

Record of Public and Stakeholder comments and authority responses to public consultation undertaken in 2018

Comments on the proposed amendments to the conservation area boundary

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Recommended change
1	In favour of protection and enhancement of the natural beauty of the unique area of Mumbles. The terrace of houses on Mumbles Road (below the Castle) on the approach road to the village should be included. These houses are included on an 1877 OS Map (map included) and the allotments and trees behind them must be protected.	<p>The proposal is to expand the Conservation Area boundary to take in <i>adjoining areas of similar architectural / townscape character or quality</i>. The draft document proposes to extend the conservation area boundary up to the prominent residential dwelling, no. 420 Mumbles Road and include the section of promenade opposite, to recognise the impending new Coastal protection scheme which extends to the Dairy Car Park and Oystermouth Castle and its associated wooded boundary.</p> <p>Following the public consultation exercise it is agreed that the Conservation Area boundary should be extended to include the row of terraces fronting onto Mumbles Road, namely no's 422 – 488 Mumbles Road. This provides a logical 'squaring' off of the boundary and encompasses some historical development which pre-dates 1877.</p>	Boundary to be extended to include the terraces on the approach to Mumbles from Swansea (no. 422 – 488 Mumbles Road). This provides a logical 'squaring-off' of the boundary and encompasses some historical development which pre-dates 1877. Additional public and stakeholder consultation required.
2	The row of terraces in front of the quarry car park extending to Castle Acre should be included within the expanded boundary.		
3	The stretch of terrace houses along Mumbles Road from Norton to Newton Road have not been included within the expanded boundary. The houses/cottages are some of the oldest in Mumbles and form the start of the village as you arrive in Mumbles from Swansea. It is important for this area to be included within the expanded boundary and preserved from future development.		
4	Welcome the extension to the boundary which recognises the significance and commercial importance of Mumbles. Concerned that the houses on Mumbles Road to the east of Oystermouth Castle have been excluded. Coming from Swansea, after Norton Avenue and Castle Acre, there is open grassland and then Castle woods – these provide a significant visual break from the 'Swansea-side' of Mumbles Road. The houses after this are the 'introduction' to Mumbles and any significant and inappropriate development would seriously change the gateway to Mumbles.		
25	The terrace of properties on Mumbles Road should be included as they are typical Mumbles cottages.		
24	Feel strongly that the properties on Mumbles Road between the Quarry Car Park and the entrance to the woods/green at Norton should be included in the conservation area. These properties are older than many of the properties that have been included, they are the first buildings you see as you enter Mumbles, and the rear of many of the houses backs onto the castle grounds or the surrounding woodland.		
28	The terrace properties near the quarry car park on Mumbles Road are of historic interest and should be included in the Conservation Area boundary.		

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

29	Mumbles Community Council welcomes the proposals and congratulates the C&C Swansea Directorate of Place on the very detailed draft consultation documents. Advocate the expansion of the Conservation Area to include the Victorian/Edwardian terraced houses below Oystermouth Castle grounds that front directly on to Mumbles Road itself. This area is the 'gateway' to Mumbles and to have this small area excluded seems illogical. MCC are concerned that previously, further along the Mumbles Road towards Swansea, some of the large and high quality houses there were allowed to fall derelict and then knocked down and replaced with flats. Including this area would prevent this happening in future.		
27	The proposed areas and extent are warranted. The exclusion of the seafront terraces on Mumbles Road should be included.		
7	Attendance at the Farmers Market on the 9 th June was very informative and the proposals to extend the existing boundary is wholeheartedly supported. The properties along Mumbles Road, northward from the entrance to the quarry car park towards Norton fields should be included as these are some of the oldest cottages remaining in Mumbles, together with later houses of comparable age to most of those now included in the proposed extended conservation area boundary. These should be included in the expanded area to make the revised conservation area coherent.		
13	Positive way forward however concerned that the Mumbles Road (near quarry car park) houses have been excluded.		
15	Proposal to expand the boundary is welcomed. The boundary should also include Norton Road, Norton Avenue, Llanfair Gardens and the row of terraces as you approach Mumbles.	The support for the boundary change is noted. However, the proposal is to expand the Mumbles Conservation Area boundary to take in adjoining areas of similar architectural/ townscape character or quality. Norton itself does not form a part of the 'Mumbles' area and subsequently a boundary expansion to incorporate parts of Norton would not be appropriate.	No change.
5	Could Norton be included in the review?		
27	The omission of Western Close is entirely justified.	The support for the removal of an area of modern development at the top of Thistleboon Road is noted.	No change.
28	Support the removal of Western Close for boundary.		
29	The western end of Overland Road between Kings Road and Langland corner should be included. The built environment here mainly consists of Victorian or Edwardian villas of high quality and includes the home of Arthur Whitten Brown who flew the Atlantic with Sir John Alcock in 1915, as is recorded on the commemorative plaque. There are some inappropriate modern infill houses/ modernisations, thus including the whole of Langland Road would prevent this in future as well as creating a more homogenous conservation area. There are some similar villas nearby (Langland Villas) that would be worth considering.	The proposal is to expand the Conservation Area boundary to take in <i>adjoining areas of similar architectural / townscape character or quality</i> . The expanded boundary incorporates a large section of Overland Road, extending as far west as the break in Overland Road where there is no vehicular through route, only a footpath link (top end of Kings Road). This provides the obvious end point to the 'Overland Road' Character Area, and subsequent Conservation Area boundary expansion. Whilst it is acknowledged that the remainder of Overland Road (no's 1-18) includes some buildings of character and historic interest, this stretch of streetscene is varied, including a large proportion of post-war and more modern infill plots set out in a looser arrangement when compared to the more grid-like pattern development of the Mumbles terraces. This western end of Overland Road is more closely related to the Langland area in terms of distance and pattern of	No change.
28	The boundary should be extended along to the end of Overland Road to Langland corner and include Langland Villas.		

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

		development. The further extension of the boundary is therefore not warranted. Additionally, the inclusion of Langland Villas and properties at Langland corner again, does not appear to relate directly with the Mumbles Conservation Area and it is not proposed to include these dwellings within the expanded boundary.	
8	Support the expansion of the boundary. It is important to conserve the architecture and appearance of this wider area of Mumbles in order to protect and enhance its special character. Details such as masonry finishes, fenestration and roofing in particular can radically alter the appearance of an area, so placing greater emphasis on quality and detail will benefit the extended conservation area.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
23	Fully support the proposal of extend the conservation area but feel this is only the start. I feel the British Legion development will further enhance the Newton Road area, and feel a similar small scale project should be carried out on the police station site.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
28	Supportive of expansion to boundary. There is a fine balance between development for visitors and residents. The overall area needs protection from unsympathetic development	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
33	Fully supportive, proposals are entirely appropriate.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
32	I would welcome the conservation area in Mumbles.		
28	Do not change the designation of the area of land at Western Close (top of Thistleboon Road), shaded blue on the proposals map, to be outside the Conservation Area boundary.	The area shaded blue on the proposal map relates to a small area of modern housing development located on Western Close (backing onto Thistleboon Road). When the Conservation Area was originally designated in 1969 this parcel of land is believed to have housed an Orphanage and the boundary was drawn accordingly. Since this time, the previous buildings have been demolished and the site now comprises more modern residential development which does not hold the same architectural / townscape character or quality than the remainder of the conservation area. The existing boundary is therefore suggested to be changed to remove this area of modern development. This is the only area which is proposed to be omitted from the conservation area boundary. No mention is made to this in the draft LDP.	No change.
22	Page 17 of the Conservation Review item 6 shows that the area of modern development at the top of Thistleboon Road is to be omitted from the Conservation Area. Has this occurred anywhere else in the Oystermouth ward, and was this included in the draft LDP?		
6	Welcome expansion of boundary and any plans to conserve the character of this part of Swansea. However, this seems at odds with the recent increased development in the area to which the proposed boundary encompasses.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
9	In favour of expanding the boundary but if no action is taken regarding the parking / loss of small independent traders then the process seems futile.	Support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
28	Good idea to expand boundary to include Newton Road commercial properties to protect shopfronts from unsympathetic changes. Supportive as will make planning more sensitive.	Support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
28	Supportive of expansion to include castle grounds and allotments.	Support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

28	Why isn't Underhill Park part of the proposed Conservation Area?	Parks and recreation land (including playing fields) are protected under policy HC23 of the Swansea Unitary Development Plan (emerging LDP policy SI 5). The policy notes that it is important to retain and improve community recreation land to maintain access to open spaces, promote healthier lifestyles and tackle health inequalities. It is considered that the policy protection in place is sufficient to control development at Underhill park and the further significant expansion of the conservation area boundary would not be necessary to impose additional controls to this open space. The proposed boundary expansion abuts the eastern boundary of Underhill Park (Langland Road), and should development proposals be forthcoming, in addition to the specific 'Parks and Recreation Land' policy, the setting of the Mumbles conservation area would also form part of the officer assessment.	No change.
1	Underhill park should also be included within the extended boundary as parks and leisure facilities are currently under threat (Underhill Park is not included in the Mumbles or Newton CA boundary).		
2	Underhill Park should be included within the expanded boundary.		
11	Concern regarding the withdrawal of status from the small wooded area on Mumbles Hill that was recently saved from development by a purchase (Area shaded blue).	There is no proposal to remove any part of the 'wooded area' on Mumbles Hill from the existing boundary. The steep wooded hillsides that overlook the built conservation area create a strong edge and setting for the historic townscape. The area shaded blue on the proposal map relates to a small section of modern housing development located on Western Close (backing onto Thistleboon Road). When the Conservation Area was originally designated in 1969 this parcel of land is believed to have housed an Orphanage and the boundary was drawn accordingly to encompass this. Since this time the previous buildings have been demolished and the site now comprises more modern residential development which does not hold the same architectural / townscape character or quality than the remainder of the conservation area.	No change.
13	Concerned that land at Newton Road and Langland Road, Mumbles Hill Pier development not included.	The proposed significant boundary expansion includes a large section of Newton Road stretching from Mumbles Road to Underhill Park, incorporating dwellings on the eastern side of Langland Road (facing Underhill Park). The expansion includes the main shopping centre of Mumbles which retains a common form and scale of development which creates the attractive townscape. In particular, Mumbles Pier, including the Lifeboat Station and slipway is grade II listed and therefore already affords a greater protection. There is no proposal to expand the Conservation Area to take in Mumbles Pier.	No change.
28	Why isn't Mumbles Pier included in the Conservation Area?		
2	The review coincides with the application to develop Mumbles Pier foreshore and headland which will then be densely developed from what is now mostly an open space. It will be 'cheek and jowl' with the Conservation Area which it will do nothing to enhance.		
18	It is important to include the woodland area that runs from Castle Road behind no's 78-92 Newton Road as it is an important wildlife corridor. The Mumbles limestone boundary walls from 78 Newton Road to the cemetery are historically important.	The proposed significant boundary expansion takes the conservation area boundary up to Lime Kiln Road. The areas referred to would be setting to the expanded conservation area and further expansion into this area is not considered necessary.	No change
19	The green areas (woodland running from the rear of Glen Road adjoining the cemetery, along Castle Road behind 78-92 Newton Road and linking back to the cemetery at Coltshill Woods at Underhill Park and at rear of Overland Road linking to Mumbles Hill) must be appropriately managed.		
16	Support for the inclusion of the area around the castle being included within the boundary.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

28	Expansion to include Overland Road is supported.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
28	Fully supported but what will the expansion mean for householders – owners need reassurance that the proposal does not result in additional bureaucracy? Owners must know the implications of designation and the proposal needs council commitment.	Once an area has been given conservation area status, the local planning authority is required to ensure that desirable features of the area are preserved or enhanced through the planning process. The planning policies typically require retention of historic features and a higher quality of design in new developments. The review of the Mumbles Conservation Area will include guidelines to help protect and enhance the special character of the area. The designation therefore does not stop change but it does require greater scrutiny of new designs. It is acknowledged that changes are required for day-to-day life, rather designation helps ensure that changes are managed to respect the special character and appearance of the area. To help householders, a 'Living in your Conservation Area' leaflet has been produced by the council which briefly sets out the effects of living in a conservation area to local people (in a positive way).	No change.
28	Support expansion and greater protection for trees. Will there be additional costs associated with works to remove trees?	The conservation area designation would bring in the notification process for works to private trees. Any person wishing to carry out works to a qualifying tree would need to notify the council of their intention of works to be carried out in writing. There is no charge associated with this notification process. The council than has 6 weeks to respond by either; i) If not response is provided within 6 weeks then the notified works can be undertaken; ii) Council can agree the works are acceptable; or iii) Place a TPO on the tree(s) and deal with any future application as a tree works application.	No change.
28	Supportive of the expansion to include Castle grounds and allotments. However, the allotments to the rear of no's 438 Mumbles Road are not mentioned in the draft document?	The allotments located to the rear of the terrace of properties fronting onto Mumbles Road are included within the proposed boundary expansion, and within the 'Castle Character Area'. The draft document text refers to 'three open spaces used for allotments including the largest to the south west of the castle walls'. It is noted that there are allotments to the south west (as mentioned above), two allotments located to the north of the castle and then a much smaller allotment area located to the rear of properties fronting onto Mumbles Road. On this basis the text should be amended to refer to 'four open spaces are used for allotments...'	Amend text in para. 5.7 as follows: <i>"Four of the open spaces are used for allotments including the largest to the south west of the castle that almost reaches the castle walls."</i>
24	An allotment site in the area around the castle has been left out located to the rear of the terraces fronting onto Mumbles Road. I suspect it is the 'Lower Norton' site, which is actually currently council run.		
28	Support the proposed expansion to preserve the value of the residential terraces and stop poor quality changes / development.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.

Comments on the Character Appraisal and the proposed Character Areas

Respondent	Comment	Council Response	Recommended change
1	Supported, but does not go far enough. The Seafront (Area 1) is under extreme threat due to the potential loss of the tennis courts. The surrounding properties have small gardens and the loss of recreational activities will impact locals and visitors to the area. The tennis courts also visually enhance the area. The tennis courts should be refurbished for the wellbeing of the young people of the area.	The Seafront Character Area provides the public face and as such its townscape qualities and character are particularly important to protect, improve and enhance. A significant portion of the Seafront Character Area is already within the existing Conservation Area boundary which terminates just before the new Oyster Wharf development, at the tennis courts. The proposed boundary expansion seeks to extend the Seafront Character Area to include Oyster Wharf, Oystermouth Square and the section of promenade up until opposite no. 444 Mumbles Road, to coincide with potential Coastal protection works. The tennis courts are located within the existing Conservation Area boundary, and subsequently the 'preserve or enhance' test would be applied to any application for development at the site. By defining specific character areas, i.e. Seafront Character Area and acknowledging its special qualities allows greater control over future development work.	No change.
27	The character areas are suited and not overly piecemeal.	The support for the Character Appraisal is noted.	No change.
33	Fully supportive.	The support for the Character Appraisal is noted.	No change.
13	The proposed character areas are supported.	The support for the Character Appraisal is noted.	No change.
28	This is a critical time for the area, there is a need to sensitively develop and retain character areas by restricting new infill development.	The draft documents identifies inappropriate designs of new infill buildings, extensions, shopfronts and alterations as issues affecting the conservation area. Para 7.5.1 notes that 'individual infill developments reflect the taste and design approach of their eras, but where they have respected the principles of the historic building line, and of the scale, massing and form of their neighbours, they are generally absorbed into the streetscape with success'. The document provides specific guidance for new development with heritage areas, and where such development is proposed it is important that it is guided by sound principles of urban design as well as sympathetic detailing in relation to its historic context.	No change.
28	The division of the area into Character Areas is helpful as it clearly defines different areas, what they include and how they can be developed sensitively.	The support for the Character Appraisal is noted.	No change.

Comments on the proposed Management Plan for the Conservation Area

Respondent	Comment	Council Response	Recommended change
1	Some of the Newton Road shops retain their original Edwardian windows, and some replacements include 'Edwardian type' shopfronts and windows, most notably 'Cash Hardware' and 'Newburys' the chemists. However, the most recent shop, Tesco's, is not sympathetic.	<p>In terms of commercial premises, the aim is to protect and preserve the remaining historic shopfronts and architectural features along Newton Road and promote further enhancement work. The Management Plan seeks to facilitate the use of both the Conservation Area review, which provides specific information for the Mumbles area, along with the Shop Front Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (2017) in order to secure good quality commercial frontages. Owners should be aware that there are currently few permitted development opportunities with commercial properties and it will be important that all future changes to shopfronts / signage within the Conservation Area provides detailed planning applications.</p> <p>The replacement of shopfronts and signage with inappropriate design and materials is acknowledged to have a significant effect on the visual qualities of the Conservation Area. The Management Plan identifies that new and replacement shopfronts, and their associated signage, should display good proportions, well thought out detailing and quality materials. Whilst it is not possible to 'turn back the clock' any forthcoming applications for new shopfronts and/or Advertisement Consent would be assessed against the 'preserve or enhance' test, the aim being to improve the character and appearance of commercial frontages.</p> <p>The Newton Road shopping area currently falls outside the Conservation Area boundaries, however the proposal seeks to extend the boundary to take in the Newton Road Area as this provides a focal point for Mumbles residents and visitors. The attractive townscape along this road was built throughout the C19th and C20th and whilst it includes a mix of building styles, most are three storey Victorian gable terraces with bay windows. The expansion of the Conservation Area to include Newton Road seeks to protect its overall heritage characteristics.</p> <p>The proposed grant aid in Mumbles Community Council's 2018/2019 budget allocated towards the costs of improving the decorative condition of the retail premises along Newton Road is advocated and goes hand-in-hand with Management Plan specific guidance on 'Improving shopfronts and signage'. As noted in the comments made by Mumbles Community Council, there may be scope in subsequent years for additional funding towards more sympathetic restoration/development works to commercial units.</p>	<p>Section 6.1.3 'Opportunities' to be updated to include reference to grant funding for commercial units, to read as follows: <i>'Potential funding opportunities for sympathetic restoration/improvement works to commercial premises'</i></p> <p>Section 7.9.8 'Funding Support' to be updated to include the following wording: <i>'There may be scope to explore funding initiatives, for example, for restoration/ enhancement works to commercial units'</i></p> <p>Section 7.7.8 re-numbered 7.8.9 to include same text, 'To encourage the protection and reuse of historic buildings that are either vacant or in poor condition, such as some seafront inns, grant funding opportunities need to be explored'.</p>
25	Shop signage and frontages encouraged to be more traditional in character and appearance.		
28	Improvements / enhancements are needed to shopfronts and signage along Newton Road and arcade. Funding support is needed to help existing owner/occupiers of independent shops, many of which are struggling to compete with the larger retail units coming into the area. Will there be funding to encourage more sympathetic alterations to shopfronts and signage?		
10	Shopping area is scruffy and poorly maintained. Last year, Assembly members undertook street surgeries in Mumbles and poor maintenance and poor shop facades were raised. It is understood that the shopping area was already in the Conservation Area? The Council should use its powers to ensure owners keep shop facades in good order – businesses and residents should maintain the quality of their buildings. Other examples i.e. Cowbridge, Penarth and Narbeth are also uniquely placed to benefit from day visitors and tourists and are beautifully kept with local authorities, businesses and residents taking responsibility to ensure enhancement of shopping areas.		
2	The high standards of shopfronts seen in Pembrokeshire could appear in Mumbles. A remarkable effort is made there to harmonise paint choices, window sized and acceptance signage.		
25	A recommendation for CCS to seek funding to improve shopfronts would also be fantastic.		
29	Mumbles Community Council's desire to make a difference in this policy area is manifest by the newly elected MCC providing a small amount of grant aid in our 2018/9 budget to go towards the costs of improving the decorative condition of the retail premises in Newton Road. This accords with para. 7.7.2, "The visual impact of inappropriate replacement and badly maintained shop frontages and signage detracts from the heritage environment. The quality of shopfronts is an important indicator of the prosperity of the area,..." The draft document, para 7.7.8 refers to 'funding support' and we would be keen to discuss working jointly with you on this. Our initial grant budget for this specific programme this year is small, but our Grant Aid and Development budgets as a whole have increased hugely to nearly £340,000, and though these are committed for this fiscal year, it does provides considerable potential going forward.		

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

29	<p>Unsympathetic alterations have been undertaken in the area, for example replacement UPVC windows, removal of bay windows and inappropriate dormer window extensions. The draft review document highlights some of these issues, plus contrasting positive examples. We fully appreciate that there can be no retrospective action but we would urge the proposals in your draft to prevent these in future be implemented as soon as possible. Mumbles Community Council would like to discuss with you the possible available funding incentives to encourage addressing the worst example of negative practice.</p>	<p>It is noted that a significant number of buildings within the existing Conservation Area and the proposed expanded area display a loss of some of their traditional heritage qualities that gradually change the overall historic townscape. The proliferation of relatively minor building alterations can incrementally erode the character and appearance of the existing and proposed Conservation Area.</p> <p>The draft document identifies key 'negative issues' and problems, including inappropriate building alterations and repairs, such as replacement of wooden sash windows with UPVC frames and different window designs, inappropriate extensions, loss of heritage details and materials and use of inappropriate roof materials. It goes on to set out guidelines for external repair and alteration work. Whilst it is not possible to 'turn back the clock', it is important that property owners and occupiers adopt the right approach to repairs, extensions and alterations.</p> <p>There is an awareness raising necessity to inform householders of the importance of 'street character' and the contribution that individual residences make to that. A 'Living in your Conservation Area' leaflet has been produced by the council which briefly sets out the effects of living in a conservation area to local people (in a positive way). Notwithstanding this, the Conservation Area designation does not stop change but it does require greater scrutiny of new designs.</p> <p>Should planning permission be required for works, once adopted the Mumbles Conservation Area Review will hold greater weight in the assessment of planning applications within the Conservation Area and provides specific guidance in terms of what works are considerate appropriate in meeting the 'preserve or enhance' test in terms of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Mumbles Community Council has stated that there may be scope for funding incentives to encourage addressing the 'worst examples of negative practice for householder works'. Any potential for funding enhancement/remedial works to residential dwellings would be outside the remit of the Conservation Area Review. Any changes to residential properties would be controlled through the planning process.</p>	No change.
31	<p>Part of our (Urban Foundry) work for Mumbles Community Council in their regeneration strategy will be to discuss how best to target their funding annually. It would be useful to continue dialogue and consider how to make the best of that from a Conservation perspective (MCC already highlight some suggestions in their response). Something could be worked into our report that gives added value to all parties - particularly, 'interpretation/incentives for remediation' as well as future development etc. could be viable from the Community Council's side.</p>		
32	<p>Many beautiful buildings have been lost through poor choices in restoration - unsympathetic upvc windows, rendering the Victorian/Edwardian brick, dormers. Also, poor architecture inflicted on the environment by wealthy people who given managed guidance would have had to make less distasteful choices. Many people in Mumbles have improved the look of the area (cottages returned to stone / sympathetic restoration). I hope the review means efforts aren't wasted.</p>		
21	<p>There is not enough information about the approach the council will take when repair work is required. Will "retrograde" work be enforced? For example, a) requiring slate roof when a concrete tiled roof is repaired b) a stained door to be painted when time for staining again c) prohibiting replacement of an aerial that has blown down, d) enforcing a different colour when repainting. The websites referred to are vague and full of guidance rather than certainty. Much greater clarity is required on the likely use of the council's extended powers.</p>		
8	<p>Entire streets can entirely lose their historic character when original windows and doors are replaced with poorly designed UVPC materials, when pebble-dash rendering is applied to replace the original masonry finish, and heavy roof tiles fitted to replace original slate roofing. Front gardens can be replaced with concrete car parking stands and trees and other greenery are often removed. When taken together many changes such as those described above can spoil the historic character of key buildings, whole streets, and eventually, the whole of the Mumbles area. We need to conserve and protect areas such as these for now and for future generations.</p>		
19	<p>Important to retain the remaining architectural identity of the village before it is destroyed by unsympathetic modernisation. This is a limestone area with houses and saddleback garden walls built from this raw material. Sash windows and small window panes should be retained, not the inappropriate styled plastic windows of modernisation.</p>		

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

25	It would be great to encourage properties to be painted attractive complementary colours. Maybe using 'advisory' colour charts.	Whilst the council cannot impose specific requirements in terms of what colour a property is painted, there is scope to include general guidance / advisory charts on sympathetic renovations and coordinated painting schemes, taking into consideration the seaside character of the area. In the section 'Guidance for reuse and enhancement of existing buildings' an image is provided of a coordinated renovation and painting scheme for traditional terraces. A paragraph should be included, para 7.3.7, making reference to the support for coordinated renovations and sympathetic colour schemes.	Include new paragraph 7.4.7 to read: <i>“Coordinated renovations and colour schemes can have significant impacts on the streetscene. Owner / occupiers should adopt a pragmatic approach when considering such painting schemes on the basis of the visual impact this can have on the character and appearance of the conservation area”.</i>
14	Consideration should be given to preventing owners from painting their houses violent colours (i.e. no. 558 Mumbles Road & Oyster Wharf).		
28	Colours are important. Concerned about the bright colours used on buildings located on Village Lane.		
23	Can anything be done to ensure that commercial buildings are not left empty for long periods? Shops at the top of Newton Road are no longer commercially viable financially and so little can be done, but at the bottom of the hill where the buildings are more desirable the two banks which have closed and their landlord are under no obligation to re-let the premises to the detriment of the aesthetic of the conservation area.	The draft document identifies 'unused buildings' as a negative issue and problem affecting the Conservation Area. It is acknowledged that unused buildings detract from the visual qualities of the heritage environment. Unfortunately the council has no powers to insist that the buildings are re-let immediately despite the negative impact empty units have on the streetscene. In terms of the former Antelope, there is a recent consent granted (2017/1133/FUL) for extensions and alterations to the former Antelope which was approved in November 2017. Whilst there is a condition attached which requires the development begin no later than five years from the date of decision, unfortunately the council does not have powers to require this work is implemented immediately.	No change.
28	Why has work stopped at the former Antelope – it looks unsightly.		
314	The former Antelope public house is currently an eyesore – please urge the developer to complete the conversion.		
6	Concern regarding the increased development and traffic on Newton Road (former British Legion site). The redevelopment of the site without proper provision of accessible parking will do anything but enhance the unique character of this area (Newton Road). Urgent need for improved parking everywhere in Mumbles, in particular at the top of Newton Road and near Underhill park. Concern that without the parking problem being addressed the ability to maintain the unique 'village' character of the area will be lost.	The draft document identifies traffic and parking congestion as a 'negative issue and problem' facing the Conservation Area, however does not encompass any specific highway management and parking strategy. The Management Plan goes on to recognise a number of key projects requiring action within the Mumbles Conservation Area, one of these being 'Traffic and parking appraisal and projects'. It is acknowledged that there are parking issues for residents, shoppers and tourists to the area. All three demands in this historic area, which was not designed for such vehicular use, cause traffic problems. An appraisal of the traffic and parking needs in the area is needed to identify projects to alleviate the current situation. This is a wider strategic project which falls outside the remits of the conservation area review. Likewise, more sustainable travel solutions could be explored to lessen traffic / parking congestion in the area, i.e. park and ride / shuttle buses, which would fall outside the remits of this conservation area project.	No change.
29	Para 7.7.4 highlights the problems caused by traffic and parking. This is an ongoing problem, especially in the 'residential terraces' area and has a significant negative impact on the historic character of the area. Para 7.7.5 advocates an appraisal of the traffic and parking needs in the Conservation Area is needed to identify projects to alleviate the current situation. We thoroughly concur with the urgent need for this and would urge reconsideration of the policy to provide each household in these narrow and congested streets with two on street parking permits, as this generates an expectation of having a parking space available but demand far exceeds supply. In similarly congested heritage areas in other local authorities prospective residents are told there will be very restricted or even zero on-street parking. Mumbles residents should be encouraged to provide their own appropriate off street parking at the rear of their households where practical. Such encouragement could be grants for a proportion of the costs from central government 'environmental improvement' policies financed by parking and traffic congestion charges income. Similarly, C&C Swansea could encourage such provision through a reduction in Council Tax for houses making their own off road spaces as the policy would enhance the area for others. The small loss of income		

	could be financed through hypothecated parking charges and fines income. Most of the affected areas in the 'Terraces' area of Oystermouth have rear access lanes, for which we understand no one takes maintenance responsibility. On the western side of the aforementioned Park Street, nearly all the houses have long gardens with potentially easy access from Dunns Close. We are aware that Dunns Close is a private road owned by Gwalia- with which we assume C&C Swansea has positive relations - and it is cited here merely as a possible solution to a seemingly intractable problem.		
28	Parking issues on narrow streets. Visitor parking overflows onto the residential terrace. An appropriate space for a car park needs to be located, or perhaps some form of shuttle bus/'park and ride' initiative could serve the area and help reduce traffic/parking issues? Parking solutions are needed to encourage more footfall to the shops located at the top of Newton Road which are struggling. Better bus stop provision is needed. Parking should be removed from the bottom of Newton Road to prevent abuse and then the pavement could be widened.		
29	We note the contents of para 7.6.7 "The steep wooded hillsides above the Conservation Area provide a valuable setting and boundary for the Conservation Area. The protection and management of these spaces is vital to ensure the long term setting for the town." (Please note that after some recent much publicised proposals we are still officially a 'village!'). We fully agree with this sentiment and indeed tried to buy part of this area of woodland which came up for auction last year. We were outbid but in considering this option, it was apparent that the woodlands are not managed at all and we were aware that residents adjoining this woodland are often detrimentally affected by this in terms of loss of sunlight and satellite signals plus falling trees etc. Some appropriate tree surgery is necessary to keep tree crowns and overhanging branch growth to reasonable historic levels, to manage the health of trees and control the increase in invasive species that threaten their character. The woodlands are privately owned by various individuals who seemingly spend no money on effective management and this is a problem that could be rectified without threatening "the valuable setting" referred to above.	The support for the protection and management of the 'steep wooded hillsides' is noted. The points raised regarding the lack of appropriate management and subsequent impact on adjoining residents is acknowledged. In terms of the management of the trees by the current landowner(s), unfortunately they are under no responsibility to manage these trees. The affected residents can approach the landowner(s) and request that works are undertaken / offer to contribute to the works required, but there is no requirement for the landowner to oblige. The landowner(s) does however have a duty of care to neighbours to prevent damage (Donoghue v Stephenson, Rylands v Fletcher and Leaky v National Trust). The high hedges legislation can be used for more than one evergreen species where shading is a significant issue – further guidance can be found on the council environmental health webpages. It should be noted that there is no 'light to light, a view or a TV signal – boundary law can seem very unfair to most people that experience problems such as these. Neighbours may however cut back overhanging branches to the boundary line following (in the case of a conservation area) a successful section 211 notice being issued to the council.	Amend text in para. 7.8.7 as follows: <i>'The steep wooded hillsides above the Conservation Area provide a valuable setting and boundary for the Conservation Area. The protection and management of these spaces is vital to ensure the long term setting for the <u>village</u>.'</i>
29	As the official body elected by Mumbles residents to represent their interest, MCC would welcome an official role in the future management proposals that have been outlined in paragraphs 7.12-13 on community involvement, consultation and engagement, conservation education and training and the processes in section 8 covering the Action Plan Summary. We look forward to discussing our suggestions and all possible options for positive collaboration.	The support for community involvement, consultation and engagement is welcomed. Para 7.12 of the draft document notes that "an ongoing programme to raise awareness of the conservation area and its significance should be continued as part of the potential regeneration strategy". The views and opinions from those who live, work and visit Mumbles are essential to consider all the conservation issues which effect the future management and prosperity of the area. The Management Plan recognises the need for an awareness raising programme for the engagement / involvement of the community, this would also provide the community with a sense of understanding and pride in what the area represents. It is identified that there is scope to further engage the community in caring for the built environment through voluntary groups / projects.	The Management Plan recommends that 'Community consultation and engagement' is undertaken in order to improve and change the area. <i>Add the following to 7.14.2: "There is scope to further engage the community in caring for the local built environment through voluntary projects. Projects can be developed by local people in partnership with the Council and could work in unison with Mumbles Community Council and other stakeholders".</i>
28	Restore a sense of pride in the area. A greater community involvement in improvements / enhancements to the area is needed.		

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

1	The natural beauty of the area is breath-taking but the lack of planning controls and inappropriate development has impacts on the area.	Once an area has been given conservation area status, the local authority is required to ensure that desirable features of the area are preserved or enhanced through the planning process. The planning policies typically require retention of historic features and a higher quality of design in new developments. Designation therefore helps to ensure that changes are managed to respect the special character and appearance of the area.	No change.
25	Greater protection should be afforded to the pavilion and the Bowls Green along the seafront as this is a key feature of the village (maybe recommendation of village green status).	The Bowls Green and associated bowls pavilion are located alongside the recently completed Oyster Wharf development within the 'Seafront Character Area' which provides the 'public face' of the area. Para 5.2.3 makes reference to this area, "...between the two built up areas are tennis courts and bowling greens lined with trees. An attractive small sports pavilion provides a heritage note which should be protected".	The bowls pavilion is included as a 'positive' building and the diagram contained on page 21 of the document be updated to show this to further acknowledge the heritage of this structure.
28	The Bowls Green should be protected and designated as a 'Village Green'.	It is recommended that the bowls pavilion is included as a 'positive' building and the diagram contained on page 22 of the draft document be updated to show this. In addition, the significance of the pavilion building is acknowledged in para 7.8 'Local Listing in the Conservation Area', identified as a structure / building worthy of additional protection by being included on a Local List of heritage buildings and structures. In terms of 'village green' status, it is possible for anyone to apply under section 15(1) of the Commons Act 2006 to register land as a green if it has been used by local people for lawful sports and pastimes 'as a right' for at least 20 years. Further information can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/town-and-village-greens-how-to-register	
6	Works to improve the public realm are required. Some thought should be given to the possible provision of improved pedestrian access to the entire Newton Road and beyond. The existing pavement is narrow and often congested especially with illegally parked vehicles. Likewise, the pavement leading from Underhill park to Languard corner is extremely narrow and very dangerous for pedestrians, especially young children and buggies (however it is noted that this is outside the boundary expansion area).	The Management Framework notes that public realm has a significant contribution to the appearance and use of the area, and that modern day living and the requirement for vehicles and parking often result in the overall quality and character of an area being diluted.	No change.
28	Public realm improvements are needed i.e. work to pavements and roads, improved materials, introduce some shared spaced. Better maintenance of street furniture along the promenade is needed, and additional places to be able to sit and rest are needed throughout the area. The facilities along the promenade are poor, no public toilets with changing facilities. The derelict old 'coffee house' unit in the car park could be brought back into some form of use.	There are several stretches of pavement within the area which require surface improvements and it is also acknowledged that parts of Newton Road is served by only narrow sections of pavement. A streetscape strategy could include shared surface improvements, de-cluttering of pedestrian space, with the primary focus being the pedestrian environment and the space in front of commercial units. Whilst general maintenance works to the streets sits outside the remits of the conservation area review, the document contains guidance on the required simple palette of materials, planting and street furniture considerations that should be taken in any wider regeneration strategies for the area. Most notably, the important public spaces along the seafront promenade owned and managed by the council, require a comprehensive management plan to coordinate and maintain the designs, materials and planning of these key locations.	
2	A major overhaul of pavement in the commercial area is needed as these are in a deplorable state.	Specifically in this seafront location, the council is undertaking preliminary design and feasibility work on a new Coastal Protection	

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

28	Risk of flooding to properties along Mumbles Road is a concern. Is there a flood study being undertaken for the promenade?	scheme in the area between Knab Rock and the Dairy Car Park which will be the subject of a future separate public consultation. The scheme aims to address the current condition of the sea wall and provide an improved standard of protection against the risks of flooding. It will further provide the opportunity for the widening of the promenade, improve accessibility of the foreshore and enhance the public realm to create a high quality, sustainable and attractive waterfront. The scheme will require careful design to integrate the new defences with adjacent areas of existing public realm, areas of existing public open space and highways. The suggestion that there is a covered cobbled road under Oystermouth Road is an interesting concept for exploration. Unfortunately this would be outside the remit of the Conservation Area review.	
25	There is a cobbled road under Oystermouth road. Would be nice to explore the possibility of exposing it.		
21	The council is intending to give itself significant powers with Article 4(2) Direction.	Article 4 Directions can be imposed by local planning authorities to control certain alterations to dwellings that would otherwise be 'permitted development' under the GPDO and not require planning permission. The implementation of an Article 4(2) Direction for residential properties provides increased protection especially where there is threat from small scale unsympathetic works. The removal of permitted development rights is a separate process to the conservation area review and will require further consultation.	No change.
33	Fully supportive.	The support for the boundary change is noted.	No change.
28	We should be celebrating Mumbles history (first railway etc). Introduce a Visitor Centre to contain information on the history of the area along with information on what is happening in the area now. More should be done in the area to cater for tourists.	Mumbles is a well-known tourist destination. There are already numerous websites which promote the local area, including: https://www.visitswanseabay.com ; http://tourismswanseabay.co.uk . In terms of a visitor centre, Mumbles Methodist Church, Mumbles Road accommodates 'Mumbles Tourist Information Centre'. It is acknowledged that the history and heritage of the area could be better celebrated and there may be scope to include additional information within the area at Oystermouth Castle.	No change.
28	More information should be provided within the area on Oystermouth Castle.		

Other comments

Respondent	Comment	Council Response	Recommended change
10	Many streets/access are overgrown dumping grounds for rubbish.	Refuse is an issue across Swansea; this consultation was focussed on conservation issues. The day to day cleansing of streets is changing due to financial pressures facing Councils. There may be scope for community clear ups in the area in partnership with Keep Wales Tidy.	No change.
14	Also concerned about the incidences of dog mess and littering in the area increasing.		
28	Littering is an issue, especially along the promenade and associated with the increased number of food outlets / takeaways. Lack of litter bins and dog bins in the area.		
1	The loss of the tennis courts and the development at the iconic Mumbles Head will damage the unique landscape.	The potential loss of the tennis courts located alongside Oyster Wharf has been raised by a number of respondents. The tennis courts are located	No change.

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

10	The proposal to scrap the tennis courts in Mumbles in favour of a car park (encouraging people to use cars rather than cycling/using public transport to reach the resort) is in breach of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. This would rob this part of Mumbles of its unique character merely to help private enterprises make more money. Any Authority allowing this would not only contradict the above Act, it would spoil the unique appeal of Mumbles. In the words of Joni Mitchell "they paved paradise and put up a parking lot" - does Swansea Council want to be guilty of this?	within the existing conservation area boundary and any potential development of the site would be assessed against the 'preserve or enhance' test. The points raised relating to a lack of facilities/activities for younger people within the area is noted. Whilst not falling within the remit of the Conservation Area review, there are several projects i.e. Underhill Park redevelopment and the Skate Park which will offer a wider range of activities to the area.	
28	There is nothing for young people / children to do in the area. More play areas are needed. There is a lack of community facilities for teenagers. The tennis courts should either be retained or the land used for facilities for young people. Concern about the potential loss of the tennis courts for temporary car parking.		
9	The same body that is seeking to preserve the character of Mumbles is submitting plans to replace the tennis courts with temporary car parking.		
2	The term conservation area seems to be a very frail concept, when features within it can still be used as bargaining chips – the sacrifice potentially of the three tennis courts near Oyster Wharf for parking.		
6	The village quality comprising small, independent shops is being slowly eroded by new chain developments which on the whole are located on the seafront meaning that the smaller more traditional cafes and shops higher up Newton Road are suffering from lack of trade/lack of footfall.	It is acknowledged that the top end of Newton Road is struggling with apparently a greater turnover in occupiers of commercial units. This may be due to a combination of factors such as lack of footfall to this area due to the steep nature of this part of Newton Road and a lack of parking serving these units. Whilst it is desirable to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, it is not possible to control the occupiers of commercial units. There may however be scope for a wider strategy to support the economic viability of this area of Newton Road working with traders.	No change.
28	Importance of independent shops which are surviving rather than thriving at the top end of Newton Road. High business rates are also causing issues. Need something to draw people to the 'top shops', maybe a separate top entrance to the Castle?		
12	What impact will the proposal have on my house which is located just outside the conservation area boundary on the proposals map?	The residential property in question is located well outside both the existing and proposed conservation area boundary, separated by the 'wooded hill slopes'. On this basis there will no impact.	No change.
9	The area is being turned into a 'mini-Swansea' with the introduction of larger supermarkets, with small independent traders being pushed out due to these unsympathetic buildings being introduced with the loss of trees (even though there was a TPO in place at the former British Legion site). The introduction of larger shops (M&S) will cause more chaos on Newton Road and have a detrimental impact on the immediate area. There is no real commitment to conserving the Mumbles area as the infrastructure is constantly undermined by the introduction of unsuitable businesses that are adding to traffic problems and are detrimental to the health of the community due to noise and light pollution. There is more to conserving an area than just looking after historic features and buildings – it's the whole infrastructure and the 'feel' of the area.	A number of new retail occupiers have recently moved into the area, and most notably the former British Legion site is under redevelopment for a mixed-use scheme with ground floor retail use and residential apartments above (ref: 2016/1472/FUL). The site is located within the proposed boundary expansion which incorporates a significant portion of Newton Road. On this basis, at the time of the planning application, whilst the Mumbles Conservation Area Review document held limited weight, the case officer would have considered the emerging document in their assessment. The development of individual infill plots, such as the British Legion site, inevitably reflect the design and taste of their eras, but on the basis that they have respected the principles of the historic building line, and of the scale, massing and form of their neighbours, they are generally absorbed into the streetscene with success. The fundamental design	No change.

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

13	New M&S on Newton Road is not in keeping with existing buildings.	theme for the Newton Road area is identified as gable dormers and first floor bay windows above shopfronts. The redevelopment of the site is considered to enhance the area, incorporating features that are characteristic of the area.	
28	What is happening to the Ostreme Hall and Police Station?	There are no current proposals for either the Police Station of Ostreme Centre.	No change.
1	The review has been very interesting, drawing attention to the ongoing problems and future issues of the area. Please save the area from overdevelopment and promote other areas that have got things right to planners. For example, Aberaeron was rundown but is now beautiful and all that has been done is make good what they have i.e. shopfront improvements and enhancement.	Support for the review is noted.	No change.
10	Mumbles is made up of a myriad of lanes intertwining the residential terraces. If the council wishes to set a high standard of conservation and heritage why then does it not bring the roads/lanes up to the required standard or ensure that residents that use them for vehicle access to their properties are required to keep them to highway standard.	A majority of the roads located within the existing and proposed boundary are adopted by the Council, however there are examples that are not, i.e. parts of Overland Road. In addition, the rear access lanes serving the 'Residential Terraces' are not adopted. Existing roads will not normally be adopted unless they are brought up to the required standards by the owners of the road. It may for example be unpaved, the surface in bad condition or possibly that the geometry of the road may be unsuitable for use as a highway maintained by public expense. Further information can be found: https://www.swansea.gov.uk/adoptedroads	No change.
26	The process is a waste of money and not required. Should get on with providing Mumbles area with some proper facilities (Under hill development has been talked about for 40 years yet it is still a reservoir with army WWII buildings for changing.	The Mumbles Conservation Area was first designated in 1969 and since this time no amendments have been made to the boundary. The Council is required to review conservation areas 'from time-to-time' with the review process involving the local community and stakeholders. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan has reconsidered the boundaries and proposes significant adjustments should be made to take account of the historic value and interest of areas with potential for conservation. Whilst planning consent may be needed for certain types of development within conservation areas which would elsewhere be classified as permitted development (i.e. dormer windows), this is in order to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.	No change.
10	The Authority should invest in raising the quality of the area to a higher standard of repair and maintenance not just an exercise in expanding the area in relation to planning applications. This review gives the impression of an administrative exercise for the planning department to regain its foothold in determining planning applications that have been circumvented by Government.		
14	Please could the clock at All Saints Church be repaired?	The required work to All Saints Church falls outside the remits of the conservation area review.	No change.
27	Positive inclusion for GPDO control. Major concerns of permitted alterations that are so prominent on the entry to Mumbles – 'Castle Acre'.	Support for the review is noted.	No change.
28	There are vandalism / anti-social problems to the allotments to the rear of the properties fronting onto Mumbles Road.	The issue of vandalism and anti-social behaviour within, and adjacent to the allotment area, is noted. Whilst this problem is appreciated, this does not fall within the remits of the Conservation Area review and management, and any such issues would likely be a police matter.	No change.

Mumbles Conservation Area: Record of public comments

2	Could SCC designate a tranche of funding from the City Deal to assist with parking problems? Does Mumbles feature in the Swansea Metro Plans? Standards for building alterations seem to be inconsistently applied in Conservation Areas. The reason seems to be the anaemic standard of enforcement currently applying in Swansea.	The comments made relating to the City Deal and Metro Plans are outside the remits of the Conservation Area review. In terms of the reference to standards for building alterations to differ across Conservation Areas, this point is disputed. There is a clear 'preserve or enhance' test that is applied to development consistently across all conservation areas. With regard to enforcement, where concerns about unauthorised works are brought to the council's attention then they are investigated.	No change.
16	There are some poor alterations to the rear of properties on Newton Road, backing onto Castle Street, and the road is in a poor condition.	The presence of some unsympathetic works to the rear of properties on Newton Road is acknowledged. Once adopted, any works within the expanded Conservation Area will need to meet the 'preserve or enhance' test. Additionally, any potential unauthorised works can be reported to the Council's enforcement team to further investigate.	No change.
13	Poor extension to the rear of wine bar on Newton Road.		
21	The council will need to make a significant investment of its own to provide timely responses to the large number of enquiries, requests and approval that will follow the implementation of the conservation area. The information published to date gives no indication that the council understands this and has allocated sufficient budget to properly administer the enlarge area. The council need to clearly explain how they will support and administer the extended area and identify how this is to be funded long term.	The expansion of the Conservation Area is not expected to have any greater financial burden on the Council. The enquiries, requests and planning applications will be dealt with within the existing services.	No change.
32	The conservation area should be managed in a way which does not become an unwarranted economic burden.		
23	We need to protect the younger generations from being driving out of the area. There should be a stop on the amount of 2nd homes allowed to be purchased which sit empty for many months of the year or are simply used as additional income through holiday homes. House prices are constantly rising and we're being driven out of our own village when looking to put down roots. These beautiful character houses do not deserve to sit empty for months of the year - they should be lived in and enjoyed by young local families. I'm 35 and when I was a child in Oystermouth Primary, the village always had a close knit feel, and that is certainly lost these days.	The impact second homes, sitting vacant for months at a time, has on a street and wider area, is acknowledged. This is however not something that falls within the remit of the Conservation Area review.	No change.
28	Pressures to convert residential dwellings to holiday homes / second homes.		
28	Must be enforced – same rules for everyone.	The point made about enforcement is acknowledged.	No change.
28	Encroachment to rear of properties into Castle grounds.	Any concerns regarding encroachment onto private land would be a legal matter and fall outside the remits of the Conservation Area Review.	No change.