clear of pedestrian space and movement
- Figure 4 - A Place for Planting



Page 281


Source: Roberts Limbrick

A Place for Parking

- Convenient
- Evenly spread
- Disabled
- Integrated from the outset
- Non dominating

Figure 5 - A Place for Parking

Page 282



Source: Roberts Limbrick

Bringing the Layers Together

The following plan was shared which brings together all of the layers into a single design response. Some artists impressions were also shared from various locations and views within Monnow Street.


Figure 6 - The Design Concept Proposal



Page 283

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Figure 7 - The Design Concept Proposal



Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 1 - View Down Monnow Street (Upper End) – Existing and Proposed



Page 285

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 2 - View Opposite Cornwall House (Middle Part) – Existing and Proposed



Page 286

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 3 - View by Controlled Crossing (Middle Part) – Existing and Proposed



Page 287

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 4 - View of Robin Good PH Corner – Existing and Proposed



Page 288

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 5 - Aerial View from the Southwest Looking Up Monnow Street – Existing and Proposed



Page 289

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Image 6 - Aerial View Looking Up into Proposal Towards Upper End of Town Centre



Page 290

Source: Roberts Limbrick

The Breakout Sessions

Group A

These are the comments and feedback from Group A.

A Place for People

- Like wider pavements.
- Need to consider disabled and visually impaired and other people using pavements.
- Please de-clutter pavements.
- Loss of previous and ongoing investment in outside space by Salt & Pepper.
- Provision of corduroy paving for visually impaired along the kerb and along the whole route.
- More benches and places to sit.
- Maintenance of the town cleaning of the pavements is poor and needs more manpower, with one man is not sufficient.

A Place for Crossing

- The crossing by the Robin Hood corner needs to be considered. Is it diagonal to the DIY store or linked straight across to toilet block?
- Need to consider Robin Hood corner. Dangerous for pedestrians
- Like zebra crossings as courtesy crossings?
- Can we change the give way priority at the bend by the toilet block, so cars have to stop and enter Monnow Street. This may help with pedestrian crossing point.

A Place for Loading

- What if we have rear access, do we need a loading bay?
- Our charity shop cannot get clothes collected!
- Policing and management of loading bays.
- Loading and short stay parking outside the post office. (3)

A Place for Planting

- No trees, more parking.
- If plants are included, they need to be maintained after installation.
- Like the Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme planting – would like more instead of some parking spaces.
- I am not sure of that the ground level green spaces will work – dogs mess, litter will be a problem.

A Place for Parking

- Disabled parking space needed near Specsavers.
- Now less on street parking. Retailers want more, not less.
- Parking from 38 to 22?
- Could disabled parking also be a drop off zone?
- Most parking should be disabled.
- Create a central drop off zone.
- Parking only for disabled, taxis and deliveries.
- Have fewer parking spaces.



Cyclists

- The proposal looks safe for cyclists.
- Bike parking provision.
- Bike parking should be more convenient than cars

General

- Need to track buses through the scheme and their access and exit from the bus station.
- Identity a rear access from car parks into High Street.
- Please consult with children and young people.
- Consider a lighting scheme that works with the street.
- Develop a town wide parking strategy

Image 7 - Images from Breakout Group A



Source: Roberts Limbrick

Group B

These are the comments and feedback from Group B.

A Place for People

- Two-metre-wide pavements are not as viable when you have A boards on pavements.
- Pedestrian signage to car parks and other parts of town e.g., Church Street (2).
- It would be a shame to take the area outside Salt & Pepper away – this bit works well now.
- By widening pavements, will vehicles be able to pass within the carriageway?
- Introduce a 20mph speed limit.
- What is the width of the carriageway – can too large vehicles pass at the same time?
- The visuals for the corner of Robin Hood pub show extra “stuff” which may make it harder for drivers.
- Why have extended tables and chairs space outside those food and drink establishments when they have rear garden space already? Coffi Lab has a large outdoor space behind the main interior area. Same issue at the Robin Hood.
- There are more impediments to people with sight impairment and whilst it provides a protection from cars parking it only has an aesthetic relevance.
- Greater flexibility to the space “over the years” as the High Street evolves (or declines). It would be served better by a blank canvas with moveable furniture to adapt to the changing environment.

A Place for Crossing

- There are too many crossings; can we monitor pedestrian activity to observe desire lines and crossing points and be more targeted?
- Too many crossing points.
- Thank you for putting these many crossings in. It’s a very helpful gesture.
- Provide a crossing at Salt & Pepper.
- Crossing by Robin Hood is very necessary as it’s a very dangerous corner, which links the car park area and old bridge.

A Place for Loading

- Can we look at a loading bay close to Boots as they have no rear access
- We need more central loading bays that on the edges

A Place for Planting

- Too much greenery will take up parking (2).
- Have a vote – give residents a chance.
- Green spaces – installation of trees and planters means additional maintenance (and cost) and isn’t conclusive with hard environments which gather leaves, moss and lichen which if not maintained will become a hazard.
- With local knowledge I can tell you that we (Monmouth) will lose between 6 to 10 more businesses before this is implemented because of more important factors than landscaping.
- The viability of the High Street is not going to be affected by landscaping, the community needs vibrant heathy businesses to attract locals and visitor alike.

- I'm a fan of greenery in the High Street but maintenance is always a problem as the present planters show. Hanging baskets could be a better option to trees.
- The installation of green planters and trees, reduces the amount of parking in the first instance and reduces the "flexibility" should businesses change over time e.g., café moves to an area of less space.
- Concerns of trees, specifically canopies and vehicles and roots damaging pavement.
- The installation of green planters and trees detracts from the historical nature of Monnow Street.

A Place for Parking

- We have lost 14 parking spaces in this proposal compared to existing situation.
- There seems to be no parking spaces at the top end of town.
- Can you look at herringbone parking rather than longitudinal? Will you get in more spaces?
- Provide a free car park in Monmouth (like in Abergavenny) apart from Tuesdays.
- Look at parking spaces outside post office.
- Disabled spaces outside key stores e.g., Boots and the other pharmacy.
- More parking – fewer crossings.
- Not sure reduction of car spaces is a great idea.
- Any disabled bays should be a maximum of one hour.
- Top rear car park (Monnow Street CP) is underused as not entry access to High Street – can we solve this to help top end of town?

Cycling



- Parking for bicycles. (2)
- Implement chippy fields cycle path.

General

- We need to look at feasibility of a new pedestrian access from Monnow Street car park onto Monnow Street.
- Get rid of the pinch point. Why is this pinch point staying? It is dangerous and causes traffic to stack up.
- We need to still understand the relationship of the town centre to the A40?
- Worries over construction works and disruption to business. How will this be managed, specifically ways to reduce business disruption and loss of trade?
- If you are making it nicer for shops to put stuff outside, are you going to try and bring back a fee on boards and street furniture, and the need for insurance. It was a nightmare last time it was tried to implement.
- There is an existing problem for buses exiting from Monmouth Keep onto Monnow Street. This needs to be resolved.
- Trees on the other side and tables on the other will make it harder for buses to exit bus station.
- If we are doing all of this, please can we have more car parking (preferably free) on the edges of town and signage please.
- Without improving access/out via A40 (reduce speed) and free car parking, town prosperity will not improve.
- More coach parking signs on A40 – promote coach friendly town.

- Good businesses, and a variety are what will make people and tourists come to Monmouth (not trees).
- Disruption caused by works to Agincourt Square had a massive impact on footfall and turnover for businesses during the works.
- Slow down A40 is a good idea as a realistic town bypass.
- Can we paint shop fronts as they are shabby.
- It was mentioned by someone else that many shops die when extended works are carried out. This is a real issue and need considering. All the crossing points are going to play havoc with traffic flows.

Image 8 - Images from Breakout Group B



Page 297

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Questions and Answers

Question: Why is there a focus on a single town centre project like Monnow Street, when we haven't got a town wide place making plan.

Answer: Ideally, we'd complete the place making plan first. But because the Monnow Street project is part of the County Council's Levelling Up Fund bid to UK Government, we need to be "shovel ready" if we are successful. The Monnow Street project is also considering linkages and immediate sites in its design development process

Question: Why is Monnow Street a Priority Against Other Levelling Up Fund Projects?

Answer: The two building focussed projects at the Market Hall (formerly Nelson Museum) and at the Shire Hall are dependent on a heritage lottery fund application process which is at the pre-development stage. The movement of the Nelson artefacts into the Shire Hall does mean that the Market Hall will not become vacant for a couple of years.

Whilst the Gateway to Monmouth project on Blestium Street is well advanced in terms of design it would need to obtain permissions from Natural Resources Wales (flood risk and proximity to water course) and also from Cadw in terms of setting of medieval Monnow Bridge. The site could also be suitable as a site compound for the contractor, in the event that the Monnow Street project was approved and proceeded to construction. Compared to the Gateway Monmouth project,

Monnow Street would not require any statutory consents for the works which would be within the highway and would be classified as permitted development by the local planning authority.

Finally, there is a need to address the Covid-19 adaptation works to the highway which all parties agree have served their purpose.

Question: How Will You Measure Success on this Public Realm Investment?

Answer: The Council's Levelling Up Fund application presents an approach to measuring the benefits and impacts of improving public realm in Monnow Street. These can be viewed at:

<https://www.monmouthshire.gov.uk/levelling-up-fund/>

The County Council also undertakes annual retail surveys which collect town centre data and analysis to understand the performance of the town centre against agreed indicators e.g., pedestrian footfall, planning use classes. In addition, the Council has invested in Meraki pedestrian footfall measuring systems that collect intelligent data on pedestrian movement, dwell and how people use town centres such as Monmouth.

Question: Do You Have Any Case Studies on Comparator Places?

Answer: As stated every town centre is unique, so it is hard to specifically focus on a town centre that has the same characteristics. Monnow Street performs both a “dwell and destination” function and a “link” onto Agincourt Square which needs to be acknowledged.

Some of the following web-links provides some case studies, research and background reading:

<https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/3890/pedestrian-pound-2018.pdf>

<https://sites.google.com/view/place-value-wiki/economy/c4-streets-public-realm-and-economic-value?pli=1>

Question: How Will the Proposal be Funded?

Answer: In August this year, the County Council submitted a Levelling Up Fund (LUF) application to UK Government. If successful, the Monnow Street project will be funded through this programme with the Council contributing some capital match funding.

If the LUF application is not successful, the Council will consider other options, including the Welsh Government’s Transforming Towns programme. This application would be dependent on the preparation of a Place Making Plan for the town. Dependent on how the scheme accommodates active travel needs, there could be support from the Welsh Government’s Active Travel fund.

Question: Shouldn’t the Local Community Provide Feedback on Options and Not Be Given a Single Preferred Option?

Answer: This project is a continuation of the County Council’s transport options assessment which commenced in 2020. Options were assessed by Capita during early 2022, with 4 options based on a two-way street, having been through a long list of options during the first stage.

The options appraisal involved a stakeholder engagement workshop on 15th February 2022 via Microsoft Teams to discuss the problems, interdependencies and scheme objectives as part of the Stage 2 WeITAG process. Views were also sought on the shortlisted options and how they could be refined. Public Consultation centred on a six period in January 2022. A questionnaire was made available on MCC’s website and was promoted via the Local Authority’s social media channels. Business Consultation involved a separate business consultation questionnaire which was made available online. To notify local businesses about the consultation, a Capita representative visited Monnow Street in late January to hand out / do letterbox drops of the notification letters.

Capita’s Strategic Case assessment of options did recommend that Option 3C (retain only loading and disabled parking). However, the County Council considered the recommendation and its starting point for this design process has been focussed on:

- Ways to improve the environmental quality for people walking and accessing Monnow Street
- Ways to accommodate cycling through the Street
- Maintaining a two-way street for vehicles
- Accommodating loading/unloading
- Provision for disabled parking
- Consideration of on-street short stay parking

Image 9 - Reporting Back



Source: Roberts Limbrick

Business Engagement Wave 2

Since stakeholder workshop 2 has been undertaken, members of the Roberts Limbrick consultancy team have gone back out to town centre businesses to share with them the emerging proposal and gain feedback.

This has taken place from the 5th of December with the engagement running upto the 22nd of December. Dependent on the availability of the business owner or manager, a team member shared with them an A2 size plan of the proposal, talked them through and sought feedback using the themes that were used at the 29th of November stakeholder workshop.

At the time of writing this document, the team has engaged with approximately 55 businesses in Monnow Street with the intent to also share the emerging design with businesses in Church Street, White Swan Court and Agincourt Square and other neighbouring streets. Due to the Christmas holiday period, the County Council will continue to talk to businesses into early January to ensure everyone has the opportunity to comment.

Overleaf are the listed comments from businesses that we have received so far.

Figure 8 indicates the ratings against each of the five design principle themes. This will be updated once outstanding business interviews have been completed.

Place for People		
<i>Positives</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like two-way traffic and more space for people ▪ Looks nice ▪ Looks better than now ▪ Good to see ▪ Looks good ▪ Looks great ▪ Like the wider footpaths ▪ Looks nice and pretty ▪ Nice to sit out in good weather ▪ Shop in abergavenny as it's been pedestrianised – it works well for people ▪ Its going the right way ▪ Abergavenny is a good example ▪ Good quality pedestrian space, levels and character ▪ Looks good and going right direction ▪ Nice to see a space for tables, places to sit and meet especially during the summer ▪ Nice to have outside space – seating area good especially in summer and tourists ▪ Overall feels good – like it ▪ Like seating area with some well used in current scheme ▪ Like proposals ▪ Looks great – nice and cosmopolitan ▪ On the right lines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visually impaired need to be considered in decision ▪ Street and flow of vehicles needs to work technically – no stacking ▪ Needs cyclist infrastructure ▪ Future licensing consideration ▪ Remove some of the current planters as they are obstacles ▪ Consider lighting in next stage ▪ Need to deal with rainwater run-off in design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A wider road to ease traffic would be good ▪ Lots of venues have seating already ▪ Don't like seating on Robin Hood corner due to perceived anti-social behaviour in pub ▪ Outdoor seating by Robin Hood – do we need it? ▪ Don't like Robin Hood corner barrier

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Awesome – nice experience – looks more homemade ▪ Appealing ▪ Nice space ▪ Interested in licensing for activity ▪ Looks good – nice wide pavements ▪ Definite yes ▪ Yes, amazing, looks lovely ▪ Great – looks like Abergavenny – good examples ▪ Outdoor street culture good but make sure enough space to get past ▪ Tables and activity good and drives business – need to become a vital and touristy town in one to tackle empty shops ▪ Yes – like it ▪ Feels cosmopolitan ▪ Nice – place to sit out and lead to browsing ▪ People, place and experience – like it ▪ This will reduce through traffic – good ▪ Pedestrian space and opportunities for tables and sitting out ▪ Character is good ▪ Good – adapts to tables and chairs ▪ Place for people ▪ Looks great ▪ Pathways are bigger – allows for all users – buggies, pushchairs, 		
--	--	--

<p>wheelchairs, larger groups – more passing space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good balance – people and business ▪ Like Robin Hood space outside – we need to embrace tourism offer and experience – the Wye Valley ▪ Nice feel to the design - mooch around – nice town to look and explore – would lead to repeat trips ▪ Love the concept ▪ Like it but we need shops 		
---	--	--

Place for Safe Crossing Opportunities

<i>Positives</i>	<i>Improvements</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definitely needed ▪ More needed than at present ▪ More needed ▪ A pedestrian crossing at Robin Hood PH is needed ▪ Good to see them ▪ Much safer ▪ Great idea – much needed ▪ More needed than now ▪ Suggesting of just 2 crossings – 9 is too much ▪ Suggest 3 crossings – than the 9 ▪ The one at the top end is good ▪ Crossings are good ▪ Maybe 3 – top, middle and bottom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To many of them – would be grid lock ▪ Too many crossings – they need to be more balanced ▪ Too many of them – 2 to 3 maximum ▪ Too many of them ▪ 10 too much – place them at key generators ▪ Too many – like the one outside their business ▪ To many crossings – reduce ▪ Few too many ▪ Looks a lot – might impact traffic flow ▪ Will they block views? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More crossings are good – maybe too many? ▪ Safety for pedestrians is paramount ▪ Needs to be safer and will also slow traffic down which is good ▪ Delivery bays are very important – if not delivery outside than likely to close as need to walk to pick up and people don't drop off ▪ Looks fine ▪ 4 to 5 crossings ▪ Like them – crossing by Waitrose is good ▪ Like them ▪ Looks good ▪ Much better – freedom of pedestrians ▪ Like how it breaks up the space ▪ Its better – it slows down traffic ▪ Its great – it slows down traffic and will remove obstructions ▪ Like them ▪ Like them... ▪ Would love one opposite their café ▪ Likes the crossings ▪ They are good visual disruptors – creates more permeability ▪ Easier to connect across the street ▪ Like them as they slow down traffic ▪ Like them ▪ Like it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perhaps too many? ▪ Not so many ▪ Speed bumps would be good ▪ Just have 2? ▪ Consider Robin Hood PH corner and crossing ▪ Not so many ▪ Too many? ▪ Consider Robin Hood corner and crossing – the corner treatment and how it relates to Handyman house – needs wider design consideration of flow, no entry and that the parking is customer parking and not for long stay abuse ▪ 	
--	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More crossings and more choice (always waiting for the lights) ▪ Suggest 5 crossings not 9 ▪ Right amount of crossings – do we need visual cue to drivers ▪ Happy with more pedestrian crossings ▪ Like but reduce the number 		
---	--	--

Place for Loading and Deliveries		
<i>Positives</i>	<i>Improvements</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good to see more for being proposed ▪ Boots the Chemist need one nearby ▪ Meat delivered from a local farm so needs to be clearer ▪ More of them as shown – need to see them down the whole street ▪ Much needed ▪ We have ours at the rear, but the proposal would help resolve the chaos ▪ Yes good – more needed ▪ Yes – but only at ground level ▪ Doesn't affect us – so no comment ▪ Deliveries cause a lot of problems – more bays are good ▪ Delivery bays are a good idea ▪ Loadings bays look ok – definitely need one by Boots due to lots of deliveries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ They need enforcement ▪ Loading bays need to be defined and managed ▪ Need to balance with short stay parking ▪ You need to consider right turn out of Monnow Keep and also parking of pharmacy vans ▪ It's about policing bays more than numbers – place restrictions on their use ▪ Pinch point is hard for Securicor, but we are used to it ▪ Had to revert to night drops due to daytime problems ▪ Just don't block their side access ▪ Needs enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not too sure

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree – need more as its chaotic at the moment ▪ Extra bays good and much needed – spread and nos looks ok ▪ Like the loading ▪ Loading bays very important – currently deliveries are very difficult and have to park in the road ▪ Delivery bays are critical to success of scheme especially for people to drop off charity items ▪ Looks good – would help with their big deliveries ▪ Businesses doesn't have large deliveries so not an issue ▪ Looks good – not a problem – we have small vans ▪ Balance between loading and parking ▪ Some loading bays good but can they be managed ▪ A balance needed - could manage better of use restricted times ▪ Very important – holds up a lot of the traffic – 6 no seems ok ▪ Ok – works for us ▪ Not so important – car and van borne ▪ Like the two bays close by to us ▪ This will help with our front loading (infrequent) ▪ Ok – works for them 		
---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a good spread ▪ Loading looks ok ▪ Works for us – 7.5 tonne close by ▪ They are in a decent location ▪ Watch the rear servicing and distribution along the front ▪ Can you consider moving loading bay further up the street? ▪ Six is ok 		
--	--	--

Place for Landscape and Greening		
<i>Positives</i>	<i>Improvements</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Looks good ▪ Really nice ▪ Love to see more ▪ Like it ▪ Very nice principle – adds to character ▪ Very good ▪ Nice – something to lift the town ▪ Definitely a good idea ▪ Very good ▪ Greening looks good ▪ Nice areas like outside salt and pepper ▪ Monmouth is a nice town, but improvements are welcome ▪ More landscape and character will help and promote the town ▪ Good to have greenery – trees are great 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need a maintenance plan ▪ Like greenery but don't take up too much space ▪ Needs to be balanced with practicalities of businesses ▪ Right plants next to crossing in terms of safety ▪ Leaves – are they a maintenance issue ▪ Low planting and views need to be maintained ▪ Maintenance – self watering systems? ▪ Please use boxless trees – root based ▪ Needs maintenance ▪ Turn planters into seats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not bothered would rather see a parking space than a tree ▪ Concerns over rainwater gardens being unkempt ▪ Need a balance between greenery and parking ▪ Do we need rainwater gardens – obstacles and maintenance ▪ Trees – will they thrive in the street?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trees look great ▪ Looks lovely ▪ Like trees and character ▪ All for green spaces and making it look nice ▪ Landscape good – get trees in the street ▪ Perfect – summer shade – nice ▪ Visual, relax, tackles climate change, creates the right mood – feels like a garden ▪ Trees look good – nice ▪ Summer trees – shade and shelter and water absorption ▪ Nice ▪ Trees would be great ▪ Greenery excellent ▪ Needs proper permanent planting ▪ Greenery space very important – not slabs of hard landscape – break up and soften – excellent to have trees ▪ Love to see greenery and trees ▪ We also like baskets on lampposts ▪ Like it nicer ▪ Like a lot ▪ No problem – like it – stop and sit ▪ Trees and environment are essential ▪ Keep it green – deals with CO2 ▪ Like green ▪ Like trees ▪ Trees are good ▪ Likes trees and greenery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider maintenance and management ▪ Keep it minimalistic - watch maintenance and management ▪ Can trees be coniferous? All year colour ▪ Leaves – shedding – hazard – nice in summer but not in winter ▪ Can we have more green boxes and hanging baskets 	
---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feels good, lots of serotonin and well-being ▪ Like greenery ▪ Like root-based trees not planters ▪ Create a street-based experience ▪ All for it – more the merrier ▪ Need to get balance of trees against space ▪ Green and nice – feels like a rural market town ▪ Like trees – not as many though – 4 to 5 		
---	--	--

Place for Parking


<i>Positives</i>	<i>Improvements</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loading is needed over parking – people will find somewhere else to park ▪ Agree ▪ Street parking is immaterial as long as it doesn't use main car parks – need more in town and cheaper ▪ All parking should be for disabled users ▪ Parking is ok – there are large car parks so never a problem ▪ We don't need more disabled bays – current number is ok ▪ Customers do like easy parking on street but as important to get street looking good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should be metered ▪ Parking for workers needs to be considered ▪ Maybe a decked car park somewhere ▪ Not enough E charge points in car parks ▪ Please look at charging strategy – 2 hours free ▪ Is should be only for disabled parking ▪ More parking elsewhere in town and pedestrianise Monnow Street ▪ All parking bays on street should be disabled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not bothered would rather see a parking space than a tree ▪ More parking outside shop ▪ We still need pop in parking. Need an approach to other parking ▪ Not enough short stay? ▪ Get more parking back in – puts elderly people off and disabled get more designated spaces – with a better spread ▪ Will parking by Pizza Express cause stacking and problems? ▪ Concerns over wider parking supply and how it is managed

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ok – parking is much better now there’s some checking and enforcement ▪ The balance is fair; businesses and their needs to load is a key priority ▪ Loss of short stay ok – disabled badge holders important ▪ What is the return on business from short stay parking? Does it work for us? ▪ Feels balanced ▪ Good – parking is nearby to drop off clothes to shop ▪ Pop in 30 min ok ▪ Maintain disabled spaces and overall parking supply ▪ Look fine on balance – needs traffic warden management ▪ Looks good ▪ Its fair – we need to change habits of over-convenience ▪ Bit of both – deliveries and parking – need confidence to find a space to unload ▪ Able bodied people can walk from other car parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need more car parks in town and cheaper ▪ More disabled parking and mother and child ▪ Disabled parking needs to be spread along street – maybe – top, middle and bottom ▪ Needs to be consistently controlled and policed ▪ More spread and disabled parking on street ▪ Increase short stay to 1 hour from 30 minutes – consider long stay needs ▪ Loss of disabled parking near to business needs to be considered – elderly customers – proper bays or drop off provision ▪ Parking for shop workers and staff – how and where we manage this? ▪ Car parks ok around the town but more free parking or reduced charges ▪ We need elderly/disabled parking towards Handyman House end for various needs – hearing, TKW and more 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car park prices are too much ▪ Need to consider parking manoeuvres with low sun at end of the street ▪ More disabled bays and better distribution for the elderly ▪ Disabled spaces are in the wrong place – too far away – some to the rear in Cornwall House and Monnow Street but not accessible ▪ Need for parking – 1st hour free – cattle market toilet block car park ▪ Need for on street parent and child parking? ▪ Disabled spaces on the edge of the street? ▪ More parking over trees – need convenience pop in ▪ Consider elderly and disabled needs ▪ Traffic warden needs to enforce double yellows by Handyman House ▪ Can we have 1 day a week – free parking? ▪ Put a footbridge into skate park car park 	
--	--	--

Other Comments	
<i>Positives</i>	<i>Negatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More positive that it is now ▪ More thought has gone into this layout – like it ▪ Coffee shops brings people in ▪ Looks really good – when can you start ▪ All looks very nice ▪ Ideally should be pedestrianised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need more shops – rates are the issue ▪ Make pinch point more way or courtesy arrangement ▪ Levels and drainage need to be sorted ▪ Current scheme does not work – parklets – people leave litter – needs to be associated with the nearby shop ▪ Need more shops and support ▪ Need to drive more footfall ▪ Benches and seating have worked really well especially in the summer ▪ Current arrangement is difficult in getting donations to shops and volume has decreased ▪ The pinch point narrowing is too long – needs to be reviewed or a priority system ▪ Pinch point – cars are mounting kerb ▪ We need a better market – more artisan – look at Ross and Worcester for their Christmas markets – ▪ Corduroy paving can be slippery in cold day ▪ Deal with boy racers on street – need to slow down and discourage them ▪ Pinch point at top causing problems ▪ We have a water downpipes issue with water ponding – this needs to be looked at in design ▪ Business has risk of flooding and drainage issues that need to be resolved ▪ Maintenance regime cost ▪ Town needs business support ▪ Town centre management needed ▪ Be very careful with implementation

Figure 8 - Ratings of the Five Design Principle Themes



Page 315


Source: Roberts Limbrick Business Engagement Discussions

Purpose

This note has been prepared from the third series of workshops. For this stage of the design process, Monmouth Chamber requested that the County Council co-host an additional workshop for their members, as well as a wider stakeholder session.

The Design Project is building on previous work undertaken between 2020 and 2022 through Active Travel funding that has looked at options on how to improve Monnow Street so that it performs better as a place within the town centre.

Roberts Limbrick Architects and Urban Designers are supporting Monmouthshire County Council with the next stage of design development between October 2022 and March 2023.



Workshop 3

Monmouthshire County Council has commenced the next stage of the design process for Monnow Street in Monmouth. We want key local stakeholders like you to be at the centre of this final step in developing the scheme, building on the principles established through design and consultation work over the last two years. We have appointed Roberts Limbrick as designers to support us in this process.

To help create the right environment for dialogue during the design process we have provided a number of focused design workshops over the last few months. Our first workshop discussed the starting point for this project, the challenges and opportunities, and what our focus should be. The second session let people see an emerging sketch design with feedback received at individual businesses in Monnow Street and across the town centre. Our third and last workshop is to share design changes and to inform stakeholders of the wider community consultation process that is planned.

The final workshop is being held from **6-30pm to 8pm on Tuesday, 24th January at the Community Room, the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square, Monmouth**. We hope you can attend and help us co-design this important town centre project.

Please email MCCRegeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk to confirm your attendance, indicating if you have any specific needs when attending the workshop. Thank You

monmouthshire sir fynwy

rl.



Monnow Street Business Workshop

Over the last few months Monmouthshire County Council has been developing the next stage of the design process for Monnow Street in Monmouth.

Businesses that are located in Monnow Street and across the wider town centre have been central to the conversation. Opportunities have been provided through stakeholder workshops held back in November and December, and through individual one to one discussions with businesses on their practical requirements and understanding how the street needs to respond to current day needs.

These conversations are shaping a preferred design which will be shared with local stakeholders before we proceed to wider public consultation in mid February. A joint meeting hosted by the Chamber of Commerce in Monmouthshire has been organised for **6pm – 7:30pm on Wednesday 25th January** at the Community Room, the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square Monmouth. If you cannot attend this meeting, a wider stakeholder workshop session has been organised for the evening before, **6-30pm to 8pm on Tuesday, 24th January** at the same venue, the Community Room in the Shire Hall.

Please email MCCRegeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk to confirm your attendance, indicating if you have any specific needs when attending the workshop. Thank You

monmouthshire sir fynwy

MONMOUTH CHAMBER

rl. Roberts Limbrick

Stakeholder Workshop 3

The third workshop was held in the Town Council Chamber Room at the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square on Tuesday, 26th January between the hours of 6pm and 8pm.

The County Council invited those stakeholders that attended the second workshop, which included any businesses that couldn't attend the Chamber of Commerce workshop on the evening of the 27th of January.

- County and Town Councillors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Local Businesses
- Interest groups

Format

This third and final workshop in the design process did not involve any breakout sessions with the main purpose to share the proposed design that would go forward to wider community consultation.

The Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Economy welcomed people to the workshop and thanked people for attending the last workshop and re-enforced the spirit and values of being involved in the co-production design process. He also raised the disappointing news that the County Council had been unsuccessful with its Levelling Up Fund bid to UK Government. He stated that the Council was reviewing whether it would apply through round three of the Fund, but projects like Monnow Street still require development and need to be designed, costed and ready for implementation.

The meeting structure was as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Purpose
3. LUF Bid Results
4. Direct Business Consultations
5. (Round 2)
6. Other Activities
7. Design Evolution
8. Next Steps

The County Council's Regeneration Manager reminded people of the Monnow Street Design Project Aim, which is

To reach consensus on a place-based design that is focussed on a two-way street environment that is vibrant, welcoming to all modes of travel and ensures exploration and activity across the whole town.

The responsible officer continued, with an update as what activities had been undertaken since the first workshop, with supplementary information related to the UK Government's decision that the County Council had been unsuccessful with its Levelling Up Fund application. Other key points made included:

These included:

- A further wave of consultation had been held with Monnow Street businesses during December with their comments fed into the design process; other town centre businesses in the top end of the town were also engaged with;
- The County Council and Town Council are making progress on the Place Making Plan and hope to start this process over the coming months;
- Handling direct email correspondence on the project and the process;
- A second County Council officers' workshop is to be held to receive technical feedback on the proposed design.

The Physical Scope

For those that did not attend workshop 2, the physical extent of the project is from the junction of Monnow Street with Blestium Street at the southwestern edge through the “pinch point” with St John’s Street to the northeast. Whilst this is the physical design area, the County Council recognises the need to understand how Monnow Street relates to Agincourt Square, Priory Street, White Swan Court and Church Street so that a cohesive experience is achieved.






Design Update

The County Council’s Regeneration Manager handed over to the lead designer at Roberts Limbrick who led the remainder of the workshop.

This initially talked to the conclusion of the business interviews held in the street held during early to mid-December 2022. The chart below was presented which showed the ratings of the proposed design against the various design principles.



Using percentages:

- 93% of businesses agree with people based benefits
- 95% of businesses agree with the improved crossings
- 93% of businesses agree with improved loading provision
- 82% of businesses agree with the landscaping and greening
- 67% of businesses agree with the parking proposals

Specific Observations

As discussed, overall very supportive.

Landscape maintenance: needs to have a robust maintenance strategy in place.

Crossing Points: really positive response and like the fact that these have been included. Are, however, there too many?

Southern loading bay: can this be moved slightly?

Parking: is there potential to include some to the southern end of the street?

Parking: How many disabled bays will there be?

Buses: footway run over when entering Monnow Street from the bus station?

Other Activities

Design input from blind / visually impaired:

Site visit and walk over with Terry Christopher (registered blind) following comments and concerns he raised at the last workshop.

Feedback: Terry was very pleased with the proposals and has said that his needs have been well considered within the design proposals

The Current Design Proposal

The Lead Designer shared the current design proposal and indicated where design changes had been made.

He took questions and points of clarification at both of the workshops which are provided within this note.

Image 10 - Emerging Design Proposal



Page 323

Source: Roberts Limbrick

Feedback and Queries

- Q. **Disabled parking** – can we have details on locations and whether some should be near the surgery and outside the EE shop, and they must have dropped kerbs?
- A. Disabled parking has 6 no spaces and can be accommodated at the edges and in the middle of the street. They would need to be differentiated to short stay spaces with signage, material and markings. A disabled space will be 6.6metres in length. The detail will need to follow on kerbs, but they would be accessible for disabled users.
- Q. **Bus station entrance** – what are the pavement levels across this junction?
- A. They will meet the carriageway with a courtesy crossing provided. Tactile paving will indicate the crossing with existing issues on levels and drainage to be addressed in the construction design.
- Q. **Drainage channels** – will this be improved for wheelchair users?
- A. The street currently has dish shaped drainage channels that direct the water run-off from building mounted rainwater goods. In the detailed design process, these channels would be designed out with an alternative that is to be flush, which could be a slotted drainage channel. This would improve the level of comfort for wheelchair users travelling through the space.
- Q. **Wheelchair users** – could the County Council arrange a site visit with a wheelchair user to understand their current experiences and future needs?
- A. Yes. This can be organised at a time convenient to all (action point).
- Q. **Lighting** – any detail on lighting?
- A. This will be developed through detailed design to ensure the scheme is properly lit to the required standards. This will include the lighting of footways and public spaces as well as the proposed courtesy crossings so that pedestrians are seen by car drivers. Detail to follow if the scheme was approved.
- Q. **Planters** – are these low level?
- A. Yes. They would be constructed to a full kerb height and would be low, not like the current planters in the street. They would have slots in them for any excess water to flow into the carriageway drainage system.

Q. Why are there 2 no. **crossings** at Estero Lounge area?

A. The one crossing adopts the pedestrian desire line from the southeastern side of the street at the bottom end of town with the bus station. The other crossing brings directly onto the island area that is Estero Lounge to ensure accessibility.

Q. Is the scheme about creating a café culture and more **food and drink opportunities**?

A. The main objective is about creating a people friendly experience and a destination that appeals to local people and visitors. Extended pavements and public space can provide opportunities for existing food and drink businesses to either retain their licenses and activity and where new food and drink outlets open up, they can apply to extend activity into their immediate frontage. The design is about providing improved and functional space that any business can benefit from whether this be tables and chairs, an outdoor display, etc.

Q. The line of the **pedestrian crossing at the Robin Hood corner** doesn't work. It should pick up the current desire line onto the toilet block island.

A. Our design scheme boundary was to the end of Monnow Street, but we could extend the scheme area into Blestium Street to accommodate the suggestion. By doing this we could look at having a courtesy crossing from the corner of the Robin Hood Public House to the public toilet block. We would also suggest that we formalise the dropped kerb crossing close to the cattle market car park and create a raised area between this crossing and the toilet block. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.

Q. **Monnow Street/St John's Street junction** – can you re-enforce narrowing here and explore a courtesy arrangement?

A. It's not in our scope but the suggestion can be made to the County Council. You would need to manage the junction with Agincourt Street so cars do not block those vehicles wishing to turn right into this street from Monnow Street.

Q. Is there a need for a **courtesy crossing**, just down from Salt and Pepper?

A. This can be removed as the crossing by the One Stop/Post Office serves a number of purposes. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.

Q. There is a need to **declutter the street** with old posts and furniture.

- A. The scheme will address the removal and rationalisation of signage and posts. There will be a co-ordinated approach to seating, litter bins, street cabinets and other furniture, exploring ways to integrate into structures such as planting areas and walling.
- Q. Can you make provision for **cycle trailers** in the scheme?
- A. Yes. Alongside standard cycle stands we will look at how we position them to accommodate cycle trailers to ensure they have the right space and means of securing.
- Q. We need to consider how the **neighbouring car parks** can have **better links** with Monnow Street. They feel divorced and now well signed or pedestrian friendly.
- A. Whilst not within the Monnow Street design area, the consultancy team and the County Council are aware of the need to communicate to town centre users the series of car parks accessed off Blestium Street, specifically Chippenham Car Park, Cornwall House and Monnow Street car parks. This could range from advanced and directional signage, pedestrian wayfinding and improved pedestrian links. This could be explored further within the Placemaking Plan process.
- Q. Is the **bus station** in the right location?
- A. There are no plans to change the location of the existing bus station. Wider access, movement and transportation challenges and opportunities would be addressed through the Placemaking Plan process.
- Q. How would you ensure **vehicles travel** through the street at the **legal speed limit** (proposed 20 mph)? Do we need additional control and management, outside of physical design features.
- B. The proposed design has the objective of slowing down vehicles through a reduced carriageway, use of courtesy crossings, planting and trees and other features. Changes in driver behaviour does take time, as other users adjust their use of the street. Some temporary Speed Indicator Signs (SIDs) could be introduced in the street that displays the exact speed of oncoming vehicles, along with a 'SLOW DOWN' message when they are travelling over the set speed limit. This will prompt drivers to correct and lower their speed.
- Q. What are we doing about the **vacant shops** in the town centre?

- A. The County Council is to be undertaking a vacant shop strategy over the coming months that will look to audit premises, engage with landlords/owners, encourage lettings and promote opportunities. A further update will follow on this piece of work.
- Q. We need to sort out the **bus stop in Agincourt Square**, specifically to make it accessible.
- A. This is not within the scope of the Monnow Street design project but will be raised with the County Council's public transport and highways teams.
- Q. Do we need to consider the extent of **visitor coach parking** along Blestium Street?
- A. There is existing provision for drop off and pick up on Blestium Street, with the Gateway to Monmouth suggesting some enhanced provision within the street. This would be addressed through this project and discussed as part of the town's Placemaking Plan.
- Q. Not within public ownership, but are there opportunities to improve how **Waitrose customers access onto Blestium Street**?
- A. This is an internal site matter for Waitrose, but the Council would be happy to facilitate a discussion.
- Q. How is the Council going to **future proof** the scheme in terms of impact and sustainability?
- A. Use baseline data that would be collected, benchmarking of outputs and outcomes would be undertaken which would look at indicators such as footfall, average dwell times, any modal shift patterns, air pollution measurements and other forms of monitoring.

Main Design Action Points

1. To organise a meeting with a local wheelchair user to understand current experiences within Monnow Street and consider how the proposed street design can respond in relation to pavement material, drainage channels, dropped kerbs and other design features.
2. To review proposed courtesy crossings in terms of frequency, specifically near to Salt and Pepper and Estero Lounge.
3. To consider provision for cycle trailers within cycle stand provision.
4. To extend design area to include a section of Blestium Street, in order to better announce Monnow Street to vehicles and provide enhanced crossings prior to the Robin Hood public house corner and to create a courtesy crossing to the toilet block island.
5. A number of items that are not within the physical design scope will be picked up through the County Council's Placemaking Plan process.

Chamber of Commerce Workshop

This workshop was held from 6pm to 8pm on Wednesday, 27th January in the Town Council Chamber Room at the Shire Hall, Agincourt Square.

It was co-hosted by Monmouthshire County Council and the Chamber of Commerce.

The meeting followed the same format as the previous evening's stakeholder workshop, with an open questions and answers session on the proposed design.

Feedback and Queries

Q. What is the height of the **planters**?

A. They will be low, constructed through the use of kerbs and low walling, with soil and associated planting contained within. The type of planting would be selected through detailed design.

Q. As **buses** exit Monnow Keep will they **overrun** the proposed **planting** on the corner?

A. The design has been checked, specifically the turning movement of a bus existing from this junction and they would not overrun this area. There would be a standard kerb height here to protect this corner.

Q. There is a need to maintain the **parking outside Car Care** at 91 Monnow Street as they assist customers with replacing windscreen wipers and providing additional car keys. Will these spaces be kept?

A. Yes. 2 no. spaces will be provided outside these businesses and for other immediate shops and services.

Q. The proposed **courtesy crossing** for pedestrians is in the wrong place at the **Robin Hood corner**. It needs to change so that it directly crosses to the toilet block. And why is the pavement so wide on this corner?

A. Our design scheme boundary was to the end of Monnow Street, but we could extend the scheme area into Blestium Street to accommodate the suggestion. By doing this we could look at having a courtesy crossing from the corner of the Robin Hood Public House to the public toilet block. We would also suggest that we formalise the dropped kerb crossing close to the cattle market car park and create a raised area between this crossing and the toilet block. The width of the pavement is to assist with creating the pedestrian crossing and to reduce vehicle speeds whilst approaching and manoeuvring around this corner. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.

Q. Is the **planting appropriate** for the street in terms of size, height, type of canopy and will it impede on visibility for pedestrians?

A. The type of planting would be appropriate to the street and would meet standards in terms of proximity to the carriageway (vehicle clearance), road safety standards (height of vegetation) and also resilience in terms of plant growth. A management and maintenance plan would be developed and adopted.

Q. Can the design existing **sewerage capacity** for businesses and uses within the street.

A. The detailed design process would involve co-ordination and notification of planned works with Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water. This advance notice would allow DC/WW to review the condition of existing private connections from businesses and whether these need to be upgraded or not during any wider construction works. The County Council is responsible for highway drains and gulleys.

Q. What is the order and **logic of the Gateway to Monmouth scheme** alongside the Cattle Market car park?

A. The scheme was designed in 2014/15 and if funding was available would be ready to proceed to detailed design, in addition to securing consents from Cadw, Natural Resources Wales and the local planning authority. Monnow Street has no approved design, which is why this design process has been undertaken. Elected members will consider prioritisation for implementation and securing funding as part of this design process.

Q. Why do we need **rainwater gardens**? What are their benefits and impacts?

A. Apart of amenity and visual benefits the use of rainwater garden as Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) meets The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. SUDs provide a solution with low environmental impact to drain away surface water run-off through collection, storage, and cleaning before allowing it to be released slowly back into the environment, such as into water courses. You will be aware that water does pond in the street and within pavements during heavy rainstorms, with rainwater gardens providing part of the solution to slow down water run off into nearby drainage systems. Case studies can be found here: <https://www.sudswales.com/region/south-east-wales/>

Q. What is the rationale for the **spill out space**?

A. The extended space is to firstly provide extended space for all users, whatever their needs. In places we been able to widen the pavements from the minimum standard to 2 metres and in some of the central areas up to 5 metres wide. Businesses that a have a trading license can also occupy some of this space to display goods, use of A boards and place tables and

chairs. New seating would allow people to sit within the space and enjoy the street atmosphere. Buskers and other street activity can also take place to add to the experience.

Q. How will the **loading bays be enforced?**

A. The design of the loading bays would be subject to detailed design, but the need to differentiate them compared to short stay spaces with different material, lining and kerb height needs to be considered. Clear signage would indicate the status of the loading bay, the time of operation and other conditions. The County Council's civil enforcement officers would police and enforce these when monitoring this street.

Q. Can the **loading bays become parking spaces after a certain time of the day?**

A. Yes, this could be considered when considering the traffic regulation order for the street, which could define the hours for loading/unloading, and outside of these hours for short stay parking.

Q. Is the **scheme adaptable?**

A. Whilst physical improvements will be made, the public realm elements can adapt to need whether this be for buskers, small events, outdoor use for businesses, etc. Where needed external power units can be provided to support public outdoor events.

Q. Why are there **two crossings in the middle** by the existing light-controlled crossing?

A. This is a key pedestrian nodal point within the street. As well as immediate connections across the street, it also has links to the wider area: e.g. Olway arcade to the west and rear car parks to the east through Howells Place. One of the crossings will be a lighted pedestrian crossing, the other a courtesy crossing.

Q. Can we provide short stay **parking by the One Stop/Post Office?**

A. The main constraint here has been the need to protect the visibility for vehicles exiting Nailor's Lane as well as the narrow pavement width. This has meant that parking cannot be provided on the Post Office side of the street. We can however remove the pocket of proposed landscaping on the opposite side which could provide 1 no. space for short stay or disabled users. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.

Q. Doesn't **Boots the Chemist** need a **loading bay** directly outside?

A. In consultation with the Manager at Boots, they are satisfied with the proposed loading provision which is either outside Superdrug or Coffi Lab.

Q. What is the **width of the proposed carriageway**?

A. It is 6.3 metres wide which will accommodate two large vehicles passing side by side.

Q. Could the **existing pavement be repaired or renewed**?

A. This design proposal intends to renew all of the existing paving with a new material as well as widening it throughout the street. If the proposed design was not approved, the County Council would need to take a separate decision on renewing the existing pavement.

Q. Can we look at a **seasonal approach** where some of the eating out areas become **short stay parking** during autumn and winter months?

A. Yes, this type of flexi-parking approach could be explored where the parking bay is designed to take tables and chairs, say from March/April to October, and during the interim months reverts to parking. Bollards could help manage this arrangement. This could provide an additional 4 no. spaces during these times. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.

Q. Can we get a sense of the **time taken to implement such a scheme**, and if it is significant, can the temporary measures be removed?

A. Subject to a decision taken on the proposed scheme, the County Council would need to estimate the time taken for detailed design development, procurement of the works and their implementation and come back to the town stakeholder groups. In terms of removing the temporary issues, it would need to understand the location of future on-street parking provision and remove these temporary in-fill areas that coincide, so that it avoids any abortive costs.

Q. What is the **timeline for these works** if approved?

A. This would need a more detailed assessment but for this scale of work, there would be a need for site surveys to understand ground conditions as well as the specific location of utilities, amongst other items. This information would assist the detailed design development that would create contract documents for procuring the civil engineering contractor. Working alongside this design development process, the Council would need to bring together the business case and funding applications for

the capital costs of the works. This package of work would take 12 to 18 months. An estimate on the implementation period would be approximately 12 months. Overall, the development and delivery on this type of street improvement works would take about 2 to 3 years.

- Q. Will cars be able to **park longitudinally when there is a cycle stand** outside WH Smiths? Will this impede the parking manoeuvre?
- A. The proposed on-street parking spaces will be designed so that they are 2m metres wide and 6 metres long (Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) 2002) which will allow for the driver to adequately park their vehicle, with the condition that neighbouring cars are parked correctly within their bay. All bays within the proposed scheme will be clearly marked out on the ground to improve efficiency. Disabled spaces will be larger. In response to the suggestion of removing the cycle stand near to WH Smiths, this can be removed and an additional on-street car parking space provided. The design will be changed to reflect this suggestion.
- Q. Is there a **risk of cyclists dismount** when bike is parked in the stand?
- A. Most cyclists tend to dismount and walk their bike into the cycle stand.

Main Design Action Points

1. To extend design area to include a section of Blestium Street, in order to better announce Monnow Street to vehicles and provide enhanced crossings prior to the Robin Hood public house corner and to create a courtesy crossing to the toilet block island.
2. To consider the traffic regulation orders for the loading bays to transfer to short stay parking outside specific hours.
3. To provide an additional disabled or short stay parking space opposite the One Stop/Post Office.
4. To develop the flexi-parking approach outside Pizza Express and Salt and Pepper that would provide approximately 4no. spaces.
5. To remove the proposed cycle stand outside WH Smiths and replace with a short stay parking space.

B. Consultation and Next Steps

At both meetings, attendees were informed of the consultation process and opportunities to comments as follows:

The Process and Opportunities



Next Steps

Once the consultation has been completed the following steps in the process will take place:

1. Prepare a report of consultation on all opportunities that have been provided for local residents, businesses and local organisations to participate in;
2. For the design team to respond to any suggested revisions to the proposed design;
3. Officers to prepare a report to the County Council's Cabinet on the design proposal and the outcome of the consultation.

Thanks

Finally, thank you for your participation and contribution to the process. If you need to find out more about the Monnow Street Design Project, please get in touch with us at MCCRegeneration@monmouthshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



monmouthshire
sir fynwy

Monnow Street Project – Report of Consultation Appendices

Workshop Notes

Leadership Academy – Monmouth Comprehensive School

Social Circles Group – Bridges Centre

March 2023

Monnow Street Design Proposal

Monmouth Comprehensive School

Leadership Academy Workshop

8-50am Wednesday, 8th March 2023

Purpose

The workshop was held with the school's Leadership Academy which comprised 25 young people from across the school Years 7-11. The lead Regeneration Officer for Monmouth supported by Chris Jones of the Roberts Limbrick design team who gave a short presentation on the background off the Monnow Street design proposal, before seeking their views on current experiences and the proposed design.

How Pupils Rate the Existing Monnow Street


The young people were asked to rate each of the six criteria by volunteering their own thoughts and experiences and by placing a sticky dot on a simple spider chart that had a rating of 0 to 5.

Getting Around

This scored 3.5 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- Busy but still easy to get around
- Lots of traffic
- Bloomin traffic!



- Easy walking
- Easy, lots of pathways but traffic
- Its accessible but lots of traffic and very busy
- Getting around is fluid and easy
- It gets quite narrow at the top
- Easy to walk but hard to drive through with traffic and cars parked
- Busy but easy to walk
- Busy with cars and people
- Traffic is busy
- Challenging for some people
- Its busy on weekends

- The large pots are obstacles
- Easy, alright, busy, traffic
- Traffic and busy
- Difficult mostly around 3pm to 4pm
- Bust but if its wasn't it would feel empty and very quiet
- Hard to get a parking space - need more parking
- Take out the car parks on the side of the street as this is what creates the traffic
- Not a lot of space to park
- Nice place but busy with cars
- Traffic – busy, accessible
- Busy with cars and people
- Easy
- Difficult, slow, hectic, often busy
- Easy to navigate

A Place to Meet

This scored 2 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- Happy to meet mates but gets boring easily
- Not enough seating in the town
- Not enough seating but easy to meet up
- Not many places to hang around with friends
- Bottom of town by the bridges is a good place to meet – good and easy

- Its safe to sit in the seating area
- I meet at friends house and walk in
- The arcade at the top end of town needs to go, otherwise perfect
- Easy to meet people
- Some of the seats ae ruined
- Need covered seating
- Not a lot of places to meet up with others
- Plenty of space to sit
- The benches should be in the middle of the pavement
- Chippie fields is a good place to meet – it's a half-way point





Figure 1 - How Pupils Rate the Existing Monnow Street



Page 342


Source: Leadership Academy Monmouth Comprehensive School

Diversity and Quality of Shops, Eating, Uses

This scored 2.7 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- Rather Hereford because there are more shops
- Very good because there is lots of choice for food
- No good shops – costa, Superdrug and Greggs are good
- Not many good shops to go into
- Chip shops are great
- Good variety of shops and cafes to choose from
- Arcade shouldn't be there
- Nothing to do
- Bit boring now
- Lots of food, pubs, cafes but no clothing shops or things to do
- Lots of variety from shops also a Greggs
- No clothes shops or quick food
- It has everything you need – coffee shops, spoons and chip shops
- Get loads of coffee shops
- Lots of cafes but no decent clothes shop now Peacocks has gone
- More clothes shops
- The shops are nice though the street are covered in litter
- Not a lot of different shops – not a variation



- Should have a Primark
- Quite boring
- Not bad places to go to
- Not a lot of cafes
- Too many supermarkets
- Not a lot of places to eat such as restaurants
- Like adventure shop
- Hardly any clothes shops
- More fast food
- Its too expensive
- Missing clothes for young people
- We need nice places to go to eat
- No clothes shops

- Could be more clothes shops
- No clothes shops
- More fast food
- There's no good shops – most don't have a big selection
- Diverse, covers all basic needs
- Plenty of eating out opportunities
- More leisure shopping
- Lack of a tourist attraction for young people
- No clothes shops but does the town need it?
- Food is very good in terms of diversity and quality
- Food is diverse
- More clothing shops
- Realistically there is nothing in Monmouth – some core shops are needed like Primark, Subway, Starbucks, but we need better quality cafes
- More stuff is needed
- I am not a big shopper so not that engaged but lots of food choices

A Safe Place

This scored 3.1 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- Lot of cars
- Sense there is no police
- Suss alleyways

- We need more CCTV
- We need a graffiti wall

Do You Like Spending Time Here?

This scored 2.4 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- It's a bit boring
- Prefer it in Usk where I live
- Tend to visit Hereford and Abergavenny more

A Nice Environment

This scored 3.7 out of 5.

These are the comments from the young people:

- More flowers
- More greenery
- Planters were put in a rush
- Litter
- Damaged pavements
- Need bins near Fish and Chip bar

How Pupils Rate the Proposed Street Design

The proposed street design was shared in the form a large plan with the lead Regeneration officer for Monmouth supported by Chris Jones of the Roberts Limbrick design team indicating the main design principles. Copies of the feedback survey were handed out, completed and returned.

Social Circles Group**Bridges Centre****Monmouth**

10-30am, Tuesday 7th March 2023

Workshop Note

A discussion was held with approximately 20 members of the Social Circles group held at the Bridges Centre in Monmouth. The group was a mix of volunteers and members of the group.

The lead Regeneration officer for Monmouth supported by Chris Jones of the Roberts Limbrick design team shared with the group the exhibition panels for the Monnow Street design with a number of questions raised during the session.

- Q. On Monday this week, two lorries were unloading on opposite sides of the road, slightly apart but caused absolute chaos.
- A. The design proposes an additional 4 no. loading bays in the street, providing a total of 6 which will take the majority of delivery vehicles off the carriageway. The design has been checked and will accommodate two large lorries passing side by side with a 6.3 metres carriageway proposed.

Q. The existing gullies in the footways are a trip hazard when your balance is not as good as it was.

A. If the design was approved these gullies would be removed and flat surfaced slot drains would be used across the scheme that would provide a minimised trip hazard and more of a comfortable journey for people in wheelchairs and for those using prams and walkers.

Q. Jay walking is a problem in the road.

A. The proposed design would introduce additional courtesy crossings with zebra crossing (no Belisha beacons) up the street to direct people to crossing points as well as the retention of the light controlled crossing.

Q. Parking for disabled.

A. 6 disabled spaces are to be provided at locations to be agreed. Discussion about whether these need to be on the edges, in the middle and close to places such as pharmacies, the hearing centre and the doctors surgery needs further development.

Q. Trip-hazards

A. The design is aiming to declutter and remove trip-hazards across the existing street such as additional posts, signage, street cabinets, and other items.

Q. Pots on pavements

A. These are to be removed as they were temporary features during the pandemic period. Further updates to follow.

Q. Seating

A. Additional seating that will be accessible to all will either be integrated into walling and landscaping or freestanding at key places down the street.

Q. Don't want trees, we want parking, pavements are disgusting – trees should be alongside the river.

A. The proposed trees bring amenity value to the street, in addition to absorbing water during heavy rainfall, thereby reducing pooling of water in the footways. Trees also provide shade from the sun. The pavements will be replaced with a new material with an opportunity to improve the levels, where we can.

Q. The top of town is blocked where it is too narrow (the pinch point)

A. This is not within the scheme area covers but it is being considered specifically a courtesy arrangement for priority cars and whether the junction with Agincourt Street needs a hatched box to prevent vehicles blocking the right hand turn from Monnow Street.

Q. Top of town is narrow and dangerous.

A. See above response.

The proposed street design was shared in the form of exhibition panels with the lead Regeneration Officer for Monmouth supported by Chris Jones of Roberts Limbri.ck design team indicating the main design principles.

Copies of the feedback survey were handed out, and those that were completed were collected the following day and entered online.



Integrated Impact Assessment document

(incorporating Equalities, Future Generations, Welsh Language and Socio Economic Duty)

Page 347

<p>Name of the Officer completing the evaluation Daniel Fordham</p> <p>Phone no: 07984 024489 E-mail: danielfordham@monmouthshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal</p> <p>To consider proposed public realm improvements to Monnow Street, Monmouth. The project objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the quality of the environment for people walking and accessing Monnow Street • Accommodating cycling through the street • Maintaining a two-way street for vehicles • Accommodating loading/unloading • Provision for disabled parking • Consideration of on-street short stay parking
<p>Name of Service area</p> <p>Placemaking, Regeneration, Highways and Flooding</p>	<p>Date</p> <p>28 March 2023</p>

1. **Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below.

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Age	<p>Movement around Monnow Street is currently difficult to navigate for some users. Footway surfaces are uneven and cluttered with street furniture and there are relatively few crossing points. The proposed scheme will address these issues.</p>	None.	<p>It is proposed that the emerging Pavement Café Policy will identify areas of Monnow Street where seating areas will be permitted and parameters for ensuring clear walkways, minimising issues with obstructions. Conversely, such spaces provide the benefit of sitting and resting spaces.</p> <p>The recently introduced 20mph speed limit makes the street safer for all pedestrians to cross the road.</p> <p>Analysis of survey results showed significantly more support for the proposals among younger age groups, with least support from 36-45 year olds, albeit some sample sizes were small.</p>

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Disability	<p>Movement around Monnow Street is currently difficult to navigate for some users, including some disabled people. Footway surfaces are uneven and cluttered with street furniture and there are relatively few crossing points. The proposed scheme will address these issues. A consistent approach to tactile paving to indicate crossing points or hazards will be adopted, which is beneficial for blind or partially sighted users.</p>	None.	<p>Consultation and engagement included site visits with blind people and wheelchair users.</p> <p>It is proposed that the emerging Pavement Café Policy will identify areas of Monnow Street where seating areas will be permitted and parameters for ensuring clear walkways, minimising issues with obstructions. Conversely, such spaces provide the benefit of sitting and resting spaces.</p> <p>The recently introduced 20mph speed limit makes the street safer for all pedestrians to cross the road.</p> <p>Subject to ground investigation surveys, the proposals will address the steep camber of the highway which currently results in pavements at different angles.</p>
Gender reassignment	None	None	N/A
Marriage or civil partnership	None	None	N/A

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Pregnancy or maternity	Movement around Monnow Street is currently difficult to navigate for some users, which may include some pregnant women or people with young children. Footway surfaces are uneven and cluttered with street furniture and there are relatively few crossing points. The proposed scheme will address these issues.	None	<p>It is proposed that the emerging Pavement Café Policy will identify areas of Monnow Street where seating areas will be permitted and parameters for ensuring clear walkways, minimising issues with obstructions. Conversely, such spaces provide the benefit of sitting, resting and feeding spaces.</p> <p>The recently introduced 20mph speed limit makes the street safer for all pedestrians to cross the road.</p>
Race	None	None	N/A
Religion or Belief	None	None	N/A
Sex	None	None	Analysis of survey results showed no significant difference of opinion by gender.
Sexual Orientation	None	None	N/A

2. The Socio-economic Duty and Social Justice

The Socio-economic Duty requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to reduce inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage when taking key decisions. This duty aligns with our commitment as an authority to Social Justice.

	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has in respect of people suffering socio economic disadvantage	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has in respect of people suffering socio economic disadvantage.	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Socio-economic Duty and Social Justice	Research by Living Streets published in 2018 finds that: “Public realm improvements which support walking have a role to play in increasing inclusion and reducing inequality. A third of households do not have access to a car in the UK, rising to two thirds for the poorest households.”	None	None

3. Policy making and the Welsh language.

How does your proposal impact on the following aspects of the Council's Welsh Language Standards:	Describe the positive impacts of this proposal	Describe the negative impacts of this proposal	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts
<p>Policy Making</p> <p>Effects on the use of the Welsh language,</p> <p>Promoting Welsh language</p> <p>Treating the Welsh language no less favourably</p>	<p>All new highway signs and carriageway markings will be bilingual with Welsh appearing before English as per current guidance. Any interpretational materials also will also be bilingual with Welsh appearing first.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Operational</p> <p>Recruitment & Training of workforce</p>	<p>None – there are no recruitment implications arising from this proposal</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Service delivery</p> <p>Use of Welsh language in service delivery</p> <p>Promoting use of the language</p>	<p>All new highway signs and carriageway markings will be bilingual with Welsh appearing before English as per current guidance. Any interpretational materials also will also be bilingual with Welsh appearing first. Consultation documents have been produced bilingually.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



4. Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below? Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal. There's no need to put something in every box if it is not relevant!




Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
A prosperous Wales Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs	Yes. Evidence suggests that investment in high quality public realm which encourages active travel modes, as proposed here, delivers economic benefits. See section 3 of main report.	N/A
A resilient Wales Maintain and enhance biodiversity and land, river and coastal ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g. climate change)	Yes. The proposal includes green infrastructure measures which will enhance biodiversity, and will include sustainable urban drainage measures which mitigate the impact of heavy rainfall.	Detailed specification of GI and SUDs at detailed design stage. Careful consideration will need to be given to management and maintenance of the rainwater gardens.
A healthier Wales People's physical and mental wellbeing is maximized and health impacts are understood	Yes. The proposal includes active travel measures which encourage walking and cycling, including an enhanced pedestrian environment and additional cycle storage.	N/A
A Wales of cohesive communities Communities are attractive, viable, safe and well connected	Yes. The proposal if implemented will create a more attractive and welcoming environment in Monmouth town centre which is accessible to all parts of the community.	Other projects are proposed, and grant funding available, to support town centre regeneration and vitality. The public realm proposals will contribute to this but will not in themselves solve all of the town's challenges.
A globally responsible Wales Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic and environmental wellbeing	Yes. The proposal is designed to encourage use of active travel modes and to reduce car reliance and consequent negative environmental impacts.	N/A
A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language Culture, heritage and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art and recreation	Yes. All streets signs, highway markings and interpretational material will be in Welsh and English.	The consultation documents were provided bilingually.

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<p>A more equal Wales People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances</p>	<p>Yes. Research by Living Streets published in 2018 finds that:</p> <p>“Public realm improvements which support walking have a role to play in increasing inclusion and reducing inequality. A third of households do not have access to a car in the UK, rising to two thirds for the poorest households.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

5. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?

Page 354

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Long Term Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future</p>	<p>Yes. The proposal if implemented will remain in place for many years, and has been designed with longevity and adaptability in mind. The rainwater gardens would ensure SAB compliance and help future proof the project in terms of climate change as well as ensuring biodiversity enhancement. The proposals build in measures to encourage modal shift in accordance with Llwybr Newydd.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
 <p>Collaboration Working together with other partners to deliver objectives</p>	<p>Yes. The proposal is the result of an extensive consultation and engagement process which included a wide range of stakeholders. The development of the forthcoming Monmouth Placemaking Plan, to be produced in collaboration with Monmouth Town Council, will build on this work.</p>	<p>The public realm improvements form one of a number of town regeneration proposals which collectively will support the vitality and viability of Monmouth as a key market town serving a large hinterland and visitor economy.</p>

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Involvement</p> <p>Involving those with an interest and seeking their views</p>	<p>Yes. The proposal is the result of an extensive consultation and engagement process which included a wide range of stakeholders. The development of the forthcoming Monmouth Placemaking Plan, to be produced in collaboration with Monmouth Town Council, will build on this work.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
 <p>Prevention</p> <p>Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse</p>	<p>Yes. The public realm in Monnow Street is tired and deteriorating. The proposal will prevent this from getting worse. There are also concerns about the economic fragility of Monmouth town centre. Evidence shows that investment of the type proposed here can bring economic benefits for high streets and town centre. The rainwater gardens would ensure SAB compliance and help future proof the project in terms of climate change as well as ensuring biodiversity enhancement. The proposals build in measures to encourage modal shift in accordance with Llwybr Newydd.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
 <p>Integration</p> <p>Considering impact on all wellbeing goals together and on other bodies</p>	<p>Yes. The proposal will have a positive impact on physical and mental wellbeing by creating a pleasant and safe environment for people on foot or cycle which encourages people to visit and spend more time in Monnow Street, benefiting communities, visitors and local businesses.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

6. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions has on the following important responsibilities: Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect any of these responsibilities?

	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has	What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Safeguarding	N/A	N/A	N/A
Corporate Parenting	N/A	N/A	N/A

7. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?

The main report sets out evidence and data which has informed the development of the proposal, including:

- Consultation evidence from Weltag stages 1, 2 and 3
- Data and evidence in relation to traffic impacts, active travel, economic impacts etc as cited in the Weltag 1 and 2 reports and in the main report

8. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?

The main impacts of the proposal identified in this impact assessment are:

- Positive impacts on the protected characteristics of age, disability, and pregnancy/maternity arising from the proposed improvements to the public realm in Monnow Street
- Positive impacts in relation to socio-economic duty and social justice relating to the role public realm improvements which support walking can play in increasing inclusion and reducing inequality.
- Positive impacts on all the well-being goals.

- The development of the proposal meets the sustainable development principles.
- No impact on safeguarding or corporate parenting.

9. ACTIONS: As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.

What are you going to do	When are you going to do it?	Who is responsible
Seek a decision from Cabinet on the proposal	Following feedback from Place Scrutiny Committee – 3 rd May Cabinet	Daniel Fordham, Regeneration Manager.

Page 357

10. VERSION CONTROL: The Equality and Future Generations Evaluation should be used at the earliest stage, such as informally within your service, and then further developed throughout the decision making process. It is important to keep a record of this process to demonstrate how you have considered and built in equality and future generations considerations wherever possible.

Version No.	Decision making stage	Date considered	Brief description of any amendments made following consideration
1	Place Scrutiny Committee	28/03/2023	Draft discussed with Mark Hand and Claire Sullivan

This page is intentionally left blank

Monmouthshire's Scrutiny Forward Work Programme 2023-24

Place Scrutiny Committee				
Meeting Date	Subject	Purpose of Scrutiny	Responsibility	Type of Scrutiny
19 th April 2023 2pm	Petition: Single Use Plastic Bags	To agree whether to refer to the Executive or full Council for action.	Catrin Maby	Receipt of Petitions
	Public Spaces Protection Order for Dog Controls	For members to inform how to proceed with the next stage of the draft PSPO.	Huw Owen Paul Griffiths	Policy Development
	Monnow Street Design	To scrutinise the proposed design for Monnow Street following community engagement and consultation.	Daniel Fordham Claire Sullivan Paul Griffiths / Catrin Maby	Pre-decision Scrutiny
25 th May 2023	Public Spaces Protection Order for Dog Controls	To scrutinise the latest report before going out to public consultation.	Huw Owen	Policy Development
	Transforming Towns Strategic Grant Regeneration priorities	To scrutinise the priority projects for bids for WG Strategic grant funding to 24/25.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Policy Development
	Transforming Chepstow Masterplan	To scrutinise the Transforming Chepstow Masterplan to inform future regeneration priorities and grant bids.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Policy Development
6 th July 2023	Economic Development Strategy	To scrutinise the Monmouthshire Business Growth & Enterprise Strategy and action plan in setting the economic ambition for the county.	Hannah Jones James Woodcock	Pre-decision Scrutiny

Monmouthshire's Scrutiny Forward Work Programme 2023-24

Place Scrutiny Committee				
Meeting Date	Subject	Purpose of Scrutiny	Responsibility	Type of Scrutiny
	Local Transport Policy	To scrutinise the Local Transport Plan.	Deb Hill Howells Catrin Maby	Pre-decision Scrutiny
	Replacement Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy	To scrutinise the RLDP Preferred Strategy, including any proposed changes arising from the public consultation.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Pre-decision Scrutiny
28th September 2023	Road Safety Strategy	To scrutinise the Road Safety Strategy.	Mark Hand Catrin Maby	Pre-decision Scrutiny
	Pavement Café Policy	To scrutinise the pavement café policy as the basis for making decisions on applications for licences.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Policy Development
9th November 2023	Local Flood Strategy *To be confirmed*	Pre-decision scrutiny of adoption of the Local Flood Strategy. Update on Section 19 flooding investigation reports.	Mark Hand Catrin Maby	Pre-decision Scrutiny
	Destination management Plan *To be confirmed*	To conduct pre-decision scrutiny.	Matthew Lewis	Pre-decision Scrutiny
14th December 2023	Monmouth Placemaking Plan	To conduct pre-decision scrutiny.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Pre-decision Scrutiny

Monmouthshire's Scrutiny Forward Work Programme 2023-24

Place Scrutiny Committee				
Meeting Date	Subject	Purpose of Scrutiny	Responsibility	Type of Scrutiny
	Magor Placemaking Plan	To conduct pre-decision scrutiny.	Mark Hand Paul Griffiths	Pre-decision Scrutiny
1st February 2024	Scrutiny of the Budget Proposals	Scrutiny of the budget mandates relating to the committee's remit.	Peter Davies Jonathon Davies Councillor Garrick	Budget Scrutiny
14th March 2024				
10th April 2024				
To be confirmed	<u>Workshop :</u> Replacement Local Development Plan 2018-2033	To brief members on the Replacement Local Development Plan 2018-2033 and discuss next steps.	Mark Hand Craig O'Connor Rachel Lewis	Scrutiny Workshop
To be confirmed	Monlife Heritage Strategy		Tracey Thomas	
To be confirmed	Active Travel Plans	Across Highways and MonLife		

This page is intentionally left blank

Place Scrutiny Committee

Action List

2nd February 2023

Minute Item:	Subject	Officer / Member	Outcome
4	Doublecheck flytipping data to see if there has been a large increase, and notify the committee	Carl Touhig	Response sent to members.
4	To provide the committee with a figure of the 'return on investment' of capital investment in pool covers and HVAC changes	Ian Saunders	
4	To explain to the committee whether a benchmark is being applied for measuring return on investment for capital investments	Jonathan Davies	
4	Confirm to the committee that with a council tax increase of 6%, it is the case that a single parent with two dependent children will be £784 worse off next year, and a two parent family will be £1200 worse off	Rachel Garrick	
4	Provide the committee with the number of registrations each year for Grassroots	Frances O'Brien	
4	To provide the committee with a breakdown of charges and concessions related to Grassroots	Frances O'Brien	

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee / Decision Maker	Meeting date / Decision due	Report Title	Responsible Cabinet Member	Purpose	Author	Date item added to the planner
Council	01-Jul-25	RLDP for Adoption	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the RLDP following receipt of the Inspector's report, making it the County's Development Plan as defined by S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	23-Aug-22
Council	01-Sep-24	RLDP submission for examination	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To endorse the submission of the Deposit RLDP to the Welsh Government for examination by an independent Inspector. By agreeing, Council will be saying it wants this document to be the adopted RLDP for Monmouthshire.	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	23-Aug-22
Council	18-Apr-24	RLDP Deposit Plan endorsement for consultation	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To endorse the Deposit RLDP for public consultation and engagement.	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	5-Jan-23
ICMD	17-Apr-24	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 4 held on 7th March 2024	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Dave Jarrett	30-Mar-23
Cabinet	10-Apr-24	Adoption of Abergavenny Placemaking Plan	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the Abergavenny Placemaking Plan, co-produced with Abergavenny Town Council, to inform future regeneration priorities and grant bids	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	3-Oct-22
Cabinet	18-Jan-24	Adoption of Magor Placemaking Plan	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the Magor with Undy Placemaking Plan, co-produced with Magor with Undy Town Council, to inform future regeneration priorities and grant bids	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	3-Oct-22
Cabinet	18-Jan-24	Adoption of Monmouth Placemaking Plan	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the Monmouth Placemaking Plan, co-produced with Monmouth Town Council, to inform future regeneration priorities and grant bids	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	3-Oct-22
Cabinet	18-Jan-24	2022/23 Revenue and Capital Monitoring - Month 9			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Cabinet	10-Jan-24	Monmouthshire Destination Management Plan			Matthew Lewis	10-Feb-22
ICMD	03-Jan-24	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 3 held on 7th December 2023	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Dave Jarrett	30-Mar-23

Cabinet	13-Dec-23	Local Flood Strategy	Catrin Maby	To adopt the Local Flood Strategy Plan	Mark Hand / Ross Price	4-Oct-22
Cabinet	08-Nov-23	Pavement Café Policy	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the pavement café policy as the basis for making decisions on applications for licences	Mark Hand / Paul Keeble	4-Oct-22
Cabinet	08-Nov-23	Road Safety Strategy	Catrin Maby	To adopt the Road Safety Strategy	Mark Hand / Paul Keeble	4-Oct-22
Council	26-Oct-23	Appointment of Monmouthshire Local Access Forum		To secure the appointment of members to the Monmouthshire Local Access Forum for its next 3 year period.	Matthew Lewis	18-Jan-23
ICMD	25-Oct-23	LDP Annual Monitoring Report	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To endorse the LDP Annual Monitoring Report for submission to WG	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	16-Jan-23
ICMD	25-Oct-23	Planning Annual Performance Report	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To endorse the Planning Department Annual Performance Report for submission to WG	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	16-Jan-23
Council	23-Oct-23	Appointment of Monmouthshire Local Access Forum		To secure the appointment of members to the Monmouthshire Local Access Forum for its next 3 year period.	Matthew Lewis	18-Jan-23
ICMD	11-Oct-23	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 2 held on 14th September 2023	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Dave Jarrett	30-Mar-23
Cabinet	06-Sep-23	Proposal to establish a Welsh medium seedling school in Monmouth		Cabinet to consider objection report and make final determination on how to proceed.	Debbie Graves	27-Mar-23
ICMD	02-Aug-23	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 1 held on 22nd June 2023	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Dave Jarrett	
Cabinet	27-Jul-23	Adoption of Transforming Chepstow Masterplan	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To adopt the Transforming Chepstow Masterplan, co-produced with Chepstow Town Council, to inform future regeneration priorities and grant bids	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	3-Oct-22

Cabinet	27-Jul-23	The Review of Respite Services For People With Learning Disabilities			Ceri York	14-Mar-23
Council	20-Jul-23	Economic Development Strategy		REFRESHING THE MONMOUTHSHIRE BUSINESS GROWTH & ENTERPRISE STRATEGY and action plan in setting the economic ambition for the county and providing a strategic framework that guides future economic	Hannah Jones	9-Jan-23
Council	20-Jul-23	RLDP Preferred Strategy consultation report	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To endorse the RLDP Preferred Strategy including any proposed changes arising from the public consultation.	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	3-Oct-22
ICMD	12-Jul-23	transfer the school balances for both Deri View and King Henry VIII School to the new King Henry VIII 3 – 19 School.	Rachel Garrick - Resources	Both King Henry VIII School and Deri View Primary school are closing on 31 st August 2023 and the new King Henry VIII 3 – 19 School will open on 1 st September 2023, under a statutory closure of schools the financial balances transfer to the Local Authority,	Nikki Wellington	4-Apr-23
ICMD	12-Jul-23	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 11	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order - parking/waiting restrictions at Justins Hill and Wyesham Avenue, Wyesham; Main Road and Castle Way, Portskewett; Loading Restriction, DYLS	Mark Hand	28-Mar-23
Cabinet	05-Jul-23	The Review of My Day My Life			Ceri York	14-Mar-23
ICMD	28-Jun-23	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 10	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order - Exception Orders to identify those restricted roads that will remain 30mph in September 2023 instead of defaulting to 20mph	Mark Hand	3-Oct-22
Council	22-Jun-23	Standards Committee Annual Report		This report is the first annual report from the Standards Committee to Council as required by the change in law set out in the Local Government and Elections Act 2021. It has to report on the discharge of the Committee's	Matt Phillips	10-Oct-22
Council	22-Jun-23	Gwent Public Services Board Well-being plan		To approve the Public Services Board's Well-being Plan that sets out the steps being taken collaboratively by public services to improve wellbeing in Gwent ahead of approval by the Gwent Public Services Board.	Richard Jones	20-Jan-23
Council	22-Jun-23	Chief Officer Children and Young People's Report 2023			Will McLean	14-Feb-23
Cabinet	07-Jun-23	2022/23 Revenue and Capital Monitoring - Month 12			Jon Davies	

Cabinet	07-Jun-23	Local Transport Plan	Catrin Maby	To adopt the Local Transport Plan	Debra Hill-Howells / Christian Schmidt	4-Oct-22
Cabinet	07-Jun-23	Transforming Towns Strategic Grant regeneration priorities and LUF3 bid	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To agree the priority projects for bids for WG Strategic grant funding to 24/25 and the submission for round 3 of Levelling Up Funding	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	3-Oct-22
Cabinet	07-Jun-23	RESERVATION OF GRAVE PLOTS IN LLANFOIST CEMETERY		To seek cabinet approval to cease the provision of reserving grave spaces (not incl cremated remains plots) in Llanfoist Cemetery	Rhian Jackson	7-Nov-22
Cabinet	07-Jun-23	Respite Opportunities for People with Learning Disabilities	Tudor Thomas - Social Care & Safeguarding	To provide an overview of the Review of Respite Services for people with learning disabilities and seek approval for implementation of the report's recommendations	Ceri York	9-Dec-22
Cabinet	07-Jun-23	Proposal to establish a Welsh medium seedling school in Monmouth		Cabinet to consider the results of the consultation, recommendations and decide whether to publish statutory notices.	Debbie Graves	27-Mar-23
Council	18-May-23	Political Balance Report		The Council is required to review at, or as soon as practicable after, the Council's annual meeting, the representation of different political groups on the bodies to which the Council makes appointments.	Matt Phillips	2-Feb-23
Council	18-May-23	Outside Bodies Report		To appoint representatives to serve on outside	Matt Phillips	2-Feb-23
Council	18-May-23	Appointments to Committees		To appoint committees together with their membership and terms of reference in accordance with the Council's Constitution.	Nicola Perry	2-Feb-23
Council	18-May-23	Constitution update		For the Monitoring Officer to bring proposed amendments and highlight changes made over the previous 12 months	Matt Phillips	2-Feb-23
Council	18-May-23	Corporate Parenting Strategy			Diane Corrister	24-Aug-22
ICMD	10-May-23	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 9	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order - including Llantrisant 20mph village lane, 40mph through road, possibly Llantrisant (Usk to Wentwood) 50mph; 20mph Gilwern and surrounding villages	Mark Hand	3-Oct-22

Cabinet	03-May-23	Monnow Street public realm improvements	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To agree how we proceed with proposals for Monnow Street public realm following consultation	Mark Hand / Dan Fordham	6-Mar-23
Cabinet	03-May-23	Socially Responsible Procurement Strategy	Rachel Garrick - Resources	To endorse the Socially Responsible Procurement Strategy	Scott James	22-Aug-22
Council	20-Apr-23	Motion for the Rivers and Oceans update		Deferred - new date to be advised	Hazel Clatworthy	10-Jan-23
Council	20-Apr-23	Community and Corporate Plan		To seek approval of a new Community and Corporate Plan that sets the direction for the council and county of Monmouthshire, articulating the authority's purpose and priorities alongside the steps we will take to deliver these, the	Matt Gatehouse	6-Feb-23
ICMD	12-Apr-23	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 4 held on 9th March 2023	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Dave Jarrett	
Cabinet	05-Apr-23	Rapid Rehousing Transition Plan	Sara Burch - Inclusive and Active Communities	To agree a plan to transition the delivery of homelessness that minimises the use of and the time homeless applicants spend in temporary accommodation	Rebecca Cresswell / Ian Bakewell	24-Jan-23
ICMD	22-Mar-23	Non Domestic Rates application for Hardship Relief - RESTRICTED	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Ruth Donovan	
ICMD	22-Mar-23	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 8	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order - including Monmouth Road, Raglan no right turn onto A40; resi permit parking at Exmouth Place, Chepstow and Ross Road, Abergavenny; 3T weight restriction on Old Wye Bridge Chepstow; waiting	Mark Hand	
Council	09-Mar-23	Pay Policy		To approve the publication of Monmouthshire County Council's Pay Policy, in compliance with the Localism Act."	Sally Thomas	1-Feb-23
Council	09-Mar-23	Council Tax Premiums			Peter Davies	18-Jan-23
Council	09-Mar-23	Capital Strategy & Treasury Strategy			Jon Davies	17-May-22

Council	09-Mar-23	Youth Council			Jade Atkins	7-Dec-22
ICMD	08-Mar-23	Proposed amendment to primary school catchment area – Llandenny Village	Martyn Groucutt - Education		Debbie Graves	10-Jan-23
ICMD	08-Mar-23	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 8 DEFERRED TO 22 MARCH	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order - including Monmouth Road, Raglan no right turn onto A40; resi permit parking at Exmouth Place, Chepstow and Ross Road, Abergavenny; 3T weight restriction on Old Wye Bridge Chepstow; waiting	Mark Hand	
Council	02-Mar-23	Final Budget Sign Off including Council Tax Resolution			Jon Davies	
Cabinet	01-Mar-23	2023/4 Final Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Cabinet	01-Mar-23	2023/4 WCF/Trust Treasury Fund Investments			Dave Jarrett	17-May-22
Cabinet	01-Mar-23	Month 9 budget monitoring report			Jon Davies	6-Feb-23
Cabinet	01-Mar-23	Monmouthshire ECO Flex 'Joint Statement of Intent' and Memorandum of Understanding"			Steve Griffiths	16-Nov-22
Cabinet	01-Feb-23	Tudor Street				9-Jan-23
ICMD	25-Jan-23	Highway Traffic Regulation Amendment Order No 7	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order	Mark Hand	15-Dec-22
ICMD	25-Jan-23	Community Council and Police Precepts - final	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Jon Davies	17-May-22

Council	19-Jan-23	To determine the name for the new 3-19 School in Abergavenny		To determine the name for the new 3-19 School in Abergavenny	Cath Saunders	28-Nov-22
Council	19-Jan-23	Council Diary		To confirm the Council Diary 23/24	John Pearson	14-Dec-22
Council	19-Jan-23	Appointments		A report for Council to appoint or ratify a number of appointments to bodies and positions	Matt Phillips	
Council	19-Jan-23	Community and Corporate Plan				
Council	19-Jan-23	Tudor Road Call-In			Nicola Perry	3-Jan-23
Council	19-Jan-23	Council Tax Reduction Scheme			Ruth Donovan	31-May-22
Cabinet	18-Jan-23	Garden Waste			Carl Touhig	21-Dec-22
Cabinet	18-Jan-23	Draft Revenue & Capital Proposals			Jon Davies	
Cabinet	18-Jan-23	Council Tax Premiums Consultation - Long Term Empty Properties and Second Homes			Ruth Donovan	
Cabinet	18-Jan-23	Proposal to establish a Welsh Medium Seedling school in Monmouth		To seek cabinet approval to commence statutory consultation processes to establish a Welsh Medium seedling provision in Monmouth.	Debbie Graves	23-Sep-22
ICMD	11-Jan-23	Clydach Ironworks Enhancement	Sara Burch - Inclusive and Active Communities	To seek approval for the transfer of land associated with the Clydach Ironworks Enhancement Scheme	Matthew Lewis	8-Dec-23

ICMD	11-Jan-23	Welsh Church Fund Working Group			Dave Jarrett	17-May-22
ICMD	14-Dec-22	Council Tax Base report			Ruth Donovan	31-May-22
ICMD	14-Dec-22	2023/4 Community Council & Police Precepts - draft			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Cabinet	07-Dec-22	Regional Integration Fund		To consider the financial liabilities and implications of the Regional Integration Fund and	Jane Rodgers	21-Nov-22
Cabinet	07-Dec-22	National Adoption Services and Foster Wales Joint Committee			Jane Rodgers	9-Nov-22
Cabinet	07-Dec-22	2022/23 Revenue and Capital Monitoring report - Month 6			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Council	01-Dec-22	Corporate Safeguarding Policy.		For Council to endorse the revised Corporate Safeguarding Policy.	Jane Rodgers	10-Nov-22
Council	01-Dec-22	Governance & Audit Committee Annual Report 2021/22			Andrew Wathan	18-Oct-22
Council	01-Dec-22	RLDP Preferred Strategy	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy	To seek Council endorsement of the new Preferred Strategy for eight week consultation	Mark Hand / Rachel Lewis	25-Jul-22
ICMD	30-Nov-22	TUDOR STREET		to seek a decision regarding the Council's forward use of the property located in Tudor Street ahead of the outcome of the consultation of Mr Dan Muffin	Jane Rodgers	14-Nov-22
ICMD	30-Nov-22	Govilon Section 106 Funding for Recreation & Play	Rachel Garrick - Resources		Mike Moran	8-Nov-22
ICMD	30-Nov-22	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 5	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment		Mark Hand	3-Oct-22
ICMD	30-Nov-22	Planning Annual Performance Report (APR) Deferred to 30-Nov-22	Paul Griffiths - Sustainable Economy		Mark Hand Phil Thomas	3-Oct-22
ICMD	30-Nov-22	Highways Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 6	Catrin Maby - Climate Change and Environment	Agreement to make the traffic order	Mark Hand	23-Aug-22
Cabinet	09-Nov-22	Implementing Sharepoint online		To secure funding to implement the project	Sian Hayward	13-Oct-22
Cabinet	09-Nov-22	A County of Sanctuary		To set out the reasons why an earlier decision is required due to time restrictions associated with TAN 15.	Matt Gatehouse	20-Sep-22
Cabinet	09-Nov-22	SPF Update Report			Hannah Jones	12-Sep-22
Cabinet	09-Nov-22	Revenue & Capital MTFP update and process			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Cabinet	09-Nov-22	MonLife Heritage Strategy (or ICMD)		DEFERRED	Matthew Lewis	10-Feb-22

Council	27-Oct-22	RESPONSE TO URGENT NEED FOR HOUSING ACCOMMODATION		To present a proposal to enable Council to respond flexibly and promptly to the urgent need for housing accommodation to address the	Cath Fallon	10-Oct-22
Council	27-Oct-22	Community and Corporate Plan		To seek endorsement of the new Community and Corporate Plan setting out the purpose, values	Matt Gatehouse / Paul Matthews	3-Oct-22
Council	27-Oct-22	Outside Bodies Appointment			John Pearson	3-Oct-22
Council	27-Oct-22	Annual Safeguarding Report			Kelly Turner	24-Aug-22
Council	27-Oct-22	Social Care & Health: Directors Report 2021/22			Jane Rodgers	6-Jul-22
ICMD	26-Oct-22	Welsh Church Fund Working Group			Dave Jarrett	14/7/22
Cabinet	19-Oct-22	PSOW annual letter		Present the Public Services Ombudsman For Wales' annual report as required by the letter	Matt Phillips	28-Sep-22
Cabinet	19-Oct-22	Regional Partnership Board - Gwent Market Position Statement		To provide a Market Stability Report produced by the Regional Partnership Board setting out a high	Phil Diamond Head of Regional Partnership Team	22-Sep-22
Cabinet	19-Oct-22	Community and Corporate Plan		To seek endorsement of the new Community and Corporate Plan setting out the purpose, values	Gatehouse / Paul Matt	20-Sep-22
Cabinet	19-Oct-22	22/23 Revenue and Capital Monitoring report - Month 4			Jon Davies	17-May-22
Cabinet	19-Oct-22	Land adjacent to Caldicot Comprehensive School - Housing Development Opportunity		To seek approval of the disposal of land at Caldicot Comprehensive School for the	Nick Keyse	
ICMD	12-Oct-22	Local Development Annual Monitoring Report (AMR		DEFERRED TO 26 OCT	Rachel Lewis/Cllr Paul Griffiths	23/08/22
ICMD	12-Oct-22	Welsh Church Fund Working Group		DEFERRED TO 26 OCT	Dave Jarrett	14/07/22
ICMD	12-Oct-22	Ending Library Fines		enabling more people to enjoy reading without the worry of incurring a fine if they are unable to return	Cheryl Haskell/Fookes?	20-Sep-22
ICMD	28-Sep-22	Transport Policy			Deb Hill Howells - MG	22-Aug-22
ICMD	28-Sep-22	B4245 speed limit		DEFERRED TO 26 OCT	Mark Hand	18-Jul-22
Council	27-Sep-22	Tackling poverty and inequalities			Nick John	24-Aug-22
Council	27-Sep-22	RLDP Options Report			Rachel Lewis	25-Jul-22
Council	27-Sep-22	Rivers and Ocean			Hazel Clatworthy	9-Jun-22
Council	27-Sep-22	Monmouthshire County Council self - assessment report 2021/2			Richard Jones	23-May-22
ICMD	14-Sep-22	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 2 held on 21st July 2022 (no meeting/no report -			Dave Jarrett	17-May-22
Cabinet	07-Sep-22	Transport Policy Consultation Update.			Deb Hill Howells	22-Aug-22
Cabinet	07-Sep-22	Cost Of Living			Matt Phillips	25-Jul-22
ICMD	31-Aug-22	MY DAY, MY LIFE SERVICE EVALUTATION			Ceri York	15-Aug-22
ICMD	31-Aug-22	Homeseach Policy & Procedure - Amendments & Welsh Translation Requirement			Ian Bakewell	
ICMD	03-Aug-22	Additional Resources in Educations Strategy		Resources required to develop and maintain schools education systems and the implementatin	Sian Hayward	14-Jun-22

ICMD	03-Aug-22	Designation of Secondary Catchment Areas			Matthew Jones	6-Jun-22
ICMD	03-Aug-22	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 1 held on 23rd June 2022 - Moved to ICMD 3rd Aug 2022			Dave Jarrett	
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Wye Valley Villages Future Improvement Plan			Mark Hand	1-Jul-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Regen Three Year Programme			Mark Hand	1-Jul-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Review of Chepstow High Street closure			Mark Hand	1-Jul-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Home to School Transport Policy 2023-24.			Deb Hill Howells	27-Jun-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	MUCH (Magor & Undy Community Hall) report			Nick Keys	9-Jun-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Shared Prosperity Fund Local Investment Plan and Regional Lead Authority Arrangements			Hannah Jones	23-May-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Welsh Church Fund Working Group - meeting 1 held on 23rd June 2022 - Moved to ICMD 3rd Aug 2022			Dave Jarrett	17-May-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	2021/22 Revenue and Capital Monitoring outturn			Peter Davies/Jon Davies	17-Feb-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Play Sufficiency Assessment and Action Plan 22/23			Matthew Lewis	10-Feb-22
Cabinet	27-Jul-22	Housing Support Programme Strategy (Homeless Strategy)			Ian Bakewell	

Monmouthshire Select Committee Minutes

Meeting of Place Scrutiny Committee held at County Hall, Usk - Remote Attendance on Thursday, 12th January, 2023 at 12.30 pm

Councillors Present

County Councillor Lisa Dymock (Chairman)
County Councillor (Vice Chairman)

County Councillors: Louise Brown, Emma Bryn, Ben Callard, Ian Chandler, Su McConnel, Jackie Strong, Richard John, Rachel Buckler and John Crook

Officers in Attendance

Hazel Ilett, Scrutiny Manager
Robert McGowan, Policy and Scrutiny Officer
Frances O'Brien, Chief Officer, Communities and Place
Cath Fallon, Head of Economy and Enterprise

APOLOGIES: County Councillors Maria Stevens, Jane Lucas and Tomos Davies

1. Declarations of Interest

None.

2. Public Open Forum

No submissions were received.

3. Local Toilet Strategy

David Jones presented the report and answered the members' questions with Cabinet Member Sara Burch.

Challenge:

There is no reference to Stoma-friendly accessible toilets – can that be included in the action plan e.g. signage on doors?

We aren't sure in the moment what adjustments need to be made but we are committed to ensuring all of our toilets are accessible to all, so will look into this matter. Other departments will be aware (e.g. Landlords Services); the requisite information from the Councillor would be welcome. As part of the action plan, we will provide proper signage.

The listings of available toilets is out of date e.g. the Baker Street Library in Abergavenny and the museum in Priory Street, Monmouth, both of which have closed. And there is no mention of the opening times of toilets – this would be very useful.

There is a link at the end of the strategy that should give this information, but we take the point that the list needs to be updated. The link isn't working though, which we will address.

There is no assessment of where there are baby changing facilities and whether they are in both female and male toilets – this is not addressed in the Integrated Impact Assessment.

These facilities are mapped in the source which the link accesses, mentioned above, but it will be reviewed with Data Map Wales this year, to give a clearer picture of what the facilities are, as well as where. Baby changing for both sexes should be available as it's a Welsh Government requirement, but we will double-check.

Changing Spaces provision will be 'considered' – this is too weak a word, given our ambition and obligation to improve our facilities. Can something stronger be written?

Yes, this could be strengthened.

The survey says that 67% consider disabled provision to be inadequate. What will be done to address that – there is nothing in the strategy?

Access to disabled toilets can be a difficult area because getting to British Standards might cause the closure of some, as the dimensions might not be compliant. Landlords Services could advise better on that, but yes, the survey did show two-thirds felt they are inadequate. We mentioned Changing Spaces but any other disabled person could access those.

Any disaggregation in the survey between men and women or other groups about their satisfaction with the facilities would be very useful.

Welsh Government guidance was followed at the time as to what was in the survey, but we could potentially revisit user satisfaction, taking this point on board.

There is mention of considering making some toilets gender-neutral but this is not addressed in the IIA when considering impacts on minorities e.g. those seeking gender reassignment, etc.

Yes, this can be included for consideration, going forward.

It would be good to explore where there are gaps e.g. there is no public toilet in Skenfrith, where there are many visitors in the summer. How are we addressing such instances?

Due to the cost involved there probably won't be any new toilet blocks installed – recurring costs e.g. drainage, electric, as well as the initial build. We can actively engage with any private facilities in the area to ensure that the public has some toilet access. The quantity in the county is good overall i.e. there are 18 blocks and another 20 with facilities, but yes we need to ensure that they are in the right places. But a lot of feedback is very good e.g. regarding the disabled provision at Abergavenny Bus Station, and how surveys tend to skew towards negative feedback needs to be considered. But it is a valid idea to revisit the survey. Though we don't currently have the funds to build new blocks we will need to look at tourism hotspots in the county.

Are the opening times shrinking on the toilets we have? Closing early is an issue if the reason is a concern about drug-taking, as we don't close parks or other facilities for that reason.

The opening hours of our current provision aren't affected by advice from Gwent Police over anti-social behaviour, and they are flexible e.g. they will be extended during events such as Abergavenny Food Festival.

I disagree that there are toilets within walking distance of White Horse Lane. Would Council consider an agreement with Abergavenny Town Council to see if responsibility could be shared, or discuss whether there's a mechanism whereby they could be reopened?

It is unusual for the population size of Abergavenny for there to be as many toilets: Brewery Yard, Castle Street, the bus station, Wetherspoons, Morrisons, etc. When the matter was previously discussed with ATC, they were 'not opposed' to MCC closing White Horse Lane toilets. The negative comments as to its condition in the survey and the high figure that would be required for repairs/refurbishment further explain its closure. It is also the toilets which Police

identified as a particular location for anti-social behaviour. But the matter could be revisited by members.

The Severn Tunnel Junction point in the report is crucial. Keeping toilets free is very important. The baby changing point is also very important. When toilets do close, they can become a greater target for vandalism, so this needs to be addressed – will they be knocked down, e.g. the closure on the A40?

These are good points which we will bear in mind. Regarding the A40, as it is a trunk road responsibility falls to Welsh Government but we can refer that back to them and request an update.

Why is the estimated repair cost for Whitehorse Lane so high, at £93k?

The figures were arrived at by Landlords Services, having visited all of the toilets. This figure is indeed comparatively high – we are informed that there are problems with the roof and drains, but we can ask for further details.

Chair's Summary:

Overall, the committee is positive about the good range of toilet provision that we offer in Monmouthshire. Councillor Bryn raised a very important point about being Stoma-friendly, and good signage. Clarification is needed over baby-changing facilities in both men's and women's toilets. Councillor Chandler asked if the Changing Spaces wording could be stronger, and what is the Council doing to address the lack of disability provision across the county. During the recent call-in meeting, residents expressed concern over the suitability and difficulty of public toilets for changing disabled adults, so that needs to be considered. It would be helpful to know if men or women are completing the User Satisfaction Survey, and their ages. The idea of gender-neutral toilets should be explored and included in the Impact Assessment, but public consultation is suggested considering safety concerns for female users. Better signage is needed. Can we explore the areas in which there is a high number of visitors, but no toilets e.g. Skenfrith? Councillor Callard suggested exploring a shared responsibility with Abergavenny Town Council for White Horse Lane toilets, rather than closing them, as there are no other toilets nearby. Councillor John supports the toilets at Severn Tunnel Junction, and notes that keeping toilets free of charge is vitally important.

Dave Jones: the MCC hyperlink to opening times in the report needs to be fixed – **ACTION**

Dave Jones to contact Welsh Government about the toilets on the A40, as they are a target for vandalism – **ACTION**

Dave Jones will seek further information from Landlords Services about costs, particularly related to the high repair figure for Whitehorse Lane toilets – **ACTION**

4. Rural Broadband

Cath Fallon presented the report and answered the members' questions with Cabinet Member Paul Griffiths.

Challenge:

A number of households still feel that they aren't getting broadband any time soon. It would be very helpful if members could know the places in each ward where broadband isn't set up, so that they can work proactively with officers.

In 3.20, there is a link to when and where we are building, which would give members the information on where Openreach full fibre is going. It is rarely that straightforward, however, so we have weekly meetings with Broadway for specific projects and can ask them to provide us with their rollout plans. So, if communities aren't being served as desired then we can get the update and start to create relationships with the engineers working in that area. Members can therefore check using the link or email the officer, who can then put members in touch with the provider.

Is there the same way to see the Broadway data as there is to see Openreach? Do they have a link?

We will provide members with the information for the Community Liaison point person for Broadway Partners, as such dialogue is more fruitful and direct than exploring website data.

There is a concern about how robust the plans are e.g. there is a resident who doesn't have full fibre because BT ran out just before her house. BT won't commit to addressing the problem so the resident can't get support for additional connection means and has been in that position for years. Will the figures for the county as a whole mean that some residents will still be in limbo in this way?

For this particular property, please contact the officers with the specific information and we will enquire with BT directly.

Rural residents are the key concern. How can we ensure, specifically, that the most deprived areas – in terms of connectivity – are the ones that get priority for new connections, especially as the same areas tend to suffer from black spots in mobile coverage?

We agree about focussing on digitally deprived/more rural areas. Because of that, we have been a testbed for a 5G project that has just concluded, looking at Raglan Castle and school and a farming environment. We are therefore at the forefront when there is an opportunity to be a testbed for alternative technologies, working very closely with Welsh Government. We are also aware that it is not always possible to get fibre to the cabinet in rural areas, due to the landscape – this is why we work with Broadway, as they use alternative technologies such as wireless, in which there is a connection to the cabinet but then beamed from mast to mast, or 'White Space', in which they use the old analogue TV signals for delivery, among others. We can't know where the difficulties are on a property-by-property basis, which is why we need to work together with members to solve these issues.

The report on the investment in Broadway came to Governance & Audit Committee, at which we were told that priorities have shifted, and our partnership vehicle with them is now unlikely to feature as a major part of their plans going forward?

We will pick this up and reply to the Councillor outside the meeting.

There are problems with BT charging individual premises for infrastructure – with a particular recent case as an example.

In this particular instance there was no problem with the connection to the property but there was a problem on site, to which we are seeking solutions, which resulted in excess charges.

Ogi provides fibre to premises but it is dependent on them being the internet provider, so there is a lack of competition with other providers. Is there a way to overcome BT Openreach's monopoly?

Where Openreach runs the ducting it has to be open to any broadband provider because much of it is publicly funded. Where there is significant private investment into companies like Ogi or

Broadway it is their ducting, and those private companies own the network. It is a very complex area.

Chair's Summary:

Cabinet Member Paul Griffiths thanked the officers for creating a record of significant improvement in the county over the years, and thanked the members for their questions and bringing to attention where there are gaps and areas for improvement.

Cath Fallon will provide members with the information for the Community Liaison point person for Broadway Partners – **ACTION**

Ian Chandler will provide Cath Fallon with specific information about the resident he spoke of, and their problem, and she will investigate the matter – **ACTION**

Cath Fallon will pick up Councillor Chandler's query about investment in Broadway Partners and reply outside the meeting – **ACTION**

5. Garden Waste Collection Service

Cabinet Member Catrin Maby and Carl Touhig presented the report and answered the members' questions.

Challenge:

Will there be alternative payment methods so there isn't a one-off fee? Is assistance possible for low-income families? Some councils don't charge for this service – is that true, and if so, how do they do that?

We don't what income will be until we start the scheme. We hope to set it at £50 based on what the consultation and survey came back with – if the survey is right then we are just going to make the £720k needed to run the scheme. If there is a change in that and we overachieve then we can look at other versions. If we achieve 17k bins this year in an overachieving budget we wouldn't want to put the bins up the following year for those customers, we would try to balance the books. We shouldn't overachieve anyway (we are not allowed to) and we don't want to charge residents more than we need to run a service. When we rolled out the bins there was concern that we would lose a lot of customers but they in fact increased by 2000 people.

It would be difficult with the Civica system that we have to do monthly or quarterly payments but it's something we could look at for the year after if we are overachieving. And, the year after, if we do overachieve we could possibly look at reductions for people on low incomes. the difficulty is that this year we won't know the customer base and we recognise that an increase to £50 from £28 is substantial.

Did introduction of a low-fee bin reduce flytipping?

We didn't see any negative effects in terms of flytipping. Changes in Waste services are always accompanied by the threat of flytipping that very rarely comes to the fore. People who flytip, generally, don't use our CA sites or council services anyway, and are therefore rarely affected by the changes that we make.

Should we more actively encourage home gardeners to compost? If there were a surplus in the budget could we provide people with the necessary equipment?

We will certainly take this on board. We provide cost-price bins through our reuse shops and water butts but this could be a way of assisting further and making them below cost price. These are the kinds of ideas that we like to look at through the scrutiny process in the coming year.

Can the figures be further explained e.g. £6 per customer, additional customers, possible costs up to £850k, etc.?

The £6 subsidy is from all households: every household is paying £6 through their council tax towards 14,000 customers using the garden waste scheme (40,000 households at £6 = £240k). Additional customers is one of the options we looked at if we do nothing i.e. if we put the service out again at £28 this year, it is likely that we will see an additional 2,000 customers based on what we have seen over the last two years. Those extra customers will put an extra £200k cost on the service because we will need an extra vehicle, but they will only bring in £56k of extra income based on £28 per bin. The main point is to say that, currently, we have expenses of £720k and an income of £480k. To meet the expenses with 14,500 customers, based on their responses, we need to charge £50. If they all come on board it will achieve £725k. Back-office costs and management fees haven't been included. If all 17,000 bins stay out in the service area, we could potentially achieve £850k but this is very unlikely given that 14% said they don't want to see cost increases and would prefer to cease the service. But, hopefully, with a strong customer base we will land somewhere between £720k and £850k, reducing the council subsidy which can be put back into other services.

If there is a reduction in the number of people taking up the service then surely you won't need as many staff and vehicles, thus reducing the costs? Is the 78% increase an over-estimate? If it's not clear what the customer base will be could there be two payments of £25, with the second geared according to the actual number of customers and vehicles, so people aren't paying more than is necessary?

Based on the 14% who said they didn't want the service if there were a cost increase, pushes us back to the £50 fee, which comes out at £725k. The risk of two separate payments is that everyone signs up for the first one but if many drop out of paying the second then the remaining customers will have to pay a second payment that is greater than £25 to make the service viable. If the 14% lived in areas that are difficult to reach then we probably could lose a vehicle, but in reality, they will be spread across the county, so we will still need the additional vehicle – we would need to lose 25% of customers in order to then lose a vehicle.

Could there be a scheme for home composting bins in an active way and letting people know how to do it in a simple way?

We promoted compost bins heavily 7-8 years ago. 10% of the county has home compost bins and is an area that we would like to look at more – potentially, if there is an overspend, we could also look at water butts, which would be very helpful. We will certainly try to promote the compost bins with videos etc. that are more appropriate to how people now prefer to receive information.

There are several concerns that should be considered: Why should someone in a one-bedroom flat and no garden, or someone who composts at home, subsidise someone with a big garden who chooses to opt into the service? How wise is recommending that we should peg future increases to RPI when we don't know if the cost of the service will go up with RPI? The timing of this report is also a concern – things should go to scrutiny before the final report is published.

We apologise for the route that this has taken, which was due to the timings of Scrutiny and Cabinet around Christmas, and getting the consultation document to where it needed to be. We will ensure that Cabinet knows what was discussed today – they will be added into the Cabinet report.

Do we also generate an income from the waste once it is composted, as fertiliser, and have those figures been considered?

The garden waste is treated at a farm in Abergavenny, where it is spread on the land. We purchase some of the material back and sell it through the reuse shops. Sending it to a plant that offered to give us some money back involved an extra £250k in costs but with the risk that we wouldn't achieve that income, so we think we have the best deal for our residents. The cost of treatment can't be included in the charges – it sits outside this. The only charge that we can make is for collection, so it doesn't form part of the £50, though if a profit were made from selling the compost, we would look to reinvest it into services, including garden waste.

Regarding the Integrated Impact Assessment and Protected Characteristics, the service is important for those who are unable to go to a recycling centre due to their age, but the mitigation for that is for them to go to a waste facility and collect a home composting bin?

Yes, that's an oversight, but we do have recycling wardens so for those that particularly struggle we could no doubt offer support by dropping the bin to them.

Chair's Summary:

Increasing the cost this much is hard to swallow – can we explore winter collections? Can we look at neighbouring councils, where the average cost of green waste is £12 – how are they doing that and where are we going wrong? Newport and Torfaen operate the service for free, whereas Monmouthshire will be 4 times the average price in Wales. The number of returning customers in April is therefore a concern.

Alternative payment methods were discussed e.g. direct debit, splitting the payment. It was asked whether wheelie bins reduce flytipping, but people paying for them tend not to want to flytip in the first place. Home composting should be encouraged; further education for residents should be explored, along with the use of water butts – depending on the figures next year, we could look at offering these. Cabinet Member Catrin Maby noted that in the coming year she would like information to be shared on home composting, particularly for town gardens. Clarity was sought about costings. It was asked if we generate an income once the garden waste is composted. It was noted that the scheme is meant to make things easier for older residents or those with a disability, but it is expected that they come to the waste transfer stations to collect home compost bins – this should be addressed in the Impact Assessment.

Carl Touhig will provide supplementary information for the Cabinet report about how the costs were arrived at i.e. a further breakdown, and to include detail of the time constraints and an explanation as to why it's come to scrutiny now – **ACTION**

6. Place Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme and Action List

The meeting on 2nd February is at 2pm. Wednesday 29th March am is agreed for the Special meeting. 10am is agreed for the time of the meeting on 13th April.

7. Cabinet and Council Work Planner

Note that this is a live document: Democratic Services update this weekly.

8. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 10th November 2022

The minutes were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

9. To note the date of the next meeting as 3rd March 2023 and Special Meeting on 2nd February 2023 (Budget)

The next meeting is in fact 2nd March but will move to 1st March.

The meeting ended at **2.36 pm**

Monmouthshire Select Committee Minutes

Meeting of Place Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr USK on Thursday, 2nd February, 2023 at 2.00 pm

Councillors Present

County Councillor Lisa Dymock (Chairman)

County Councillors: Louise Brown, Emma Bryn, Ben Callard, Ian Chandler, Tomos Davies, Jane Lucas, Su McConnel, Maria Stevens, Jackie Strong, Fay Bromfield, Rachel Garrick, Angela Sandles, Mary Ann Brocklesby and Sara Burch

Officers in Attendance

Hazel Ilett, Scrutiny Manager
Robert McGowan, Policy and Scrutiny Officer
Paul Matthews, Chief Executive
Peter Davies, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Officer, Resources
Will McLean, Chief Officer for Children and Young People
Frances O'Brien, Chief Officer, Communities and Place
Matt Phillips, Chief Officer People and Governance and Monitoring Officer
Matthew Gatehouse, Head of Policy, Performance and Scrutiny
Ian Saunders, Chief Operating Officer, MonLife
Jonathan Davies, Head of Finance
Nikki Wellington, Finance Manager
Dave Loder, Finance Manager
Carl Touhig, Head of Neighbourhood Services
Tyrone Stokes, Accountant
Stacey Jones, Senior Accountant

APOLOGIES: Councillor Paul Griffiths

1. Declarations of Interest

None.

2. Public Open Forum

No submissions were received.

3. Budget Scrutiny: Scrutiny of the Budget proposals for 2023/24

The Cabinet Member for Resources presented to the committee the proposals for 2023-2024 (presentation available online) prior to the committee asking questions.

Challenge:

What reassurance is there that the proposed reductions, especially for grounds maintenance and the community improvement team, won't undermine the ambition for the county to be a greener place to live? What is the potential impact on rural villages?

Cabinet Member for Resources: We have committed £750k towards decarbonisation as part of this budget, which is the principal goal of reducing environmental impact in the county. We also have bio-diversity written into this budget.

Recycling Strategy Manager: In terms of the reduction in the Community Improvement Team, we did have two teams, largely recruiting prisoners from Prescoed, but it has been increasingly difficult to recruit them, so we now have one team operating. We want to channel that work into the Council's grounds maintenance functions, so the public shouldn't notice a reduction. Where we have reduced mowing as part of the 'Nature isn't Neat' programme, we do have a little more capacity there to do more planting with community involvement. We currently mow 14 times a year but plan to reduce it to 10, but still cutting paths through green amenity spaces that are used, whilst also continuing the 'Nature isn't Neat' programme.

Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that the 'reconfiguration of sweeping functions across the county' won't undermine the positive contribution to addressing the climate and nature emergency?

Recycling Strategy Manager: The reason for reconfiguring the sweeping function is to provide a greater sweeping function. Currently we have 2 part-time staff undertaking sweeping and a litter picking, but we feel that losing the two part-time posts and having a full-time mechanical sweeper which will undertake the litter picking will be more beneficial and save costs. The town councils have also bought into the expanded town teams, and this has given us more cover in Chepstow and Abergavenny, so we have seen great improvements there and we would like to implement the approach elsewhere, backed up with more mechanical sweeping.

To what extent can the mechanical solution be applied to littering in more rural areas? Would a physical solution be more effective in this context?

Recycling Strategy Manager: There are no changes to how we manage sweeping in rural areas. We have 3 large sweepers for the rural areas and 3 small ones in the town centres and there is capacity for the smaller ones that are sometimes parked up to do more sweeping in out-of-town areas, so the intention is to increase, not reduce sweeping.

In the preceding financial year, Monmouthshire was one of only a handful of authorities to not issue a single penalty notice for littering – is there resource to pursue those, particularly given the increase in littering and fly tipping? Were budgetary allocations considered made for these and, if so, why were they discarded?

Recycling Strategy Manager: We are not aware of a large increase in flytipping, not at a level that would indicate an upward trend, although there is a slight increase across Wales, but I can return to the committee with the date. (**Action:** Carl Touhig). In terms of issuing Fixed Penalty Notices for littering, we have long wanted to adopt this for littering and dog fouling and Welsh Government were developing a national strategy and we had hoped for an 'all Wales' approach, with enforcement backed by Welsh Government, but this hasn't materialised. We remain hopeful for the strategic direction nationally.

In the Cabinet paper, fig.1 gives a total expenditure of £311m, but fig.4 shows £208m. What is the difference between the two tables as it's unclear to the casual observer?

Finance Manager: Quite simply, it's that the second figure is taking into account specific grants that are expected to be received, but I understand this could be better explained.

What is the additional revenue gained by the council for each 1% of council tax increase, so that we can gain a sense of scale?

Cabinet Member for Resources: 1% according to our calculations is in the region of £630k.

There is concern about the robustness of the figures in the Decarbonisation 1 and 2 proposals: the energy awareness campaign's projected saving is based on a 5% saving across the board – how was that figure tested? Why 5%? How predictable are the savings, and what is the margin of error?

Chief Officer: Officers have looked at other organisations to see what we could achieve if we did things like switching lights off and using some buildings less, so that is an estimate, but we will be establishing a forum across the council of relevant officers to ensure we are all aware of how we can make those saving and we will raise awareness through a communication campaign.

The increase from the income of the solar farm is not specifically decarbonisation of our existing footprint. What is the margin of error on the £150k as it says it is uncertain? Has there been any further investigation?

Cabinet Member for Resources: I believe the solar farm figures are uncertain due to the uncertainty and fluctuation in process, but the Chief Officer can clarify.

Chief Officer: We are trying to set a prudent level, but we have achieved over and above this figure to date.

Capital investment is required for some things: e.g. pool covers and HVAC changes. What's the return on investment – how many years before we get money back?

Chief Operating Officer for Mon-Life: The cost of heating pool water is astronomic at the moment, with 75% of the Mon Life budget being utilised for energy costs, but pool covers do more than just keep the water temperature stable, as they also enable us to reduce the temperature in the buildings. We previously had pool covers which for various reasons were removed and we believe the costs of outlay will quickly be recovered, as currently we have to keep the heating on for a day to move the pool temperature up by 2 or 3 degrees, so it's a huge energy drain and having to remove and replace water also then incurs more cost to reheat it, but we have to drain and replace water to meet environmental health standards. We will return to the committee with the 'return on investment' figure (**Action:** Ian Saunders).

To achieve £70k for additional walking routes, it doesn't say what capital investment is required? It's £150k, which would have been useful to have in the paper at that point.

Cabinet Member for Resources: I think you answered your own question, but I note your point about the difficulty in finding the figure.

More specifically, away from just pool covers, my point was more about whether we applying any benchmark for measuring return on investment, so that we have clarity on how revenue expenditure is delivering a return on investment for capital investments (Action: Jonathon Davies).

What is the impact on increased car use and possibly reduced enrolment in sixth forms of raising the price for concessionary travel? And reverting to statutory distances for free school transport? There's no assessment for that in the report. Does it take into account where there are no available walking routes?

Chief Officer: This will depend on whether families decide not to use the discretionary concessionary fares and pay the additional charge in order to provide transport for their children. The consequence will be whether they are able to walk to school or use other modes of transport, or whether the family determine that the best route would be to use a car. I would suspect that whilst there is an increase in the cost, the increased charge would still be cheaper than driving the children to school. It is in line with what the Public Bus Network charges, so we have tried to set it at a sensible level.

Some of the Monlife savings involve transferring costs between budgets, which are not then real savings.

Chief Operating Officer for MonLife: It does depend on the lens through which you look at this, as there's no profit being made, it's more cost recovery for a service that was very valuable. Schools do go outside of Monmouthshire for courses and pay huge costs, so this is a small cost for the service they get and the headteachers seem very supportive of the service.

Under ML22, Gilwern, there is no explanation of where the £100k saving will come from?

Cabinet Member for Housing: We have started a review of the Gilwern Outdoor Education Service in the context of the new education curriculum, noting the appetite of schools to return to the residential experience that was so popular with families, so we want to keep this affordable. We also want to make sure the service to contribute to cost avoidance elsewhere, for example, for providing education to a few young people and if weren't able to do this, we would probably have to seek other options to provide education out of school, which would be more expensive. So the reason it is non-specific, is because all options are on the table and we need to explore various options. We want to make the best use of that resource.

Part of the saving of £215k in RES24 involves disposing of Tudor St., but the situation has changed – will we update the proposal on that? It also includes places like Drybridge House and Melville Theatre as priority 2 – what consultation was taken with the charities and users of those centres? There is the suggestion that some activities will transfer to Market Hall but that is also to be disposed of – so there is a very concerning lack of coherence between the proposals.

Cabinet Member for Housing: Similarly to the previous answer, the lack of clarity in relation to the buildings is because the council has a large number of buildings across the county, some of which are being used differently to how they were pre-pandemic. Many are not energy efficient and whilst we have a multiplicity of relationships with community organisations, there is a need to rationalise our use of buildings both short and long term. Before any disposals are made, we would complete a full options appraisal which would be brought to this committee.

The concern is that we're putting into a budget proposal specific savings in relation to the disposals of assets. We are expected to sign off those figures at council but I would feel very uncomfortable signing off those figures when those appraisals haven't happened, and with a very uncertain outcome. The budget is prejudging some of those decisions by putting them in the proposals, regardless of any process you put in place in the future.

Deputy Chief Executive: The mandate talks to 21 specific assets that have been identified with the potential opportunity to lead to increased income or reduced cost, or the potential for disposal as part of an exercise of rationalisation of the Council's estate. For each of those, we would need to go through a proper and robust process in order to look to achieve the level of mandate savings that have been positioned within the budget. Clearly the savings figure is not predicated on all of the 21 being brought forward and delivered. We have taken a measured assessment of the levels of risk depending on the level of use of those buildings, the potential to be able to rationalise in some form and for some of those buildings that are currently occupied, they are coming to the end of their respective lease terms, which in any event, offers an opportunity to be able to look to review and as necessary, renegotiate leases. So let us not fall into the trap of thinking that each one of these assets will be closed or disposed of. It's about exploring the live opportunities in front of us to reduce cost, increase income and where relevant and applicable, consider the potential for disposal.

For clarity, for RES24, the table projects that the savings include 4 of the 6 Priority 1 properties, some of which are still subject to review – so can we have clarity on that? The same case for the savings projected for 2024-2025, so that's my point about prejudging.

Deputy Chief Executive: We are in agreement with you. The sizing of the potential saving and in respect of the years, is predicated on the assets that are in our immediate line of sight, as they have been ranked accordingly and the ones that you have referred to, they are not all 'givens', for the reasons that you have outlined and there are processes that need to be worked through, but it is why officers are extending their radar as widely as possible in the first instance to look at assets that potentially offer some opportunity. Clearly, if we rightly come to the conclusion that some assets are not right for rationalisation, we will look further and beyond, which is part of the process, which is why 21 assets have been initially identified. Work will extend over a 2-year period, so we will monitor and update that as needed. In the context of the budgetary challenges that we are facing, the asset management strategy and plan that we will be looking to develop following approval of the corporate plan will need to ensure our estate is fit for purpose, running optimally and at lowest cost, whilst meeting the needs of our communities at the same time.

Withdrawing the Gwent Music subsidy is a great concern, an example of a 9-year-old being able to borrow a saxophone via the subsidy and achieve a Grade 6. This an example of the importance of the fund. I don't think £9k is a great amount as a hardship fund to cover the whole county for low-income families?

Finance Manager for Schools: This was a very hard decision and we maintained the subsidy after other authorities withdrew. The hardship fund of £9k has been in place for a number of years and has actually been underspent, so we will continue to work with Gwent Music to ensure that families that need to access that fund can access it. In terms of the other support we provide to Gwent Music, we provide a subsidy through schools' budgets, which supports whole class provision, so is the scheme your resident's child would have benefitted from, whereby pupils can try out different instruments and we want to still maintain that. One of the decisions we need to make with Gwent Music is whether the music lessons will increase, as we don't want to pass that burden on to families, but we will be working very closely with them to ensure we can provide the best support possible. At the moment there is a budget of £44k across schools to provide the whole class provision, which will form part of the reduction, but we are going to be working with Gwent Music to see what they are going to still be able to provide in terms of whole class provision for schools. Schools can request that and we will be working with schools to see if they want to top that back up to the £44k so that they continue with the whole class provision.

Regarding school transport, there is concern about the levels of mileage going down. There is a discretionary element as to whether it's a safe route to school. Can we have reassurance that a safe route to school will still be considered? On the concessionary side, it is £880 for a family with 2 kids for the bus, so the car will be used instead, increasing pollution and congestion – what level is being proposed for this increase in concessionary travel and whether there is an allowance for the number of children involved?

Chief Officer: Yes, it is still part of the assessment process to determine whether there is a safe route to school when the consideration of the application comes in from the family of a pupil, so there is no change there. With regard to the concessionary charge, at present, it is £440 for the whole academic year. The proposal set out within the budget mandate is to increase that charge from £440 to £550 for a Monmouthshire resident and to increase it to £650 for a non-Monmouthshire resident. In terms of the mileage limits, this isn't something that will be implemented during this academic year, as there would need to be a full public consultation and engagement exercise, so this will be brought back as a separate report to commence the consultation exercise, with the proposed implementation being in October 2023. So the proposal being considered here is to revert back to the statutory limits set by Welsh Government, which are currently more favourable for primary and secondary children, so that would revert from 2 miles for primary children to 1.5 miles and from 3 miles to 2 miles for secondary children, so those are the proposed changes. Our calculations based on current pupil numbers are that it would affect approximately 127 learners who would then not be eligible for free transport. One of the key things we want to do is improve the access for pupils to be able to access active travel routes for walking, cycling and scooter use.

Is the safe route independent from the mileage, or are they considered together?

Chief Officer: It will depend if they are entitled to that transport, because if they were entitled to the transport, we wouldn't need to undertake an assessment on the safe route to school, but for pupils within that mileage, we would undertake an assessment of the safe routes to school first. Within the budget mandates, there are some routes which we think could be improved, which could prevent the need for home to school transport.

With regard to the 21 council assets detailed on page 524, are all of these part of the savings reductions? I would like to see Severn View go to affordable housing, as it is in a perfect location.

Cabinet Member for Resources: The priority 2 and 3 assets are there as estimates and would need much greater consideration, so no, we are not looking to dispose 21 properties.

Cabinet Member for Housing: In terms of Severn View, there is the question of what we will do with Severn View Care Home when Crick Road Care Home opens and will need further consideration in terms of the capacity, so it's an open question at the moment as to whether it would be brought forward for affordable housing or other use.

The report isn't clear about the reduction in opening hours for libraries and leisure centres. and how it will affect different users e.g. older people wanting to access in the day – will one group be affected more than others? I would appreciate more detailed analysis on this budget overall and impacts on people. For example, changing opening times of libraries could an impact for older people who may seek to access warm spaces.

Cabinet Member: In terms of community hubs and libraries, we are liaising with staff at present and we may be reducing staffing levels but not affecting the opening hours.

Cabinet Member for Housing: We are reviewing the opening hours of leisure centres, because we are conscious that people use the leisure centres more in the winter and less in the summer, so we are looking to make any reductions in the times of lesser use.

Are we confident that enough funding has been allocated for school traffic management improvements, especially as cuts in school transport service budget will mean more children finding their own way to school? Will the children be encouraged to walk, scoot or cycle independently, and how will we monitor the effect of those changes? Are distances measured 'as the crow flies' or 'as walked'?

Chief Officer: We are hoping the funding will be sufficient to make the improvements needed within the constraints we have. Yes we will monitor it, but as it would be difficult to monitor for each school individually, we will be relying on elected Members and the schools to provide us with feedback. Distances measured are 'as the crow flies', but we try to take into account that in a rural county, we need to take into account the actual route.

Regarding the Newport Retail Park and Castlegate Business Park, are the figures shown a true representation of costs incurred, including officer time? What are the future plans for these sites? How do they sit with the ambitions in the corporate plan to

reduce commuting out of county? How to explain raising or creating car parking fees in county while funding somewhere out of county with free parking?

Cabinet Member for Resources: The numbers are correct. Newport Retail Park is out of county and has been contentious as an investment, with questions raised. It's not an investment this administration would have chosen to make and we are not seeing the returns we would like, but the economic situation means it's not entirely prudent to divest them either. So yes, we have an out of county investment with an element of risk, but we are where we are and it is part of the Council's asset programme.

Deputy Chief Executive: Just to confirm the figures are accurate and the position evolves on a regular basis and officers and advisers ensure we keep on top of the level of associated risk. This reported up through the Investment Committee and we receive regular performance updates on the portfolio and we continually take an assessment of whether the benchmark returns are met and if not, to determine through the options appraisal whether the asset is retained. The current economic climate is not conducive to disposal at this point and certainly with Castlegate, it's fair to say that it has been very resilient through the pandemic in terms of its occupancy and yet we have lost Mitel as a tenant, but in its place we have expanded significantly the footprint of other tenants, which is a good news story, with a lot of interest in the remaining occupancy to be let. Newport Retail Park is a different story and we acknowledge the point that it's outside of county, but it is on the periphery and if you look at the habits of Monmouthshire residents, particularly in the south of the county, they make heavy use of it. However, it is a little more volatile, given the nature of it and coming out of the pandemic and the tenancies that are positioned there, but nonetheless despite the levels of risk that you will naturally carry around investments like this, the interest in the retail park remain very strong, so as an investment asset, whether for continued future return or for sale, it is in a good place.

Even with this price increase, are car parks still being subsidised? Is the funding raised ringfenced for their upkeep?

Chief Officer: Car parks are not subsidised as we receive an income from them and this is then ringfenced and reinvested into the car park infrastructure, which is quite expensive.

Residents are concerned about the raise in cost of the green waste collection service, specifically the single payment – if the use falls away will we assume a lack of demand rather than factoring in people being put off by the price? What scope is there for spreading the cost over a year?

Recycling Strategy Manager: The scheme went live last week with over 3000 applicants, so we're on target. We've looked at the 3 payments system or Direct Debit, but technical difficulties are preventing it at present, but we could look to do it for next year, once we know how many service users we will have.

What about staggering payments school transport?

Chief Officer: We already offer spread the payments on this.

Regarding lowering energy costs, can we turn off lights in some buildings, and street lights in certain areas after certain times? e.g. the lights at Osbaston School within the school grounds are on all night when there are no children there.

Recycling Strategy Manager: Our street lights are all energy efficient LED technology and we have reduced lighting over the years through dimming programmes, but any shutting off completely would need consideration on an individual case by case basis. We are developing a corporate policy on energy use and are also working with schools to reduce lighting across all of our sites.

There is a reference to having a litter picker in towns, but Monmouth Town Council pays for its litter picker.

Recycling Strategy Manager: The repurposing of the cleansing regime is not to reduce cleansing but to make the mechanical sweeper more available more of the time, as it is very efficient. We still very much value the litter pickers and the work that they are doing funded by the town council.

How would the closure of Bridges be implemented?

Cabinet Member for Resources: We are not looking for disposal but we are looking at the income potential and as the lease is due for renewal, it would be about putting it on a more commercial fitting.

Deputy Chief Executive: Just to confirm that as we are nearing the renewal of the lease, Bridges have approached us, because they are undertaking very good work there but are keen to explore options. There are aspects of how the building is used that falls more into commercial use, so we might need to explore renewal on that footing.

Increasing business rates and parking charges will further the decline of town centres. Regarding the Monmouth cattle market, can we not move those stallholders up to Agincourt Square and make the market there more active? Would it not increase the ability to get more people into Monmouth, as half the car park is closed off?

Chief Officer: Business rates are not something that we as a local authority are in control of setting, this is outside of our remit. There was a commitment by the previous administration and this cabinet to undertake a review of car parking charges and the charging mechanism across the county and this will commence in the new financial year and will be subject to scrutiny. In terms of your suggestions around the cattle market, this is something we can take away and look at.

If Market Hall is up for selling off, why is so much officer time being spent trying to get the levelling up fund?

Deputy Chief Executive: Again, this is not about disposal, there are opportunities for income generation through secure tenancies.

In respect of the £300k of cuts to those with learning disabilities – why are we cutting the support from those who need it most?

Finance Manager for Social Services: In terms of the mandate, we are looking at the high-cost placements to see if we can strengthen our negotiation and look for alternatives to those high-cost placements. Another part of the mandate is looking at meeting triggers for continuing health care, to see if they can take over some of the funding, rather than it falling to the Council. This is the biggest part of the saving, and the client shouldn't see any impact, as the client is placed at the centre, but the Council needs to have the conversations around the budget and what it has to fund as opposed to health funding it.

The increase in basic Councillors' pay to £818k creates a budget pressure of £45k. Would it be wise to reject this pay rise? Will the Cabinet Member and colleagues lead by example and forego their own salary increases for this financial year?

Cabinet Member for Resources: It would not be my decision as to whether to reject it, this would require a full Council decision, so I'm not in a position to comment. If you would like to send a full motion to Council, you can do so.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that with a council tax increase of 6%, based on modelling is it still the case that a single parent with two dependent children will be £784 worse off next year, and a two-parent family with 2 children will be £1200 worse off?

Cabinet Member for Resources: I'm afraid I would need to confirm this following the meeting (**Action:** Cabinet Member for Resources).

Cabinet Member for Housing: These really are 'worst case scenario' figures for a household using almost every conceivable service and assumes for the single parent household no single persons discount on Council tax, no free school meals eligibility and the use of both home to school transport and pre-school childcare, so I'm not sure that is possible or that it's entirely accurate and we need to refine those figures.

Will staff have the training and support to be able to do the required continuing healthcare assessments and get proper NHS funding? Is it correct that continuing healthcare is not possible without a direct payment, and will that deter people from going down the continuing healthcare route?

Finance Manager for Social Services: We have a quality panel that's been operating for many years between the Council and health partners and several years ago we set up a specific post that was an expert in this area and they are instrumental in passing on the knowledge on the requirements and triggers and the negotiations, so we have got this covered. I'm aware of the direct payments issue, and my understanding is that it's not that continuing health care can't take over the funding, it's that they can't pay for the direct payment, so the local authority would still have to service the direct payment, and then re-charge continuing health care. I will check this and let you know if any of my explanation is incorrect.

Is it correct that the workforce development proposals are to merge the team with a neighbouring authority but be hosted in Monmouthshire?

Finance Manager for Social Services: In terms of the savings, we are undergoing an exercise of where we can get of efficiencies out of the workforce recognising the unmet

need. There are areas in the market around recruitment and retention so we are reviewing vacancies to see if we can do something differently and see if improvements could be made through other means.

The CCTV scheme in Caldicot needs to be made fit for purpose – some of the changes are welcome but Community Safety remains a worry for people in the town.

Cabinet Member for Housing: Community safety is one of the areas that has been historically under resourced and is one where we are proposing to spend a little more. We have a multiplicity of CCTV systems in the towns, so the proposal is to rationalise and coordinate the systems.

The Grassroots scheme is very popular and valuable – rather than scrapping it can it be remodelled for our residents?

Chief Officer: In the budget mandate, we have proposed two options, one being an annual subscription charge, the other being to cease the service entirely, but the subscription option is the recommended option.

Please can we have more detail about the £550k set aside to fix Redbrook footbridge? Does Gloucestershire County Council have the funds for its half?

Chief Officer: Within the capital side of the budget, we have identified the potential capital expenditure likely to be incurred over the next three years, so it's for the next financial year, not this year. We are discussing this with Gloucestershire County Council, so the figures are indicative for the next financial year, not this one. If something were to happen in this year, those figures may change.

For clarity, in respect of Grassroots, will the £30 annual subscription be per household? The overwhelming majority of users are in Newport, Chepstow and Caldicot, areas that are already served by public transport – what plans are there to promote it to users in more rural areas, which was the original intention of the scheme? How many new registrations do we get each year?

Chief Officer: It is very much something we want to promote because its original intention was for rural areas rather than those where there are public bus services. Some people are using it almost as a private taxi service for work. The charge proposed is per person rather than per household. I can obtain the number of registrations for you following the meeting (**Action: Frances O'Brien**).

Public transport around Chepstow is poor, with only one bus on a Saturday from Mathern village, for example. One pensioner there uses the Grassroots service – any increase in charges would affect her. A breakdown of those charges and concessions would be useful.

Chief Officer: I can provide the committee with a breakdown of charges and concessions following the meeting (**Action: Frances O'Brien**)

Summary:

The Committee undertook thorough scrutiny of the budget proposals for 2023-2024, during which the following key issues and questions were raised:

- Whether there was reassurance that the proposed reductions, especially for grounds maintenance and the community improvement team, won't undermine the ambition for the county to be a greener place to live, and asking what the potential impact on rural villages would be.
- Asking if the 'reconfiguration of sweeping functions across the county' won't undermine the positive contribution to addressing the climate and nature emergency.
- Is there sufficient resource to pursue single penalty notices for littering? Were budgetary considerations made regarding tackling littering and fly tipping in this way and, if so, why were they discarded?
- Asking to what extent the mechanical solution can be applied to littering in more rural areas, and whether a physical solution would be more effective in this context.
- Clarifying the total expenditure figures in the report, and what the additional revenue is for the council for each 1% of council tax increase.
- Concern about the robustness of the figures in the Decarbonisation 1 and 2 proposals, asking how the figure of 5% was reached for the energy awareness campaign's projected saving, and what the margin of error is.
- Asking what the margin of error is on the £150k projected income increase for the solar farm
- What is the return on investment for the capital investment in things like pool covers and HVAC?
- Clarifying what capital investment is required to achieve £70k for additional walking routes.
- The possible impact on increased car use and reduced enrolment in sixth forms of raising the price for concessionary travel.
- Whether reverting to statutory distances for free school transport takes into account where there are no available walking routes.
- Noting that some of the Monlife savings involve transferring costs, which are not then real savings.
- Clarifying where the £100k saving will come from under ML22, Gilwern.
- Understanding why part of the £215k saving in RES24 involves places like Tudor Street, whose fate is not yet decided, and transferring activities to Market Hall, which is also set to close – does the budget prejudice those decisions by including them in the proposals?
- Asking what consultation was taken with the charities and users of the centres in places like Drybridge House and Melville Theatre.
- Regarding withdrawing the Gwent Music subsidy, whether £9k can be considered sufficient as a hardship fund, to cover the whole county for low-income families.
- Regarding school transport, whether there is reassurance that a safe route to school will still be considered, and for concessionary travel, whether there is an allowance for the number of children involved, given the cost of £880 for the bus for a family with 2 kids.

- Whether Severn View could become affordable housing, given its ideal location.
- Clarity about the reduction in opening hours for libraries and leisure centres etc. and how it will affect different users e.g. older people wanting to access in the day.
- Whether the safe route is independent from the mileage, or they are considered together.
- Asking how much confidence there is that enough funding has been allocated for school traffic management improvements, especially as cuts in school transport service budget will mean more children finding their own way to school, and how we will monitor the effect of those changes.
- Clarifying the costs incurred for Newport Retail Park and Castlegate Business park, and the future plans for those sites.
- Clarifying how those sites sit with the ambitions in the corporate plan to reduce commuting out of county, and how it can be explained that these sites are being funded with free parking while raising or creating car parking fees across Monmouthshire.
- If car parks are still being subsidised, and is the funding raised ringfenced for their upkeep.
- Whether payments for school transport or the green waste collection service can be staggered through the year.
- Whether more can be done to save energy by turning off lights and street lights when they aren't needed, such as at school sites.
- Clarification and further detail of how bridge closures would be implemented.
- Whether increasing business rates and parking charges will further the decline of town centres, and whether stallholders at Monmouth cattle market could be moved to Agincourt Square to make the market there more active and free up the car park.
- Clarifying why, if Market Hall is up for selling off, so much officer time is being spent trying to get the levelling up fund.
- Whether reducing hours for libraries and leisure centres will engender staff redundancies.
- Why £300k is being cut in support from those who need it most, i.e. those with learning disabilities.
- Whether members should reject the pay rise that is creating a £45k pressure, and whether the Cabinet Member and colleagues will lead by example and forego their own salary increases for this financial year.
- If the Cabinet Member can confirm that with a council tax increase of 6%, a single parent with two dependent children will be £784 worse off next year, and a two parent family will be £1200 worse off.
- Will staff have the training and support to be able to do the required continuing healthcare assessments and get proper NHS funding.
- Is it correct that continuing healthcare is not possible without a direct payment, and whether that will deter people from going down the continuing healthcare route.
- Clarifying that the workforce development proposals are to merge the team with a neighbouring authority but be hosted in Monmouthshire.
- Whether an impact on training might be that people decide to work for other authorities.
- If the CCTV scheme in Caldicot can be made fit for purpose.

- Whether the Grassroots scheme can be remodelled.
- If there is further detail about the £550k set aside to fix Redbrook footbridge, and whether Gloucestershire County Council has the funds for its half.
- Asking what plans there are to promote Grassroots to users in more rural areas, how many new registrations we get each year, and if the £30 annual subscription will be per household.
- Noting that a further breakdown of the Grassroots charges and concessions would be useful.
- Asking if the lease for Bridges Community Centre is negotiated, will there be grant facilities to cover any increase in rent.

4. Next Meeting

Wednesday 1st March 2023 at 10.00am.