

## Appendix A

### Proposed amendments to the project resulting from the recent public engagement

	<b>Proposed change</b>	<b>Reasoning</b>
1	Change the two proposed loading bays for Castle Street to general loading bays.	<p>This is proposed in response to concerns raised by business owners about them not being able to use their own vehicles to unload goods. It will also allow customers to move heavier items.</p> <p>Main negative impact of this is that the loading bays will be occupied more frequently which will reduce their availability and result in more interruptions to the flow of traffic. Will also increase need for regular enforcement.</p>
2	Consider placing time limit on Castle Street loading bay from 0930 until 6pm	<p>This would make the bay an unrestricted length of road outside of these hours. This would allow anyone to park prior to 0930 in the morning subject to the availability of a space.</p> <p>Negative is that bays could be taken up by overnight resident parking i.e no guarantee that they'd be available.</p>
3	Change the proposed loading bay for Market Street to a general loading bay	<p>This is proposed in response to concerns raised by business owners about them not being able to use their own vehicles to unload goods. It will also allow customers to move heavier items.</p> <p>Main negative impact of this is that the loading bay will be occupied more frequently which will reduce its availability. Will also increase need for regular enforcement.</p>
4	Inset proposed Castle Street loading bays (This means that the existing pavements won't be widened where they are adjacent to the proposed loading bays).	<p>This will mean that the loading bays won't extend out as far into the road as would have been the case.</p> <p>Only negative impact of this is that the pavements won't be widened where adjacent to the loading bays.</p>
5	Withdraw proposal to close Short Street. Reconsider options for Short Street as part of Phase 2 including potential for one-way with left turn only restriction	<p>In light of opposition to closure of Short Street it is recommended that it is reopened and a traffic camera survey is undertaken to monitor the use of Short Street and any road safety or congestion-related issues.</p>
6	Consider amendments to East Street/Parade Street 90 degree bend	<p>Consider scope to improve the existing "pinch-point" issues that have been reported.</p>

7	Consider and, if possible, provide additional short stay parking on Market Street one way section	One-way restriction may provide sufficient width to provide 2 no. on-street parking spaces. This needs to be checked to ensure it won't interfere with the swept-path of large vehicles turning into Market Street off Castle Street
8	Undertake traffic assessment and consider options for re-routing of HGV through traffic	Evaluate and quantify HGV through traffic, is it same local hauliers using the route for example?

## Appendix B

### Other comments and suggestions from the public engagement that haven't resulted in changes the design of the project

	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>DCC officer response</b>
1	Reducing the width of Castle Street to 6.0m means that it will be too narrow to allow two large vehicles to pass	<p>Design guidance in Department for Transport (DfT) publication <i>Manual for Streets</i>, suggests that a road width of 5.5m is adequate for 2 HGVs to pass one another. We are proposing 6.0m for Castle Street. The DfT publication <i>Manual for Streets 2</i> (wider applications) states "Lanes wider than 3m are not necessary in most urban areas carrying mixed traffic".</p> <p>Reducing lane the road width reduces vehicles speeds and shortens the distance that pedestrians need to cross.</p> <p>Active Travel Design guidance states that traffic lane widths should be 3.0m or less or more than 4.0m. The existing road width in Castle Street (before the Covid scheme was introduced) was 7.3m. Making Castle Street 8.0m wide road would not be possible in Castle Street without making the existing pavements even narrower.</p>
2	Castle Street/Abbey Road junction will be too narrow	The proposed layout has been designed using Computer Aided Design (CAD) vehicle tracking software to ensure that all manoeuvres can be completed by the largest vehicles expected to use the junction.
3	Castle Street/Bridge Street junction will be too narrow	The proposed layout has been designed using Computer Aided Design (CAD) vehicle tracking software to ensure that all manoeuvres can be completed by the largest vehicles expected to use the junction.
4	Road narrowing will increase traffic congestion and increase traffic exhaust fumes	Any increase in queuing will be marginal and will have a negligible impact on local air quality levels.
5	Llangollen needs a by-pass	The cost of constructing a by-pass, including a new crossing of the River Dee would cost tens of millions of pounds. There is also an argument that traffic by-passing Llangollen could have a detrimental effect on the town's economy.
6	HGVs should be banned	Unfortunately, as Castle Street is also the A542, it forms part of the strategic road

		network and wouldn't be appropriate to prohibit HGV traffic. We will instead liaise with the WG and Wrexham CBC to consider the longer distance routing of through-traffic, including the role of SatNavs.
7	Proposed Bridge Street loading bay isn't required/is in the wrong location	The current location has been identified because of the potential hotel redevelopment. The loading bay can however be used by any business and its location closer to Castle Street will be beneficial in this regard.
8	Castle Street short stay parking should remain because of the detrimental impact it will have on businesses	The proposed loading bays will provide delivery space for businesses. Business owners will be able to use the bays to load/unload their own vehicles. Customers will be able to use the bays to load heavy items.
9	Castle Street short stay parking is needed to provide parking close to shops for people with disabilities	Disabled parking bays are proposed closed to Castle Street on Bridge Street and Oak Street respectively
10	Loading bays need to be mixed-use i.e. short stay parking for part of the day and then loading bays for rest of the day	Consideration is currently being given to changing the start times of the loading bay so they're unrestricted for the first part of the day. Experience of mixed-use bays in other towns suggests that they often cause much confusion amongst motorists leading to significant amounts of illegal parking.
11	Yorkstone paving will be damaged by road salt	DCC Highway maintenance manager confirms that the Yorkstone will be suitable and not vulnerable to road salt.
12	Abbey Road short stay parking (at the Castle Street junction) is needed as otherwise more vehicles will park in side streets	Removing parking will allow the narrow pavements to be widened in this location which is also part of the school walking route for many school pupils.
13	There is no need for the loading bays as they will just cause traffic hold-ups	Loading bays will create delays for larger vehicles trying to pass them but this will also slow traffic speeds. Loading bays are necessary to service local businesses.
14	Making the section of Market Street one-way will cause confusion	The current one-way has resulted in some confusion as locals get used to it, but this is quite usual when one-way systems are first introduced. Making the scheme permanent is unlikely to be detrimental in this regard.
15	Don't include free parking in Market Street car park as it will displace more tourist parking	The free parking will provide short stay spaces for local people even if they're arriving later in the day. It is unlikely that an hour would be enough for visitors to the town. Experience suggests that parking charges do not put off visitors who see parking costs as part of the costs of their

		day out, plus generally Denbighshire parking tariffs are cheap compared to other parts of the UK.
16	Provide free parking for the beginning of the day for locals doing their shopping	This is being considered in looking at the operational times for the loading bays.
17	Providing disabled parking bays in Market Street car park is too far for many blue badge holders	Blue badge bays are proposed for Oak Street and Bridge Street – close to Castle Street.
18	A ramped road surface isn't a good idea	Ramping the road surface will encourage slower traffic speeds.
19	Why can't we have a pedestrian crossing on Castle Street?	One of the principles of the Llangollen 2020 scheme is to reduce street clutter, which means minimising the amount of traffic signs and posts. A pedestrian crossing would also require an extensive length of zig zag lines which could impact upon the ability to provide loading bays.
20	Why was a shared space not proposed?	It was considered at the outset of the project but wasn't considered suitable owing to the heavy traffic flows from Castle Streets status as part of the A542.
21	Why aren't there more street trees proposed?	We did consider more trees but there are high amounts of underground mains and services. Also pavement widths will still be relatively narrow even with the proposal to widen them.
22	The scheme doesn't include cycle routes/cycle lanes	Phase 2 of the project will look at the interconnecting cycle routes either side of Castle Street
23	Needs more locations to park bicycles	This has been considered at but a suitable location hasn't yet been agreed.
24	Narrowing road will impact upon cyclist safety	Active Travel design guidance suggests 3.0m lanes with speed reduction features or 4.5m lanes. Providing 4.5m lanes would require a 9.0m wide road which isn't achievable on Castle Street. Active Travel Wales design recommends that lane widths should be 3.0m or less, or more than 4.0m. Providing an 8.0m wide road wouldn't be possible in Castle Street without making existing pavements even narrower.
26	The project doesn't address the town's parking problems especially for locals such as visitors parking in surrounding streets	The next stage of the project is to look at a parking strategy for the town to try and better manage parking. We have received lots of suggestions about possible additional parking locations.
28	Making Castle Street narrower will place pedestrians in more danger	3.0m wide traffic lanes are fully compliant with DfT design guidance for urban areas with mixed traffic. Making Castle Street narrower shortens the crossing distance for

		pedestrians, reduces traffic speeds and enables the pavements to be made wider.
29	Provide controlled crossing from A5 to Castle Street	Was considered by the WG as part of their proposals to upgrade the current traffic signals but there is not the junction capacity to enable this without further increasing traffic delays. This is because an all-red traffic stage would be required to enable pedestrians to cross under a pedestrian stage (green man).
31	Removing on-street parking/loading makes it easier to cross the road for those with visual impairments	Loading bays are necessary to service Castle Street businesses.
32	No point widening pavements unless Council clamp down on allowing A-boards	The Council has a standard A-board policy which recognises there is a balance between providing suitable pavement width and allowing businesses to attract customers.
33	Consider park and ride	The next stage of the project will consider parking options for Llangollen.