Cyngor Abertawe
Swansea Council

Cabinet Office
The Guildhall,
Swansea, SA1 4PE
www.swansea.gov.uk

Councillor Peter Black
Chair
Scrutiny Programme Committee

BY EMAIL

Please ask for: Councillor Mark Thomas
Direct Line: 01792 63 6926
E-Mail: cllr.mark.thomas@swansea.gov.uk
Our Ref: MT/KH
Your Ref:
Date: 26 March 2021

Dear Councillor Black

SCRUTINY OF ACTIVE TRAVEL CONSULTATION PROCESS

I am writing in response to your letter dated 8th March 2021 regarding the Committee Views and to address the areas that you have highlighted for formal response, following the Scrutiny Programme Committee meeting held on 16th February 2021.

I would firstly like to thank you for the opportunity to provide further information on the process that has been followed to enable Swansea Council to improve and increase active travel provision in recent years.

Swansea Council is fully committed to providing an expansive and well-connected active travel network, evidenced by the continued increase in the total length of the off-road network serving residents and visitors to the City and County.

As a Council, we have received the highest levels of funding in Wales for active travel schemes in recent years. £12.7million has been invested in the past three years resulting in a 25% increase in the length of the network, providing 60% of the 72,000 households in Swansea with access to a dedicated off-road active travel route within 500m of their home. Further ambitious schemes are proposed for the future, continuing to link communities into this important network.

A robust and reliable network of active travel routes is required to facilitate everyday journeys by pedestrians and cyclists. Swansea Council is committed to providing the necessary supporting infrastructure to enable people to choose to travel actively, ensuring that active travel becomes a prominent and first-choice of transport for daily journeys in Swansea. This approach is intended to meet the needs of the present, whilst protecting the needs of future generations.

In your letter, you have invited my response to the content of your letter, and specifically noted a number of areas for formal response. I shall outline my response to each area individually.

Key Findings | Response

Your letter describes the purpose of the Existing Route Map (ERM) and Integrated Network Map (INM), and continues to outline that 'the INM sets out the plans for the next 15 years, mainly a tool to enhance forward planning of active travel'. It is important to note that the INM produces a comprehensive plan setting out the short, medium and long-term capital infrastructure walking and cycling routes that the local authority will seek to deliver, for the improvement of active travel across the City and County of Swansea over the next 15 years. The map is however refreshed every three years, and is subject to a statutory public consultation prior to being adopted.

During the meeting on the 16th February, I outlined that engagement on active travel schemes has continued throughout the design and development of schemes, and this has resulted in minor changes or alterations being made to the design, but not the intended alignment. This engagement cannot however override the previous public consultation which outlined the routes that we have consulted upon and clearly indicated an intention to deliver. Amendments to construction materials, surface dressing systems and the inclusion of speed restriction measures have all been incorporated in to schemes as a direct result of ongoing engagement with local residents and community groups. It is my intention to maintain this dialogue on all future schemes, and I continue to welcome the input and contributions from local residents and community groups on all schemes.

You have included a link in your letter to the Council's website where details of the current active travel schemes being delivered can be found. It should be noted that this webpage contains specific information on the individual routes, including where available, design drawings of the route to be constructed and answers to frequently asked questions.

https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelschemes

This webpage is complementary to the Council 'Active Travel Act' webpage which provides the ERM and INM maps, route lists, and is accompanied by the consultation report from the development of the INM in 2017.

https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelact

Committee Views

In relation to your comments regarding the report presented to Cabinet on 30th July 2020, you have suggested that additional detail be provided in similar reports in the future. To that end, I have taken immediate action to include a summary map of the routes proposed to be constructed in 2021/22 in a report shortly due to be taken to Cabinet. Any routes taken forward however will also be contained on the INM and their alignment available to view under the Council's 'Active Travel Act' webpage.

As outlined in the meeting of the 16th February, the challenging timescales for the submission of Active Travel Fund schemes, does not give opportunity to consult widely on the schemes prior to their submission to Welsh Government.

It should however be noted, that many of the schemes being developed will have benefitted from engagement with local ward members, where this development has been funded by Welsh Government. The Council is not in a position to engage upon schemes for which it does not have any funding or resource secured against.

In response to your statement 'you told us that after Cabinet has approved expenditure, based on Welsh Government funding approval, it is effectively too late to consult', I would like to clarify and reiterate that all of the active travel schemes taken to Cabinet have been consulted upon as part of the statutory public consultation for the INM, and the route alignment funded by Welsh Government will be in-line with the route consulted upon in 2017. This does not mean that the Council is unwilling to engage with local residents and community groups on the detail of the scheme, and make minor changes to enhance the route, rather that the route alignment forms the basis of the funding allocation which underpins the active travel scheme proposed.

I will ensure that communications and press releases continue to be released to inform and raise awareness of the active travel schemes being developed, and opportunities for engagement communicated. I will also continue to write directly to local ward members regarding active travel schemes in their area, continuing to provide the opportunity for input and ongoing dialogue.

Letters

You have asked that I specifically address the extent of letters being delivered to adjacent properties along routes. I can confirm that as standard, letters would be delivered to those propertied directly adjacent to a route to being delivered. However, as I have previously confirmed and due to the scheme being progressed at the outset of the coronavirus pandemic, a virtual public meeting was held in conjunction with the Blackpill, Derwen Fawr and Mayals Residents Association, to engage with the wider community.

Mayals Road Engagement Session

You have requested to receive a copy of the report compiled as a result of a virtual public meeting held with members of the local community to discuss the Mayals Road scheme. I have attached the report for your perusal.

I trust that this provides you with the necessary information that is required in a formal written response. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate in contacting me.

Yours sincerely

Y Cynghorydd / Councillor Mark Thomas
Aelod Y Cabinet Dros Gwella'r Amgylchedd a Rheoli Isadeiledd/ Cynghorydd dros Penclawdd
Cabinet Member for Environment Enhancement & Infrastructure Management/ Penclawdd Ward Councillor
01792 63 6926

3rd November, 7pm, Zoom Session – Proposed changes to Mayals road

Presentations from Alan Ferris and Martin Bignell on the proposed Mayals Cycle Route, including removal of trees

This is the summary of questions raised and feedback provided by residents and attendees.

This document has grouped questions and feedback based on the following topics;

- Consultation undertaken for the scheme
- The demand for this proposed cycle route
- The details / design of the proposed cycle route
- The impact to trees along the route
- Wider environmental concerns

Questions have been included in a table, and grouped when similar. Feedback is also detailed in each section.

Consultation

Consultation Process	
Questions	Response
Has the decision already been made? Is this still a proposal or is it an approved plan that is going ahead? Are we participating to be told what is going to take place regardless?	Mayals Road was identified as a key route in 2017 when we completed our city wide integrated map of existing and proposed cycle routes. This map was the subject of a three month consultation. While we are willing to consider issues raised on the detail of the proposals, the fundamental design of the route is established and will be implemented.
How has this [scheme] been passed? Has due process been followed	Funding was provided by Welsh Government to extend cycle infrastructure in Swansea.
Why has there not been any consultation? Can you provide evidence of any previous consultation for this project? It may have been done but where was it advertised?	The requirements of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 places a statutory responsibility on each local authority in Wales, to map, plan and make continuous improvements to its active travel (walking and cycling) networks.

	Swansea Council developed two maps in 2017, as required under the act, an Existing Route Map (ERM) and an Integrated Network Map (INM). The INM produced a comprehensive plan setting out the short, medium and long-term capital infrastructure walking and cycling routes that the local authority will seek to deliver, for the improvement of active travel across the City and County of Swansea. The draft INM was published for comment as part of a statutory twelve week public consultation period, as required by the Act. The Consultation ran from 12th June to 8th September 2017, and included online consultation, a series of workshops held at Civic Centre, Clydach and Gorseinon, alongside consultation with a number of schools and stakeholders. The community engagement events were advertised by Swansea Council, alongside the opportunity to take part in the consultation through the Council's website. The consultation exercises engaged with the public and gave individuals the opportunity to share their views and help shape the INM throughout Swansea. The Cabinet Member for Environment Enhancement and Infrastructure Management approved the submission of the INM to Welsh Government in October 2017, and following review by Welsh Government, was subsequently approved and adopted. Further information can be found on the Council's Active Travel webpage: https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelact
Why there has not been a public consultation as required under a Traffic Regulation Order?	The traffic regulation orders will be published in due course. The public will be invited to comment on this element of the proposals.

In the Council's Corporate Plan 2017/22 - Delivering a Successful & Sustainable Swansea, the Council state "we will continue to engage with and seek the views of residents and service users." If this is the case, and given that the scheme programme shows a three-week consultation period in	Funding was not confirmed by Welsh Government until July 2020. At that point tree surveys and trial holes had to be completed to allow the detailed design to be confirmed.

May 2020 for the Mayals Link alone, why hasn't the Council or our Ward Councillor engaged with or sought the views of residents?	Our intention was always to display the plans for public viewing. However the opportunity to present them at the zoom meeting seemed an ideal way to circulate the ideas locally.
The drawing I have seen was dated January 2020. How come this is the first time we have seen it?	The plan you refer to was the initial design which was presented to Welsh Government to seek funding. This was developed to address many of the issues that are of concern to residents. These plans were not completed until this month.
Will further significant public consultation be offered as the detail is developed?	Unfortunately, there is no opportunity to do this. However there will be opportunitry to comment on the proposal to introduce Traffic Regulation Orders along the route.
Who has been consulted	
Questions	Response
Have residents ever been consulted about this path officially? Have the community actually been asked what they want? 1.8 million pounds for this project? How about consulting the community? Have residents of Mayals Rd been consulted? What were their views? Have residents been consulted at all? Why haven't residents been consulted?	As noted above, the draft Integrated Network Map was published for comment as part of a statutory twelve week public consultation period, as required by the Active Travel Act. The Consultation ran from 12th June to 8th September 2017, and included online consultation, a series of workshops held at Civic Centre, Clydach and Gorseinon, alongside consultation with a number of schools and stakeholders. The provision of cycle infrastructure is for the wider community to consider, not specifically those living on Mayals Road.
How many cyclists have you consulted regarding this scheme? What're their opinions? Were any cyclists who actually ride Mayals Road consulted about this plan? What about people who aren't on the internet?	The plans were submitted to Welsh Government for funding who used Sustrans to advise them. Since award the Council have had meetings with Wheelrights to explain the ambition of the scheme. This involved a number of cyclists who are familiar with the route.
Other Queries	
Questions	Response
Has the Council reviewed or consulted with Welsh Government to see what potential revisions and Regulation changes are to be incorporated in the pending update of the Active Travel Design Guidance that could impact on	The proposed arrangement complies with Active Travel Design Guidance, published by Welsh Government in support of Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013.

the current design? And implications of any proposed modifications to the Highway Code?	
Given the obvious local opposition to the scheme would the council consider dropping it?	The Active Travel (Wales) Act (2013) places a legal duty upon local authorities in Wales to map, plan for and promote active travel journeys. Mayals Road was identified as a key route in this network and is seen as bringing benefit to the wider community not just those living on Mayals Road. However, the developed design has been undertaken to be sympathetic to the local environment, recognising the high quality environment through which the route passes.
How much room for negotiation is there still left if the scheme is starting in December?	Where there are specific concerns over the detail of the design, these will be examined. However, the fundamental alignment has now been confirmed.

Could we see the map in more detail please Can we have copies of the presentation afterwards, please? How can we obtain these details in hard copy so that we can look at them properly? Are these latest detailed drawings now available publicly please	The plans are now available to view on line at https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelschemes
Would it be possible to provide a computer generated mock up showing the road, paths and trees? If this could be done to scale it would help us to appreciate the aesthetics and practicalities.	Unfortunately this is not available.
Could we have copies of the comments from this meeting AND Swansea City Councils response?	
Can we have a date at which the feedback is given to us.	
Where can we find the feedback? Same place the original so called consultation?	
Can we run another session, please?	Unfortunately, there is not sufficient time to accommodate this.

The following feedback was also received during the session regarding the consultation process;

- This doesn't seem to be a consultation with interested parties, it's more that we are being told what is going to happen.
- Serve the community - without going through normal planning consent where the community have their say
- So if it is starting in December, there is not much point in consultation here. You are just telling us what you are going to do

- Swansea Council! Please listen to your citizens!
- No, there was no consultation 2 years ago. There NEVER has been any consultation with residents
- PROVE THE CONSULTATION WENT AHEAD!
- I actually agree with this scheme, with adaptations, but there has not been sufficient consultation, we have heard nothing!
- I agree but we haven't been able to get hold of any plans
- I think you'll find we should be co-producing according to council principles
- It’s the first I’ve heard of the consultation.
- I cannot believe this is at this stage starting in less than 4 weeks, with no consultation !!! shocking
- No consultation that we’re aware of- Green Close resident
- They've just bypassed the residents. Having lived here for since 1981 I am disgusted.
- The first I heard of this project was literally a few months ago in the Evening Post - now it’s a ‘fait accomplice’ -it is not acceptable.
- You should have the details of this consultation.
- This project is totally unacceptable and their has been No consultation with local residents.
- A public consultation exercise did take place in Bishopston and their Ward Councillor fed back how well attended and constructive it was. Our own Ward Councillor has known about this scheme for at least a year but has failed to mention it.
- What are Mayals Residents views.
- It’s to inform us, nothing more.
- They are telling us not asking us....
- I think it’s a great idea. but consultation needs to happen in future.
- We need better information.
- Consultation seems entirely missing
- This is all such a shame. What could've / should've been an opportunity to build support for cycling, understand needs, has led to a defensive last minute meeting, in which our views are being downplayed. Considering the concerns from pedestrians, cyclists and others it's wrong that Alan is saying it's a done deal. DISGRACEFUL
- There is not a lot of time until this proposal will be implemented and I am conscious that feedback will be given to us last minute to avoid discourse.
- We shouldn't dance to do something just because there is money available, it should be done because it is the right thing to do with support of residents
- Delivering a badly conceived scheme in a rush to secure funding is not professional or ensuring good value.
- Bit disappointed that there wasn't consultation with local people but there was with one or two select people
- Agree with the suggestion to post plans on council website

- This is probably a group in which over 90% are against this scheme as it stands? Perhaps there should be a survey undertaken by an independent company to determine the views of the residents
- Isn't wellbeing better served by clean air and exercise for all, and are not all the objections from local residents
- No consultation whatsoever with local people. Surely we should have an input into a scheme costing so much and with big geographical changes.
- We should be informed of total cost.
- It is not clear whether cyclists have specifically requested these changes or been consulted on them.
- If detailed plans to explain the changes proposed do exist, then they have not been made easily accessible to the public.

Need for the Route

Evidence Base	
Questions	Response
What is the volume of bicycle traffic using mayals road currently? How many cyclists per hour on Mayals road daily, not an average, but exact number please? Where is the cyclist traffic study justification for this major disruption? I assume that a study has been undertaken of existing usage of Mayals Road by cyclists and projected use. How many local and out of the area cyclists use Mayals Road at present and are expected to use it in future?	The route has been developed as a first phase to create opportunity for cyclists to travel from the Mayals area and the Gower beyond. It accords with Welsh Government policy in developing a cycle network aimed at changing how people choose to travel. In this context, the numbers of cyclists currently using the route is not relevant.
Cyclists are a very small minority, what about the other majority users?	The carriageway will continue to operate two way, albeit with a reduced width of 6m. New controlled crossing points will also be introduced which will benefit both pedestrians and cyclists.
Demand for the route	
Questions	Response

We all want more cycling, less cars is a good thing. BUT Is this really the best value for public funding? There are serious concerns from cyclists, pedestrians, residents etc. Who actually wants it?	The proposed measures are designed to support active travel creating an environment that separates vulnerable road users from moving traffic. The funding provided by Welsh Government was assessed against submissions from other Local Authorities across Wales.
It is stated in the Council's Scheme Application that the scheme "will principally provide connectivity and access for those living in Mayals and West Cross, a population of 9,124 people". It is also stated that the population of Mayals is 2,700, which means that the majority of the perceived benefit, some 70%, is based on the population of West Cross alone. Given the above bias, is it fair to include the total population of West Cross since most cyclists in this area will likely take a more direct route rather than use the Mayals Road link?	The route is being introduced to develop on existing cycle infrastructure. In future years it is proposed to extend this into the Gower. Plans already exist to take this across Clyne Common to Bishopston.
Can you share the evidence that this route if the best place to invest the active travel money?	As noted above, the funding provided by Welsh Government was assessed against submissions from other Local Authorities across Wales.
Is this a huge expenditure for relatively few cyclists? Spend the money elsewhere so that greater numbers can enjoy cycling...?	As noted above, the funding provided by Welsh Government was assessed against submissions from other Local Authorities across Wales.
Links with a larger strategy	
Questions	Response
What is the benefit of doing mayals road rather than the Common first?	Completing Mayals Rd first will allow the common link to integrate directly onto an established cycle link to the city centre. Otherwise, cyclists reaching the end of common would be vulnerable and some may continue to use the existing footways which are not wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians.

This seems an awful lot of change, is there even the demand for this?? Where do the cyclists go after Clyne common??	At present there are no specific plans on how the will extend beyond Bishopston.
Please tell us when this part of the route across the common will be built?	Currently the Council do not own the land. However, negotiations to acquire the land have commenced but it is not possible to put a timeframe on this at present.
I don't really understand the overall vision, will there be a cycle path on the B4436? Where is the cycle path going, how much will be 99% traffic free?	The proposed facility will be a shared use path running on the southern side of the existing road linking Mayals with Bishopston.
Has a safe route linking the top of Mayals Road to Bishopston been set out/planned/consulted on? This is a key route to enable healthy active	Plans have been developed which identify the route. A public consultation exercise was held in July 2019 in Bishopston Community Centre.

travel for hundred of school children who wish to go to school every single day as well as regular cyclists for the route you are discussing here.	
Is the route across the common going to be secured before the work on mayals road starts please? What is the timeline on securing the route and all permissions for the route across the common please? Why don't you use the money you already have for the road along the common? Would the money be better spent in sorting out a safe and well lit combined pedestrian & Cycle path over the common which should have higher priority than Mayals Road? When can we expect the section from mayals to bishopston will be built? What do the Planners have ready to extend the cycle path from the top of Mayals Road, across Clyne Common and into Bishopston. Do they intend to widen these roads also since the Common has been the scene of many accidents over the years. Will this be a “track to nowhere” as there is no track over the common?	No, monies awarded for Mayals Road are for 2020/21. However, it is proposed that future bids for funding will be made to secure the land in 21/22 with the potential to construct the following year. The award from WG was to construct the Mayals Road link. The Council regard both elements of the link as being important in extending the network. It is not proposed to widen the carriageway across the common. In the last three years the police have recorded three collisions which resulted in injury on the B4436 across the common. All three were classified as slight. As noted above, the proposal is to extend the cycle route beyond Mayals Road to Bishopston. Funding will be sought for this in future years.
I would like to see the new south Gower cycle route please	
Isn't it crazy to start the mayals part if funding and permissions for the fairwood road isn't secured? will be a small section of cycle path to nowhere	I’m unclear on the issue with Fairwood Road.
Will the cyclepaths around the Bay be widened? They are too narrow for current traffic. Cyclists & pedestrians are already hazards to each other. many parts of the shore line path have been encroached upon by verges which have not been maintained properly. What funds are available for future up-keep of the new and existing cycle paths?	It is not proposed to increase the width of the bay cycle infrastructure at present. However, improvements to the alignment have taken place in recent years to address concerns and this issue will be reviewed in due course.
If the numbers of cyclists using Mayals Road are expected to increase would the money be better spent in improving the facilities along Mumbles Road and in particular separating pedestrians from cyclists?	Without the investment on Mayals Road we would not anticipate that demand will grow.

The following feedback was also received during the session regarding the need/priority for the cycle route;

- What is the point of this, if you don’t know what volume of cyclists are using it!
- I think we need to take a step back if it's needed at all.
- Surely if the objective is to encourage cycling the first place to start should be across Clyne Common which is currently dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians

- Where is the due diligence in monitoring of usage?
- good to see - the bishopston/common cycleroute is really needed
- I cycle with my son (sometimes!) and for us the worst part is NOT cycling on Mayals Road but going between Bishopston and Kittle. This section of road is too dangerous for anyone but experienced cyclists. This is where the action is needed
- Mayals Rd is a big challenge for all cyclists. I'd rather spend the money on supporting other activities in our city.
- As a regular cyclist on the upper part of the Mayals Road en route to Bishopston I can't see how this scheme helps. It creates a dangerous junction with Fairwood Road where cyclists priority is downgraded. The really scary part of the journey is from the top of the Mayals Road to Bishopston and I think that the money would be better spent there.
- I know people who drive and park at the bottom of Mayals to cycle safely to work in Swansea
- Why do we need this defacing of Mayals Road when the Council has failed in its attempt to get land for a path across the Common. This is like defacing a valuable painting
- You must understand that many of us on this meeting live on Mayals Road BUT are cyclists. We therefore want more safe routes. Unfortunately this is not one of them because it goes nowhere.
- I use the Mayals Road regularly as a way onto the common. Opposition to this project is of course expected but believe any increase in cycle use is to be welcomed. H0wever I do agree there are many major commuter routes into the city that would be better provided with cycle paths
- Don't build this until you get funding for it to go somewhere.
- As a cyclist, I don't find that Mayals Road is a problem- I would like to see the Common being prioritised as it's far more of a problem this would be with far less disruption and wouldn't require any trees to be felled
- Please answer the questions about the cycle paths around the Bay area which are too narrow and not maintained properly for the high volume of traffic on them.
- I don't think this is a good use of public money
- If the money has to be used to build a cycle track, which it seems clear cyclist don’t want up Mayals road would the fund better be used to build a cycle route around the coastal path from Mumbles to Langland?
- Clyne common is the dangerous road not mayals road
- It's not just a matter for local residents, we need to see the bigger picture
- My son used to cycle over here from Murton into Swansea every day for work - it was the common that used to worry him not Mayals rd.
- I am in favour of a cycle path for the community of Swansea. It is a shame there is a delay in the most dangerous part which is the common crossing - this would link the city to the Gower which it seems is the aim of the initiative. David N. seemed to make a good point about merging the two sides.

- I don't understand why such a big scheme is the only option for this stretch, what about a cheaper scheme to just widen the existing paths, have shared use with pedestrians, crenulate around the existing trees which will help to calm speeding cyclists as they would need to go slightly around them. Spend the money on the actual difficult stretch on fairwood common
- Of all the things Swansea needs investment in, this seems not only environmentally disastrous but also a waste of funding
- Broadly supportive that active cycling infrastructure should be encouraged but don't agree the council should not adequately consult because of a finance spend deadlines. Think consultation processes with residents and cycle groups should take place to get the best solution (or least worse solution), with clear objectives for active travel that the residents can understand the benefits. Also, big question over if the route to Murton can be successful, in terms of how much value this phase of work can bring.
- No knowledge of numbers of cyclists now and forecast numbers.
- The road over the Common is a 'no go' area for pedestrians, so I hope that a pedestrian footpath will be incorporated along the entire Common.
- I have spoken to a lady who regularly cycles over the common with her children. She said that in her opinion there was no problem with Mayals Road, it was the Common that was the problem.
- Our main disappointment was to learn that the link from the top of Mayals Road across the Common to Murton/Bishopston is not to proceed. In our opinion that was by far a more important link for safe cycling activity. Without it, the Mayals Road proposals have nothing to link up with. We think any available resources should be prioritised to make progress with the Common link. That would allow more time to develop safer and sounder proposals for Mayals Road; and time for proper consultation.
- We do appreciate that there are significant constraints on the Council about the funding, the time scale and the technical requirements. This is clearly a project that poses many challenges. But better in our view to ensure a major review and reassessment, and greater consultation to secure improvements. We think the vast majority of residents want to support enhanced cycling activity in this area.
- The government grant is specifically to make Wales a safer place to cycle, scoot and walk. The critical link where safety is most at risk is where the B4436 road crosses Clyne Common between Mayals and Murton. This is a main artery to the Gower and has no walking or cycling paths or road lighting. It is inconceivable that the Mayals Road link scheme can take precedence over this.

Proposed Route

Design Process

Questions	Response
Who designed these plans? The drawing detail is inadequate for a complex plan.	The Council's in-house design team. More detailed plans have been prepared to enable the works to be built. These are not suitable to provide general information.
Has this scheme been designed around the so called diseased trees or the diseased trees discovered to fit in with the scheme.	The cycle lane alignment is not dependent on any trees being felled.
Perhaps the Council should bring in a professional organisation to do a credible design??	The design accords with Welsh Government design standards.
You keep talking about safer solutions what is the problem that you are tackling?	The creation of a shared use paths and hybrid cycle lanes offer protection for cyclists who are considered to be vulnerable road users. However, the scheme also offers controlled crossings to benefit pedestrians negotiating Mayals Road and a narrower carriageway which should see a reduction in the speed of motorised traffic using the route.
Do you consider it safe to build a cycle path that ends abruptly just before the Common which every cyclist knows, is very dangerous?	This is not the end of the route proposed by the Council. A further phase is proposed to extend across the commom.
What about a one way road system down Mayals and up Fairwood Road?	Whilst this would enable more road space to be designated to cyclist it would create relatively significant detours for residents on both Mayals Road and Fairwood Road. Increased speed of traffic may also cause problems.
How long will the work be phased over please, given the traffic disruption there will inevitably be?	It is anticipated that works will continue for around 5 months.
How high is the risk of the scheme going over budget and the burden of completing the scheme falling on the tax payer?	Detailed costings have been prepared with contingency included for unforeseen issues which may arise during construction.
Has the possibility of diverting cyclists into Clyne Gardens been considered and using the existing wide track in the Gardens as a shared cycle/pedestrian track?	A route through Clyne Gardens was assessed during the initial design phases. Whilst the topography at the eastern end is suitable, the western end of the park has very steep gradients and is not suitable for cycling. Furthermore, even assuming that the gradient issue could be worked around, this would only offer a solution between Wesport Avenue and Mumbles Road
Given the Council's past record with regard to traffic schemes, how confident are the planners that this scheme will not prove another that will require major changes in the future?	As previously noted, the design conforms to Welsh Government design guidance.

The narrow downhill 'hybrid' cycle lane is considered dangerous by highly qualified civil engineers and experienced cyclists; why is this untested idea (which has not been implemented anywhere else in Wales) being proposed for Mayals Road?	As previously noted, the design conforms to Welsh Government design guidance. The solution is being used on Mayals Road to balance the needs between the different road users whilst maintaining the tree lined characteristic of the route.
Cycle paths recently completed/currently under construction in Gors Avenue/Cockett Road use the SUP principle; why is Mayals Road being treated differently?	Shared use paths are part of the design for both the western and eastern sections of the route. It was not possible to continue this solution through the central section without significant tree loss (not only the diseased trees).
Does the scheme comply with the latest guidelines on cycle lanes and also the revision of the Highway Code currently under consultation?	Yes
Given the high volume of motorised traffic (including buses and commercial vehicles) on Mayals Road, have the consequences of narrowing the road been considered?	Yes, it is anticipated that narrowing the carriageway will help in reducing the average speed of vehicles using the road.
Knock on effects of the changes	
Questions	Response
Have Swansea council considered the amount of congestion that will result in the introduction of the toucan crossings along Mayals Road? There is a significant amount of congestion at rush hour at the junction between fairwood road and mayals road as it is. Please provide more details.	It is not anticipated that the Toucan crossings will significantly impact on levels of congestion. Indeed the scheme is fundamentally designed to create an environment where more people will choose to travel by more sustainable means.
What about deliveries to Mayals Road properties? Won't this block these cycle paths? How will deliveries be possible if double yellows on road? What provisions are planned for the servicing of the many properties on Mayals Road (deliveries, parking etc)?	It is proposed to introduce a prohibition of waiting on Mayals Road. This will not prevent deliveries to properties.
Please may I have a considered response from the Council regarding residents who require visits at home from carers, physios, OTs, podiatrists and have medicines delivered to them. Where should these visitors park (especially when residents have hybrid cycle/footpaths directly outside their entrances)? Will the parking on Mayals Road outside Clyne Chapel be lost? Will the Council be improving parking in the 'free' car park at the Woodman? Where will people visiting Clyne Gardens park? What about less able people's access to Clyne Gardens?	Observations are that there is very limited levels of parking on Mayals Road, visitors, carers etc will be required to park in the nearest available space if they cannot be accommodated on residents drives. It is proposed that the parking outside Clyne Chapel will be relocated to the southern kerb in proximity to Clyne Drive to accommodate the section of shared use path outside the chapel gate. There are no plans to

What about the impact of no parking on Mayals road, on side streets? What about the extra parking on side streets as a result of double yellow lines on Mayals road? Has impact on parking on side roads been assessed? it will have a big impact How is it projected that these changes will affect householders in Mayals Road and surrounding streets? Deliveries, services, visitors, carers will all be affected by double yellow lines, narrowed roads etc as there will be no possibility to stop near roadside properties. It will impact on nearby streets which will have far more people parking there instead.	There may be an element of migratory parking as a consequence of the works. Where this results in a safety issue the Council will look at this.

Does the Council intend to implement traffic orders on Mayals Road prohibiting stopping/parking of vehicles on the hybrid cycle lane and reduced carriageway?	It is proposed to introduce a “no waiting at any time” parking restriction.
Design Features	
Questions	Response
The new crossing is not wide enough to put your bike perpendicular as you are mid way across mumbles road is this going to be widened?	It is a single phase crossing.
Do you need benches in a cycle lane?	They are not a requirement, however there is space in this location to accommodate this facility which is seen as being of benefit to the wider community.
If there is an island in the middle of the road, the carriageway is reduced to 2.5 m each side?	I have attached a link showing details of the crossing points both new and existing.
The toucan crossing appears to go from nowhere to nowhere – i.e of limited benefit to pedestrians, not least at the nearby junctions. What is the rationale for this?	The crossing are located in proximity to Clyne Drive and Fairwood Road.
Have Swansea council considered how the removal of more than half of both sides of grass/tree area either side of the road will impact on surface water flooding? Have Swansea council considered the increase in surface water flooding that will result from reducing the amount of grass and canopy cover either side of the road??	The cycle link will take up significantly less than half of the verge area. It is also proposed to use permeable paving to construct the hybrid cycle links. This will allow water to infiltrate into the substrate.
How can I ride my motorbike over this upstand safely?	As at present, there will be no kerb upstand at driveways.
How will it be safe for the cyclists when we pull out of our drives? Many of us reverse out.	Cyclists will have priority over those accessing and egressing their drives. This matches the current position where cyclist are on the road.

What will happen to the existing pedestrian crossings?	Where possible these are retained and supplemented by the controlled crossings. Elsewhere the narrower carriageway width, and anticipated resuction in speed of traffic, will benefit pedestrians in crossing the road.
Double yellow lines, toucans, traffic lights. This is quite a change for the tree lined environment is it not?	The proposed changes are designed to support a more sustainable transport network in accordance with Welsh Government policy.
Double yellow lines for full length?	Double yellow lines will be required to ensure the free flow of traffic and prevent parking on the new cycle link. It will not prevent loading and unloading to service properties.
Porous surfacing? as a senior engineer I would like you expand on this. from what I can see the surface drainage currently installed cannot cope with the amount of surface water currently produced.	There are a number of porous asphalt products on the market designed to allow water to flow through the paved layers into the substrate below.
Could you please explain why there is a need for a shared path at either end of the proposed changes - I assume that the limited width opposite the church is the main issue, but can you confirm that is the reason	The western end will be a continuation of the shared use path coming across the common. The eastern end shared use path is required due to limitations in the carriageway width. In particular, the section to the east of the chapel has no footway or verge provision on the northern side restricting our options at this location.
Simplify the Westport junction for whose benefit? pedestrians and cyclists. Sounds like for cars	There have been a number of concerns expressed to the Council over the operation of this junction. Non-compliance of the prohibition of entry by some drivers is a source of particular concern and is often referred to by residents.
I welcome any additional provision for cyclists but it is questioned whether the scores awarded in the Cycling Audit truly reflect the actual site conditions and if they did, what impact they would have had on the funding application? (as evidence, kerbside activity has been scored as “No/very limited conflict with kerbside activity”, which does not reflect the many private means of accesses that will be affected. Similarly, under “Risk of Collision”, the cycle lane has been scored relative to a width of 1.8m rather than the narrower 1.5m).	Consideration on the impact of driveways was considered to be extremely limited as the proposed construction reflects existing practice. Cyclists using the new link will be, more or less, in alignment with the existing kerbline.
How will this look in terms of aesthetics, will we lose the tree lines?	The tree line will not be lost. As noted the project offers the opportunity to replace existing failing trees with new trees which will be planted on the alignment of those removed.
It is not clear how existing bus stops and recently installed central reservations will be incorporated into the proposal without imposing on the cycleways or the road usage.	I have attached a link to the Council’s webpage which shows the alignment. https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelschemes

Why is there a need to have a shared pathway from Mumbles Rd up to Clyne Drive?	There is insufficient road space to continue the hybrid solution through this section.
Does the design adequately consider safety factors to minimise / eliminate risk at the various existing junctions onto Mayals Road, including driveways?	The design complies with Welsh Government design guidance in promoting cyclists ahead of motorised transport at minor junctions. However, cyclists will be required to give way to traffic at Fairwood Road.
If this development is to proceed please could one side of Mayals Rd be designated for cyclists and the other side designated for pedestrians?	Separate pedestrian facility will be available on the majority of the route. The exception to this is the relatively short section between Clyne Gardens and the Chapel where there is a retaining wall on the southern side of the road.
Could pelican crossings be sited at the entry / exit gates to Clyne Gardens?	Unfortunately not.
Use by cyclists	
Questions	Response
How will you ensure all cyclists use the path as 6m width will not allow easy passing [on road]? How is it safe to push cyclists onto a narrow steep road and make it narrower. as noted experienced cyclists will not use the path How can you ensure that cyclists will not continue to use the road? What is to stop a cyclist riding on the roadway? What happens when inexperienced cyclists become experienced [move to the road]?	Cyclists cannot be forced to utilise the new facility. However, it will offer users a safer environment in which to cycle.
Are electric bicycles permitted on cycleways? Are tricycles and electric scooters allowed?	Electric bikes and tricycles will be permitted. At present, electric scooters are not.
How fast do the cyclists go?	?
If the scheme proceeds and the carriageways are narrowed then will cyclists be required in law to use the dedicated cycle paths instead of the road or will they still be allowed road use?	It is not possible to force cyclists to use the new facility. However, it will offer a safer environment for them.
Given the steep gradient and volume of traffic on Mayals Road, a reduction in lane width to 3m (outside of the critical range) is not considered appropriate for this Link. Traffic speeds will be reduced to the speed of those cyclists who chose to continue to use the road, which will undoubtedly lead to driver frustration and increase the risk of collision. How will the Council mitigate against this?	The new facility will protect cyclists from moving traffic creating a safer environment for them.

And how will you assess impact? By that I mean how will you know how many new cyclists you've enabled, how many extra active travel miles have you achieved?	The Council continue to monitor cycle usage at fixed counters around the area. This allows the Council to review usage in general terms over the county area.
Pedestrians	
Questions	Response
Will the cycle track be shared with pedestrians? Mumbles Bay Court is located at the bottom of mayals road and the safety of people leaving here by foot should be a priority.	The proposals show a shared use path at this location. However, it is significantly wider than the existing footway by the entrances on Mayals Road and will be able to support both cyclists and pedestrians safely.
How are Cyclists and Pedestrians segregated. By Barrier?	There will be no segregation of pedestrians and cyclists on the shared use paths. The verge separates pedestrians and cyclists through the hybrid sections.
At what points on the shared path do cyclists have priority over pedestrians?	None.
Will it be safe for pedestrians?	The additional width will enable pedestrians and cyclists to use the shared use path safely.
What consideration has been given to other types of users, not just cyclists and car drivers? Just from my viewpoint cyclists on the coastal path (round the bay) tend to be less sympathetic to pedestrians.	The Council are aware of tensions between pedestrians and cyclist on the coastal path, particularly during periods of fine weather. However, volumes of both cyclists and pedestrians will be significantly less as will the potential for conflict.

The following feedback was also received during the session regarding the proposed cycle route;

- Great news on the plateau hugely needed
- An average HGV is 2.55 m wide therefore doubled equals 5.10 for two vehicles
- I do not believe that this has been well thought out. The width of a bus with it's mirrors is over 3m this will mean a congestion when they meet. This already happens on the Kingsway and is a recognised problem.
- A 6m width may be ok in relation to the volume of traffic based on the Kingsway, but the Kingsway is flat. Thus any impact on the speed of traffic will be much less than it will be on Mayals Road.
- Mayals Road is a major access route onto Gower. You cannot compare it to Kingsway.
- Raised cyclist path segregation is a dangerous proposition for cyclists and cars alike

- The bottom line as far as I can see is safety -if we are are looking at dedicated cycle lanes -this will inevitably mean higher speeds,the egress and ingress of peoples drives are going to become an even greater risk than they are now. Also reducing a large section by 2m is going to have a dangerous effect with so many large lorries which we know use this road.
- Shared use is incredibly dangerous.
- Presumably Mayals Road is considered to be highway, therefore the highway authority can do what it likes.
- Delivery drivers cannot fit in our drives. Not all drives allow for vehicles to be turned. You then have vehicles reversing out of drives across shared routes into the road. Excellent road safety
- There are many vehicles parked off drive, by necessity on mayals road
- Concerned about safety of Mayals residents
- Not impressed that his evidence Is based on a few visits during lockdown
- The speed of this road is much faster than you have indicated Alan. You stated you have only been on site a few times during lockdown.
- Lived here for 26 years, there has never been a problem with cyclists on the footpaths
- There are issues with it but it will help cyclists.
- Most cyclists using Mayals Road push their cycles uphill because it's too steep to cycle.
- More people are using ebikes - often new cyclists and so the hill is nothing - . My 75 year old mum took up cycling in lockdown and could get up it easily so it is not challending on an ebike
- It is not within the highway boundary. It is eating into the grass area either side.
- If experienced cyclists continue to use the main road will this create a greater traffic hazard
- I agree traffic calming on this section is more important, with a linked cycle route to Bishopston
- Uphill is a struggle should focus be on uphill alone as gradients are wellin excess of standards for cycle paths ..
- Downhill cyclists can easily do over 30mph and I have been overtaken I n my car ..better paving at edges would assist and better footways
- Totally agree downhill lane will be a danger and not used
- Please take on board danger of hybrid path to pedestrians
- This is not a safe cycling solution
- This is not NIBYISM. There is no route to Gower from this project. Most of us cycle on Mayals Road.
- I am broadly in favour It is always the case that those against will make the loudest noise. we need to increase cycle use and this will do that
- I am in favour of the scheme if it is a requirement for the next phase to Bishopston
- We want pedestrian friendly, cycle routes, and more trees, and less space for cars
- I am sure you are aware of your duties under the Design (Construction and Management) Regulations 2015 and the fact that you cannot plough on with a scheme regardless when you have been advised by several experts that it is dangerous. To do so would open yourself up to criminal prosecution.

- Increase cycle use yes...and keep wider roads to allow it safely, narrower roads will not help, especially when more electric bikes.
- I am in favour of this cycle route but it should be done well and safely after considering peoples concerns
- Have our speakers actually cycled Mayals Rd
- I agree with the lady who said she is a cyclist and this route is not safe
- I am in favour of Active Travel but not this proposal.
- Makes it more dangerous for motorists if cyclists going down are bunched
- I support a cycle path but I do feel these plans are not appropriate and planners should take the views of cycle clubs much more seriously.
- In favour of increased cycle paths but they have to be done right and this plan does not address many different concerns.
- In favour if active travel but not this proposal. It is not safe
- I'm supportive of a route here. There are elements that can be improved and this feedback needs to be included.
- Everyone I speak to is 100% in support for controlled crossings on Mayals Road to allow for safe crossing and traffic calming
- Toucan crossing are not the only way to provide safe crossings. There is a perfectly good island refuge up at the Fairwood end. More traffic lit signage, crossing and yellow lines is the worst option.
- But there is no safe crossing at the bottom, Clyne Drive, end.
- Development of two-three-and four wheeled electric bikes will lead to increase
- Confident cyclist will use the carriageway
- Agree with you Dareyoush, safer down Fairwood rd
- With reduced road widths and cyclist still using the road this will only cause further disruption
- A much needed route. A really high priority to create joined up cycling across gower and Swansea. Support the wheelrights proposal for an up and down route on the south side of the road.
- Do we want a load of cyclists doing 30+ mph down a cycle path and running into pedestrians
- Could we have the wheelright proposal please-seems more people are with this
- My concern is the speed of traffic or cyclists coming from the common down Mayals Road. Just past the bend is a blind spot for getting out of our drive as it is. Looking forward to seeing the feedback.
- Im also a regular cyclist and horse rider, I like the idea of slowing down the traffic to protect cyclists and other users but im really concerned that this hasn't been thought out well enough
- Mayals Rd is a real challenge even for experienced cyclists.
- I am in favour of cycling. I'm a cyclist myself. But this route is badly thought out from a safety perspective.
- If you tempt inexperienced cyclists up to the top of Mayals Road and then cease the safe route this is ludicrous!
- [Feedback from this session] may not be representative but they are views.
- There is an overwhelming opposition to this, please take this forward

- I am in favour. A lot wrong in the process and think design from Wheel rights
- I fully support more cycle paths and to try and increase use of bikes and reduce traffic and petrol/diesel emissions, But I'm worried that this scheme hasn't been thought through properly
- Not everyone is objecting
- For many people crossing Mayals road is difficult, for older people, those with dogs or prams and the large groups of children catching the school bus. I feel speeding cyclists could make it even more dangerous.
- We think there should be a rethink about that part of the route and re-examine use of Clyne Gardens and Roman Way to link with the cycleway and Toucan crossing on Mumbles Road. That would make that hazardous SUP proposal redundant, maintain safe access to the Chapel and footpath and make unnecessary the expense of the link across to the Foreshore Cycleway from the new Toucan at the bottom of Mayals Road, and the relocation of car parking spaces for the Chapel. It would also allow a better location for a crossing of Mayals Road to and from the Gardens west of Clyne Drive nearer the bus stops.
- The more we look at the part of Mayals Road designated for the on road Hybrid Path we are most sceptical. There did not appear to have been sufficient traffic surveys to assess the impact of the narrowing- this is a busy distributor Road for buses and large commercial vehicles which seems likely to make congestion and hold ups worse. Hazardous access for significant numbers of houses on both sides of the Road will be inevitable.
- The impact of continuous double yellow lines for the whole of Mayals Road appeared not to have been assessed. All side roads will see an increase in parking to gain access to Clyne Gardens. Unsafe parking on verges will continue.
- The path for cyclists could run through Clyne Gardens and skirt the golf course rough ground then continue along Clyne Common without road and traffic disruption
- Cyclists already use Clyne Gardens as a cycle route and a formalised path would result in happy cyclists, beautiful healthy trees continuing to flourish , happy drivers and residents.
- I live in Mumbles Bay Court, sheltered housing, which opens on to Mayals Road. I've already had an encounter two years ago with two women cyclists on the present pavement, which ended in a Colles fracture. When a cycle race takes place, the Police have clocked them at 41 mph in a 30 mph zone. Now with the latest craze, there are at least two young men using the path going to work every day on their Electric skateboards. So I would like to know more about what is, I understand, already planned to take place.
- Most cyclists descending the hill do so at speed on the road and presumably would not want to be speed constrained on a downhill cycle path. If the downhill cycle path is sited directly next to the downhill footpath then cycling speeds would have to be significantly constrained.
- In the proposal the cycle path would be restricted both at the bottom of Mayals Road and the top of Mayals road entering the common. This would appear to reduce both its value and safety protection.

Mayals Road Trees

Removed Trees	
Questions	Response
What is the council going to do to maintain the trees that currently line mayals road? The pleasant aspect should not have to be lost in order to keep the cycleway	We already do maintain the trees on Mayals Road. The 108 other trees on the road are all part of that maintenance. My team have worked on and removed many trees over the years. All the young trees that line the road have been planted by my team over the last 15 years as donations from councillors and other bodies. The trees are inspected annually to ensure they are safe. Remedial work is carried out after the surveys. The species chosen for replacement trees are in line with the species that are already on the road.
How many trees will be felled to carry out cycle path on Mayals Road? How many trees are will be felled? How many trees- healthy or diseased- that you want to fell? What trees are planned to be felled? Please identify the 19 trees that are planned to be felled. Clarification needed on number of trees to be felled and where they are on the map? Will any mature trees be felled?	The trees are not being felled because of the cycle path. 6 trees are dangerous following this year's survey. These will be removed whatever happens. We are using the opportunity of funding to remove and replace other trees with an expectedly short life span ahead of them so as to maintain the tree stock and provide longevity to the tree stock on the road. There are 19 trees in total to fell. None of these are healthy There are 5 ash with ash dieback, 8 rowans that are 90% or more dead, 5 Norway Maple varieties and 1 Ailanthus that are decayed/rotted/diseased and dangerous. A plan showing the location of the diseased trees and the replacement sites can be found on the following link. https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelschemes The ash trees are 4 mature and 1 semi mature. The rowans are all semi mature, 4 maples are semi mature, 1 is mature and the ailanthus is semi mature to mature
Are you taking out any trees that are not ash or rowan? What trees are they and what diseases do they have?	1. 5 Norway Maple varieties and 1 ailanthus. Each of these trees has either; advanced heartwood decays, crown dieback weakening structural integrity leading from bleeding cankers, advanced decay with vertical cracking following impact from a vehicle, hollowed out and decaying across

	approximately 60% of stem, bark wounds covering more than 20% of stem with crown dieback crown and stem rot with a weakened imbalanced crown.
How many trees that are NOT diseased will be felled?	none
Is it possible to share the plans and a detail of the trees to be felled please? I would love an alternate survey by an independent tree surgeon please	A plan showing the location of the diseased trees and the replacement sites can be found on the following link. https://www.swansea.gov.uk/activetravelschemes
If so many trees are diseased and dying and need to be felled, then why aren't you prioritising keeping all the others?	I'm not sure what the question is asking? We are prioritising the retention of the other trees. I have been working with highways on the best way to avoid damage to any healthy trees and where specific high priority should be given to the tree root area
Replacement Trees	
Questions	Response
What sort of trees will be used to replace current trees? It would be nice to have British broad leaf instead of tiny alternatives	Most British native trees are not particularly good street trees. My choices were; Tilia cordata – small leaf lime Acer rubrum 'scanlon' – Red Maple Acer campestre 'streetwise' – field maple Betula utilis jacquemontii – Himilayan birch Malus hupehensis – crab apple Crataegus x lavallei – hybrid cockspur thorn This is a mix of large species and smaller species for the different locations though full planting scheme has not yet been drawn
Would the number of replacement trees relate to the age of the trees, and depend on the diameter of the trunk?	No, I would hope that all available spaces where a tree can be planted are used in the scheme. Please be aware that utilities are present and may impede planting at some locations
[Replacement] Planting?? Or Trees?	trees
What about plane trees which seem to do well in urban environments?	These trees are good for urban environments but there are associated problems with the species including large leaf size that can block gutters and

	eventual immense size. If you look at the trees we have planted along the road in the last 15 years all have done well, these include some of the above list plus some other species
Can we have sight of the list of proposed trees, please?	See above although as I have said this has not been designed yet and I would expect to discuss species with the landscape designer who carries this out.

Other Queries	
Questions	Response
Have you produced a tree survey and will this be made public?? Can we have sight of the tree survey, please, and a site visit to discuss, please? Can you confirm we can have the Tree report, and a site visit to discuss? Can we have a list of the trees that are there now please	I'm not entirely sure we will make the tree survey public but all the relevant information is included in the plans that Alan has. I am willing to look at the trees on site with anyone with any Arboricultural background who can identify what I am referring to
If these trees are so dangerous - why are [they still there]? If trees are so dangerous - why have they not been felled yet? Ash trees on Mayals Rd? If so many trees on the Mayals Road suddenly need to be removed due to disease, why have these not been removed before? Trees may be replaced, but will take years to mature and grow into a lovely canopy again. So sad.	As stated above we inspect the trees every year. Some of the trees have been monitored for a few years but the degradation in their decaying areas this year was noticeable. The survey this year was in the summer, we consider removal within 12 months for a tree with an 'essential' categorisation as correct. If the scheme does not go ahead for any reason, my team will be removing these trees before next summer. With trees like the rowans we would keep them as monitor until they were completely dead. As stated before, we are using the scheme to provide funding to replace these almost dead trees. Same can be said for the ash
When would they remove them if not for this [cycle route] plan?	Within the next 6 to 8 months
What has the council done to protect the trees from those disease? Can those sick trees be treated? It will be a shame to lose them. Have Swansea council tried every other avenue to treat these diseased trees? Felling should be the final solution	There is no means to stop Ash die back or treat it. It is spread by airborne fungal spores. The other diebacks, decays, diseases and structural faults cannot be treated as such and are a natural part of a trees life. We manage their die back and at some point make the decision to remove the tree for public safety.
Are there any limes on Mayals road near Westport Avenue junction?	No, Westport Avenue has mature Planes, a healthy ash and a newer planted hornbeam around the entrance to it.
For the layman, please could you describe the physical indications of the tree diseases you have mentioned?	For the 6 dangerous trees you will see at the base of the tree large holes, large areas of exposed heartwood that is cracking and splitting where bark should be, fungal fruiting bodies growing up the trunk. Higher on the trunk

	you will see areas of peeling bark, areas that have lost bark, cavities and decay pockets. For the rowan trees you will see that the tree is mostly deadwood with only a very small amount of leaf at the very tips of the highest branches. It may be hard to see now that the trees have lost their leaf but we did take photos back in the summer when we surveyed. For the ash it is a little harder for the layman to see what ash die back looks like until the tree is practically dead or in category 4. Outward signs of a tree with ash dieback may include, an increased amount of twig drop and larger twig drop scattered about under the tree, die back of the growing tips of the tree with increased growth of upright growing shoots along the branches that may give the outward impression that the tree crown is 'leafy'. The main thing to consider though is the overall vigour and leaf cover of the crown. A heathy mature ash tree would almost completely block out the sky if you looked up underneath one. It's a judgement call made from experience to estimate how much leaf cover a particular tree may have lost.

The following feedback was also received during the session regarding the propose removal and replacement of trees;

- why are we going to listen to a council officer about the trees and not an independent expert
- If trees are to be removed does it not provide an opportunity for much more sophisticated and environmentally sensitive provision with pedestrians and cyclists in mind, especially at these key crossing points
- Replacing mature trees (even if diseased) with new plantings reduces the carbon capture for the next 40 years or so.
- lf this gentleman is a council employee then an independent expert should be brought in.
- Has there been a secondary tree survey by an independent body - which is required by law
- I think that people are saying is indigenous tree that will thrive.
- There is absolutely no point in doing this without a detailed survey
- Swansea air quality is above WHO guidelines... trees absorb CO2
- It is a tree lined road with lots of diesel fumes which does not help the health of trees.
- I don't support the felling of trees even 5 years before the end of their life- we need their oxygen and we need to get to carbon zero- felling trees any earlier than they have to be, is not the way to go.
- You have marked trees outside our house. THEY ARE NOT DISEASED.

- Trees cannot be felled for cyclists - sheer madness
- We were initially reassured that mature trees would not be affected - but then told that 19 diseased trees of various ages and sizes would need to be cleared.
- It is assumed that the trees lining Mayals Road have tree preservation orders placed on them, since the trees predate 1877, and cannot be removed unless they are causing an existing safety concern.

Wider Environmental Concerns

Air Pollution and emissions	
Questions	Response
What about the air pollution caused by the blockage of traffic? Taking trees down will have a detrimental effect on this AONB. what is Chris Lindsey, Team Leader's opinion about this	The proposals are designed to promote more sustainable modes of transport. However, this has not been done at the expense of maintaining two way flow on Mayals Road. Overall there will be an increase in the numbers of trees lining Mayals Road, replanting the diseased trees will be at a ratio of over two to one with infill planting on sites where trees had previously been felled due to their condition.
Any carbon offsetting? You mentioned wellbeing act not clean air strategy	This calculation has not been undertaken.
How can Swansea Council justify spending £1.8 million on Mayals Rd since the council declared a climate & ecological emergency? Air pollution is a problem in Swansea (according to WHO)	The scheme has been valued at £800k and is funded by Welsh Government through their Active Travel Programme. The overall ambition of this is to create an environment where the population feel secure in travelling by more sustainable means.
As this is a 'green scheme' is anything being done to offset the huge amount of carbon which will be produced during construction?	The contractor will be selected from a shortlist of local contractors to assist and will be encouraged to source local materials to help minimise the carbon footprint of the works.
Has the impact of possible increased carbon emissions as a result of traffic delays arising from the narrowing of the road been considered?	It is not anticipated that the narrowing of the road will lead to an increase in congestion. Whilst there is the potential for occasional wide loads, general traffic, including buses and hgv's can travel safely and freely on a 6m carriageway. The introduction of parking restrictions will also assist in ensuring the smooth flow of traffic..