

VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting held on 24th June, 2015.

Present: Councillor Howard Hamilton (Mayor); Councillors Antony Bennett, Richard Bertin, Janice Birch, Rhiannon Birch, Bronwen Brooks, Lis Burnett, Philip Clarke, Geoff Cox, Rob Curtis, Pamela Drake, John Drysdale, Kate Edmunds, Stuart Egan, Christopher Elmore, Christopher Franks, Eric Hacker, Val Hartrey, Keith Hatton, Nic Hodges, Jeff James, Hunter Jarvie, Gwyn John, Fred Johnson, Dr. Ian Johnson, Peter King, Kevin Mahoney, Anne Moore, Neil Moore, Andrew Parker, Bob Penrose, Anthony Powell, Audrey Preston, Rhona Probert, Gwyn Roberts, John Thomas, Ray Thomas, Rhodri Traherne, Stefan Wiliam, Margaret Wilkinson, Christopher Williams, Clive Williams, Edward Williams and Mark Wilson.

146 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors Jonathan Bird, Claire Curtis and Maureen Kelly Owen.

147 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

The following Members declared an interest in the Agenda Item No. shown:

Name of Member	Agenda Item / Nature of Interest
Councillor Richard Bertin	Agenda Item 10(f) – Bus Services Support Grant 2015/16 – on grounds of being employed by Cardiff City Transport
Councillor Geoff Cox	Agenda Item 9(a) – Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan – dispensation granted to speak and vote during any debate in connection with matters involving the (Draft) Local Development Plan, save for the Evan Jenkins Charity candidate site.
Councillor Audrey Preston	Agenda Item 9(a) – Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan – on grounds of owning an unallocated site.
Councillor John Thomas	Agenda Item 9(a) – Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan – on grounds of owning an allocated site.
Councillor Rhodri Traherne	Agenda Item 9(a) – Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan – on grounds of owning an allocated site.

148 MINUTES –

The minutes of the meeting held on 29th April, 2015 and the Annual Meeting held on 13th May, 2015 were approved as a correct record.

149 CHANGE TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE (MD) –

Councillor Penrose, as the Leader of the Independent Group, had indicated that he wished to replace Councillor Richard Bertin with Councillor Christopher Williams as a Member of the Community Liaison Committee.

RESOLVED – T H A T Councillor Christopher Williams replace Councillor Richard Bertin on the Community Liaison Committee, with effect from 25th June, 2015.

150 INDEPENDENT MEMBER SERVING ON THE COUNCIL'S STANDARDS COMMITTEE (MO) –

The appointment of independent members was governed by the Standards Committee (Wales) Regulations 2001 ("the Regulations"). Paragraph 20 of the Regulations provided that the term of office of a member of the Standards Committee who was an independent member of the Committee shall be not less than four nor more than six years.

The Council had five independent members, three (Mr. D. Carsley, Mr. A.J. Lane and Mrs. M.J. Pearce) whose terms of office would expire on 13th March 2019, one (Mr. J.F. Baker) whose term of office would expire on 15th September 2015 and one (Mr. A.G. Hallett) whose term would expire on 19th July 2017.

Mr. Baker was appointed to the Standards Committee on 16th September, 2011 for a period of four years.

The Welsh Assembly Government issued amendment Regulations in 2006 providing for a second term of office for independent members, given its view that the operation of the original Regulations preventing an independent member serving more than one term was unreasonably restrictive and was causing practical difficulties.

Apart from the lengthy process of recruiting independent members, a number of Authorities had experienced difficulties in appointing members and many felt that the experience gained by such members over the first years following their appointment to the Standards Committee would be lost if Authorities were required to appoint and train new members.

The main amendments introduced in 2006 which affected the Council's current working arrangements in respect of independent members were as follows:

- An independent member of the Standards Committee of a relevant Authority may be reappointed by the relevant authority for one further consecutive term which shall not exceed four years
- In reappointing an independent member, the Council is not obliged to comply with the advertising and recruitment requirements imposed by the 2001 Regulations

- No business shall be transacted at a meeting of the Standards Committee unless-
 - (a) at least three members are present, including the chairperson; and
 - (b) at least half the members present (including the chairperson) are independent members.

The Council had exercised this power in the past in respect of the Chairman of the Standards Committee, Mr. Hallett, and also Mr. Carsley, Mr. Lane and Mrs. Pearce

RESOLVED – T H A T Mr. J.F. Baker be appointed for a further term of four years, to take effect on the expiry of his current term of office.

151 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION/OFFICER DELEGATIONS (MO) –

Since the formal introduction of the Council's new executive arrangements in May 2002, the Constitution had remained under review and would continue to be so on an ongoing basis. Under Article 15 of the Constitution the Monitoring Officer had a duty to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that the aims and principles contained therein were given full effect. Any changes considered necessary were subject to approval by the Full Council after consideration of the proposals by the Monitoring Officer.

A cross-party Constitution Working Party had been established to consider amendments to the Council's existing Constitution, taking into account the new Model Version issued for consideration/adaptation by Local Authorities in Wales. Various officers had been going through the existing Constitution and preparing draft revised sections for consideration by the Working Party. Often, the text was very similar to the current version. However, there were also various new legislative requirements and provisions which needed to be taken into account and which were reflected in the Model Version. The Working Party would conclude its work shortly and a revised draft Constitution would be submitted to the Council meeting in September.

Notwithstanding, and in advance of, the above, Appendix A to the report to Council contained a number of proposed amendments / updates / recommendations to the Constitution together with the rationale for such. In summary, these related to:

- Part 4(F) of the Constitution – Financial Procedure Rules – amend references to "Director of Resources" to read "Section 151 Officer"
- Part 4(G) of the Constitution – Contracts Procedure Rules – amend references to "Director of Resources" to read "Section 151 Officer"
- Part 8 of the Constitution – Officer Delegations – amendments to reflect Senior Management Restructuring within the Visible Services and Housing and Development Services Directorates (also see Agenda Item 9(b) - Senior Management Restructure in the Directorates concerned). Full details of the proposed amendments were set out in Appendix B to the report
- Part 8 of the Constitution – Officer Delegations – amendment / addition to an existing delegation (resting under current interim management arrangements

previously agreed, with the Director of Visible Services and the Operational Manager (Development and Building Control)) as follows:

"1.32(a) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the preparation of Enforcement and Stop Notices, after consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, where reference to the Planning Committee would occasion detrimental delay and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such notices, if appropriate.

1.32(b) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the variation or withdrawal of a previously issued Enforcement Notice or Stop Notice to correct a defect or error or make such other minor variation as deemed necessary and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such amended notices, if appropriate.

1.32(c) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the preparation of Temporary Stop Notices and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such notices, if appropriate."

- Part 8 of the Constitution – Officer Delegations – new delegation, as recommended by Cabinet on 23rd March, 2015 (and subject to the reference to the Director of Development Services being regarded as meaning the Director of Visible Services under current interim management arrangements in place) and the addition of reference to the Head of Shared Regulatory Services) as shown. The original reference from Cabinet was attached as Appendix C to the report. (N.B. This item was included amongst items on the agenda for Council on 29th April, 2015 for the Council to note the use of the Council's Urgency Decision Procedure. However, the Cabinet reference actually sought Council approval of the recommendations contained therein.)

"(1) That the Director of Development Services, Head of Shared Regulatory Services and Head of Public Protection authorise Council Officers to issue, vary and revoke licences under the provisions of the Mobile (Homes) Wales Act 2013

(2) That the Director of Development Services, Head of Shared Regulatory Services and Head of Public Protection authorise Council Officers to carry out the Council's function under the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013."

The opportunity would also be taken to make any minor typographical / housekeeping changes to bring the document up to date.

In addition to the above (and as stated in the supplementary information e-mailed to Members earlier in the day, and tabled at the meeting, Appendix B included the following delegation :

"9. Authority, following consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to make such amendments to the C.C.T.V. Code of Conduct Code and / or the Confidentiality Agreement to ensure that compliance with the Code extends to police radio and storenet radio communications." - **To be determined.**"

The Leader informed Members that it was proposed that (from 1st September, 2015), the delegation rest with the Director of Environment and Housing Services and the Head of Housing and Building Services.

RESOLVED

(1) T H A T the following amendments/additions to the Council's Constitution be approved:

Article/Part	Proposed Amendment	Reason for proposed amendment
Part 4(F) - Financial Procedure Rules	Amend references to "Director of Resources" to read "Section 151 Officer".	To reflect agreed Senior Management Restructure.
Part 4(G) - Contracts Procedure Rules	Amend references to "Director of Resources" to read "Section 151 Officer".	To reflect agreed Senior Management Restructure.
Part 8 - Officer Delegations	Amendments to delegations / post titles contained therein relating to the Development Services and Visible Services Directorates. Full details set out in Appendix B to the report.	To reflect Senior Management Restructure. The proposed restructuring would come into effect on 1 st September 2015.
Part 8 – Officer Delegations	Amendment / addition to an existing delegation (resting under current interim management arrangements previously agreed, with the Director of Visible Services and the Operational Manager (Development and Building Control) as follows : "1.32(a) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the preparation of Enforcement and Stop Notices, after consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, where reference to the Planning Committee would occasion detrimental delay and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such notices, if appropriate. 1.32(b) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the variation or withdrawal of a previously issued Enforcement Notice or Stop Notice to correct a defect or error or make such other minor variation as deemed necessary and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such amended notices, if appropriate. 1.32(c) In consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to authorise the preparation of Temporary Stop Notices and to instruct the Head of Legal Services to issue such notices, if appropriate."	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Commencement No. 14 and Saving) Order 2015 brings into force several development control provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The provisions of this Order are brought into force in Wales on 22nd June 2015. To the extent that they are not already in force, the Order brings into force the provisions of the 2004 Act, including : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 52 (temporary stop notice).

<p>Part 8 – Officer Delegations</p>	<p>New delegation as follows, as recommended by Cabinet on 23rd March, 2015 (and subject to the reference to the Director of Development Services being regarded as meaning the Director of Visible Services under current interim management arrangements in place) and the addition of reference to the Head of Shared Regulatory Services) as shown.</p> <p>“(1) That the Director of Development Services, Head of Shared Regulatory Services and Head of Public Protection authorise Council Officers to issue, vary and revoke licences under the provisions of the Mobile (Homes) Wales Act 2013</p> <p>(2) That the Director of Development Services, Head of Shared Regulatory Services and Head of Public Protection authorise Council Officers to carry out the Council’s function under the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013”.</p>	<p>To facilitate the Council undertaking the functions provided for within the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013 and to accord with the Joint Working Agreement for the Shared Regulatory Services.</p>
--	---	---

(2) T H A T the revised officer delegations covering the existing Visible Services and Housing and Development Services Directorates, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be approved to take effect from 1st September, 2015, to reflect the restructuring which will have taken place

(3) T H A T with effect from 1st September, 2015, the Director of Environment and Housing Services and the Head of Housing and Building Services be granted the following delegation:

“Authority, following consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to make such amendments to the C.C.T.V. Code of Conduct Code and / or the Confidentiality Agreement to ensure that compliance with the Code extends to police radio and storenet radio communications.”

152 GLAMORGAN HERITAGE COAST ADVISORY GROUP: APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN (HDS) –

At the Annual Meeting on 13th May, 2015, there was an agenda item dealing with the appointment of various Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees. Councillor Audrey Preston was appointed Chairman of the Advisory Group. Whilst Councillor Eric Hacker was nominated and seconded as Vice- Chairman, due to late changes to the adjustments of seats on Committees originally notified by the Plaid Cymru Group, the Llantwit First Independent Group (of which Councillor Hacker is a Member) did not, in fact, have a seat on the Advisory Group.

Council was, therefore, requested to appoint a Vice-Chairman of the Advisory Group from within the remaining 6 members of the Group, i.e.

Councillors Lis Burnett, Rob Curtis, John Drysdale, Val Hartrey, Ray Thomas and Christopher Williams.

Following both Councillors Ray Thomas and Val Hartrey being nominated and seconded for the position, and upon it being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED – T H A T Councillor Ray Thomas be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast Advisory Group.

153 VALE OF GLAMORGAN LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (REF) –

Councillors Audrey Preston, John Thomas and Rhodri Traherne, having declared an interest in this matter, left the meeting for the duration of the item.

Cabinet considered this matter on 1st June, 2015 and resolved that the report be referred to the Community Liaison Committee, Planning Committee and Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) for consideration. Community Liaison Committee on 2nd June noted the report. The reference from Planning Committee of 4th June to Cabinet on 22nd June, together with the Cabinet report for the same

meeting, was attached to the report to Council. The recommendations of Cabinet of 22nd June, together with the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) of 16th June, 2015 had been e-mailed to Members in advance of the meeting and were also tabled at the Council Meeting.

In introducing the item, the Cabinet Member (Regeneration) informed Members that Cabinet had welcomed the reference from the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) and had commented that the Committee's recommendation to amend paragraph 53 of the Local Development Plan report had already been considered and amended for clarity so that it accurately reflected the background documentation.

The report to Cabinet on 7th October 2013 sought the endorsement of the DLDP and approval for a six week public consultation to be undertaken on the DLDP in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005. The six week formal public consultation on the DLDP took place between 8th November and 20th December 2013 and a brief summary of consultation was contained in the report. A more detailed outline was contained at Appendix 1 in the Deposit Local Development Plan Consultation Summary Report.

As well as representations to policies, paragraphs and supporting evidence, the DLDP consultation generated representations from individuals, groups and organisations that sought the inclusion of new sites as well as the deletion or amendment of allocated sites. Collectively, these site specific amendments were termed 'Alternative Sites' and the Council had again been required to undertake public consultation on the Alternative Sites to ascertain people's views. Whilst the Regulations required the Council to undertake a public consultation on the Alternative Sites, the Council was not promoting the sites in any way.

The six week consultation exercise on the Alternative Sites took place between 20th March and 1st May 2014. A summary was set out below and a more detailed outline on the Council's response to these representations was set out at Appendix 3 to the report.

Deposit Local Development Plan Consultation

In total, 3,367 representations were received to the DLDP from 1,328 organisations, bodies and individuals. The majority of the representations received were site specific in that they either sought the inclusion of new sites not shown in the DLDP, objected to allocations in the Deposit LDP or sought amendments to site boundaries or the uses of sites allocated in the DLDP. Other representations sought a variety of changes to the DLDP including, but not exclusively,:

- Amendments to policy wording or text to ensure compliance with Welsh Government guidance, to improve policy effectiveness or merely to reflect factual updates;
- Mapping changes, in terms of accuracy and requests for amendments, deletions and additions; and

- Clarification and requests for additional evidence in respect of supporting evidence and particular topic areas.

Of the 3,367 representations raised, 2,921 were objections, 291 expressions of support and 155 provided general comments to the DLDP. The responses resulted in the identification of 225 alternative sites, of which 108 related to new alternative sites, 53 to the deletion of allocated sites, 64 to amended sites. Copies of the representations received could be found in the Alternative Sites Representations Register. A summary of those, together with the Council's response to individual representations, could be found within the Deposit LDP Representations Summary and Responses Register at Appendix 2 to the report.

Main Issues Raised in the DLDP Consultation

In accordance with LDP Regulations, the Council was required to consider the representations received in advance of submission of the DLDP to the Welsh Government for Independent Examination and to consider if any changes were required to ensure that the Plan was sound.

The main issues emerging from the DLDP and Alternative Sites consultations along with an outline of the officer responses to these issues, was attached at Appendix 1 to the report in the form of an extract from the Council's Consultation Report.

The Cabinet Member (Regeneration) pointed out that the development of the Plan had involved a long process, with this being the final stage at which the Plan was in the hands of the Council prior (if approved by Council) to submission to Welsh Government for independent inspection. She alluded to the recommendations set out on page 2 of the report and moved that Recommendations (1) to (5) be accepted. This was formally seconded by the Deputy Leader.

Councillor Jeff James alluded to the significant amount of work undertaken by officers in dealing with this matter and pointed out that his comments were not a reflection on their work. He considered there to have been a 'political direction' and influence on the site allocation within the proposed Plan. He referred to a significant amount of development now being proposed for the South West Vale, as opposed to other areas previously. He suggested that Barry, as the town with the largest population would, with the exception of the Waterfront Development, receive the smallest allocation of housing development. He felt that certain communities would feel overwhelmed due to a disproportionate number of houses being proposed within certain areas. He felt that the stated intent of the Labour Group to 'scrap' the LDP had been broken and considered the overall Plan to be flawed. He also suggested that an aspiration for 40% provision of Affordable Housing was unsustainable, suggesting that the impact would fall not on developers, but landowners.

Councillor James moved an amendment that the report not be accepted and asked that the matter be put to a Recorded Vote. This was duly seconded by Councillor Jarvie. More than the requisite number of Councillors stood to confirm that a Recorded Vote would take place.

Councillor Mahoney indicated he had a number of concerns regarding the LDP, most of which he had raised previously. He acknowledged that such concerns would have to be pursued with the Inspector, should the Plan be approved by Council for submission to Welsh Government. However, he had a particular concern in that his attempt earlier in the day to 'Call-In' the decision of Cabinet on 22nd June had been turned down by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee.

Notwithstanding the above, Councillor Mahoney alluded to three specific points that he had made in his 'Call In' submission regarding the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Hayes Road, Sully. In summary, these related to

- His view that no consideration had been given to the representations made by Beechwood College regarding the potential effect on their students.
- Discrepancies he considered to exist between the Council's own Gypsy and Travellers Site Assessment Reports of 2011 and 2013.
- The fact that, despite requesting a detailed analysis and rebuttal of his, and others' representations on the alternative site proposals, officers had failed to provide such a rebuttal. He referred to having been informed by an officer within the Planning Department that no such rebuttal or analysis existed due to the fact that alternative site representations had not been examined in detail in terms of most of the sites. He had been informed that this was due to the fact that the Council was not obliged to do so in the event that it had been happy with its original assessment.

At this stage, Councillor Anne Moore, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) clarified for Members the full reasons why she had refused Councillor Mahoney's 'Call-In' request earlier in the day. These were:

"This matter was dealt with by Cabinet on 22nd June and the Urgency Decision Procedure was used which means it is not subject to 'Call-In' and the Cabinet referred it to the Council on 24th June where it will be fully discussed.

Before it went to Cabinet on 22nd June a report on the subject was presented to Cabinet on 1st June which included detailed appendices and that report was referred to Community Liaison on 2nd June, Planning Committee on 4th June and Economy and Environment on 16th June, where it was fully considered and all Members had an opportunity to attend any, or all of those meetings and make representations. Therefore, I am not allowing the 'Call-In' for these reasons."

Councillor Penrose referred to having been advised that any request for a 'Call-In' had to await the publication of the formal Cabinet decision and that was why a 'Call-In' had only been submitted earlier in the day. He indicated he supported Councillor James' proposed amendment (i.e. that the recommendations in the report be not accepted).

Councillor Penrose referred to the site in Hayes Road, Sully as previously having been "promised" to Sully and Lavernock Community Council for the provision of allotments. Despite having produced supporting documentation, he referred to the Planning Committee as having refused the application from the Community Council. However, he believed that the appeal which the Community Council was currently

undertaking would be upheld by the Welsh Government. In overall terms, he was also unhappy with the number of houses proposed in the Plan. He also considered certain of the projections regarding potential employment (e.g. at the Enterprise Park, St. Athan) as being unrealistic and not well thought out.

Councillor Dr. Ian Johnson considered the Administration had not listened to the views of local people and to have ignored 'hard facts' in developing the Plan. He felt that the Plan had not led to sound planning decisions and suggested that the Welsh Government should completely revise the process, in order to avoid Councils spending considerable time on one master plan document that was then frequently superseded by events.

He considered the central issue for the LDP (as with many other Councils) to be the estimated number of houses, which, in his view did not reflect actual population increases. Referring to the final draft Plan proposing a figure of around 9,500, he alluded to the Welsh Government's principal projection as being just 5,600 (based on actual 2011 census population, not just earlier mid-year estimates, and an average larger number of people per household). As such, if the revised population figure was used, he stated that approximately 40% fewer houses would be required. Referring to a principal projection (by Welsh Government) of 5,600, he referred to the higher calculation being based on substantial migration and comparison with the period of mass house building, including estates at Pencoedtre, Rhoose Point and off Pontypridd Road. However, he alluded to there now being no evidence of similar large scale economic growth as had existed at the time of previous developments.

Given the above, Councillor Dr. Johnson considered the Plan to not be credible or realistic in terms of the housing figures contained therein. He also considered there to be confusion over the status of land at Barry Docks and waste disposal. He also felt that local residents were unhappy with proposals for biomass and bottom ash facilities near to their homes and sought clarification as to whether the Barry Docks area was allocated in the Plan for such uses.

In conclusion, he referred to the draft Plan as being flawed and confirmed that the Plaid Cymru Group would continue to oppose the Plan.

Councillor Dr. Johnson moved an amendment to the recommendations before Council as follows: That Recommendations (1) to (5) be deleted and replaced with:

“(1) That this Council does not support approval of the Local Development Plan because the housing provision is significantly greater than the Vale of Glamorgan's housing need, as established by Welsh Government Housing Projections published in February 2014.

(2) That alternative proposals be brought to Council before October 2015.”

He also asked that a Recorded Vote take place on his amendment. It was confirmed by the Mayor that a Recorded Vote had already been called for.

Councillor Franks, whilst thanking Councillor Anne Moore for allowing him to speak at the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment), nevertheless expressed

disappointment that some 3,000 representations, in his view, had been ignored. He questioned why such a detailed and very expensive public process was entailed when, in reality, there was very little change from the initial document. In recent debates at the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) and the Planning Committee, he stated that it had been said that much of the Plan was based on an assumption that the Cog Moors Treatment Works could cope with additional demand. However, there now appeared to be question marks over the ability of the Works to actually cope.

Councillor Franks also referred to the issue of public transport and to the lack of delivery of more bus services, improved bus priority lanes and more rail stock. He felt there to have been very little, or no, progress regarding crucial 'pinch points' such as Murch Road merging with Cardiff Road and the Merrie Harriers junction. He suggested that the Plan would, in fact, result in significant additional housing, with very little prospect of improved transport arrangements. Finally, he expressed disappointment regarding the lack of reference to crucial by-passes within the Vale of Glamorgan, namely in Dinas Powys and Llysworney. He duly seconded Councillor Dr. Johnson's amendment.

Councillor Drysdale reminded Members that, at this stage of the process, the emphasis was on focussed changes. By definition, this meant relatively small changes and Members should not have been under the impression that major changes to the draft Plan would now be entailed. As such, it would have been completely unrealistic to have issued detailed individual rebuttals for around 3,000 representations.

In terms of the reference to the Sully and Lavernock Community Council, Councillor Drysdale stated that the Hayes Road site had never been "promised" to the Council. He had read the relevant documentation and that had stated that the use for allotments would be "considered".

Councillor Drysdale disagreed with the assertion made by Councillor Dr. Ian Johnson that the Administration had not listened to residents. On the contrary, he stated that the whole process had been designed and characterised by an open and expansive consultation process, with the Council making extensive efforts to go out into communities, provide information and seek residents' views. However, as he had stated at the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment), by their very nature, the amount of representations received were, in many cases, contradictory. Part of the role of the Council was to balance conflicting interests and, indeed, self-interest by different groups of people.

As far as the Cog Moors and sewage improvements were concerned, drainage and sewage requirements were involved on virtually every housing development submitted to Planning Committee for consideration. Until houses were actually built, he did not consider there to be any reason to improve capacity, but he reminded Members that every application for housing, if approved, was done so on condition that satisfactory drainage and sewage arrangements were put in place.

Finally, Councillor Drysdale referred to the points raised by Members regarding the projected housing figures contained in the draft Plan. Referring to the number

already approved or in the “pipeline”, Councillor Drysdale quoted a figure in excess of 5,000, which was more than half way to the overall total.

Councillor Cox was of the view that many residents felt deceived in that the former LDP had not been “scrapped” as had been indicated by the Labour Party that it would. He felt residents did not consider the current draft Plan to be a sustainable alternative and also pointed out that, following public consultation and several thousand representations, there had, nevertheless, been few changes to the Plan.

Councillor Cox quoted from Welsh Government observations on the proposals contained in the Plan referring to it being unclear as to how the role and functions of settlements had been reflected with regard to the scale of housing proposed. He also quoted comments from Welsh Government regarding some minor rural settlements appearing disproportionate to current services and facilities and to the proposed spatial distribution potentially encouraging reliance of the car and compounding existing infrastructure problems in rural locations. He felt that certain of the proposals, which involved reducing the level of housing in urban areas and balancing the figures with a corresponding increase in the rural Vale, were unsustainable, particularly given the lack of corresponding infrastructure improvements planned. He referred in particular to a proposal for 390 dwellings, a highway link and land for a new primary school at Darren Farm in his constituency. In contrast, he referred to a Public Inquiry in 2003 against refusal for a similar link road and the development of 145 houses, where the Council had vigorously defended its position not to grant planning permission. He suggested that many of the points raised by the Council at that time had been raised by Members of the community during the current consultation process, but were now being refuted by the Council. He would be supporting the earlier amendment moved by Councillor James.

The Leader considered Councillor James’ amendment to not be an appropriate amendment, but to simply be a straight rejection of the proposals before Council. Furthermore, he did not understand Councillor James’ rationale for his objection.

The Leader reminded Members of the housing allocations already underway within Barry (e.g. at the Waterfront). He also reiterated the point made earlier by Councillor Drysdale that a lot of houses had already been built, or were in progress. Consequently, the remaining figure was not as significant as was being suggested. He pointed out the provision proposed in Colwinston had actually been in the previous (Conservative Administration) Plan. He also reminded Members of the fact that many people within the rural Vale could not afford to live within their own communities and, consequently, there was a need to pursue a reasonable proportion of Affordable Housing. Obviously, any developments that were proved to be unsustainable would be looked at further.

The Leader referred to Councillors Mahoney and Penrose as having suggested that Cabinet should have determined the matter and not referred it to Council. However, he pointed out that the issue was, in fact, a matter which Full Council had to determine. The use of the Urgency Decision Procedure by Cabinet on 22nd June had been questioned by Councillors Mahoney and Penrose, but the procedure had been used simply to enable the report to come before Council at this meeting.

Responding to points raised by various Members, the Leader referred to the fact that:

- the Administration had responded to representations received in that it had removed proposals for housing at Weycock Cross and Cowbridge Market and were working with a local community group to develop the market site.
- he considered the link contained within the proposals for Darren Farm to, in effect, constitute a Llysworney By-pass.
- in terms of overall transport developments, Welsh Government was considering the possibility of establishing an 'arms-length company' to progress matters.

Finally, the Leader reminded Members that, given the Council was now at the Deposit Plan stage, the only matters remaining for consideration related to focussed changes.

In summing up, the Cabinet Member (Regeneration) thanked both Councillor Drysdale and the Leader for their responses to many of the points raised during the debate.

It had been the aim of the current Administration to deliver a sustainable LDP, with the intention being to:

- strengthen the evidence base (a range of reports and evidence had been produced which underpinned assertions within the Plan)
- consider infrastructure in greater depth
- to achieve a better fit with the LDP strategy
- increase levels of concentration and engagement (a total of 12,000 representations having been received).

Additional briefing sessions had been added into the consultation process and the matter had been considered by relevant Council Committees at every stage. Whilst she had attended nearly all of the briefing sessions, on a number of occasions, no other Members had been present.

Within the 12,000 representations received, the main topics covered were:

- strategy
- housing provision and sites
- gypsy and travellers
- employment
- transport and
- built and natural environment.

She pointed out that, if people felt that their views had not been taken into account, they would be able to make their submission to the Inspector at the independent examination.

As a result of the representations, a number of focused changes had been made and these were set out in the Appendix to the Cabinet report. In terms of affordable housing provision, the proposals would result in quality housing for local people, with the aim of meeting the huge backlog of unmet need across the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Cabinet Member expressed her appreciation of the officers for the work they had undertaken in developing the Plan.

In picking up some of the other points made by Members and referring to democratic processes, she referred to her comments made at previous Council meetings on the subject in that there had been many opportunities for Members and the public to get involved in the process and to suggest otherwise was “a bit rich”. She referred to the time spent over the previous three years in discussing the subject and yes, the Council had a delivery agreement. She had talked about TAN1 and had had very productive discussions with the Minister on the matter as early as today. She totally refuted the allegations that public representations were ignored and she would be personally attending all the independent evaluation sessions. Referring to her comments made at the most recent meeting of the Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) in relation to Darren Farm, she also refuted that this site would not be sustainable and considered it to be probably one of the perfect examples of sustainability in terms of infrastructure, highways and meeting the needs of local communities. As for speculative planning applications, Members knew that the Council was unable to stop these being submitted. She felt that if the Council were to refuse the proposal, it would create a policy void, which would encourage speculative applications until an agreed LDP was in place.

The Mayor reminded Members that the amendment proposed by Councillor James was not an amendment in line with Council Procedure Rules as it negated the Motion of Councillor Burnett, Cabinet Member (Regeneration) and, upon request by the required number of Members, Recorded Votes took place as follows.

In respect of Councillor Dr. Ian Johnson’s proposal that recommendations (1) to (5) of the report before Council be deleted and replaced with:

“(1) That this Council does not support approval of the Local Development Plan because the housing provision is significantly greater than the Vale of Glamorgan’s housing need, as established by Welsh Government housing projections published in February 2014.

(2) That alternative proposals be brought to Council before October 2015.”

Voting took place as follows and it was

RESOLVED – T H A T the Motion be lost.

For the Motion	Against the Motion	Abstain
Councillor	Councillor	Councillor
A.G. Bennett	Mrs. M.E.J. Birch	
R.J. Bertin	Ms. R. Birch	
P.J. Clarke	Ms. B.E. Brooks	

G.A. Cox	Ms. L. Burnett	
C.P. Franks	R.F. Curtis	
Mrs. V.M. Hartrey	Mrs. P. Drake	
K. Hatton	J. Drysdale	
N.P. Hodges	Ms. K. Edmunds	
H.J.W. James	S.C. Egan	
T.H. Jarvie	C.P.J. Elmore	
I.J. Johnson	E. Hacker	
K.P. Mahoney	H.C. Hamilton	
A.C. Parker	G. John	
R.A. Penrose	F.T. Johnson	
R.P. Thomas	P. King	
S.T. William	Mrs. A.J. Moore	
A.C. Williams	N. Moore	
C.J. Williams	A. Powell	
	Ms. R. Probert	
	G. Roberts	
	Mrs. M.R. Wilkinson	
	E. Williams	
	M.R. Wilson	
18	23	0

Given that Councillor James' amendment was, in fact, to not accept the report, the vote took place in respect of the original recommendations before Council, with voting taking place as a recorded vote as follows:

For the Motion	Against the Motion	Abstain
Councillor	Councillor	Councillor
Mrs. M.E.J. Birch	A.G. Bennett	
Ms. R. Birch	R.G. Bertin	
Ms. B.E. Brooks	G.A. Cox	
Ms. L. Burnett	C.P. Franks	
P.J. Clarke	Mrs. V.M. Hartrey	
R.F. Curtis	K. Hatton	
Mrs. P. Drake	N.P. Hodges	
J. Drysdale	H.J.W. James	
Ms. K. Edmunds	T.H. Jarvie	
S.C. Egan	I.J. Johnson	
C.P.J. Elmore	K.P. Mahoney	
E. Hacker	A.C. Parker	
H.C. Hamilton	R.A. Penrose	
G. John	R.P. Thomas	
F.T. Johnson	S.T. William	
P. King	A.C. Williams	
Mrs. A.J. Moore	C.J. Williams	
N. Moore		
A. Powell		
Ms. R.F. Probert		

G. Roberts		
Mrs. M.R. Wilkinson		
E. Williams		
M.R. Wilson		
	24	17
		0

RESOLVED -

(1) T H A T the responses to the Deposit Local Development Plan (DLDP) and Alternative Site representations as contained at Appendices 2 and 3 as referred to in the report, be approved.

(2) T H A T the Focused and Minor Changes detailed at Appendix 4 as referred to in the report be approved for public consultation purposes, the results of which would be considered by the Inspector in due course.

(3) T H A T the Deposit Local Development Plan (DLDP) together with the accompanying documentation be approved for submission to the Welsh Government and the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005.

(4) T H A T delegated authority be granted to the Operational Manager, Planning and Transportation Policy in consultation with the Managing Director and Cabinet Member for Regeneration to negotiate issues, agree amendments and respond to requests for further information as required by the Inspector during the examination process.

(5) T H A T the Operational Manager, Planning and Transportation Policy, in consultation with the Managing Director and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, be authorised to make any necessary typographical and minor changes and associated amendments to the Deposit Local Development Plan (DLDP) consultation report, proposed focused changes and associated submission documents.

(6) T H A T thanks be given to the Operational Manager, Planning and Transportation Policy and her team for all their hard work on producing the detailed report.

154 SENIOR MANAGEMENT RESTRUCTURE: DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND VISIBLE SERVICES AND HOUSING DIRECTORATES (REF) –

The Director of Visible Services and Housing and the Operational Manager (Planning and Transportation Policy) left the meeting whilst this item was under consideration, given they were both postholders affected by the proposed restructuring.

A copy of the report considered by Cabinet on 22nd June, 2015 was attached to the report before Council. The recommendations of Cabinet had been e-mailed to Members prior to the meeting and were also tabled at the meeting itself.

The appointment of the Director of Development Services as Managing Director from 1st May 2015 presented an opportunity to review the structure of that Directorate and the management of the associated services.

As an interim measure, the Director of Visible Services and Housing was asked to manage the Directorate of Development Services alongside his current duties with effect from 1st May 2015. This was approved by Cabinet on 27th April 2015, pending a review and the consideration of longer term and more substantive proposals.

The review had now taken place over the last six weeks and proposals had been framed in consultation with all affected staff, the recognised trade unions, the Corporate Management Team and all Group Leaders.

The proposals had been put together on the basis of the following principles and imperatives for change:

- The need to build resilience and capacity in areas within Development Services, which had been subject to reducing employee numbers and increasing workloads.
- The particular need to build strategic capacity and increase focus in relation to the Council's regeneration priorities.
- The need to build in greater capacity at Head of Service level within the Visible Services and Housing Directorate to support the Director on both operational and strategic issues and priorities.
- The need to exploit operational and strategic synergies across the Development Services and Visible Services and Housing Directorates and improve service efficiency.
- The need to provide management oversight of the newly-created Shared Regulatory Services function from 1st May 2015 and as part of the Council's "host" employment responsibilities.
- The continuing need to respond to current financial challenges and contribute to savings targets for 2015/16.

A number of options had been considered as part of the review and having regard to the issues and principles as set out above. A summary of the options was set out in the report.

In summary, the options outlined were:

- Retention of the post of Director of Development Services
- Merging of two Directorates
- Expanding the Directorate of Visible Services and Housing.

Having considered all options Cabinet had been asked to consider and approve Option 3.

The main senior management implications of Option 3 were as set out below:

- under this proposal, the Director of Development Services post would not be replaced and would be deleted from the establishment.
- the Director role would be replaced with a new post of Head of Regeneration and Planning with a narrower portfolio and reporting to directly to the Managing Director.
- two Operational Managers would report to the new Head of Service. This would include an Operational Manager (Development Management) and an Operational Manager (Regeneration).
- the role of Operational Manager (Development Management) would manage the statutory land use planning services of Development Control and Building Control alongside Planning Policy and Conservation and Design.
- the role of Operational Manager (Regeneration) would manage areas within the remit of the current Operational Manager (Economic Projects and Countryside) alongside the additional areas of Tourism and Arts Development.
- the Business Support Unit previously serving the Directorate would now serve the residual services within the remit of the new Head of Regeneration and Planning. The Project Management Officers (within the PMU) would also report directly to the new Head of Regeneration and Planning and continue to provide a cross-cutting project management service.
- the post of Director of Visible Services and Housing would be reframed as Director of Environment and Housing Services, to include responsibility for Housing and Building Services, Visible Services, but also the areas of Shared Regulatory Services, Leisure Management, Transportation and Transport Policy and Highway Development. The post would also take overall responsibility for the development of integrated passenger transport alongside the wider management of fleet and garage services.
- the capacity issues raised as a result of the transfer of responsibilities would be mitigated by the creation of a new post of Head of Visible Services and Transport, reporting directly to the Director of Environment and Housing Services. The postholder would take responsibility for those operational areas relating to Waste Management and Cleansing, Parks, Grounds Maintenance, Leisure Services, Traffic and Highway Development, Transport Policy and Integrated Passenger Transport.
- three Operational Managers would report to the Head of Visible Services and Transport. This would include the current Operational Manager (Waste Management and Cleansing), Operational Manager (Leisure Services) and Operational Manager (Highways and Engineering). The Operational Manager (Leisure Services) would manage the alignment of services between the Parks and Grounds Maintenance Service and Leisure services (including play and sports development) and the (Operational Manager) Highways and Engineering, the alignment of Traffic and Highways services with Highway Development.
- the Head of Housing and Building Services and Head of Shared Regulatory Services would report to the newly designated post of Director of Environment and Housing Services but would be otherwise unaffected.

The restructuring process would see the reduction of affected Chief Officer posts from eight to seven. The grades for the proposed new posts had been determined following evaluation through the HAY Group evaluation methodology.

The new structure would take effect from 1st September 2015. This would allow time for the appointments process to commence and, where appropriate, possible, appointments to be made.

The arrangements approved by Cabinet on 27th April 2015 were put in place as an interim measure only and, for the reasons set out in the report, were not felt to be sustainable in the medium to long term.

The Leader reminded Members that most of the recommendations contained in the report to Cabinet on 22nd June were a matter for Cabinet itself to determine. He also referred Members to the reference in Recommendation (5) to any consequential changes to the Council's Constitution emanating from the recommendations. These had formed part of the proposals / recommendations which had been discussed, and approved, under Agenda Item No. 7 earlier in the meeting.

In response to a query from Councillor Penrose regarding the reference in paragraph 37 of the report to a planned expenditure reduction of £70,000 per annum resulting from the proposed restructuring, the Leader confirmed that the figure related to the combined service areas of the current Visible and Development Services Directorates. He indicated he would provide a fuller explanation of the nature of the savings to Members.

RESOLVED – T H A T the grades of post for the new post of Director of Environment and Housing Services and Head of Regeneration and Planning, as set out in Appendix E to the report, be approved.

155 SENIOR MANAGEMENT RESTRUCTURE: RESOURCES DIRECTORATE (REF) –

A copy of the report considered by Cabinet on 22nd June, 2015 was before Council. The recommendations of Cabinet had been circulated to Members prior the meeting and were also tabled at the meeting itself.

The focus of this report was to progress consideration of Option 3 of the Hay Group Report – Review of Senior Management arrangements and to determine the recommendations as set out within the Hay Report, which was approved by the Council on 17th December 2014.

The above option within the report recommended the reduction of the span of control of the Managing Director to enable the role to be more freestanding and “doable” by the Managing Director undertaking a broader, guiding role for the Resources functions. To accommodate this arrangement, the report identified the opportunity to reduce the number of Heads of Service who directly reported to the Managing Director from five to three. The report identified that such an arrangement would also realise the deletion of the Director of Resources position, but recognised the

need to retain the existing number of five Heads of Service roles, with changes to the reporting lines to enable the more senior Heads of Service to extend their range of responsibilities and to operate with greater autonomy.

Since June 2013, the statutory role as the Council's designated Monitoring Officer had been undertaken by the Head of Legal Services, for which an additional allowance was payable in recognition of the additional duties and responsibilities associated with the legislative responsibilities attached to the statutory role.

The Hay Report acknowledged the above in addition to recognising the responsibility of Returning Officer being transferred on a temporary basis until November 2016 to the Head of Legal Services.

In addition to the above, the Hay Report identified the potential for the role of the Operational Manager Democratic Services (the Council's designated 'Head of Democratic Services' under the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011) to transfer reporting lines from the Managing Director to the Head of Legal Services.

The decision of the Council on 17th December 2014 also confirmed that three Heads of Service should report to the Managing Director, but the actual "nature" of this arrangement be deferred until the Managing Director had been appointed to enable their input into the restructure.

The report was intended to consider and to identify amongst the recommendations a revised "Resources" establishment to reduce the number of Heads of Service reporting lines within the corporate functions in the Council to the Managing Director. The report also sought to establish a new position of Operational Manager reporting to, and supporting, the Head of Performance and Development to progress the ongoing significant Business Improvement, Policy and Performance agenda.

The proposals entailed:

To delete the post of Director of Resources and to confirm the continued allocation of the Section 151 duties and responsibilities to the position of Head of Finance.

The current Head of Finance / Section 151 postholder had given notice of his retirement which would take place on 19th July 2015. The salary to the existing postholder was paid in accordance with the Head of Service pay range, plus a temporary interim honorarium payment in respect of the responsibilities of the Section 151 Officer which had been undertaken by the postholder which would cease on his retirement in July 2015.

In anticipation of the forthcoming retirement of the existing postholder, Council at its meeting of 4th March 2015 approved the recommendation of the Cabinet to recruit to the post of Head of Finance / Section 151 Officer, with the salary for this responsibility and the honorarium incorporated within the salary on a permanent basis. The post was subsequently advertised to encompass the above, with the successful candidate scheduled to start in this post on 20th July 2015. In line with the recommendations of the Hay Group, the Cabinet had confirmed the transfer of reporting lines of the Head of Strategic ICT from the Managing Director to the Head

of Finance / Section 151 Officer. The Strategic Head of ICT would deputise for the Head of Finance on ICT issues and as required.

The Council was required to designate a Deputy Section 151 Officer. This was currently being undertaken on a temporary basis by the Operational Manager (Accountancy). Given the recent appointment of the Head of Finance, which incorporated the substantive Section 151 Officer responsibility, it was considered appropriate to designate the Operational Manager (Accountancy) to the statutory position of Deputy Section 151 Officer and they be paid the agreed allowance on a permanent basis. This arrangement would provide a consistent, appropriately qualified and readily identified officer to deal with and determine financial matters in the absence of the Head of Finance (particularly given the additional ICT reporting responsibilities which would be applied to the Head of Finance).

The report of the Hay Group included reference to the Council considering changing the existing reporting lines of the Operational Manager (Democratic Services) from the Managing Director. The Managing Director, having reviewed this option, had determined to recommend in favour of the continuation of the existing arrangement to Cabinet. Retention of the existing reporting arrangements would maintain the continued autonomy of the "Head of Democratic Services" to undertake his statutory obligations. Similarly, this arrangement would enhance the ability of the Managing Director to undertake his statutory duties and responsibilities as "Head of Paid Service" in the provision of leadership to the organisation, implementation of policy objectives and the priorities of the Council being achieved through the regular interaction between these statutory officers.

The Hay Group report also identified the opportunity for either the Head of Human Resources or the Head of Performance and Development to assume a Senior Head of Service role and the line management responsibilities across both services. The successful applicant would report directly to the Managing Director and attend and represent both services at the Corporate Management Team. This opportunity had significant merit, especially given the synergy and co-operation within both services. Of particular relevance was that both officers were undertaking a key role in respect of the ongoing Reshaping Services and transformation agenda within the Council.

As a consequence, it was recommended to progress the above option and in accordance with the recommendations of the Hay Report. It was proposed that both the existing Heads of Service be invited to register their interest for the senior position and to assume responsibility for the reporting and line management responsibilities for both Services to the Managing Director. A competition selection and appointment process would be determined by the Council's Senior Management Appointment Committee following registration of interest.

In addition and separate from the Hay Group Report, a new post of Operational Manager was proposed to be added to the Council's establishment. This post was necessary to deal with matters relating to Business Improvement, Policy and Performance to maintain a keen emphasis on Reshaping Services and to respond to budget pressures and change management challenges.

On the basis of the proposals contained within this report, each of the existing Heads of Service would be eligible to be matched to their current roles and responsibilities as contained within their current Job Description and both the Head of Finance (to include ICT) and the Head of Legal Services at the level of Senior Head of Service.

The new structure would become effective on 20th July 2015. This would coincide with the retirement of the current Head of Finance and with the new postholder taking up this appointment to include the duties and responsibilities of Section 151 Officer and the line management of the existing Head of Strategic ICT.

The Operational Manager (Accountancy) would be formally designated as the Council's Deputy Section 151 Officer and the Job Description amended and the appropriate allowance paid to the current postholder on a permanent basis in recognition of the responsibilities associated with this statutory role.

The above approach would facilitate a seamless transition within the Finance and ICT functions and provide a target to commence and conclude appropriate appointments in a timely and consistent manner to realise the new management structure within the Resources Directorate. This arrangement would also provide sufficient timespan to implement administrative and financial changes to support this objective.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the appointment to the proposed Senior Head of Service within the Resources Directorate would need to be determined by the Senior Management Appointment Committee. The new Senior Head of Service post would be "ring-fenced" and expressions of interest sought from both the Head of Human Resources and Head of Performance and Development. This arrangement reflected the Hay Group recommendations as previously agreed by the Council in December 2014.

All other appointments be managed by the Managing Director, with the support of the Head of Human Resources under similar procedural requirements.

The post of Operational Manager (Performance and Policy) would be advertised internally and subject to the Council's normal recruitment and selection procedure.

There were no displaced employees envisaged as a consequence of the process.

A further report would be submitted to Cabinet and Council to confirm changes to the Council's Constitution as a consequence of the proposed revised senior management arrangements, including any necessary changes to the scheme of delegations.

Again, the Leader reminded Members that, apart from Recommendations (4) and (7) set out in the report, the matters had been for determination by Cabinet. As indicated during the previous agenda item, he referred to the fact that the consequential changes to the Council's Constitution referred to in Recommendation (7) had, in fact, been discussed / approved earlier in the meeting under Agenda Item No. 7.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the grade of the Senior Head of Service Post – Head of Human Resources or Head of Performance and Development – include the senior Head of Service Allowance as set out in paragraph 41 of the report to Council, be approved.

(2) T H A T any further consequential changes to the Council's Constitution arising out of the proposed restructuring be submitted to the Council meeting in September (if necessary).

156 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE WHITE PAPER "REFORMING LOCAL GOVERNMENT: POWER TO LOCAL PEOPLE" (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2750, 27th April, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to facilitate the submission of the Council's response to the White Paper to Welsh Government by 28th April deadline, be noted.

157 IMPROVEMENT PLAN PART 1 (IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES 2015/16) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2751, 27th April, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to enable the report to be presented to Council on 29th April, 2015 for approval in order to meet statutory timescales, be noted.

158 INTERIM SENIOR MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2754, 27th April, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to facilitate the arrangements taking effect from 1st May, 2015, be noted.

159 RESOURCES DIRECTORATE: AMENDMENTS TO OFFICER DELEGATIONS (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2755, 27th April, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to facilitate the arrangements taking effect from 1st May, 2015, be noted.

160 JENNER PARK STADIUM: 3G PITCH PROJECTS AND FUTURE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2774, 11th May, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to enable construction of the 3G pitch at Jenner Park to commence as soon as possible, be noted.

161 BUS SERVICES SUPPORT GRANT 2015/16 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C2800, 22nd June, 2015) as set out in Article 13.09(a)(ii) of the Council's Constitution, in order to enable the Council to approve the grant by 30th June, 2015, be noted.

162 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8.2 –

Due notice had been given of the following questions:

(i) **Question from Councillor S.T. Wiliam**

Following my request for consideration last year when I drew attention to the failure of Vale beaches to reach Blue Flag Status, it was disappointing to hear that it has happened again.

- i) Is there a connection between this failure and the capacity of Cog Moors sewage treatment works?
- ii) Does the STW adequately handle the volumes of sewage sent to it?
- iii) How many times between May and September last year has the by-pass been used and what is the level of bacteria and viruses from sewage that have been found in the sea around our beaches?
- iv) If it is overflowing frequently and affecting bathing beaches, then does this mean that the Sewage Treatment Works is failing the Urban Waste Water Treatment directive?
- v) Why has no progress been made since attention was drawn to these issues last year?
- vi) What measures will the Council take and what pressure will the Council put on other relevant bodies such as Dŵr Cymru, that will assure local businesses and bathers that the Council is trying to ensure that the necessary improvements to the water quality of our coast are going to be made?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

To be clear there was no "failure" of Vale beaches to reach the standards required for Blue Flag status for this bathing season. As we have advised through the local press, in response to a number of articles concerning alleged poor water quality, no Blue Flag applications were submitted this year due to the ongoing regeneration works at Barry Island, which would have impacted upon the assessment process.

As Councillor Wiliam may be aware, the regulator for sea water quality is Natural Resources Wales and I would respectfully suggest that he poses his questions to them on detailed issues of discharges from any Dŵr Cymru / Welsh Water facility.

Blue Flag status would only relate to the four designated bathing water sites in the Vale all which according to Natural Resources Wales have an annual water quality forecast as follows:

Cold Knap Barry: projected excellent
 Jackson's Bay Barry Island: projected good
 Southerndown: projected excellent
 Whitmore Bay Barry Island: projected excellent.

Supplemental

Referring to being disappointed by a lack of proactivity on the part of the Council, Councillor Wiliam asked whether the Cabinet Member would agree that it would be an act of “sheer lunacy” to allow building east of the River Thaw, given the current capacity of the sewage treatment works at Cog Moors.

The Cabinet Member stated that, whilst Dŵr Cymru / Welsh Water had indicated that there would come a time when improvements to the facility would be necessary, no such improvements were required to accommodate the proposed LDP growth, which, in turn, meant there was currently capacity at the facility. Natural Resources Wales were working with Dŵr Cymru / Welsh Water to identify areas of concern that might have a detrimental impact on bathing waters. Dŵr Cymru / Welsh Water had identified particular combined sewage overflow (CSOs) that were having an impact and had developed an action plan for improving such works, which Natural Resources Wales was monitoring.

(ii) Question from Councillor S.T. Wiliam

Could the Cabinet Member provide us with an update on progress regarding signage at the ruins of St. Baruc's Church on Barry Island?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

I am aware of this outstanding request and the Council's Tourism and Marketing Officer, Nia Hollins, is undertaking a review of all our Tourist Information Points to establish what additional signage is required throughout the Vale. Irrespective of the above, I am aware that progress has already been made in respect of this particular site and discussions have been held with representatives in relation to the issue.

(iii) Question from Councillor R.J. Bertin

When are we likely to receive feedback on the recent allegations made about home care services in the BBC Week In Week Out programme and will all Members be privy to this information?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

The Council is treating very seriously all the issues raised by Week In, Week Out. I'm especially concerned to ensure that service users and their carers get quick and well-evidenced reassurance.

As a result of discussions with the programme makers, we have been able to take prompt action to safeguard people from any potential harm and to ensure that they get a quality service. For example, we have now reviewed the cases of 40 service users currently receiving care from the company highlighted in the programme. There are ongoing discussions with the company providing the care and improvements are being monitored by a range of staff from the Social Services Directorate. This work includes liaising with the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) and other Local Authorities.

With regard to the most serious allegations, only one of them involved a Vale of Glamorgan resident. The incident is said to have occurred in 2013. The BBC has been very helpful to us as we begin making our own enquiries and the matter has been referred to Adult Protection staff.

A report will be presented to the Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee as soon as sufficient evidence is available and so it will be available to all Members of the Council.

Supplemental

Councillor Bertin asked whether the Cabinet Member was doing everything possible to seek to achieve additional funding from Welsh Government for such services.

The Cabinet Member reminded Members that the Council was constantly pursuing Welsh Government for additional funding for the services the Council provided. Whilst sometimes the Council was successful in doing so, he reminded Members of the problem which had arisen following the introduction of the Fairer Charging Policy cap which, as Members were told at the time, had had a significant impact on the Council's budget. Nevertheless, the Council would continue to seek additional funding wherever it considered it was necessary to do so.

(iv) Question from Councillor J.W. Thomas

I would be grateful if the Cabinet Member could update me on the plans to upgrade the Five Mile Lane?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

Reports relating to the Five Mile Lane road improvement project were provided to Cabinet in August 2014 and in February 2015. The latter report set out to Cabinet the various concerns and risks associated with the terms of the funding offer proposed by the Welsh Government with regard to the likely works costs, the required land acquisition costs and the delivery programme. Since that date further negotiations have taken place with Welsh Government officials and whilst some amendments to the offer letter have been forthcoming, there remains a level of risk to the Council in proceeding. The Managing Director has recently advised Welsh Government in this regard and a response to his latest correspondence is awaited.

Supplemental

Given his view that the problem seemed to be largely one of funding, Councillor Thomas asked the Cabinet Member whether she had approached Jane Hutt and, if so, whether she was in a position to assist the Council in this matter.

The Cabinet Member indicated that the problem was not one of “money”, but of the risks to the Council which existed at various stages in the process. Indeed, there remained a level of risk in terms of the agreement currently being set out. Whilst there remained a commitment from Welsh Government and the Council to work together on this development, the level of risk currently in terms of proceeding was too great. She expressed surprise that Councillor Thomas had raised the matter, given that regular updates had been provided to Group Leaders.

(v) Question from Councillor J.W. Thomas

How much agricultural land does the Council own, how is this land managed and how much rent does the land produce?

Reply from the Leader

The Council disposed of the majority of its smallholdings estate in 1998/9, but retains a small residual estate made up of 3 farms of approximately 27 hectares, and approximately 8 hectares of other agricultural / grazing land. The Council manages the residual estate using “in house” resources within the estates team, however, external specialist rural practice firms are occasionally engaged to provide specific advice, when the need arises (which is very rare). The income receivable from the residual estate totals £13,400 for 2014/15.

Supplemental

Councillor Thomas referred to the Council’s ownership of 15 acres of land opposite Dyffryn Gardens, which he considered to be in a bad, overgrown state. He also alluded to land at the end of Rhoose and to little work being undertaken there in recent years and asked whether the Leader could look into the possibility of raising some funding from that piece of ground.

The Leader referred to advice which the Council had received in terms of some of its holdings, i.e. to plough fields in order to stop unauthorised grazing of horses. He understood that some such work was due to be undertaken shortly at one of the holdings but he undertook to look into the matter and into whether any expenditure was being received from the land alluded to.

(vi) **Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne**

I understand that approximately 95% of domiciliary care in the Vale of Glamorgan is delivered by the private sector. Are you satisfied that the standard of service provided is of a high quality and that elderly and vulnerable people are being cared for in a dignified, compassionate and respectful manner?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

I am confident that this Council can demonstrate that it effectively supports the majority of responsible agencies who seek to provide good quality care. However, at the same time, it prioritises the need to deal promptly and effectively with those who fall short of the expected standards.

We have in place a robust system of checks and balances across a range of social services functions to ensure that people who receive social care from independent providers commissioned by the Council are kept safe and receive the service specified in contracts. This system involves close collaboration between practitioners involved in managing individual cases and those staff responsible for contract compliance, complaints, advocacy and the arrangements in place for Protecting Vulnerable Adults.

In addition, the service liaises closely with CSSIW, the Care Council, third sector partners, adjoining Local Authorities and the Older People's Commissioner for Wales. There are local forums in place for engaging regularly with groups of providers to look at workforce matters, fees and performance issues.

These efforts are underpinned by a formal provider performance protocol which facilitates planned remedial action when concerns first arise or persist. The protocol enables the Council and its partners to deal with issues of poor performance in a considered, agreed and timely way. It has been used on a number of occasions during the past year when providers have failed to meet the quality standards required. Where the response by providers is inadequate, there is an 'Escalating Concerns Process' which operates in conjunction with any action taken by CSSIW.

Supplemental

Referring to reference in a CSSIW report regarding risks to the health, safety and wellbeing of service users due to a lack of sufficient training for a high percentage of staff, Councillor Traherne asked whether the Cabinet Member considered that the Council should be looking to other providers for domiciliary care, rather than entrusting the health and wellbeing of elderly and vulnerable people to the current

service provider. He asked whether the Cabinet Member felt that, given the level of remuneration paid by the Council, other companies would not necessarily provide any improvement in service.

The Cabinet Member considered the suggestion that the Council was, perhaps, paying too little to be debateable, given the costs of providing care to elderly people in the Vale of Glamorgan. He would, indeed, like to see more money being put in to that particular area of service, but the Council was not always in a position to do so.

He referred to the Scrutiny Committee (Social Care and Health (of which Councillor Traherne was Chairman) as having actually agreed the budget going forward over the next few years and to the Committee having agreed with the areas where the Council would have to try to make savings. He referred to all 47 Councillors on the Council as having an obligation to try and make sure that that service provided was the best possible.

He alluded to there being a number of different companies who operated in the Vale of Glamorgan and, therefore, there was a wide choice. However, nobody could predict the quality of the staff who were employed by those agencies. Often (albeit not always), shortcomings would be down to members of staff and it would not make any difference whether or not those staff were working for that particular agency or another agency. The important thing for all was that checks and balances were in place and the Council did rely on CSSIW for the work that they carried out. However, the Council also picked up on information from its social workers and from other people who visit those vulnerable adults in the Vale of Glamorgan, and, if appropriate, would escalate action. He also considered it important to state that the Council also relied on those individuals and their families or their carers / advocates to actually inform the Council when things were not what they should be, so that swift and decisive remedial action could be taken.

(vii) **Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne**

The Cabinet Member will be aware that 'When I am Ready' is a scheme developed by the Welsh Government in partnership with local government and key third sector partners to enable care leavers to continue to live with their former foster carers once they turn 18. I understand that all Local Authorities are expected to develop and begin implementing these arrangements during 2015-16, ready for when the new duties come into force on 1st April 2016 as part of the Social Services and Well Being (Wales) Act. How is the Directorate going to cope with this new duty?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Schools

The 'When I am Ready' scheme will allow young people in foster care to remain with their former foster carers up to the age of 21 or even 25, if they are engaged in an extended period of education or training. In terms of outcomes for looked after children and care leavers, a major priority for this Council, allowing them to stay as long as possible in a supportive family environment is a really positive step. These young people will gain the time and support needed to develop the skills and resilience needed to make a successful transition to more independent living.

There are cost and resource implications. Fostering placements are at a premium and prolonging the Council's financial support well into adulthood does increase the burden on children's services, where the budget is already under pressure.

However, over the past two years, we have worked closely with the Authorities piloting the scheme, to develop our own policies in preparation for implementing 'When I am Ready'. Indeed, the Vale of Glamorgan has allowed young people to remain with their foster carers (when they have requested to do so) for the past two years. The 15 Plus Team, working in partnership with the Fostering Service, has developed a financial policy to help foster carers and young people understand their rights post 18 years of age. The Fostering Service has been seeking to recruit new carers to offset any further impact 'When I Am Ready' may have. They are also preparing and training foster carers to look after young people beyond the age of 18. We will further develop their policies in line with the new regulations from Welsh Government ready for implementation in April 2016.

Supplemental

Councillor Traherne referred to Welsh Government guidance as seeming to state that Local Authorities might wish to consider paying an additional amount to foster carers to ensure that "When I am Ready" arrangements could go ahead. As such, he asked the Cabinet Member whether he was attempting to make any new funding available to meet these new duties.

The Cabinet Member stated that the Council paid £182 per placement per week. Adding the carers' Level 3 payment for skills and the National Minimum Wage Allowance for an older child increased this cost to £300 per placement per week. The cost was often offset by the young person claiming housing benefit of £98 per week and paying a contribution of that of £20 per week. Young people in higher education were not eligible to claim housing benefit so, therefore, the Authority paid the full cost. There was an additional cost in place but he made it clear that the Council had been doing that for the last two years, already paid more and had actually increased it in line with the system in place for paying foster carers higher rates as they progressed through their own training and as the young people went past the age of 18.

(viii) Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne

In a recent document circulated to Members, the CSSIW 'National Inspection' of services that support looked after children and care leavers stated that there still aren't enough experienced social workers and managers in children's social services. Is this true here in the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Schools

In this Council, the workforce in Children and Young People Services is largely stable, with considerable experience and qualifications. This is not the case consistently across Wales. The position in the Vale perhaps reflects our reputation

for providing social workers with a setting where good professional practice is valued and achievable. We also have a good track record of appointing managers from within the staff group. This demonstrates their levels of competence and the support and development opportunities afforded to them.

In common with all other Local Authorities, however, we have experienced some difficulties in appointing to Social Work posts within our Intake and Assessment Team. This appears to be a consequence of career choices made by social workers and professionally qualified staff and the many other opportunities available to them across Wales.

I'm pleased to inform Councillor Traherne that we have just had a very successful round of recruitment. Offers of appointment have been made to all Social Work vacancies in the Children and Young People Services Division. We have also recruited permanent managers to the Fostering Service and the Fifteen Plus Teams, where we had been using interim arrangements during a period of service redesign.

(ix) **Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne**

What plans do you have to secure funding for the regeneration of Barry?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

A number of funding streams are already in place for programmes which are underway, including, for instance, the Castleland Renewal Area and the Welsh Government's Vibrant and Viable Places / Tackling Poverty Programme which alone totals over £1 million and is available until March 2017. The Council's delivery of Communities First in Barry has secured a further £1.5 million over three years ending in March 2016. Officers are working with Welsh Government to secure further funding as these and other programmes are extended.

However, regeneration is multi-faceted. New areas are being explored: an application has recently been submitted for approximately £850,000 of loan funding under the Vibrant and Viable Places Repayable Funding Scheme, to address social housing opportunities and officers continue to engage regionally to secure European funding under the new round of structural funds and I am confident we will see some successes.

The Housing team is currently working with its partner Newydd Housing Association in determining suitable sites for new build Council housing. Feasibility studies are expected in July 2015 and planning permission will be sought on those sites that are deliverable. Any new build scheme will be underpinned with the principles of economic regeneration and local employment and skills.

The Council Housing Business Plan includes funding for the regeneration of Council estates and work is currently underway to design a regeneration scheme for the Buttrills Estate in Barry.

Officers from Housing and Building Services continue to work with social landlords in identifying new build affordable housing opportunities and are maximising the Social

Housing Grant available from Welsh Government to deliver these; a good example of this is the newly developed Marine Hotel site on Barry Island.

In addition the Housing team is working with partners to lever in additional funding from Welsh Government for external improvements works associated with fuel poverty e.g. ARBED.

Supplemental

Councillor Traherne considered the Council had failed to secure a beneficial end use for the land at Nell's Point and stated that, unless he had misunderstood the Cabinet Member's recent letter in the Gem, that the Council intended to remarket Nell's Point. He asked the Cabinet Member whether, in reality, there would need to be some form of public facility to attract appropriate indoor and outdoor leisure facilities at the site.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that the marketing of Nell's Point had already started and that it had generated a great deal of interest, with many people having already requested information. She alluded to the much greater amount of confidence and, specifically, in Barry Island which now existed. The Council was committed to working in partnership with suitable propositions and, looking forward, she was confident that an end use would, indeed, be found. However, the use would have to be of a type that was right for Barry and right for Barry Island.

(x) Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne

The Cabinet Member may recall that at Full Council in December 2014 he promised a Cabinet Report on the introduction of car parking charges in a number of car parks in the Vale of Glamorgan 'early next year'. There has been no report and furthermore there is no mention of a report on this matter in the Cabinet Forward Work Programme - May to July 2015. Has the Cabinet Member decided to abandon this deeply unpopular and damaging proposal?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

I can confirm that the Council has been considering and investigating in detail the potential for car park charging throughout the Vale for some time.

The Council is committed to implementing parking charges in order to ensure that proposed savings are realised and identified budget targets are met. This is particularly critical given the increasing financial challenges facing the Council over the next few years, when it is estimated that the Council will need to find savings of £25 million. However, at the same time, we do not wish to jeopardise the viability of our town centres in achieving such savings.

It has been considered necessary to review the previous work and undertake further works in relation to price sensitivity testing on the proposals being considered in order to ensure that there will be no detrimental impact from the introduction of car parking charges within town centre areas.

Supplemental

Councillor Traherne referred to the Council's stance on this matter as appearing to have changed and asked the Cabinet Member when a further report was going to be submitted to Cabinet as previously indicated.

The Cabinet Member was hoping that a report would be submitted prior to the August recess, following which Members would have ample opportunity to consider the report and / or call-in the matter. He would also be willing to meet with Councillor Traherne if required.

(xi) Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne

What are you doing to help businesses in Holton Road?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

The Council recognises the ongoing difficult economic climate for retailers in our Town Centres. That is why we created the post of Town Centres Development Officer and have significantly improved dialogue with the business community. That officer has, for instance, recently facilitated a Continental Market on King Square, and other such projects are under development. The Christmas lights event last year was reported as 'possibly the best in Wales', no doubt drawing in new trade. A recent report to cabinet outlined proposals for a repeat / enhancement of the event.

The Town Centres' Framework provides the backdrop for much of our support, including, of course, high quality maintenance of the public realm, but in Holton Road and upper Holton Road we provide grants programmes to facilitate investment in properties, in addition to the Renewal Area which is massively improving the street scene.

There is the need for further improvements to the public realm, and officers continue to pursue funding options.

Cabinet will shortly be considering a proposal to take up a Welsh Government grant scheme and target retailers in particular in respect of opportunities for substantial rate relief. This is in addition to the small business rate relief scheme currently in place.

Supplemental

Councillor Traherne asked the Cabinet Member when she had last met with the Chair of the Holton Road Traders.

The Cabinet Member indicated that, whilst she had met with the Chair of the High Street Traders, she had not, to date, met with the Chair of the Holton Road Traders.

(xii) Question from Councillor R.L. Traherne

In 2015 – 2016 Adult Social Services is expected to make almost 1 million pounds in savings. In view of the ever increasing need and the introduction of the Social Services and Well-Being (Wales) Act, which is most definitely not ‘cost neutral’, do you think that this is sustainable?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

It is greatly to the credit of this Administration that it has managed the Adult Services budget very well – despite increasing demand and rising expectations, plus the fact that it is probably the most complex of all Council budgets. We have put in place a very successful budget programme which has enabled the service to deliver the substantial savings required year on year. The programme provides us with an effective platform upon which to achieve the very challenging targets set for the current financial year and for the period beyond.

Also, because of the Council's prudent approach to financial management, it has been possible to allocate additional funding to the Adult Services budget for 2015/2016. As a consequence, the service has been able to continue providing good quality, vital services to individuals in the Vale of Glamorgan who require care and support.

However, the long-term sustainability of the Adult Services budget is a cause for concern. The service is experiencing increased burdens from a number of sources, including the pressure on care home and domiciliary care fees and the increasing complexity of care that people require. Councillor Traherne is right to be concerned about the potential cost of implementing the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act, which comes into force from April 2016.

(xiii) Question from Councillor C.J. Williams

I attended an excellent Event at Barry Memorial Hall on 10th June where keynote speaker, Jane Hutt AM explained how Welsh Government is actively encouraging Communities / Groups / Community and Town Councils, to come forward with their plans to take over Council-owned assets for their communities. I was overjoyed to hear this news. I believe that the most valuable asset in Dinas Powys is the derelict site of the St. Cyres School, grounds, fields and wooded areas totalling some 33 acres. Can you please help us to take over this asset for the benefit of the poor, exploited, hard-working residents of Dinas Powys?

Reply from the Leader

As a local Member, the Councillor will be well aware the Council recently marketed the site for a master planned redevelopment that, subject to planning, would deliver a balanced mix of both community uses and new homes. A mixed use development of the former school land offers a highly sustainable approach to the redevelopment of the site and the opportunity for a “community hub” to be created along with the new medical centre. This mixed use vision with the community at its heart was

brought forward as a proposal by this Cabinet following the Council carrying out a community consultation exercise between 12th November 2012 and 18th January 2013. We carefully took on board the views of the local community and subsequently abandoned the original proposals for all of the site to be developed for housing. Instead, we reduced the amount of land at the site proposed for housing and earmarked part of the site for community uses. Having recently marketed the land on this mixed use basis the Council is presently engaged in legal negotiations with the preferred bidder for the wider site.

Supplemental

Councillor Williams asked whether the Council was already having discussions with community groups such as Dinas Powys Football Club regarding a possible facility within the St. Cyres site and, if so, whether it would be dependent upon the Inspector's Report before it was submitted to the Planning Committee.

The Leader confirmed the Council was talking to groups and, would do so, to every group that was interested and wished to come forward. Any application submitted meant that the Council was duty bound, in planning terms, to actually determine the application (whether the LDP was in place or not). He reiterated the point made in his initial answer that, as a planned redevelopment, it would be subject to planning legislation.

(xiv) Question from Councillor C.J. Williams

I read with dismay that we did not apply for the coveted 'Blue Badge' designation for Whitmore Bay for this year. I myself have joined with a fellow Councillor colleague, known to us all, in his efforts with 'Friends of Barry Beaches' to clean up our beaches for the benefit of us all. Can you please tell me who took this decision not to apply and why; and also how many discharges of raw sewage have been dumped into the Severn Estuary by Dŵr Cymru/Welsh Water off the coast at the Barry area in the last 12 months?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

Firstly can I thank Councillor Williams, other Councillors, particularly Rob and Claire Curtis, and those who regularly join them, who donate their time to support the cleaning of the Council's beaches. Together, this makes a major contribution to a cleaner environment and safeguarding the marine and bird wildlife at our coast.

There are a number of reasons why we did not feel it appropriate to submit an application for the Blue Flag at Whitmore Bay for the 2015 bathing season, some of which I have already stated in response to an earlier question. At the time when the submission would have to be made the regeneration works on the Island were at a stage where we were not certain that they would be fully completed by the bathing season and given that the amenity of the beach is a criteria of the gaining the award we were reticent to commit to making the application.

As I have previously advised, Natural Resources Wales is the regulating body for discharges into the sea and whilst they do advise this Council of major overflow

incidence, we would not necessarily be advised of all such occurrences. As also advised, Dŵr Cymru/Welsh Water has plans to continue to improve its infrastructure going forward so it is hoped that such discharges will become less and less frequent in years to come.

Supplemental

Councillor Williams asked whether, with regard to the Waterfront Development in Barry and the proposed housing sites in the Eastern Vale, this would result in sewage being treated in Cog Moors.

The Cabinet Member indicated that it would.

(xv) **Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson**

What support does the Council provide to boxing clubs in the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has provided various levels of support to boxing clubs in the area.

Land adjacent to the Colcot Sports Centre was provided by the former Vale of Glamorgan Borough Council to allow a new gym to be built for the Colcot Boxing Club with funding provided by the Foundation for Sports and the Arts.

The Council has recently also supported the relocation of the Barry West End Boxing Club, formerly located in the Winsor Public House, to a former pensioners centre in Barry, although some information is still required to complete this transfer.

The Council's Sports Development Team has also worked a number of Boxing Clubs to increase opportunities for young people to become involved in the sport. They have assisted in numerous Community Chest applications for local boxing clubs to benefit from grant funding, totalling £2914 during the period between July 2014 – June 2015. Colcot Sports Amateur Boxing Club and Rhoose Boxing Club were awarded the grants for coach education courses and new equipment to raise club standards and meet demand of increased membership.

Supplemental

Referring to boxing clubs often finding themselves in "precarious situations" due to having to use old buildings, Councillor Dr. Johnson asked whether the Council would be providing support to any boxing clubs in future which found itself in such a position.

The Cabinet Member confirmed the Council was always available to assist in such matters where it possibly could. For example, Lee Selby had been assisted with his training arrangements prior to his preliminary fight before his subsequent world title fight. However, providing assistance generally was not easy given, as Members

were well aware, and as made clear under the Reshaping Services programme, huge amounts of money to support people did not exist.

(xvi) **Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson**

Can you provide an updated estimate of the cost of the Vale of Glamorgan Council becoming a Living Wage employer, with all staff paid at least the Living Wage of £7.85?

Reply from the Leader

The latest estimated cost for the implementation of the Living Wage for employees across the Council is £771,651. This is based on salary levels subsequent to the 2015 nationally negotiated pay award and incremental pay rises from 1st April 2015. The estimate includes overtime and agency employee costs. The estimate does not include any additional costs arising from the requirement for external contractors to adopt the Living Wage requirement for their staff.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson asked the Leader whether the Budget Working Group would consider upgrades to the Living Wage as part of their discussions for the 2016/17 financial year.

The Leader indicated that the Group would consider the matter, but that the answer had been given previously, in that it would cost £771,651, which would mean either a reduction in / impact upon other services or, indeed, a loss of jobs.

(xvii) **Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson**

What discussions has the Council had regarding participation in the Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

The Head of Housing and Building Services and officers in Housing and Community Safety have attended information seminars/progress meetings with the Home Office on the both the relocation of vulnerable people from Syria and the relocation of armed forces' local support staff from Afghanistan e.g. interpreters.

Monmouthshire Council has been the first Council to receive a number of single men from Afghanistan who have been relocated successfully in terms of accommodation and are seeking employment and educational opportunities in the vicinity.

Both schemes offer packages of funding to participating Councils that cover the majority of costs, however there is a lack of clarity at this time from Welsh Government on how health services will be funded for the Syrian project which may

cause concern for the Local Health Board (in England monies have been made available centrally).

The Council has allocated £100,000 for support and interpretation services for asylum seekers (N.B. technically neither projects are classed as asylum seeker projects).

Both schemes will be discussed at the forthcoming Local Service Board meeting to be held on 14th July 2015.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson asked the Cabinet Member whether clarification could be sought regarding the costs from Welsh Government, specifically in terms of health and whether it could be suggested that the Council would be interested in taking people forward on this scheme.

Whilst not within his area of expertise, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the matter was being discussed at the Local Service Board and he was sure that they would take on board concerns expressed at the Council Meeting.

(xviii) **Question from Councillor C.P. Franks**

Will the Leader make a statement on the future of Local Government ?

Reply from the Leader

I am surprised you are asking that question. Councillor Franks has already been provided with my statement. I circulated it to all Members on the afternoon of Wednesday 17th June and that same message was placed on the front page of the Council's staffnet the next day. My statement was very clear and to the point. IT has also appeared in the press since that time and I am surprised Councillor Franks has not seen it yet.

Supplemental

Councillor Franks asked the Leader whether he would consider supporting the plan that the Vale would remain an independent county, as proposed by Plaid Cymru.

The Leader reminded Members that he made his position very clear on numerous occasions. He did not agree with the planned local government re-organisation and would, indeed, prefer to see the Vale of Glamorgan Council stand alone. The Council had however, submitted what he considered to have been a very good merger proposal with Bridgend Council. It had covered all the points that were necessary, including the Police and Fire Brigade. The only element it had not covered related to Health Authority boundaries but the Council had the agreement from both Health Authorities to actually submit the bid.

The rejection letter came from the Minister indicating that the submission had not been accepted as it had crossed a Health Authority boundary. However, “perversely and bizarrely”, the Minister had allowed the crossing of the boundary between Abertawe Bro Morgannwg, which was the one the Council was with, and Cwm Taf. The Leader stated he had made the point very clear in his statement and that he would stick by what he had said. He disagreed with his Party and he disagreed with the Minister.

(xix) **Question from Councillor C.P. Franks**

Will you indicate if you consider that staff resources within the Planning Department are adequate to deal in an efficient manner with enquiries from the public and Councillors with processing planning applications and associated matters?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

The Planning Department is currently dealing with a very high number of Planning Applications as well as large appeals and a high number of enforcement cases. In particular there are currently over 30 major applications for housing development being considered by the Department which does generate significant workload. Notwithstanding this high volume of work, all officers endeavour to provide the public, applicants and Councillors with responses to their questions and queries as quickly as is possible, but given the above workload, some matters are prioritised according to the importance of the request.

Supplemental

Councillor Franks asked the Cabinet Member whether it was time to allocate additional resources to the Planning Department in order to cope with the significant workload of officers.

The Cabinet Member suggested that it might be a way forward if the Council was not actually performing in the top quartile of dealing with planning applications (which it was). She referred to results from January to March of this year, which showed the Council dealing with the fourth highest level of applications determined within eight weeks. Consequently, whilst there were no performance issues at present, she pointed out that there would be occasions when officers would deal with a query, respond to a Member and then a subsequent query might arise which would require waiting until the officer was available and in work to deal with the matter. Notwithstanding that, she reiterated that performance continued to indicate that the Council was amongst the “top performers”.

(xx) **Question from Councillor C.P. Franks**

Will you indicate the cost of preparing the last Administration's LDP and the current draft LDP ?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

The production of the LDP commenced in 2006 and is an iterative process with costs being incurred year on year.

The pre deposit stages from 2006 to 2010 informed both the 2012 and 2013 plans therefore the figures I give below exclude those costs.

The cost of preparing the Deposit LDP (2012) is £447,852.

The cost of preparing the replacement Deposit LDP (2013) is £264,893.

I am able to provide Councillor Franks with a spreadsheet detailing the LDP costs from 2006 to date should this be required.

Supplemental

Councillor Franks asked whether, given the dissatisfaction expressed by Members and others, the Welsh Government should be requested to scale down the process in order to save money and also to not encourage "excessive confidence" that people's objections would be listened to.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was always worth examining a process in order to see whether or not it could be improved and she believed there were, indeed, proposals to improve the process contained within the forthcoming Planning Bill.

(xxi) **Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson**

With regard to Discretionary Housing Payments,

- (a) How many and what value of payments were made in the 2014-15 financial year,
- (b) how many applications were rejected and
- (c) what was the total value of the budget available.

Reply from the Leader

- (a) A total of 563 DHPs were awarded with a total of £246,829.35 paid out.

- (b) 290 DHP applications were rejected
- (c) The Departments for Works and Pensions allocation was £244,982, with up to an additional £215,000 also being made available from the Council's own resources depending upon uptake and eligibility.

Supplemental

Referring to the Council as facing further benefit cuts, Councillor Dr. Johnson asked the Leader what resources would be made available in the current, and future, years to ensure that all relevant people would be supported.

The Leader reiterated the fact that up to an additional £215,000 had been made available from the Council's own resources, albeit the full provision had not been used. There remained a budget provision and he reiterated previous comments he had made regarding the continuing austerity within which the Council was forced to operate and, indeed, to the fact that cutbacks to the public sector were going to continue to increase. He did not consider the full impact had yet been seen, but he felt that the benefit changes would eventually result in an increasing amount of claims being submitted. In the meantime, officers would continue to assess all claims. Where it was considered that an individual was in particular trouble, they were advised to make an application. However, payments could obviously not be made unless an application existed in the first place.

(xxii) **Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson**

How many comments have so far been received on the Trinity Street traffic proposals and how many of these were

- (a) (largely) in favour or
- (b) (largely) against.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Visible and Leisure Services

As we are in the middle of a formal and statutory consultation it will be premature to provide a breakdown of responses until that consultation has closed. To do otherwise could potentially prejudice the process.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson asked when the statutory consultation period would be officially ending and what would happen to any submissions.

The Cabinet Member indicated that the actual arrangements had been made prior to his becoming Cabinet Member for Visible Services, but he was able to confirm that the consultation period started on 1st April 2015 and, therefore, would end at the end of September. From October, the Council would be in a position to assess the process and for Cabinet to consider a report as to the way forward.

(xxiii) Question from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson

Which concrete actions have been taken as a result of the Barry Regeneration Annual Forum 2014.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

The Forum Feedback Report was presented to Cabinet on 23rd February 2015 and Scrutiny Committee (Economy and Environment) on 24th March 2015. The observations and contributions captured in the Feedback Report are being used by the Council, the relevant partnerships and partner organisations and assists them in taking forward their priorities, e.g. the Town Centre Repayable Funding Scheme 2015/16, reported to Cabinet on 13th April 2015.

In response to specific feedback further consideration is being given to:

- i. broadening the demographic of delegates for future events;
- ii. making better use of the local media to publicise future events;
- iii. making better use of social media to share information and coordinate activities;
- iv. reviewing the format, frequency and scale of future events; and,
- v. tailored future engagement events with an emphasis on targeted spatial areas and/or groups.

The Barry Regeneration Advisory Group will play an active role in the preparation work leading up to the next Forum in November 2015 and it is expected that several Members will actively share their knowledge and experience on the day free of charge as workshop facilitators and speakers.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson understood that attendance at the Regeneration Group was not always of a high level. He asked whether consideration would be given to advertising for new members of the Group, to include Members of the opposition groups on the Council.

The Cabinet Member indicated she did not recognise the description given. She referred to the Group as being very active and keen and to the fact that, at last year's Annual Forum, a vast majority of workshops had been run by very dedicated members of the Group.

(xxiv) Question from Councillor R.J. Bertin

What does the Leader think about the latest proposals to merge Welsh Local Authorities down to just eight and merge us with Cardiff?

N.B. Councillor Bertin indicated that, given the earlier question from Councillor Franks on the same subject, and the reply given by the Leader, he was withdrawing his question.

(xxv) **Question from Councillor C.J. Williams**

Please can you give me an update regarding this Council's arrangements to remove the Travellers on Parc Bryn y Don playing fields in Dinas Powys?

Reply from the Leader

The Park Division are in the process of taking the correct legal action to end the unauthorised occupation of the land. A multi-agency case conference was held yesterday, Tuesday 23rd June 2015, following which Notices were displayed on site yesterday afternoon requesting that the travellers leave by 12 noon tomorrow, Thursday 25th June 2015.

In the event that the travellers do not leave by the above deadline legal proceedings will be commenced.

Supplemental

Councillor Williams asked whether, should the travellers refuse to move, what contingency arrangements were in place to physically remove them.

The Leader reiterated his original reply, i.e. in the event that the travellers did not leave by the above deadline, legal proceedings would be commenced.

(xxvi) **Question from Councillor N.P. Hodges**

At the start of the Cabinet meeting on 23rd February you stated that you had received a request from Councillor Rob Curtis to be released as he could not commit enough time to his post due to work commitments.

Have you had the opportunity yet to correct this statement?

Reply from the Leader

I don't need to correct the statement that I made.

Supplemental

Councillor Hodges again asked the Leader whether his original statement had been correct.

The Leader replied that it was.

(xxvii) **Question from Councillor N.P. Hodges**

Following the last Full Council are you now able to update me on the progress of the second Road to and from Barry Island?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

Both the Managing Director and Officers have continued to meet with the Barry Waterfront Consortium team who are constructing the road. Contrary to the programmed completion date previously advised to the Council, the Consortium has recently indicated that due to delays in both ground consolidation and services provision at the site, the programme of road construction has slipped. Given the concerns of officers regarding how the continuation of construction works through the summer might impact upon traffic flows to the Harbour Road Car Park, there has been agreement with the Consortium team that full completion of the road works should be delayed until after the summer season is over. In order to deal with peak traffic flows the Council has reached an arrangement with the Consortium to allow exit from the Harbour Road Car Park and egress from the Island via the road lengths already constructed through the Waterfront. This approach, taken together with the early completion of the road improvements at the Ship Inn junction, is considered sufficient to deal with likely peak flow demand for this season.