

COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

Minutes of a remote meeting held on 5th October 2023.

The Committee agenda is available [here](#).

The recording of the meeting is available [here](#).

Present: Councillor S.M. Hanks (Chair); Councillor M.R. Wilson (Vice-Chair); Councillors A. Asbrey, R.M. Birch, W. Gilligan, S.J. Haines, N.P. Hodges, H.M. Payne, S.D. Perkes and R.R. Thomas.

Representing Town and Community Councils: Councillors S. Hodges (Barry Town Council); A. Trousdell (Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council); M. Cuddy (Penarth Town Council); B. Morris (Colwinston Community Council); M. Phillips (Substitute) (Dinas Powys Community Council); J. Radcliffe (Ewenny Community Council); H. Osbourne (Llancarfan Community Council); D. Hackett (Substitute) (Llandow Community Council); S. Bonnar (Llanfair Community Council); J. Sykes (Substitute) (Llangan Community Council); M. Narusberg (Llanmaes Community Council); P. Summers (Penllyn Community Council); S.M. Toker (Substitute) (St. Athan Community Council); S. Roberts (St. Brides Major Community Council); I. Perry (St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council); N. Parry (Sully and Lavernock Community Council), C. Hawkins (Wick Community Council).

Also present: Councillor G. Bruce, W.A. Hennessy, Dr. I.J. Johnson, and E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health).

407 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business of the Committee, the Chair read the following statement: “May I remind everyone present that the meeting will be live streamed as well as recorded via the internet and this recording archived for future viewing.”

408 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors S. Campbell and C.A. Cave (Vale of Glamorgan Council) and Community Councillors G. Thomas (Llantwit Major Town Council); K. Hatton (Dinas Powys Community Council); J. Shaw (Llandow Community Council); P. Wilson (Llangan Community Council, S. Harries (St. Athan Community Council) and A. Thomas (Welsh St. Donats Community Council).

409 MINUTES –

AGREED –

(1) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd March 2023 be approved as a correct record subject to it being noted that the reference to loss of ‘salary’ within bullet point three of Recommendation (2) (Min. No. 874) also refers to the loss of Clerk ‘jobs’ as raised by Councillor Cave.

(2) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 6th July 2023 be approved as a correct record.

410 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interest were received.

411 SOUTH WALES POLICE SERVICE - VERBAL UPDATE -

The Chair welcomed the new Inspector for Barry and the Vale, Gareth Childs, to the Committee and offered the Committee’s thanks to the previous Police Representative, Inspector Mark Henderson, for their contributions to the Committee.

Inspector Childs subsequently apprised the Committee on the following good news stories and policing matters for the Vale of Glamorgan area as follows:

- On 11th September 2023, Police Constable Dan Tunnicliffe was successfully able to seek medical attention for a female in distress at Llantwit Major beach. As a result, the police constable had received grateful thanks from the family of the young lady and had undertaken excellent safeguarding work. The incident tied into an ongoing suicide prevention project being undertaken in partnership with the Vale of Glamorgan Council. The project related to preventative measures and partnership working utilising the ‘What three words’ technology which could identify a location within any three-square metres. The advantages of this technology would allow the police service to identify the location of individuals more easily and quickly in emotional or medical distress along 25 points of the Vale of Glamorgan coastline. It was anticipated that the suicide prevention project would be publicised in the media as well as social media in the coming weeks.
- In relation to community projects, PCSO Angela Stone had been meeting up with members of the Prison and Probation Service to conduct local work initiatives and gardening work in the Southerndown area. This project supported other community projects also happening in the Llantwit Major area to commemorate 50 years of community police projects. Community Support Officers had regularly been engaging in the community projects that were all going very well.

- In early September, Inspector Childs had met with the First Minister for Wales who visited the St. Brides Major area to witness the 20mph speed restrictions that have been implemented by pilot in the village. Local residents, schoolteachers and parents alike offered their praise for the initiative and the visit with the First Minister went very well in partnership with other police colleagues and the headmaster of the local school. The visit raised the profile of the St. Brides Major area and individuals involved in the visit walked from the primary school in the village to a local farmhouse where there were a number of police community initiatives taking place. The 20mph speed restriction in the village had been in place for two years prior to the visit and was positively received.
- Leanne Davies, Police Community Support Officer, had undertaken a volunteer litter pick on Barry Island with a number of members from the community as well as other police community support officers.
- Operation Elstree, which was a partnership working approach with the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service as well as the Vale of Glamorgan Council was run from June until the end of September and therefore, the operation had concluded for the current calendar year. Due to the poor weather experienced in the months of July and August the volume of persons travelling to the Vale of Glamorgan area was less than in previous summer months and there had been no real issues experienced as part of the operation. The Harbour car park in Barry had experienced some instances of anti-social behaviour and therefore safety measures were now in place and the police force was working in partnership with the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

In response to Inspector Childs' query in relation to statistical data required to present, the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer advised that previous Inspectors had provided the Committee with statistical information in relation to the different categories of crime figures for the area as a whole. In response, Inspector Childs thanked the Committee for its time and advised that further statistical figures would be presented on particular crime trends at the next meeting of the Committee.

The Vice-Chair of the Committee then offered their congratulations to Inspector Childs on his recent appointment and wished to seek clarification on the areas covered within the role, to which, Inspector Childs advised that the areas of Penarth, Dinas Powys, Sully and Llandough were covered by Inspector Abbey Biddle who worked out of the Cardiff Bay Police Station and therefore their role covered Barry town centre and as far west of Vale of Glamorgan as Ogmere by Sea.

The Vice-Chair then asked a second question in relation to burglary crime on commercial properties in relation to retail premises in both the Penarth and Barry areas. In response, Inspector Childs advised that a spate of three burglaries in the September period in Barry had been reported that related to the Lloyds Pharmacy at Barry Tesco's, opticians on Holton Road and an attempted burglary at Argos on the Waterfront in Barry. In relation to these three reports and individual had been brought into custody and work was currently ongoing to collate evidence in order to charge. A link was made between the three separate instances based on the

vehicle involved and the individual remained on bail and the cases were ongoing. A stronger volume of commercial burglaries had also taken place in the Penarth area and particularly in relation to Penarth Road and a number of DIY premises. A person had been arrested in relation to these and Inspector Childs was collaborating closely with the Inspector for the area, Abbey Biddle, concerning the crimes. The force was optimistic that based on evidence collated to date that it had the right individual concerned who would be coming back to court at the beginning of November and would hopefully be charged.

The Representative for St. Brides Community Council congratulated the Inspector on their recent appointment and commended the gradual descent of speed limits from 50mph to 30mph and eventually to 20mph on the Wick side of the St. Brides Village, which had made a big difference to the traffic flow through the village. As a secondary point, the representative referred to a very serious accident that had recently taken place in Ogmore village and advised that the 30mph limit within the location did not seem to be working as well, due to the fairly regular occurrences of car races taking place for individuals trying to access the Ogmore by Sea car park. In response, Inspector Childs advised that the matter raised by the Community Council representative was a matter being looked into by the service and agreed that it was a difficult period of transition when speed limits were reducing from national levels into smaller villages with a slower speed limit. Inspector Childs expressed his support of the 20mph speed restriction roll out and in particular in relation to rural villages which significantly helped to slow traffic down. The feedback received to date in relation to the 20mph roll out was very positive and, having spoken to a number of headteachers in local primary schools, traffic was definitely slower around the school locations which was better for the community.

In addition, the Chief Executive of the Council advised that as an authority, the Council would be reviewing how the 20mph scheme was working throughout the Vale in light of the expansive roll out taking place over a short period of time when the Welsh Government legislation came into effect. It was fair to say that, with any roll out of that scale, there would be areas that the Vale of Glamorgan Council would want to modify in time once the roll out had bedded down. Therefore, once it was possible to see how the scheme changes were working in reality, in particular in relation to approaches to villages as set out by the Representative for St. Brides Community Council, the Vale of Glamorgan Council would be looking closely at any further changes needed and would subsequently make any changes as required.

In conclusion, the Chair commended all PCSOs working in the Vale of Glamorgan area who were undertaking excellent work.

With no further comments or questions, the Committee subsequently

AGREED – T H A T Inspector Childs be thanked for their time and verbal update.

412 SOUTH WALES FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE – VERBAL UPDATE -

Mr. Treherne, Group Manager, apprised the Committee on the following matters in relation to the Bridgend and Vale of Glamorgan areas:

- The total number of incidents that the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service had attended in the current financial year was 10,256. 3,527 of these were related to fires, 2,118 were special service calls and 4,611 were false alarms.
- The service had attended 194 fires in the current financial year and dwelling fires had peaked in the months of July and August with four vehicle fires, 8 grass fires and 6 dwelling fires over the month of July.
- The statistics in relation to vehicle fires had declined as the year progressed.
- Injuries sustained to members of the community as a result of incidents that were attended through the financial year to date was 44. 15 injuries were sustained as a result of fires, 16 as a result of road traffic collisions and 13 in relation to other special service calls.
- In terms of fatalities, sadly two persons had lost their lives in one vehicle fire. There had been two road traffic collisions over two separate incidents, one in a dwelling fire and one in road vehicle fire.
- Derelict building behind the HINDS Garages location VOG - Fire Crime visited the location and highlighted some potential access points and danger alongside the crews report. As a first protocol the building was 're secured' by putting boards up over the main access door. Unfortunately, this did not work and there was a serious fire within the building which involved 3 teenagers getting stuck and having to be rescued by crews. Luckily no serious injuries were caused. The Council then produced a plan to completely block off access to the building by putting up a metal fence gate down the ramp to Barry Docks Station that would tie into the existing fencing around the building. This had limited any room for anyone to climb over and the fencing its 2.4m high. This arrangement also had the benefit of being next to active footpath to help with visibility. New fencing across the existing gates had also been installed, and the tree which was being using to climb over in the far corner of the sight had been cut down. Since the work had been conducted there had been 0 fire calls to the area and anti-social behaviour had reduced significantly as well. Without the partnership working, it would not have been possible to achieve this outcome which was stopping a serious incident from happening and reducing risk in the area.
- Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Week 3rd-7th July - Joint patrols had taken place in hot spot areas with local PCSO's and Housing such as St. Cyres School, Barry waterfront, and Ogmore by Sea event/patrol.
- Penarth Waterfront Event – In partnership with road Safety and police – offices gave out water safety advice but also informing the public about the benefits of Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR).
- Police Patrols – In the Chickenwood area and knap due to some on-going deliberate fire setting in the area.

Following the Group Manager's presentation, the Vice-Chair noted that a lot of the work of the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service was preventative rather than responsive and incredibly important for increasing basic understanding that, if missing, could lead to serious injury and a loss of life. Therefore, it was vital that people had a basic understanding to save lives and avoid serious injuries, as often individuals would panic and make the dangerous situation far worse. As a secondary point, Councillor Wilson requested that he be informed of any future events taking place in the Penarth area in order to offer his support. All Councillors would welcome the same and police officers were also welcome to attend Town and Community Council meetings.

In conclusion, the Chair commented on a very busy summer that had been undertaken by the service and stated that it was good to see strong collaboration taking place between the fire, police, and RNLI in order to keep the residents of the Vale of Glamorgan safe.

With no further comments, the Committee subsequently

AGREED – T H A T Group Manager Treherne be thanked for their time and verbal update.

413 VALE OF GLAMORGAN COMMUNITY REVIEW (CX) –

The Chief Executive of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, supported by the Deputy Electoral Registration Officer for the Council, presented the Cabinet report, the purpose of which was to update Members of the Community Liaison Committee on the Vale of Glamorgan Community Review and to reference the suggested response of the Vale of Glamorgan Council's Cabinet to the Boundary Commission's ("the Commission") Draft Proposals.

The Chief Executive began by advising that the Vale of Glamorgan Cabinet had also considered the report earlier that same day and that each Town and Community Council, as well as individuals, were able to raise representations directly with the Commission as part of the ongoing review.

The report was presented over three parts, as set out in the papers circulated in advance of the meeting, as follows:

1. The History of the Review to date, **paragraphs 1.1 – 1.13.**
2. The Proposals presented by the Commission, **paragraph 1.14**, which in summary outlined:

In relation to Town & Community Councils:

- An overall reduction in the number of community areas in the Vale of Glamorgan from 27 to 20 (A reduction of 7 community areas).

- An overall reduction in the number of town and Community Councillors from 269 to 209 (A reduction of 60 Community Councillors).
- Three un-changed communities (Llangan, Colwinston & St Athan).
- The creation of 7 new community wards (Waterfront (Barry), Cosmeston (Penarth), Brooklands (Wenvoe), Penmark (Llancarfan), Cowbridge Northwest (Cowbridge), Cowbridge Central (Cowbridge) and Llanblethian (Cowbridge), and
- A maximum Council Size of 23 councillors (Barry) and a minimum of 7 councillors (Colwinston, Llancarfan, Llandow and Llanmaes, Peterston & St. Georges-super-Ely, Sully and Lavernock, and Wenvoe).

In relation to consequential impacts to the Vale of Glamorgan County Council:

- An overall increase of County Councillors from 54 to 58 and the creation of 2 additional electoral wards (Cosmeston & Waterfront). The Waterfront in Barry would form a new electoral ward represented by 2 county councillors. The Dyfan electoral ward in Barry would be allocated an additional councillor and, as a result, would be represented by 3 county councillors and Cosmeston in Penarth would form a new electoral ward represented by 1 county councillor.
- Llanmaes to be transferred from the existing Llantwit Major electoral ward to the Llandow electoral ward with no change to councillor representation.
- The Community of Michaelston-le-Pit and Leckwith would transfer from Dinas Powys to the Llandough electoral ward.
- St. Lythans would transfer from Wenvoe to St Nicholas and Llancarfan electoral ward.
- Penmark ward would transfer from Rhose to St Nicholas and Llancarfan electoral ward, and
- St Georges and St Brides Super Ely would transfer from St Nicholas and Llancarfan to a new electoral ward of Peterston-Super-Ely.

3. The Vale of Glamorgan Council's suggested response to the Boundary Commission proposals as an independent consultee, **paragraphs 2.5 – 2.26.**

In summary, the following strategic points were to be reflected in the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response:

- The proposed changes to the boundary between Penarth and Sully be accepted.
- The new Waterfront ward in Barry be accepted.
- The proposed changes to Cowbridge with Llanblethian and the associated boundary changes be accepted.
- The proposed changes to Llantwit Major be accepted.

- The new arrangements in the rural Vale be accepted, subject to the following comments and caveats:
 - Consideration be given to a single new community in respect of Colwinston and Llangan as referenced in paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 of the Cabinet report.
 - The redrafting of the Brooklands ward boundary in Wenvoe and the associated changes to the boundary between St Nicholas and Wenvoe communities and other minor changes to the boundaries of wards within St Nicholas and Bonvilston, and
 - A consideration to some of the names of the proposed new Councils around the length of the new names.

In conclusion, the Chief Executive reiterated the fact that each Town and Community Council, as well as individuals, were able to raise representations directly with the Commission in response to its proposals. The current consultation period ran until the 30th of October 2023.

Following the Chief Executive's presentation, the Chair welcomed any questions or comments on the report which could be summarised as follows:

Comment(s)/Questions(s)	Chief Executive Response
<p>Dinas Powys Community Council The proposed changes to the Dinas Powys Community Ward boundaries were acceptable to the Council on the whole, as it avoided the Community Council having to create a 5th ward. However, the Community Council was concerned by the proposed transfer of houses along Sully Road. It was deemed quite illogical and unacceptable to move said houses into Penarth. One of the Dinas Powys Community Councillors actually lived in the area concerned and had been representing the Dinas Powys area for many, many years.</p>	<p>It was acknowledged that there would be differences of opinion on many of the proposals put forward by the Commission amongst the various consultees. Having looked at logical boundaries, the view was reached that Sully Road was a logical boundary, with houses on both sides of the road being represented by Penarth Town Council, in light of the fact that most of the related properties looked towards or had an affinity with Penarth. All comments of the meeting would be captured by the Democratic Services Officer, but it was advocated that Dinas Powys Community Council share its views directly with the Commission to allow the Commission to consider all comments in the round.</p>
<p>Llanfair Community Council The Community Council had recently held a meeting to discuss the proposals of the Commission. Concerns had previously been raised by the Council in relation to future proposals meaning a loss in rural</p>	<p>At the 23rd of March meeting of the Community Liaison Committee, when the review was last considered by the Committee, one of the suggestions put forward to the Commission by the Council was that Llanmaes Community Council be combined with the larger Llantwit Major Town Council</p>

<p>identity should it merge with the larger Cowbridge Town Council.</p> <p>The Council felt that some of the issues faced by it over recent years had been very rural related such as glamping and collaborating with the police on Lamping issues in the farmlands around the three villages that sat under the Community Council.</p> <p>Following the Community Council meeting, it was deemed appropriate to hold further discussions with neighbouring Llandow and LLanmaes Community Councils to work on a joint proposal response to the boundary commission.</p> <p>Having considered the electoral numbers, close proximity to Llanmaes Community Council, as well as the similar community makeup of other nearby villages such as Llysworney (that currently sat under Llandow Community Council), it was deemed appropriate to have a discussion with the other two Community Councils to see whether any other alternative proposals could be presented to the Commission.</p>	<p>and Llanmaes Community Council was very much against the idea of merging. It was a proposal considered by the Commission, but the Commission had chosen to make alternative proposals based on the relationships between Community Councils.</p> <p>Therefore, the comments put forward by Llanfair Community Council were not dissimilar to previous discussions, albeit in the context of the Llanmaes / Llantwit Major issue.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that the Community Council intended to make representations directly to the Commission and the Vale of Glamorgan Council was grateful to be sighted on the Community Council's intentions and noted the same.</p>
<p>Ewenny and Corntown Community Council</p> <p>It was proposed that the Community Council be twinned with St.Brides Major and Ogmore however, it was the Community Council's view that the suggested merging would not enable the residents of Ewenny to be properly represented.</p> <p>The Council felt it was geographically separate from St.Brides and Ogmore and Ewenny Community Council had been a long-established Community Council with its own specific needs and requirements in the area which would not be best serviced by joining with another.</p> <p>Fundamentally, the proposals would be a dissolution of the democratic process because it would move further away</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.5 of the Cabinet report set out the considerations that the Vale of Glamorgan had applied in order to formulate its independent response to the Commission.</p> <p>Comments raised by the representative were respected and it was advocated that the same views be raised directly with the Commission.</p>

<p>from the area currently administered by the Community Council.</p> <p>At present, the Community Council was making the rounds and looking to make representation to the Boundary Commission, voicing its displeasure at the proposals.</p> <p>Another of the Community Council's concerns was that the proposals were based on a mathematical calculation rather than local identity and local politics.</p>	
<p>Llandow Community Council</p> <p>The Council had similar concerns to that of Ewenny and Corntown Community Council, in the context of the potential joining with Llanmaes Community Council, in terms of electoral numbers, community representation and the identity of the three villages that currently made up the Llandow area.</p> <p>The size policy ignored the composition of the area. For example, Llandow Community Council had the industrial area within its boundary as well as the only second household waste recycling centre for the Vale of Glamorgan area as a whole. These added a higher pressure for the Community Council than in other areas.</p> <p>If the Community Council were to reduce down to the numbers as suggested, the likelihood was that some areas would not be represented or underrepresented within the current Community Council as it currently stood.</p> <p>The Council also had concerns over the level of precept between the two councils proposed to join and what that meant in terms of proper discussion on spending and voting on spending. Llanmaes Community Council had a higher precept than Llandow Community Council.</p> <p>It was the intention of the Community Council to put together a detailed proposal and objection for the Boundary Commission on the basis</p>	<p>The points raised by the Representative were understood and reflective of previous comments received during the meeting.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that Llandow Community Council wished to retain its current council arrangements rather than merge with any other Town or Community Councils.</p>

<p>that, as its stood, Llandow should stay the size and makeup that it currently was for democratic reasons. Fundamentally, the Community Council wished to retain, as was, rather than grow in any particular direction for the region to avoid dilution of local village representation and identity.</p>	
<p>Colwinston Community Council The Boundary Commission had looked at the community review in detail and had found that it made sense for Colwinston and Llangan to remain separate even though the individual electorate numbers did not reach 1000. Therefore, the only issue with keeping the two councils separate laid with the Vale of Glamorgan Council. Llangan and Colwinston were six miles apart, considerably different, separate villages, with nothing in common, so the suggested merging did not make sense.</p>	<p>The Commission were conducting the review, for which the Vale of Glamorgan Council was a consultee, and therefore able to make representations as per all other consultees.</p> <p>The final decision on proposals raised would be made by Welsh Government at ministerial level.</p> <p>On completion of the Draft Proposals Consultation period (30th October 2023) all submissions would then be considered by the Commission, and Final Recommendations would be submitted to Welsh Government Ministers who would then, if it thought fit, to give effect to the recommendations either as submitted, or with modifications.</p> <p>Welsh Government would make its decision based on the review undertaken by the Commission which was formulated on the feedback and comments received from consultees such as Colwinston Community Council.</p>
<p>Llangan Community Council Llangan, Troes and St. Mary Hill were very different areas to Colwinston. The Community Council also bordered with a very different local authority, Bridgend County Borough Council therefore, the Community Council's issues were completely separate and irrelevant to the residents living in Colwinston.</p>	<p>The Representative's comments were noted and understood.</p>

<p>The Llangan community area may be a very small area geographically, but its issues were completely different to Colwinston.</p>	
<p>Llanmaes Community Council The Community Council was thankful that the Boundary Commission had not proposed to merge Llanmaes with Llantwit Major Town Council as originally suggested. It was disappointing to hear that the Vale of Glamorgan Council would be supporting the Boundary Commission's proposal for changes to the Llanmaes Community boundary due to the fact that the changes involved only 2 properties, housing 5 individuals, who considered themselves to live in a rural area and therefore wished to remain under a community rather than town council. The existing boundaries were based on water course, which in many instances was logical for setting boundaries. However, the boundary change now being suggested was as a result of boundaries following a road boundary rather than water course which was disappointing.</p>	<p>The boundary along the Northern Access Road was being proposed by the Commission and it was logical for the Vale of Glamorgan Council to support the proposed boundary change. This was not only due to the fact that the change affected only two dwellings but also consideration of future proposed development along the same area of land.</p> <p>There were a number of sites identified within the Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan that, if progressed, would result in a significant number of dwellings being built. In the Council's view, the relationship of the properties concerned and the change in character of the area due to future development, the community would be better suited sitting under Llantwit Major.</p> <p>The Representatives comments were well-made and noted. It was advocated that the comments be raised with the Commission by the Community Council directly.</p> <p>The comments of the Committee would be referred back to the Vale of Glamorgan Council Cabinet for consideration.</p>
<p>Barry Town Council The proposals relevant to Barry Town Council seemed logical moving forward. The only minor criticism was that the Cadoc Ward in Barry was potentially too large and therefore it could be suggested to split the Cadoc ward in to two. Democracy was really healthy in Barry and every seat was contested by</p>	<p>In the context of the comment raised by the Representative in relation to the Cadoc Ward in Barry, Appendix 1 of the report set out a minor change being suggested in relation to a small parcel of land off Port Road at the northern end of Barry being added to the Cadoc ward from Gibbonsdown.</p> <p>The proposal was made simply to reflect any future development of that</p>

<p>multiple parties at elections. Therefore, it was hoped that the proposals put by the Commission would help to promote democracy in smaller communities across the Vale by encouraging and holding elections, as many seats were often uncontested in the Community Councils.</p>	<p>land and the fact that it would be accessed off streets that were currently within the Cadoc ward. So, there was logic as to why it was suggested to increase the Cadoc Ward which was in opposition to the Representative's comments.</p> <p>The Vale of Glamorgan Cross Party Working Group looked quite closely at the Cadoc Ward in Barry, due to its size, and considered whether the ward would be better as two separate wards however, the Working Group stopped short of making the recommendation.</p> <p>The Vale of Glamorgan Council had not been sighted on the representations made by Barry Town Council directly to the Commission, however the Town Council was entitled to raise the recommendation with the Commission directly.</p> <p>Current membership, the extent of co-options, and casual vacancies, which provided an indication of the democratic effectiveness of current Town and Community Council arrangements, was a key consideration when formulating its response to the Commission on the review, as already set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report. The valid point raised by the representative would be considered by the Boundary Commission.</p>
<p>Wenvoe Community Council The Community Council had held a meeting to discuss the proposals and it was bitterly opposed to the proposals put forward. The Wenvoe Community was a close-knit community, and the proposals made no sense at all. One of the main reasons for objection was in relation to the playing fields and allotments based in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, which were owned by Wenvoe Community Council and bequeathed to</p>	<p>The representative's comments in relation to the Twyn-Yr-Odyn allotments and playing fields are noted and of relevance.</p> <p>For clarity, the proposal to establish a new ward in the Wenvoe area, under the name of Brooklands, was a suggestion raised by the Wenvoe Representative in attendance at the 23rd of March meeting and the Commission had adopted the</p>

<p>the Council some time ago for the use of people living in the Wenvoe community.</p> <p>A petition had been organised by Councillor Russell Godfrey amongst the residents of Dyffryn, St. Lythans and Twyn-yr-Odyn and not one resident expressed a wish to move out of the Wenvoe community.</p> <p>There was also an ongoing major issue with regards to a proposed solar panel farm, which the residents of Dyffryn were being consulted upon.</p> <p>Prior to the last Town and Community Council election, the Wenvoe community lost the St.Nicholas with Bonvilston ward to the Llancafarn ward and therefore Wenvoe Community Council did not want any further changes.</p> <p>St. Nicholas and Bonvilston were developing areas with residential property development ongoing and therefore looking to increase its number of residents but, this should not be to the detriment of the Wenvoe community.</p> <p>The Wenvoe community boundary was quite a tight boundary which encapsulates the area as a whole. There were also concerns that the proposals could result in school children having to travel much further to school from St. Nicholas than they did at present.</p>	<p>suggestion into their proposals. However, the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response to the proposals would be requesting that the Commission redraft the Brooklands ward boundary to include the St. Lythans Park housing estate.</p> <p>School catchment areas and where children travelled to attend school would not automatically follow Community Council boundaries. Therefore, assessing the proposals based on property addresses under particular school catchment areas was a separate matter.</p> <p>In response to the Representative's supplementary comment that, from their previous discussions held directly with the Commission, it appeared that the Commission was of the view that the proposals for change had been instigated by Wenvoe Community Council rather than St.Nicholas Community Council, the Chief Executive advised that the Representative's comment demonstrated the importance of Community Councils providing representations to the Commission directly.</p>
<p>Penllyn Community Council</p> <p>The Community Council was very pleased to see that both the Boundary Commission and the Vale of Glamorgan Council's cross party working group had supported the Community Council's proposals in terms of the Penllyn area, especially in terms of the area that would be affected by the Darren Farm residential development.</p> <p>Cowbridge Town Council were looking for a much larger area involved in the Darren Farm development which would</p>	<p>The Representative's comments were noted in particular the support for the boundary amendments.</p>

<p>have had a severe impact on the Penllyn estate and Church in the area so, the Community Council was pleased to see that the proposals mitigated this.</p> <p>The Community Council was concerned about the reduction in the number of councillors that was being proposed as, being a relatively dispersed area, the council found that the current numbers of councillors worked very well. Therefore, the council would be making a recommendation to the Commission that councillor numbers were not reduced taking account of the fact that the sizing policy was for guidance only.</p>	
<p>St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council</p> <p>For clarity, St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council and the relevant ward member did not wish Twyn-Yr-Odyn to join with St.Nicholas so, that point was misinformation in the public domain.</p> <p>In terms of the Playing fields and allotments in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, those facilities could remain within the area for Wenvoe Community Council, and this had been endorsed by the St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council.</p>	<p>Appendix 2 of the report considered the Commission's proposals in relation to new boundary lines between Wenvoe and St.Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Councils. The newly proposed Brooklands Ward was suggested as sitting within Wenvoe and sat either side of the approach on Port Road towards Culverhouse Cross and encompassed two modern estates: Brooklands Terrace and St. Lythans Park.</p> <p>The Representative was correct that Appendix 2 did not include the allotments and the playing fields as referred to, which were the other side of the road which the Vale of Glamorgan Council was suggesting as a boundary. Therefore, the comments of the Representative would be noted and taken forward.</p>
<p>Wick Community Council</p> <p>The council would be writing to the Commission to oppose the proposals. Comments raised by councillors at Town level demonstrated a lack of understanding on how democracy worked in small communities. To suggest there was a democratic deficit</p>	<p>The Representative's comments were noted.</p>

within Community Councils, if there had not been an election, was wrong.	
--	--

With no further comments raised by Town and Community Council Representatives on the committee, the Chair welcomed comments from the elected members of the Vale of Glamorgan Council also on the Committee.

In support of Town and Community Councils, Councillor Haines highlighted that there appeared to be a desire to bulk smaller Community Councils together and remove their character. Reducing the number of councillors representing the smaller communities would result in the councils losing their character and value as a community. Retaining the smaller Community Councils as they were, would be better value for money, as the precepts were very small and Community Councillors did not get paid however, they cared very much about their communities and other projects.

As a secondary point, Councillor Haines noted that basing proposals on making assumptions on what would be included or not within the Council's Local Development Plan, or what would happen or not within a community in the future could lead to unfulfilled promises for the area which was best avoided. Therefore, it was important for the Vale Council to really think about what it recommended to the Commission.

In response, the Chief Executive advised that community reviews were undertaken every 10 years and therefore, given the timescales, it was necessary to give consideration to future developments in the region to future-proof new arrangements. Not doing this would be an error on the Council's part.

Councillor Wilson then noted that, for the 2022 elections, there were a number of Community Councils that did not have elections and therefore individuals were co-opted which was a concern because there were not enough individuals standing for the number of seats available. To a certain extent, the Cabinet report and subsequent recommendations of the Vale of Glamorgan Council tried to address the issue. There was a collective wish for democracy to work well in the Vale of Glamorgan area as a whole and not just in the main towns.

As a secondary point, Councillor Wilson then noted that when communities worked together, this did not mean that the communities diminished, rather they grew stronger and increased their capacity to do things because of pooling finances and resources as well as more likely to be heard at a county council level.

Community reviews happened rarely and therefore there was a need to think ahead to future proof communities for how they would develop over the subsequent decade until the next review was undertaken.

With permission from the Committee, Councillor Dr. Johnson then addressed the committee to highlight that the political situation was clearly different in some of the more urban areas than it was in some of the more rural areas. By way of example, a Town Councillor had previously required over 1000 votes to be

successfully elected, which was greater than the size of a number of existing Community Council electorate.

Councillor Dr. Johnson then advised that, of all Town and Community Councils in the Vale of Glamorgan, only six held elections in 2022 to his knowledge so this represented a democratic deficit when people were setting local taxes without being elected by local people.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Dr. Johnson in relation to conservative group member attendance at the Vale of Glamorgan Cross Party Working Group, the Chief Executive confirmed that each political group and every independent member of the Vale of Glamorgan Council was invited to attend the group meetings. The Deputy Returning Officer subsequently confirmed from minutes of the working group that Councillor Carroll was in attendance at both the October and November meetings of the group.

Following the comments raised by Councillor Haines, Wilson and Dr. Johnson, the Community Council Representative for Wick wished to respond in disagreement and stated that the comments raised by the councillors at Town level demonstrated a lack of understanding on how democracy worked in small communities. To suggest there was a democratic deficit within Community Councils, if there had not been an election, was wrong. Irrelevant of elections, Community Councillors were very much in touch with their communities, and it would be established very quickly were an individual not representing their communities effectively.

Councillor Hodges then advised that the size of some of the Community Council budgets were very small and, to their knowledge, about six or seven Community Councils had a budget under £10k, which was extremely small once clerk salaries were accounted for. This meant that there was very little money to do anything with and effecting change in the community using the precept available to a council was most important. Therefore, increasing the size and population of a community could increase the chance of constituents engaging in local elections as well as increasing the money available to it to effect meaningful change. In response, the Wick Community Council Representative confirmed that the precept information set out on the Vale of Glamorgan website was incorrect. The budget of the Community Council was not viewable on the Council's website and the efforts of the Community Council were not simply focused on spending precepts and also raised money through grants. Town Councillors saying it was not in the precept, was quite wrong and it was showing a misunderstanding from town councillors as to what democracy was in the rural areas. There was real antipathy in the Vale Council towards rural areas and it had been strongly demonstrated during the course of the meeting.

With no further comments or questions, the Committee subsequently

AGREED – T H A T Committee notes the Vale of Glamorgan's draft response to the Boundary Commission's draft proposals, Cabinet's suggested response and deliberations on the proposals at its 5th October meeting, along with the following

comments of the Committee on the suggestions raised within the report to be forwarded to Cabinet, as follows:

- **Dinas Powys Community Council** - The proposed changes to the Dinas Powys Community Ward boundaries were acceptable to the Council on the whole, as it avoided the Community Council having to create a 5th ward. However, the Community Council was concerned by the proposed transfer of houses along Sully Road. It was deemed quite illogical and unacceptable to move said houses into Penarth.
- **Llanfair Community Council** - Concerns had previously been raised by the Council in relation to future proposals meaning a loss in rural identity should it merge with the larger Cowbridge Town Council. Having considered the electoral numbers, close proximity to Llanmaes Community Council, as well as the similar community makeup of other nearby villages such as Llysworney (that currently sat under Llandow Community Council), it was deemed appropriate to have a discussion with the other two Community Councils to see whether any other alternative proposals could be presented to the Commission.
- **Ewenny and Corntown Community Council** -The Community Council was looking to make representation to the Boundary Commission voicing its displeasure at the proposals. It was the Community Council's view that the suggested merging with St. Brides Major and Ogmere would not enable the residents of Ewenny to be properly represented. The Council felt it was geographically separate from St.Brides and Ogmere and had been a long-established Community Council with its own specific needs and requirements in the area, which would not be best serviced by joining with another. The proposals would be a dissolution of the democratic process because it would move further away from the area currently administered by the Community Council. The proposals were based on a mathematical calculation rather than local identity and local politics.
- **Llandow Community Council** - It was the intention of the Community Council to put together a detailed proposal and objection for the Boundary Commission on the basis that, as it stood, Llandow should stay the size and makeup that it currently was to avoid dilution of local village representation and identity.
- **Colwinston Community Council** - The Boundary Commission had looked at the community review in detail and had found that it made sense for Colwinston and Llangan to remain separate even though the individual electorate numbers did not reach 1000. Therefore, the only issue with keeping the two councils separate laid with the Vale of Glamorgan Council. Llangan and Colwinston were six miles apart, considerably different, separate villages, with nothing in common so the suggested merging did not make sense.
- **Llangan Community Council** - The Community Council bordered with a very different local authority, Bridgend County Borough Council therefore, the Community Council's issues were completely separate and irrelevant to the residents living in Colwinston. The Llangan community area may be a very small area geographically, but its issues were completely different to Colwinston.

- **Llanmaes Community Council** - The Community Council was thankful that the Boundary Commission had not proposed to merge Llanmaes with Llantwit Major Town Council as originally suggested. However, it was disappointing to hear that the Vale of Glamorgan Council would be supporting the Boundary Commission's proposal for changes to the Llanmaes Community boundary due to the fact that the changes involved only 2 properties, housing 5 individuals, who considered themselves to live in a rural area and therefore wished to remain under a community rather than town council. The existing boundaries were based on water course, which in many instances was logical for setting boundaries. However, the boundary change now being suggested was as a result of boundaries following a road boundary rather than a water course which was disappointing.
- **Barry Town Council** - The proposals relevant to Barry Town Council seemed logical moving forward. The only minor criticism is that the Cadoc Ward in Barry was potentially too large and therefore it could be suggested to split the Cadoc ward in to two. Democracy was really healthy in Barry and every seat was contested by multiple parties at elections. Therefore, it was hoped that the proposals put by the Commission would help to promote democracy in smaller communities across the Vale of Glamorgan by encouraging and holding elections, as many seats were often uncontested in the Community Councils.
- **Wenvoe Community Council** - The Community Council had held a meeting to discuss the proposals and it was bitterly opposed to the proposals put forward. The Wenvoe Community was a close-knit community, and the proposals made no sense at all. One of the main reasons for objection was in relation to the playing fields and allotments based in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, which were owned by Wenvoe Community Council and bequeathed to the Council some time ago for the use of people living in the Wenvoe community. A petition had been organised by Councillor Russell Godfrey amongst the residents of Dyffryn, St. Lythans and Twyn-yr-Odyn and not one resident expressed a wish to move out of the Wenvoe community. Prior to the last Town and Community Council election, the Wenvoe community lost the St. Nicholas with Bonvilston ward to the Llancarfan ward and therefore Wenvoe Community Council did not want any further changes. St. Nicholas and Bonvilston were developing areas, with residential property development ongoing, and therefore looking to increase its number of residents but, this should not be to the detriment of the Wenvoe community.
- **Penllyn Community Council** - The Community Council was very pleased to see that both the Boundary Commission and the Vale of Glamorgan Council's cross party working group had supported the Community Council's proposals in terms of the Penllyn area, especially in terms of the area that would be affected by the Darren Farm residential development. The Community Council was concerned about the reduction in the number of councillors that was being proposed as, being a relatively dispersed area, the council found that the current numbers of councillors worked very well. Therefore, the council would be making a recommendation to the Commission that councillor numbers were not reduced taking account of the fact that the sizing policy was for guidance only.

- **St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council** – The Council and the relevant ward member did not wish Twyn-Yr-Odyn to join with St.Nicholas so, that point was misinformation in the public domain. In terms of the Playing fields and allotments in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, those facilities could remain within the area for Wenvoe Community Council, and this was endorsed by the St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council.
- **Wick Community Council** - The comments raised by councillors at Town level demonstrated a lack of understanding on how democracy worked in smaller communities. To suggest there was a democratic deficit within Community Councils, if there had not been an election, was wrong. The council would be writing to the Commission to oppose the proposals.
- **Councillor Haines** – 1) Reducing the number of councillors representing the smaller communities would result in the councils losing what they were as a community.
2) Basing proposals on making assumptions on what would be included or not within the Council's Local Development Plan or what would happen or not with a community in the future could lead to unfulfilled promises for the area which was best avoided. Therefore, it was important for the Vale Council to really think about what it recommended to the Commission.
- **Councillor Wilson** – 1) for the 2022 elections, there were a number of Community Councils that did not have elections and therefore individuals were co-opted which was a concern because there were not enough individuals standing for the number of seats available. To a certain extent, the Cabinet report and subsequent recommendations of the Vale of Glamorgan Council tried to address this issue. There was a collective wish for democracy to work well in the Vale of Glamorgan area as a whole and not just in the main towns.
2) When communities worked together, this did not mean that the communities diminished, rather they grew stronger and increased their capacity to do things because of pooling finances and resources as well as more likely to be heard at a county council level.
3) Community reviews happened rarely and therefore there was a need to think ahead to future proof communities for how they would develop over the subsequent decade until the next review was undertaken.
- **Councillor Dr. Johnson** – 1) the political situation was clearly different in some of the more urban areas than it was in some of the more rural areas of the Vale of Glamorgan.
2) There were currently 26 Town and Community Councils in the Vale of Glamorgan and, out of that number, only six held elections in 2022 to his knowledge, so this represented a democratic deficit when people were setting local taxes without being elected by local people.
- **Councillor Hodges** - The size of some of the Community Council budgets were very small especially once clerk salaries were accounted for. This meant that there was very little money to do anything with and effecting change in the community using the precept available to a council was most important.

2) Increasing the size and population of a community could increase the chances of constituents engaging in local elections as well as the money available to it to effect meaningful change.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the Cabinet report on the Community Review to ensure that Community Liaison Committee has the opportunity make any representations to Cabinet.

414 VALE OF GLAMORGAN PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2022-23 (REF) -

The Director of Corporate Resources presented the reference received from the Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 19th July 2023, the purpose of which was to present to Committee an overview of the fifth year of progress in delivering the Well-being Objectives and actions set by the Vale Public Services Board (PSB) in its Well-being Plan 2018-2023.

The PSB's four Well-being Objectives in the 2018-23 Well-being Plan were: 1. To enable people to get involved, participate in their local communities and shape local services 2. To reduce poverty and tackle inequalities linked to deprivation 3. To give children the best start in life and 4. To protect, enhance and value our environment.

The Director advised that there were a series of priority work streams that partners of the PSB had agreed and were undertaking around the Cardiff and Vale of Glamorgan areas in relation to the Eat Well Initiative, plans and proposals on how to tackle climate change collectively, a pathfinder project looking at value in the Vale which was how to recognise and reward volunteering in communities and work that the fire service were leading on in terms of improving engagement. The report before Committee provided a breakdown across the five areas in terms of what had been done and what had been achieved to date and set out the future direction and how it worked with the new Wellbeing Plan that was adopted in May 2023.

The Annual Report made some specific references to Town and Community Councils, and the PSB had welcomed new nominated Town and Community Council representative, Councillor S. Hodges. Thanks from officers were passed to Councillor Hodges as well as the previous sector representative M. Cuddy from Penarth Town Council.

Some of the Town and Community Councils had a specific duty under the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act to illustrate how they were aiding the development and delivery of the Public Service Board's Wellbeing Plan but all Community Councils were encouraged to look at the Wellbeing Plan and to consider how the Plan could be taken forward within their individual communities

and therefore the Vale of Glamorgan Council welcomed their participation in future liaison meetings.

Following the Director's presentation of the report and subsequent comments that were raised by both the current and previous Town and Community Council representatives of the Public Service Board, the Director added the following points of advice:

- Over the last 18 months, and in the production of the new Wellbeing Plan, significant efforts had been made to engage with the Future Generations Commissioner's Officer throughout the production of the Plan. This had been a really useful process and had given the opportunity to test thinking and the development of the Plan. The Future Generations Commissioner's Office had offered some thoughts and their perspective from elsewhere in Wales and the same had been the case with Welsh Government and therefore, there was a network of PSB support over co-ordinated offices across the country allowing there to be the possibility to test ideas in production.
- There were a number of invited participants as well as statutory participants to sit on the Public Service Board and a number of the statutory participants were attendees or partners of other Public Service Boards which was really useful. In terms of colleagues from the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, it had been possible to look at how the work of that Board tied into the work of the Regional Partnership Board and in relation to health, social care, housing, and education. The Vale PSB was making really strong links with its colleagues in Cardiff and Natural Resources Wales.
- The Vale's Public Service Board Wellbeing Plan had been well received in terms of its sharpened focus on the key areas. Links that had been made between partners and the ethos of checking the thinking processes was the stimulus behind the Town and Community Council Liaison meetings, and it would be really interesting at one of the future sessions to explore how prescriptive Town and Community Councils would like to be.
- Colleagues from the Council's Regeneration Team were leading on placemaking plans, and connection with the Public Service Board Wellbeing Plan was fundamental as part of that ongoing work. Therefore, the Council would be looking to make really strong connections in that regard.
- In relation to SPSF4, which was the collective role of Community Councils in their shared interests in terms of taking forward the Future Generations Act, the Council ran a series of workshops that Town and Community Councils were invited to and indeed many came along to, and more opportunities would be available in the future.

In conclusion, the current Town and Community Council Representative on the Public Service Board thanked officers of the Council for their enormous amount of hard work that had been undertaken in the Vale and commended officers for stepping up the amount of liaison initiated with Community Councils, as this was higher than it had ever been for quite a number of years. All Town and Community Councils now had the opportunity through the PSB Liaison meetings to pass on their thoughts and comments.

In conclusion, the Chair echoed the thanks provided to Council officers.

With no further comments, the Committee subsequently

AGREED - T H A T both the Committee reference and appended Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Annual Report 2022-23 be noted.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of both the Committee reference and appended Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Annual Report 2022-23 to provide an overview of the fifth year of progress in delivering the Well-being Objectives and actions set by the Vale Public Services Board (PSB) in its Well-being Plan 2018-2023.