

APPENDIX 4

Q1 Are you in favour of the proposal to re-designate and extend the Conservation Area boundary?

Yes	12 (80.0%)
No	3 (20.0%)
Unsure	0 (0.0%)

Q2 Are you in favour of the proposal to review and extend the existing Article 4 Direction and boundary?

Yes	10 (66.7%)
No	5 (33.3%)
Unsure	0 (0.0%)
.....	0 (0.0%)

COMMENTS FROM RESIDENTS	CCBC OFFICER RESPONSE / ACTION
<p>1. Very good for long-term future of a mining community for conservation.</p> <p>2. After 40 years living within the Conservation Area of Bute Town I do not see any point in extending the existing Article 4 Direction to include the bungalows of Swn-y-Coed, Ty Newydd, Woodstock and Cerrig Llwyd. There has been NO benefit or contribution by the Council to the bungalows or boundary walls / fencing and it is not clear of the effect on our permitted development rights. I am not in favour of the extension to the Article 4 Boundary.</p> <p>3. I am not in favour of the proposal to re-designate & extend the Conservation Area boundary. I recently purchased my property in September 2014 and wish to maintain my property and land without it being in the conservation area boundary I have fully considered the proposals and I am not in favour.</p> <p>4. I attended the meeting with Pat Martin at Bute Town church where I made my objections and the reasons for them clear. I have put forward my views in writing to yourself and to the Secretary of State, Mr Eric Pickles. I would be quite happy to discuss matters with the Heritage Lottery people. I do not wish the hotel to be included in the Conservation Area I would be grateful if you would amend the plan sent by Pauline Elliott accordingly and send me a copy.</p> <p>5. I strongly oppose any change to the existing conservation boundary, as I own a parcel of land within this proposed amendment. I feel that this would devalue my property.</p>	<p>1. Comments are noted</p> <p>2. Whilst the bungalows are not of any historic value in themselves, they do form an integral part of the Bute Town collective and this extension is proposed in order to provide the local planning authority with control over some permitted developments that could have a detrimental impact on the integrity and character of the Conservation Area and listed buildings.</p> <p>3. Comments are noted</p> <p>4. This is addressed in paragraph 4.9 the Report</p> <p>5. No settlement envelope boundary currently exists around the Bute Town settlement in the Council's LDP (Adopted Nov 2010) and as such in policy terms there would already be a presumption against the principle of residential development on this parcel of land, so this designation would not alter its status nor devalue the owner's property.</p>

<p>6. I am in favour in principle, but only if any boundary changes are maintained. Maintenance is the key to everything and sadly the one thing that seems to be missing in most places.</p> <p>7. The pathways are essential. The top path is dangerous and inexcusable. Must be done.</p> <p>8. We feel that any actions that protect this area for future generations are a positive for the village.</p> <p>9. I am one of the 3 owners of the Old Furnace Farm and I support the Conservation Area re-designation and the Article 4 Direction replacement and extension to its boundary.</p>	<p>6. Maintenance issues relating specifically to the roof replacement works will be addressed during the delivery of the project with homeowners and landowners via the Friends and/or a Heritage Trust. The need for maintenance to other areas will be indentified during delivery of the project</p> <p>7. This is one of the key elements to the proposals, to 're-unite Bute Town with its heritage.'</p> <p>8. Comments are noted and welcomed.</p> <p>9. Comments are noted and welcomed.</p>
--	---