

No.

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting held on 29th July, 2019.

Present: Councillor Christine Cave (Mayor); Councillors Julie Aviet, Vincent Bailey, Rhiannon Birch, Jonathan Bird, Bronwen Brooks, Lis Burnett, George Carroll, Janice Charles, Millie Collins, Geoff Cox, Robert Crowley, Andrew Davies, Pamela Drake, Vincent Driscoll, Stewart Edwards, Ben Gray, Owen Griffiths, Stephen Griffiths, Nic Hodges, Hunter Jarvie, Gwyn John, Dr. Ian Johnson, Gordon Kemp, Peter King, Kevin Mahoney, Kathryn McCaffer, Anne Moore, Neil Moore, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Rachel Nugent-Finn, Andrew Parker, Bob Penrose, Sandra Perkes, Andrew Robertson, Leighton Rowlands, Ruba Sivagnanam, John Thomas, Neil Thomas, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Marguerita Wright.

204 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

Apologies were received from Councillors Anthony Hampton, Sally Hanks and Steffan Wiliam.

205 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations were received.

206 MINUTES –

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 1st May, 2019 be approved as a correct record.
- (2) T H A T the minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 20th May, 2019 be approved as a correct record.

207 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

The Mayor made the following announcement relating to recent activities that she had taken part in since the end of May 2019. That she had the great pleasure to take part in the important Armed Forces Flag Raising commemoration held at the Civic Offices. Other events she had attended included the Barry Food Festival, hosting Twinning dignitaries from Belgium, France and Germany who attended the Barry Food Festival weekend. She also attended the Hindu festival in Barry, a number of civic services, village fetes, scouting events and the Barry Friends and Neighbours Strawberry Tea, a two day model railway show, the Llantwit Major Dog Show, the Vale of Glamorgan Classic Car Show and the Antique Roadshow. She

No.

had met the owners who recently opened their zero waste shop in Holton Road, Barry and she looked forward to more shops like this opening up across the Vale. She had also met with the Youth Cabinet, who intend to undertake research into young people's mental health and they are hoping to present this to a future Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee. She met with the cast of Jesus Christ Superstar who performed in Rhose with members of the National Youth Orchestra and Royal Navy Volunteer Reservists from HMS Cambria, who would be soon relocating to Cardiff. In concluding, she referred to her recent visit to Billericay and met the Mayor to promote the Bedroom Build which would feature the world's fastest tuk tuk and a convey of vehicles leaving Barry towards the end of October on a three day fund raising convoy.

The Mayor announced that her Civic Service would take place on Sunday, 22nd September at the Ewenny Priory which would be celebrating volunteering that occurs across the Vale.

Finally, she reminded Members that herself, Consort and a number of staff would be running in the Barry 10k on Sunday, 4th August, and would welcome any donations to the Mayor's Foundation Grant Fund.

208 PETITIONS –

Two petitions had been received.

(i) Councillor Rowlands presented a petition on behalf of the residents of White Farm, Barry, which requested that the Council put pressure on Persimmon House Builders to complete the road works in a speedy manner and ensure it was finished to the high standards that the Council expects and for the Council to finally be able to adopt the road as soon as possible.

(ii) Councillor Burnett presented a petition on behalf of Barry Action for Nature entitled "Climate Emergency – Time for Action" calling on the Council and Barry Town Council to declare a climate emergency, commit to making both Barry and the Vale of Glamorgan Councils carbon neutral by 2030 and call on both Welsh Government and Westminster Government to provide the powers and resources to make these targets achievable, work with other Local Authorities and organisations on sharing good practices which will help limit global warming to less than 1.5°C and report to Full Council within six months of declaring a climate emergency with the action the Councils will need to take to address this emergency.

209 NOTICE OF MOTION –

The following Notice of Motion (submitted by Councillors L. Burnett (Deputy Leader) and N. Moore (Leader)) had been included on the agenda for discussion:

No.

“This Council notes the ‘*Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C*’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), (October 2018), which found that:

- Human-induced global warming has already caused multiple observed changes in the climate system which include more frequent heatwaves in most land regions, an increase in the frequency and duration of marine heatwaves and an increase in the frequency, intensity and/or amount of heavy precipitation events at the global scale.
- Human activity related global warming reached approximately 1°C above pre-industrial levels in 2017, and is likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052.
- A 1.5°C rise will result in multiple negative impacts, including increases in frequency, intensity and/or amount of heavy precipitation in several regions, and the majority (70–90%) of warm water (tropical) coral reefs that exist today will disappear.
- A further increase to 2°C rise will result in much more severe harm, including a greater risk of water scarcity in some regions and increased frequency of severe weather events, droughts, floods, higher sea level rises, crop failures and destruction of land and marine eco-systems with the loss of 99% of tropical coral reefs.
- With current strategies, the world is on track to overshoot the 1.5°C limit of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Paris Agreement before 2050 and exceed 3°C by 2100.
- Limiting global warming to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from local and national government, organisations and businesses, and local people and their communities.

This Council further notes:

- The commitment of the administration to deliver its Well-being Goals as set out in the Corporate Plan ‘Strong Communities with a Bright Future’ and the Well-being of Future Generations Act, and the progress of initiatives in support of the existing Carbon Management Plan.
- That bold action to reduce carbon emissions can also deliver benefits in terms of new jobs, economic savings and market opportunities.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Join with Welsh Government and other councils across the UK in declaring a global ‘climate emergency’ in response to the findings of the IPCC report.
2. Reduce its own carbon emissions to net zero before the Welsh Government target of 2030 and support the implementation of the Welsh Government’s new Low Carbon Delivery Plan, to help achieve the Welsh Government’s ambition for the public sector in Wales to be carbon neutral.
3. Make representations to the Welsh and UK Governments, as appropriate, to provide the necessary powers, resources and technical support to local authorities in Wales to help them successfully meet the 2030 target.

No.

4. Continue to work with partners across the region to develop and implement best practice methods that can deliver carbon reductions and help limit global warming.
5. Work with local stakeholders including Councillors, residents, young people, businesses, and other relevant parties to develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions by 2030 and explore ways to maximise local benefits of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy.”

Councillor N. Moore formally seconded the Motion.

The Deputy Leader, referring to her Motion, indicated that she was pleased to bring it before Council and hoped that it would receive unanimous support.

The topic of climate change and sustainable development had been widely discussed for a number of decades and she alluded to the recent IPCC report which clearly evidenced the need to recognise that we were now in an emergency.

Alluding to the Motion before Council which outlined some of the predicted impacts of climate change such as extreme weather events and the destruction of tropical coral reefs along with ecosystems that depended upon them, she also referred to the increasing news coverage of flash floods with cars and houses being washed away.

Making reference to the IPCC report and the impacts detailed within that report these were considered to be more subtle, would have an impact in terms of the geographical spread of species of insects which in turn would have a knock on affect regarding the food supply of other animals further up the food chain and the pollination of plants.

Bringing the matter closer to home, she referred to the Puffin, which was one of the UK's most popular birds, but was in decline in some areas due to the threat to its food source which was having an impact on population figures. Whilst not all impacts of climate change were environmental, she referred to new forms of discrimination as certain communities suffered more than others due to the increasing global temperatures and therefore exacerbating existing patterns of inequality.

In terms of the Council's position, whilst she considered the existing Carbon Management Plan was a good start, it would be foolish to think the Council could make the necessary changes on its own and this was why she considered the Motion to be important and included working with individuals, organisations and businesses across the county; to work with others across the Region and across Wales, to influence the Welsh and UK Governments to provide the necessary powers, resources and technical support so that the Council could achieve its target.

At this juncture, Councillor Bailey indicated that he intended to move an Amendment to the Motion. Whilst he applauded the Council's efforts to follow the Welsh Government and UK Government in reducing its carbon emissions targets to zero, he considered there to be a factual inaccuracy in the Motion before Council as

No.

currently drafted which related to the UK and Welsh Governments' position in terms of signing up to a net zero target by 2030. This was not his understanding as he understood their target was 2050, and accordingly he moved the following Amendment:

T H A T reference to 2030 in the draft resolutions 2, 3 and 5 be deleted and the date of 2050 be inserted.

Councillor Carroll duly seconded the Amendment.

Discussion ensued with the Leader providing clarification, citing the Welsh Government's Climate Emergency Declaration which stated "The Welsh Government has committed to achieving a carbon neutral public sector by 2030 and to co-ordinating action to help other areas of the economy to make a decisive shift away from fossil fuels, involving academia, industry and the third sector. Last month, it published Prosperity for All: A Low Carbon Wales, which sets out 100 policies and proposals to meet the 2030 carbon emissions targets".

In light of the clarification provided by the Leader, the Mayor invited Councillor Bailey to make a comment or, with the agreement of his Secunder, to withdraw his Amendment.

In response Councillor Bailey, alluding to the updated information from the Welsh Government reiterated his understanding that the UK Government's target was 2050 and on that basis and on his understanding believing that the legislative target was indeed 2050, indicated that he would not be withdrawing his Amendment.

Councillor Wilson, referring to the proposed Amendment expressed concern that there appeared to be some confusion on the dates Members were being asked to consider and enquired as to the source of Councillor Bailey's information.

Councillor Bailey indicated that it was his contention and his understanding that the legislative target was indeed set at 2050; and whilst he acknowledged that the earlier petition submitted supported the target of 2030, which he had no problem with, he was solely making the point regarding the factual inaccuracy and his understanding that the UK Government had signed up to a target of 2050 and also believed that Welsh Government had agreed to the same.

The Leader further attempted to clarify the matter, indicating that his understanding based on all available information within UK Government and Welsh Government was that there was no single definition of what was meant by carbon neutral, but there was scope within the public sector and locally to achieve a carbon neutral target by 2030, which was different and causing the confusion relating to the UK Government's position which was based on a reduction of carbon emissions by 80% of the emissions based on 1990 data by 2050. He indicated that Councillor Bailey's understanding of the UK Government was correct, however the Motion as tabled before the Council would commit to reaching the 2030 target through developing and delivering well-being goals through the new Corporate Plan and committing the

No.

Council along with the Welsh Government and other Councils across the UK to declare a global climate emergency in response to the findings of the IPCC report.

Councillor Johnson, in echoing the comments made by the Leader, acknowledged that there were obvious and different milestones, different targets in different places and for different organisations to reach, but understood that that was the premise of the Motion before Council. It was clear that the intention was to have a separate target of 2030 as opposed to the UK's target of 2050. He took the view that Councillor Bailey would take the Council in a different direction to the one that was being intended by the proposed Motion. Accordingly, he considered that the 2030 Welsh Government target was appropriate and suggested that Councillor Bailey withdraw his Amendment.

Councillor Davies, by way of explanation, suggested that the Welsh Government target, as supported by the Committee on Climate Change which was the official body that recommended such matters to Welsh Government, was actually a 95% reduction of carbon emissions by 2050 and accordingly the Welsh Government had, in his understanding, decided to take the target to 100% as they considered the 95% reduction was not desirable due to a number of factors, particularly the agricultural sector within Wales. He considered it essential to recognise that both Westminster and the Assembly had endorsed the recommendations of the Climate Change Panel for policy reasons and that the Council was moving forward in the same direction as the Committee on Climate Change which set a goal of 2050 and accepted by Welsh Government as their official target. If the Council was looking to achieve a target of 2030 ahead of the UK Government and the Welsh Government, which was commendable, he suggested that the Council had an appropriate road map and costings in place to enable the target to be achieved by the date.

Upon being put to a vote, the Amendment was lost.

At this juncture Councillor Driscoll moved a further Amendment to the Motion by inserting a Resolution (6) as follows:

(6) T H A T the Council withdraw its support for the environmentally damaging Sycamore Cross to Junction 34 link road to help the Council meet its carbon zero targets.

The Amendment to the Motion was duly seconded by Councillor Carroll.

Upon being put to the vote the Amendment was lost.

At this juncture, Councillor Davies moved a further Amendment to the Motion by inserting a Resolution (6) as follows:

(6) T H A T the Council recognises over 2,000 premature deaths occur each year in Wales due to poor air quality and calls on the Welsh Government to adopt the World Health Organisation targets for air quality as a matter of urgency to address this chronic situation.

No.

Councillor Carroll duly seconded the Amendment.

In moving his Amendment, Councillor Davies considered it important to address the fact that five premature deaths a day occurred in Wales, 2,000 for a year due to air quality being some of the poorest in Europe and it was vital that the Council signed up to the World Health Organisation's recommendations and he hoped that his Amendment would find favour and to the betterment of air quality throughout the County.

The Leader, in response to the proposed Amendment, considered it to be too specific given the narrative set out in the draft Resolution (5). To accept the Amendment would be confusing, although he accepted the spirit behind the proposed Amendment. That said, the Leader indicated that he would not support the Amendment.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, whilst acknowledging the point made by the Leader, indicated that on this occasion he agreed with Councillor Davies and accepted the broadening and thinking within the scope and spirit of the Amendment and was appropriate as it affected the health and the quality of residents and accordingly he indicated that he would be supporting the Amendment.

The Deputy Leader indicated that she concurred with the points made by the Leader and set out the rationale behind the Notice of Motion which had not been brought through the Cabinet process, being not just about the Council it was about the whole community, and a Vale wide initiative. She considered the Amendment as proposed would merely deflect from this principle and therefore she would be resisting the Amendment.

Councillor King, in supporting the comments of the Leader and Deputy Leader, suggested his Council colleagues should err on the side of caution in regard to air quality management given that there were local hot spots in the County, given that he was aware that Cardiff City Council could be encouraged by the proposed Amendment to introduce congestion charging which would inevitably hurt residents in the Vale. He also indicated that the Amendment if approved would be unhelpful in terms of its timing given the need for lower carbon fuels, better transport options being in place.

On being put to a vote, the Amendment was lost.

At this juncture, Councillor Carroll moved a further Amendment to the Motion by inserting a Resolution (6) as follows:

(6) T H A T this Council bring forward a full economic impact assessment that highlights the measures the Council will take to meet its target of net zero carbon emissions and the impact that this may or may not have on jobs and job creation in the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Amendment to the Motion was duly seconded by Councillor Bailey.

No.

Councillor Carroll, in welcoming the Council's commitment to tackling climate change and its commitment to achieving a net zero target, advised that it did cause him concern and made reference to discussions at a recent meeting of the Council's Audit Committee, which gained cross-party support, relating to the impact that this was likely to have on the Council's finances.

Councillor Dr. Johnson considered that the Amendment as submitted by Councillor Carroll made complete sense given that the motion as brought before Council required action to progress related matters. He considered it therefore to be a belt and braces approach and should be included within the original Motion and hoped that the Council would support the same.

Upon being put to a vote, the Amendment was lost.

At this juncture, Councillor Rowlands moved an Amendment to the Motion by inserting a Resolution (6) as follows:

(6) T H A T the Council reviews its Local Development Plan at the earliest available opportunity in light of the changing circumstances brought about by declaring a climate emergency.

The Amendment to the Motion was duly seconded by Councillor Bailey.

The Leader reminded the Council that the Strategic Development Plan (SDP) would be considered later in the agenda which he hoped Council would accept. He also reminded Council that a review of the Local Development Plan (LDP) would be at odds with the City Deal proposals. In the event that the Council chose not to approve an SDP aligned to the City Deal proposals it was likely that any future LDP would have to be jointly prepared with Cardiff Council. He assumed that no Member within the Vale of Glamorgan would want this to occur and indicated that for those reasons he would be resisting the Amendment.

Councillor Dr. Johnson disagreed with the comments of the Leader. He cited the remaining period for the current LDP and therefore, it made sense irrespective of any developments with a City Deal / SDP to review the Council's LDP in the context of the climate emergency.

Upon being put to a vote, the Amendment was lost.

Councillor Mahoney, in referring to the Motion before Council, indicated that he was as concerned about the climate, the world, pollution as anybody else. However, he considered himself to be a cynic given that over the years various references had been made in regard to a potential ice age occurring which did not then materialise, with the discussion now moving on to global warming. He did not consider himself to be a scientist and he suspected that no other Member in the Chamber was either and he would have much preferred a debate which included those qualified to debate the subject. The point that he actually wished to make related to the "virtue signalling" of the Motion and considered it to be particularly galling that such a debate had been carried out by Councillors of political parties who had approved the

No.

planning permission for the biomass plant. Once in operation the facility would be emitting more CO₂ than a coal power station of similar capacity, emitting a number of toxic particulates. He also alluded to a recent report published relating to the deforestation of trees in northern American and in the Amazon rain forest which products were being used to create biomass wood pellets. He considered that many of the comments made regarding the Motion to be gross hypocrisy and therefore he indicated that he would not be supporting the Motion.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, alluding to the previous interesting discussions that had taken place, indicated that his Group would be supporting the Motion, but signalled that beyond the headlines and the good intentions, he was keen to see how the Council's position moved forward in the future. Referring to recent meetings of the Public Services Board and the Council's Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee, where it became apparent that the County had the third highest per capita in terms of emissions across Wales due to the location of the airport, certain industries and agricultural activity, he anticipated that these themes would need to be picked up within the Council's new Corporate Plan.

Councillor Wilson, in supporting the comments from Councillor Dr. Johnson, echoed the need for an action plan and expected Elected Members to feed into a new Corporate Plan. He also reminded Members that they were also ambassadors who could influence and inform their community, encourage residents to shop locally and to think about the use of plastics.

Councillor Carroll, alluding to his previous comments, considered the objectives of the Motion were laudable in its aims, but considered it important that the Council pursued the same target as the Welsh and UK Governments. Alluding to the various Amendments put forward at the meeting which had not been accepted, he considered with regret that without those Amendments, the Conservative Group would struggle to support the Motion as it stood due to its wording.

Councillor Davies, alluding to Councillor Carroll's previous comments, considered that his Group had made a meaningful offer to assist the Council in addressing some of these key concerns and to map out how these could be progressed. He disagreed with the comments made by the Leader in regard to the Local Development Plan in the event the Council took the view not to support a City Deal SDP. He also took the view that his Amendment regarding air quality and related premature deaths and the refusal to adopt his Amendment to be depressing and reminded Council of the key guidance issued by the World Health Organisation. He also acknowledged the comments of the Deputy Leader and Councillor King, but considered it to be a lost opportunity not to have taken on board the various Amendments to the Motion which would enable a number of levers to be exerted to bring about various improvements, including improvements to air quality, the LDP in terms of sustainable transport models. He viewed the Amendments put forward by his Group as merely seeking to compliment the Motion and add clout to the same, but feared ultimately that the Motion would have little or no bite or effect.

Referring to her extreme disappointment, Councillor Brooks considered that the matter had been turned into a political football and referring to the previous

No.

Amendments put forward by the Conservative Group were overly prescriptive, removing any scope for all the stakeholders to be involved in shaping future proposals.

The Leader, in referring to the comments made by Councillor Davies in reference to pulling levers suggested that the proposed resolutions as set out in the Motion indeed provided those levers and would encompass such matters as air quality. The Motion and its accompanying resolutions would allow the Council to bring forward a policy for future consideration. Regarding Councillor Davies' comments relating to the SPD and any potential review of the LDP, it was likely and as indicated by Welsh Government, that if the Council did not adopt the City Deal SDP, the Council would be required to prepare a joint LDP.

The Deputy Leader, in summing up, thanked all Members for their comments and the proposed Amendments. She strongly felt that the Council could make a difference if it worked together with other bodies / agencies. Her Motion was not about compelling everyone to be a vegan, cycle everywhere and not to build another road or house and reminded Members that sustainable development was a balance of social, economic and environmental outcomes. She also touched upon the Centre for Alternative Technology's publication "Zero Carbon Britain – Making It Happen" and some of the principles contained therein. She also referred current building regulations and to the renewable energy industry in the UK and associated benefits.

The Deputy Leader commented that she often felt that Councillors were rightly criticised for short-termism, for only looking ahead to the next election or the next press headline. Whilst it was unlikely that the Climate Emergency would have an impact on most of the population now, it was likely that it would have on future generations. Accordingly, she asked Members to put politics and personal prejudice aside and to support the Motion.

A Recorded Vote then took place as indicated below on the Notice of Motion as submitted:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Julie Aviet	√		
Vince Bailey			√
Rhiannon Birch	√		
Jonathan Bird	√		
Bronwen Brooks	√		
Lis Burnett	√		
George Carroll			√
Christine Cave			√
Janice Charles			√

No.

Millie Collins	√		
Geoff Cox	√		
Robert Crowley			√
Andrew Davies			√
Pamela Drake	√		
Vince Driscoll			√
Stewart Edwards			√
Ben Gray	√		
Owen Griffiths	√		
Stephen Griffiths			√
Nic Hodges	√		
Hunter Jarvie	√		
Gwyn John	√		
Ian Johnson	√		
Gordon Kemp			√
Peter King	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	
Kathryn McCaffer	√		
Anne Moore	√		
Neil Moore	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Rachel Nugent-Finn			√
Andrew Parker	√		
Bob Penrose	√		
Sandra Perkes	√		
Andy Robertson			√
Leighton Rowlands			√
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
John Thomas	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Margaret Wilkinson	√		
Edward Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		

No.

Marguerita Wright			√
TOTAL	29	1	14

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council join with Welsh Government and other Councils across the UK in declaring a global ‘climate emergency’ in response to the findings of the IPCC report.
- (2) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council reduce its own carbon emissions to net zero before the Welsh Government target of 2030 and support the implementation of the Welsh Government’s new Low Carbon Delivery Plan, to help achieve the Welsh Government’s ambition for the public sector in Wales to be carbon neutral.
- (3) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council make representations to the Welsh and UK Governments, as appropriate, to provide the necessary powers, resources and technical support to Local Authorities in Wales to help them successfully meet the 2030 target.
- (4) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council continue to work with partners across the region to develop and implement best practice methods that can deliver carbon reductions and help limit global warming.
- (5) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council work with local stakeholders including Councillors, residents, young people, businesses, and other relevant parties to develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions by 2030 and explore ways to maximise local benefits of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy.

210 NOTICE OF MOTION –

The following Notice of Motion (submitted by Councillors V.J. Bailey and V.P. Driscoll) had been included on the agenda for discussion:

“The Vale of Glamorgan Council:

- Regrets Cabinet proposals to introduce car parking charges across the Vale;
- Notes the devastating impact that the proposals – as currently drafted – would have on High Streets across the Vale, and on trade at Barry Island;
- Calls on the new Administration to scrap the proposed charges, and to endorse cross-party recommendations of the two main Scrutiny Committees.”

Councillor Driscoll formally seconded the Motion.

Councillor Bailey, in introducing the Motion indicated that he had submitted it in order to debate the matter given the recent change in the Administration of the Council and therefore an opportunity to scrap the proposals once and for all. He referred to the

No.

many meetings that the Council had held to discuss the subject and where, at those meetings, Councillors had spoken passionately in opposition to parking charges. He also alluded to the various stakeholders i.e. traders to primary school teachers who had spoken on the introduction of such charges and the implications of the same at those meetings.

He indicated that the Motion would address damaging and unfair proposals which could cause serious harm to the County's high streets and resorts. He further alluded to the aims of such a charging policy, which could be addressed without a need for charging, with proper enforcement of limited free parking windows. Referencing the proposals were about income generation, the very introduction of such a policy would lead to a fall in footfall and the subsequent loss of jobs. The proposed policy had many flaws, including that it would take a number of years for the plan to break even, the fact that the proposed policy omitted a charge for Council employees, the feedback on the proposals were not received positively and moreover, if such a policy came into existence it would not be too long before the charges were increased.

He also referred to a number of Members' comments made during the consideration of the matter through the Council's various Committees who at that time had described the policy as flawed, the impact on shops with the subsequently loss of customers with the potential for shops to close, the impact the proposals would have on Barry Island and the impact of charging at Cosmeston Country Park which would lead to visitors parking in the nearby residential areas. In summing up Councillor Bailey referred and quoted the recommendations made by the relevant Scrutiny Committee when it considered the matter in April 2019 and pointed out the now Leader, Councillor Moore, who was a Member of the Committee at that time, had supported that recommendation. Indeed, all of the Committee's membership did so. He called upon Members to support the Motion to send a strong message of support to local residents and traders by rejecting car parking charges outright.

Councillor Mahoney, in echoing the points made by Councillor Bailey, indicated his surprise that the now Leader, given his previous objections to the proposal, had not stopped the proposals at the point he became the new Leader. He sought an assurance from the Leader that he would live up to his previous statements when he was in opposition and to live up to what he was proposing at that time.

Councillor Charles, referring to Members' previous opposition to charging proposals with the exception of the former Conservative Group Members, asked what had changed since the matter had been debated at the Scrutiny Committee earlier in April. Referring to that meeting which had been attended by the now Leader and Deputy Leader, it was clear from the comments made at that meeting that there was strong opposition from the public and traders to Council's proposals. She had no doubt in her mind that the current plans before Members would be devastating for the high streets of the County, especially areas such as Holton Road and High Street in Barry, all of which were being affected by online shopping. She also referred to out of town shops at Culverhouse Cross and the like, which offered free parking and which added further challenges to local traders. It was her view that Barry Town Centre and local parks should be exempt from any future charging arrangements. However, the Group accepted the fact that during the summer months and holiday

No.

periods parking at Penarth front and Barry Island could be subject to a sensible parking fee i.e. £1 for 2 hours, £2 for 3 hours, and £6 all day. This would create a faster flow of traffic and accordingly raise income for the Council.

The Leader, referring to the previous comments made on the Motion, took the view that the Conservative Group were attempting to debate what he considered to be a now defunct resolution and on that basis there were no proposals currently for car parking charges. Referring to the Motion before Council which talked about regretting the Cabinet proposals to introduce car parking charges across the Vale, he reminded Members that the current Cabinet had requested a review to be undertaken of the current proposals. Referring to the other points raised in the Motion, it was clear to him that there could not be any “devastating impact” as there were no current proposals. He also noted with interest that Councillor Bailey on one hand was calling on scrapping charging across the Vale even though the Council currently were charging at Barry Island, Ogmere by Sea and Porthkerry. He also corrected Councillor Bailey’s comments which he had attributed to him at the Scrutiny Committee, as what he had said was that he would take heed of the consultation at that time and any further consultation in the future. Accordingly, he signalled that he would be opposing the Motion.

Councillor John indicated that it was his understanding that a new report would be submitted to Members in the Autumn of 2019. He also referred to the numerous hours discussing at Members’ briefings and previous Scrutiny Committees on the subject matter. He too had concerns on the impact of any proposals on town centres across the Vale. It was quite clear to him that residents and traders across the Vale had very strong views regarding the matter.

The Deputy Leader, referring to earlier comments made by Councillor Bailey, stated that she was unsure if she was being criticised for attending every single Scrutiny Committee to discuss the item or for attending every consultation event. She was also unsure if she was being criticised for preparing notes and publishing the same online. She invited Members to access those notes to ascertain what she actually had commented on at the Scrutiny Committee meetings. She stood by every single word said at those meetings and events. However, she would not be supporting the Motion and the new Administration would be working through a comprehensive review of the subject with the view to bringing forward a further report on the matter. She also called for clarification on the Motion put forward by Councillor Bailey, as it appeared to her that it called for scrapping of proposed charges which on the other hand Councillor Charles appeared to be contradicting given that she had referred to charging.

Councillor Dr. Johnson referred to a Motion that he had submitted to Council in 2015, which called upon the Council to criticise the then Cabinet proposals for car parking charges. It was his view whoever was in Administration favoured the introduction of car parking charges. He was broadly in favour of the Motion as he saw it as an issue that residents wished to see ended, particularly given that the subject had been almost in perpetual discussion since 2011. In that time there had been various petitions which had been submitted by Members who had, in those years, been part of the controlling Administration, but then in opposition. Referring to two car parks within the vicinity of the Civic Offices, it was likely that no income would be

No.

generated in the first seven years following the introduction of charging, therefore he did not understand the purpose of charging for car parking in the first place. This was particularly relevant given that the Council put into reserves approximately £6m in the previous financial year. He also referred to the various costs to the Council that it was incurring in developing such a policy, not only just in terms of consultant costs but also in officer costs. In acknowledging the comments made by the Deputy Leader which went in some way to address the issue he called upon the Administration to provide a route map of what it intended to achieve as a result of any review of current proposals. However, he signalled that he would be supporting the Motion.

Councillor Nugent-Finn indicated that she specifically wished to represent the views of Holton Road Primary School and to express the views of the staff who were currently employed at the school. In essence the school's concerns centred around the staff and parents' ability to park their cars safely and in proximity of the school. The school was seeking that car parking levels 6 and 7 be dedicated in the multi-storey car park at Court Road for the exclusive use of staff.

Councillor Carroll, in referring to the many points and comments made by Members that preceded him, sought to provide further clarification in terms of the intention of the Motion on the matter. On a point by point basis, he contended that proposals were in existence, that they had not been scrapped or dropped, that they were currently under review and consequently did not have the wide support of Elected Members. As for the Administration now in charge, they were at that time clearly against the proposals. He reminded Council that he personally voted against his own Administration proposals on the matter as he considered he acted in the best interests of the Vale of Glamorgan constituents. Now that there was a new Administration in place, it was important that they made a clear stand on the issue and dropped or scrapped car parking charging proposals and supported the Motion.

Councillor John Thomas, having listened to all the previous comments, suggested that his former colleagues in the Conservative Group were living in a fantasy world. He alluded to the previous week's meeting of the Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee when at that time Councillor Carroll had criticised the increase in Council Tax as being too high, despite the fact that it was the third lowest in Wales and lower than any Council with a Conservative influence in its Administration. Making reference to the Motion and to the draft proposals regarding car parking charges put forward by his previous Administration and subsequently considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee, he reminded Members that he had attended all the related Scrutiny Committee meetings on the matter and assured his former Conservative Group colleagues that there had been every intention of his Cabinet to bring a further report then for consideration by Members, however the forced change in the Administration of the Council had prevented that occurring. It was his view that the report, if it had proceeded to consideration by his Cabinet, would have addressed many of the concerns mentioned. His attention then turned to the wider principle behind the debate which related to funding and income to the Council. Making reference to the next item to be considered relating to Llancarfan Primary School, he did not consider it to be an efficient use of funding to maintain a school given the challenges it faced. He also further alluded to Members' questions which would be considered later in the agenda, which had raised matters in relation

No.

to verge cutting, CCTV, Victorian street lights, which all required funding, but yet the Conservative Group were not prepared for the Council to raise any income.

Councillor Brooks, having listened to all the previous comments made by Members and to the fact that the debate appeared to be going in circles about old proposals which had been debated by the Scrutiny Committee some time ago, pointed out that the Motion as proposed made no reference to any cost implications to the Council and also showed a conflicting and confused viewpoint from the Conservative Group. It was her view that it would be better for Members to await a new report on any proposals which would be submitted in due course.

Councillor Bailey, in summing up, rebutted comments made by certain opposition Members, clarifying his Group's position which was calling on the new Administration to scrap the proposals as laid out in the current report, he further clarified the comments of his colleague Councillor Charles, in that she was referring to car parking charges which had been subsequently recommended by the Scrutiny Committee at that time and unanimously agreed by the Committee.

A Recorded Vote than took place as indicated below on the Notice of Motion as submitted:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Julie Aviet		√	
Vince Bailey	√		
Rhiannon Birch		√	
Jonathan Bird		√	
Bronwen Brooks		√	
Lis Burnett		√	
George Carroll	√		
Christine Cave	√		
Janice Charles	√		
Millie Collins	√		
Geoff Cox		√	
Robert Crowley	√		
Andrew Davies	√		
Pamela Drake		√	
Vince Driscoll	√		
Stewart Edwards	√		
Ben Gray		√	
Owen Griffiths		√	

No.

Stephen Griffiths	√		
Nic Hodges	√		
Hunter Jarvie		√	
Gwyn John			√
Ian Johnson	√		
Gordon Kemp	√		
Peter King		√	
Kevin Mahoney	√		
Kathryn McCaffer		√	
Anne Moore		√	
Neil Moore		√	
Michael Morgan		√	
Jayne Norman		√	
Rachel Nugent-Finn	√		
Andrew Parker		√	
Bob Penrose	√		
Sandra Perkes		√	
Andy Robertson	√		
Leighton Rowlands	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam		√	
John Thomas		√	
Neil Thomas		√	
Margaret Wilkinson		√	
Edward Williams		√	
Mark Wilson		√	
Marguerita Wright	√		
TOTAL	19	24	1

RESOLVED – T H A T the Motion be lost.

211 NOTICE OF MOTION –

The following Notice of Motion (submitted by Councillors A.R.T. Davies and G.C. Kemp) had been included on the agenda for discussion:

“The Vale of Glamorgan Council:

No.

- Regrets the decision to move Llancafarn Primary School from its current site;
- Notes both the Labour Party and Conservative Party's election pledges to support the village in its fight to keep Llancafarn School in Llancafarn;
- Calls on the new Labour administration to reverse the decision, and apply to the Welsh Government for funding under the 21st Century Schools Programme to upgrade both existing schools in Rhoose and Llancafarn."

Councillor Kemp formally seconded the Motion.

Councillor Penrose commenced speaking on the Motion, however Councillor Carroll requested clarification as to whether under the Rules of Debate Councillor Davies had been permitted to open up the debate on this Motion. A number of other Members sought clarification as to whether Councillor Davies had indeed reserved his right to speak later and consequently the Mayor indicated that it had been a misunderstanding on her part, and as such indicated that Councillor Davies would be entitled to speak on the Motion and to sum up.

Councillor Davies, in setting out his rationale behind submitting his Motion, referred to the fact that many of the residents within Llancafarn Village and its surrounding area wished for it to remain open for a number of reasons. Notwithstanding its educational record which had been recognised by Estyn in its associated reports, he took the view that the school had indeed had a future ahead of it should the Council wish to invest and support the school going forward. Councillor Davies referred to the earlier comments of Councillor John Thomas in reference to the school and reminded him that it was a fact that the community had consistently attempted to engage with the Council to secure its future. He further acknowledged that the current school facilities required to be brought up to 21st Century standards and contested that if the Council was so minded it could bring proposals to the Welsh Government for funding to make improvements at the school. He also acknowledged that the previous Cabinet Member for Education had to make difficult choices relating to future funding decisions. That said, he drew Members' attention to the political commentary that had taken place regarding the school in the run up to the Rhoose by-election and to the now Cabinet Member for Education who had stated that if the Labour Group had been running the Council that they would have refused the proposals to close the school. He also made reference to the Labour Party's candidate in the Rhoose by-election comments made in regard to the impact on the community in the event of the school closing. He also cited the comments of the current AM for the Vale of Glamorgan who had also cast doubt on the proposals. Taking account of the above, he considered it not unreasonable to put forward his Motion and to seek cross-party support to ensure that a school was preserved within Llancafarn Village and further to secure 21st Century funding.

Councillor Penrose reminded all Members that the proposal approved by Council was to move the school from the existing site to a new £4.2m site in Rhoose which had been supported by teachers and Governors. He also reminded Members that Council officers had spent over two years developing what they considered to be educationally best for the school. Given that the plans had been considered separately on three occasions by the relevant Scrutiny Committee and approved, he enquired why Councillor Davies considered his option better than the Council's

No.

current proposals. Councillor Penrose also posed how Councillor Davies planned to address the constant reduction in pupil numbers that would result from keeping the existing school open at Llancarfan as well as building a new school in Rhoose, how he planned to meet the additional cost of maintaining the school at Llancarfan which he had been reliably informed would amount to £500k per annum, how he planned to introduce and fund additional playground open space, nursery provision, provision for a student with physical disability and the requirement for new adaptations to the existing school and why did he feel it appropriate to ignore the feelings and approval of the existing staff at the school who, he understood, were 100% behind the Council's proposals. He was also concerned that Councillor Davies was implying that 21st Century School funding would be available to remodel the existing school as well as providing funding for the new school in Rhoose. In summing up, Councillor Penrose reminded the Members of the Labour Party's slogan "For the many not the few" which the current proposals would clearly achieve and the alternative would fail to deliver and accordingly he advised that he would not be supporting the Motion.

Councillor Bailey, in supporting the Motion, suggested that it was an opportunity to correct a wrong. Disagreeing with the Council's decision to close the school and to Councillor Penrose's comments regarding the availability of 21st Century School funding, reminded Members that Councillor Penrose as the then Cabinet Member for Education, had been continually challenged about providing funding to allow improvements to be made to the existing site of the school. He considered the matter not to be closed and alluded to the Welsh Government Minister for Education who would be the person ultimately responsible for deciding whether the business case for a new school at Rhoose would be approved. He also alluded to the National Framework for Primary Schools Development and the associated minimum standards for arrangements on a school site. Whilst the standards were merely guidance, there was no reason to assume at the outset that any proposal to improve either the site at Llancarfan or at Rhoose would be rejected under these provisions. He considered that the Council had taken a defeatist stance and not attempted to access funding for the above. He considered that it was better for the Council to bring forward such proposals and present them to Welsh Government, putting the onus upon them to decide whether they would provide the necessary funding to support the schools. Rather than admitting defeat and allowing the school to be closed thus impacting on the wider community at Llancarfan, it would have been better for the Council to stand up for its communities and been ambitious. He accepted the point made by Councillor Penrose regarding the £500k revenue costs to maintain the school which was slightly higher than the average for the Vale of Glamorgan. He also made reference to the now Leader's comments made two years ago that the closure of the school would not be approved. More recently, the Labour Party's leaflet circulated in the by-election at Rhoose made the point that it would be supporting the community group in the campaign to keep the school open. Warm words aside, Councillor Bailey called upon the Leader and his Group to support the Motion.

At this juncture it was agreed that Standing Orders be suspended in order to allow the Director of Learning and Skills to clarify the position as regard to the availability of 21st Century Schools funding and the criteria that would have to be met.

(Standing Orders re-invoked).

No.

The Deputy Leader indicated that she was pleased that she received a strong following on her social media account. That said, she wished to reiterate what she had said previously regarding what a Labour Administration would do for a matter of accuracy. She reminded Members that there had never been a proposal from any previous Labour Administration regarding actions to do with Llancafarn Primary School. Referring to the Labour Party and Conservative Party pledges at the Rhose by-election, she noted that it had only been Councillor Davies who had made an election manifesto pledge on the future of Llancafarn Primary School.

Councillor Carroll interjected by indicating that it was his belief that 22 Members who stood on the Welsh Conservative manifesto in the 2017 Local Government elections pledging to protect rural schools. Llancafarn Primary School was classified as such and therefore at least 22 Members had stood on that manifesto.

The Deputy Leader, referring to the fact that she had retained most election literature from then, would check to see if that was the case and if incorrect, would apologise. However, she was not aware that that was the case. She indicated that she would be voting against the Motion as she considered it to be premature and reminded Members that the Administration would review the current situation which was currently in progress. She had only met the previous week with representatives from the Save Llancafarn Group to discuss the issue and they had been informed of the Administration's timetable which they had accepted. Alluding to a request received from Councillor Kemp to meet on the subject which had come on the same week that Councillor Davies had attacked the Administration in the press, she considered this to be confusing as it appeared that within the Conservative Group no one knew who was doing what.

Councillor Kemp, referring to his disappointment that the Leader had refused to agree to a meeting with him as a consequence of comments made by Councillor Davies, was however pleased that a meeting had been held with the Campaign Group and was also pleased that the Leader had agreed to attend a meeting of Llancafarn Community Council in September. Referring to his time as a Cabinet Member in the previous Administration, he reminded Members that he was the sole voice within that Cabinet who was against the proposal to close Llancafarn Primary School. Alluding to the Labour Administration of 2012/13 he intimated that there was more than a suggestion regarding the potential closure of Llancafarn School at that time. He reminded Members of the impact of closing the school and drew the analogy of rural bank closures that were taking place across the country and would have the same effect to the community. He also considered that there had been a misunderstanding regarding the Welsh Government Education Minister's position regarding guidance and that there was nothing set in stone, new proposals could be put forward to Welsh Government for consideration. He also recalled that the Scrutiny Committee at that time when it was considering the proposals, did not stop the current proposals but recommended that further consultation be undertaken and he was now pleased that the Leader was doing just that in a positive way. That said, he reminded Members that the overwhelming view of the community, the Community Council and various organisations, were opposed to the school's closure.

No.

Councillor Kemp also had concerns for the new proposal to build a new school in Rhoose in the event of land north of the railway line in Rhoose was not progressed for housing development. The absence of any development on this site would leave any new school in Rhoose under capacity. He welcomed the fact that the proposals would be reviewed and that proper attention would be given to the community which had been sadly lacking before. He hoped that Members would support the Motion as a sensible way forward to resolve the situation. However, he was minded to propose an Amendment to the Motion which he had seconded, but he did not wish to extend the debate any further and referred to the former Leader's comments made earlier in the evening were now a matter of record regarding the school's position. Thanking his colleagues for bringing the Motion before Council and to the rhetoric from the Administration, echoed the comments of Councillor Davies regarding comments made by Labour Party Members in the run up to the Llancarfan by-election.

The Leader, referring to Councillor Kemp's comments regarding the opportunity of a meeting, reminded him that his request had been conditional on officers not being in attendance. He was happy to speak to any individual or group on the matter and he had done so the previous week.

Referring to the Motion before Council it was untrue to imply that the Council could apply for 21st Century School funding to improve the current school at Llancarfan. Referring to the Rhoose by-election and alleged comments made by the Labour candidate at that time, it was his view that this had been done without the permission of the Labour Party. He also challenged the likely success of attracting 21st Century School funding for both schools in Rhoose and Llancarfan to upgrade them given that pupil numbers were reducing at Llancarfan. He concurred with the previous points made by Councillor Penrose in regard to the ongoing funding requirement of Llancarfan School with reduced pupil numbers. It was his understanding that 21st Century Schools funding was not available to upgrade the school and accordingly he would be opposing the Motion.

Councillor Davies, in summing up, acknowledged given the previous comments that it was unlikely that his Motion would attract support. The Labour Party's candidates comments made at the Rhoose by-election was a matter of record as indeed comments made by the Conservative Party at the same by-election and he stood by his comments made at that time that he welcomed the Deputy Leader and the Leader's engagement with the Community Group and in particular to the commitment that had been made by both in the debate regarding any proposals relating to the school and hoped that these would come forward in the Autumn. However, he did take issue with officers' advice that had been provided relating to Welsh Government Guidance and the ability / inability of the Local Authority to submit plans and make a case for 21st Century funding to upgrade Llancarfan Primary School. As he understood it, there had been no assessment undertaken on whether the site could be developed and consequently whether plans could be submitted to develop the school further under the 21st Century School Programme. In concluding and referring to the questions posed by Councillor Penrose earlier in the debate and in response to the same, it was his view that the school had a bright future ahead of it and reminded Members that the School Closure Code had been

No.

modified in 2018 making Llancarfan Primary School the only Rural School that fell within that Code.

The Leader, in clarifying the position regarding the current proposals, had informed residents that he would personally be reviewing the situation and subject to him being satisfied with the process, it was not his intention to report back to Cabinet on the matter in the Autumn as indicated in Councillor Davies' summing up.

A Recorded Vote then took place as indicated below on the Notice of Motion as submitted:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Julie Aviet		√	
Vince Bailey	√		
Rhiannon Birch		√	
Jonathan Bird		√	
Bronwen Brooks		√	
Lis Burnett		√	
George Carroll	√		
Christine Cave	√		
Janice Charles	√		
Millie Collins		√	
Geoff Cox		√	
Robert Crowley	√		
Andrew Davies	√		
Pamela Drake		√	
Vince Driscoll	√		
Stewart Edwards	√		
Ben Gray		√	
Owen Griffiths		√	
Stephen Griffiths	√		
Nic Hodges		√	
Hunter Jarvie		√	
Gwyn John		√	
Ian Johnson		√	
Gordon Kemp	√		
Peter King		√	

No.

Kevin Mahoney		√	
Kathryn McCaffer		√	
Anne Moore		√	
Neil Moore		√	
Michael Morgan			√
Jayne Norman		√	
Rachel Nugent-Finn	√		
Andrew Parker		√	
Bob Penrose		√	
Sandra Perkes		√	
Andy Robertson	√		
Leighton Rowlands	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam		√	
John Thomas		√	
Neil Thomas		√	
Margaret Wilkinson		√	
Edward Williams		√	
Mark Wilson		√	
Marguerita Wright	√		
TOTAL	14	29	1

RESOLVED – T H A T the Motion be lost.

At this juncture, the Mayor indicated that there would be a 10 minutes adjournment in the proceedings.

(Meeting reconvened.)

212 PUBLIC QUESTIONS –

The following questions were submitted and replied to as shown, in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 5th May, 2010:

(i) **Question from Mr. K. Wimbleton**

Please can you tell me what is happening at the Knap Skatepark as it has been closed for some time now with no work taking place. This is a memorial skatepark from the late former world champion skater, Richard Taylor, and is an essential asset to the community, especially the youth. To have this park closed at the start of the summer holidays is a very poor decision indeed.

No.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Arts and Culture

Thank you Mr. Wimbleton for your question. Regrettably, the park had to be closed because after some routine inspections it was established that there were some of the ramps that were considered dangerous. So fortunately we are happy to advise that a contractor is already on site so the park will be reopened as soon as possible.

(ii) **Question from Mr. M. Lock**

Late in 2018 new webcasting equipment was installed by the Council to improve the webstreaming service. At the time, Beautiful Barry suggested it would be a big improvement to have not just the Full Council and Planning Meetings livestreamed but also each of the Scrutiny Meetings and Cabinet Meetings. Can this be implemented in the interests of public engagement?

Reply from the Executive Leader and Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources

Thank you for your question Mr. Lock.

As you rightly pointed out in your previous question raised at the Council meeting on 26th September last year, the Council has made recent further investment in its webcasting facilities. Consideration as to whether webcasting will be extended to other meetings of the Council, including meetings of Cabinet, is under consideration and will no doubt be influenced by any requirements as a result of the pending introduction of the new Local Government and Elections Bill.

I point out also that since raising your question last year, webcasting has been extended to meetings of the Council's Scrutiny Committees in such circumstances where the subject matter has been determined to be of a Vale wide interest.

It is my contention that a balance has to be struck in terms of available resources to webcast all Council meetings against other competing service resourcing priorities. Clearly, the inception of the new Bill will give the Council direction regarding webcasting requirements in relation to the Committee meetings. At the current time it is on hold, we will continue to carry out webcasting wherever possible but we will wait until the introduction of the Bill.

(iii) **Question from Mrs. A. Sloman**

Why would this Council consider decimating the green field land on the left of the Port Road approach to Cardiff airport in favour of an unnecessary business park, when there are other suitable sites in the immediate vicinity? The proposed development will not benefit the local area or the residents in the wider communities and will result in a family losing their home and their livelihood. Let common sense prevail and consider responsibly this proposal and the impact it will have.

No.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services

The land relates to an area which has been allocated within the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) for strategic employment developments under two specific policies (MG9, 2 and MG 10) which refer to 77 Ha of development land and forms part of the St. Athan – Cardiff Airport Enterprise Zone, one of a number created by the Welsh Government since April 2012 to support investment, business growth and job creation

The LDP commentary advises that development of the site would encourage inward investment to the area and consolidate the role of the Vale of Glamorgan within the Cardiff Capital Region

As part of the LDP process, the designation of the site for business purposes has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and subject to an assessment by an independent Inspector as part of the LDP Examination before it was adopted by the Council in June 2017 in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation.

Although allocated in principle for development, any proposals for future developments will still be required to comply with national and local planning policy such as enhancing biodiversity and promoting sustainable travel.

At present, the Council has not received a formal planning application for the site, however we are aware of the pre-application consultation that the developer is currently undertaking in accordance with their statutory obligations prior to submitting a formal planning application. I would encourage all interested persons to engage in this process to make their feelings known.

It should also be noted that the Council as you are aware, in Cabinet this afternoon we put forward Cardiff Airport and Gateway Development Zone Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document which will include this site, and will be subject to a public consultation exercise before it is adopted. This SPG will offer further information on the type of development the Council expects to come forward on the site and what developers should consider when designing and submitting their proposals for future developments within the designation.

(iv) **Question from Mr. J. Brown**

Does the Council have plans for large scale employment / leisure based regeneration for Barry, both within the Island / Waterfront and the town centre areas?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

The Council has been proactively marketing the Nell's Point site as a leisure / hotel opportunity. This has been undertaken in partnership with Welsh and UK Governments and the City Deal team. In March, the site was promoted at the world's largest property market in France and in July the UK Government facilitated

No.

a presentation to potential investors and the Department for International Trade. I will refer again to this in my response to a further, albeit similar question from Mr. Brown.

A feasibility study has been jointly commissioned by the Council and ABP into the viability of a Marina on the Waterfront. This study is due to be reported in November of this year. The Council continues to work with local business and groups in order to maximise tourism benefits for Barry.

Barry Town Centre has been selected as a key target zone for the Thematic Grants Programme under the Welsh Government Targeted Regional Investment fund. £1m or just slightly under £1m of Grant funding will be available to carry out improvements to retail and commercial property frontages and associated external and internal works, including bringing vacant floor space back into use and undertake external and internal works enabling the conversion of vacant floor space into residential use.

A £9m project to convert the old Railway Goods Shed building and adjoining land at Hood Road, Barry Waterfront, has been facilitated in partnership with Welsh Government and Loftco and that will compliment obviously the earlier Pumphouse development.

The mixed-use scheme will include a shipping container village and apartment complex, office space, retail units, restaurants and a coffee shop. The area will also contain a flexible events space for use as an outdoor cinema, farmers' market and pop-up street food zone.

(v) **Question from Mr. J. Brown**

When will the land use masterplan be published for Barry Island and also what is being done to take forward development options for Nell's Point?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

Officers have continued the development of a variety of documents to support investment opportunities at Barry Island and a "Strategic Opportunities" document was completed in Autumn 2018 for this purpose. The document has been under review given the alternative approaches to marketing suggested at the Welsh Government's Property Conference in Cardiff in November 2018 and following the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal office presence at the Mipin Property Conference at Cannes in March. The intention is to publish the document following this latest review. In addition, the site has been included as one of only six Welsh sites in a Department for International Trade prospectus detailing investment opportunities in Wales. Officers from the Council attended and presented at a launch of this prospectus earlier this month.

The Council's officers continue to follow up investment opportunities emerging from recent events and the intention is to prepare a report to Cabinet, in due course, setting out the alternate approaches to investment opportunities.

No.

What I will add to that is that I know Mr. Brown has been very interested in regeneration in Barry for a number of years and if he would like to get in touch with me I will be delighted to sit down and talk to him about our strategic direction.

(vi) **Question from Mr. L. Robertson**

The Vale of Glamorgan Council have proposed a Climate Emergency, is this a call to action where we truly mean to scrutinise and take action on our emissions to air, water and land do the Council have a plan of how they can lead the Vale of Glamorgan into tackling the emergency in hand? And could you please provide details on how you propose to secure the wellbeing of future generations.

Reply from the Executive Leader and Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources

In relation to the Climate Emergency, Council's Corporate Plan sets out the Council's aims and objectives in relation to how we will meet our responsibilities under the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015. Specifically, the Corporate Plan sets out Wellbeing Outcomes, Objectives and Actions which promote an "environmentally responsible Vale". Objective 4 requires the Council to review and implement the Council's Carbon Management Plan and targets to reduce emissions from street lighting, Council vehicles and Council buildings. The Carbon Management Plan was reviewed and reported to Cabinet on 17th December, 2018 and I sure that there will be a further review. The Carbon Management Plan sets out the progress made to date and outlines the actions being taken and being considered by the Council to reduce its CO2 output in line with the targets set by the Welsh Government and indeed now by ourselves.

You will be aware having been here all night, that I have, as part of this meeting's agenda tabled a Motion on this very same topic. This will take forward the issues of climate change and the need for all public bodies to change their way of working in ensuring we minimise the impact on the climate and the wider environment. I am confident further reports will be presented to Cabinet in the very near future.

(vii) **Question from Mrs. A. Westerland**

Can the new Administration guarantee the continued roll out of water fountains across the Vale, given the enormous success of those already in place and in line with the requirements of the Welsh Government's responsibility to implement the Future Generations Act to ensure the health and wellbeing of all and also responding to concerns about the environment and the reduction of single use plastics?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Thank you Mrs. Westerland for your question.

No.

In our efforts to reduce reliance on single use plastics I believe that this Council is leading the way in Wales when it comes to the provision of free fresh drinking water in our parks and open spaces. We have plans this year to install 14 drinking fountains at various locations throughout the Vale. A number have already been installed with the remainder to be completed by 31st March, 2020. The locations are as follows:

Central Park, Barry
Knap Gardens, Barry
Romilly Park, Barry – 2 Units
Upper Gladstone Gardens, Barry
Barry Island Promenade – 2 Units
New Skate Park Cogan Leisure Centre, Penarth
Cliff Walk, Penarth
Penarth Seafront / Pier – 2 Units
Lougher Place, St. Athan
Dinas Powys – The Murch or Bryn Y Don Playing
Fields
Main Car Park, Ogmore By Sea.

These units have been provided either via our own capital funds or funding obtained through Section 106 planning agreements and we are currently reviewing other possible locations for water fountains for 2020/21 should similar funding be available.

213 CARDIFF CAPITAL REGION CITY DEAL (REF) –

At its meeting on 25th June, 2019, the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee sought nominations of a named deputy representative on the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC).

The report outlined that arrangements for the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) were agreed by Council on 18th July, 2018 (minute no. 194), with the Chairman of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee being appointed as the representative for the Vale of Glamorgan.

Members noted at that time that the Terms of the Joint Working Agreement for the JOSC allowed constituent Local Authorities to name a deputy representative in the absence of the Scrutiny Chairman and Councillor Neil Moore was duly appointed to be the nominated deputy.

Following the Council's Annual Meeting held on 20th May, 2019, Councillor Bronwen Brooks was appointed Chairman of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee, and so, had become the Vale of Glamorgan's JOSC representative.

As Councillor Neil Moore had become Council Leader, and therefore no longer eligible to sit on the Joint Scrutiny Committee, a new nominated named deputy was

No.

required. The report therefore sought the Scrutiny Committee to recommend a nominated deputy in the absence of the Scrutiny Chairman.

The Scrutiny Committee had subsequently recommended to Council the following:

“THAT the Scrutiny Committee recommends to Full Council that Councillor S. Sivagnanam be appointed as the nominated deputy to represent the Council on the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the absence of the Chairman of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.”

RESOLVED – T H A T the above recommendation be endorsed and Councillor S. Sivagnanam be appointed as the nominated deputy to represent the Council on the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for decision

To allow the Council to participate in Joint Scrutiny arrangements.

214 ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2018/19 (REF) –

In July 2019, Cabinet considered and approved the Annual Report on the Council's Treasury Management operations for the period 1st April, 2018 to 31st March, 2019.

The Annual Report outlined the changing conditions under which Treasury Management operations were carried out during the year.

The Council's primary objectives for the management of its investments were to give priority to the security and liquidity of its funds before seeking the best rate of return. Saying this, the Authority placed the majority of funds available for investment purposes with other Local Authorities during the year. These investments attracted a slightly more favourable rate of return than investing with the UK Government, but still give priority to the security of funds invested. This was a change in practice for the Authority during the past financial year in order to improve the rate of return on the Council's investments but still maintained the security of the Council's monies.

When managing the Council's debt, the primary concern was to ensure its long term affordability. In 2018/19 the Council continued to finance a significant proportion of its capital expenditure from internal resources. As a result the Council's external borrowing was well within the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary set for 2018/2019 and therefore limited the debt charges that were paid during the year.

Insofar as the Council's Treasury Management operations entered into for the 2018/19 were concerned, all treasury management activity undertaken during the financial year complied with the Council's approved strategy, the CIPFA Code of Practice and the relevant legislative provisions.

RESOLVED – T H A T the proposals of the Cabinet, as set out in Cabinet Minute No. C34, 15th July, 2019, be approved.

No.

Reason for decision

To formally approve the Annual Report on Treasury Management 2018/19.

215 PROPOSALS FOR A STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP) FOR THE CARDIFF CAPITAL REGION (REF) –

Cabinet, at its meeting held on 15th July, 2019, considered proposals to prepare a Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for the Cardiff Capital Region comprising the 10 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) in the region. The decision to proceed required endorsement from all 10 Councils in the region to authorise the Responsible Authority to submit a proposal to Welsh Government. A similar report was being presented to each of the 10 relevant Councils over the coming months.

An SDP was a regional level Development Plan that sat above a Local Development Plan (LDP) and below the Welsh Government's National Development Framework and provided a strategic framework for Local Development Plans to be prepared at a more local level. A statutory SDP provided certainty to developers, investors and our communities that key strategic decisions around housing, transport, employment and infrastructure provision were being taken at an appropriate regional level, whilst still allowing key decisions on planning proposals to be taken locally through Local Development Plan allocations and policies and thereafter in development management decisions.

The report identified some key issues for consideration around the preparation of the SDP, in particular defining the Strategic Planning Area Boundary, governance arrangements, scope, content and plan period.

The process required identification of a Responsible Authority to submit the proposal to Welsh Government, and it was recommended that the Vale of Glamorgan Council take this role, which had been agreed by the Regional Cabinet.

The preparation and adoption of the SDP was undertaken by a Strategic Planning Panel (SPP), with representatives from every LPA within the boundary having a weighted vote. It was recommended that the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration represent the Vale of Glamorgan Council on the Panel, given their experience and knowledge.

Cabinet, having considered the report subsequently

“RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the content of the report be noted and referred to the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee for consideration, prior to consideration by Full Council.

(2) **T H A T** in the event of any comments being made by Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee, these be referred back to Cabinet for consideration prior to final determination by Full Council.

(3) **T H A T** the Vale of Glamorgan Council endorses the content of the report and agrees that the Responsible Authority be authorised to submit the Proposal for a Strategic Development Plan for the Cardiff Capital Region to the Minister on behalf of the 10 Local Planning Authorities in the region.

(4) **T H A T** the Vale of Glamorgan Council endorse itself as the Responsible Authority for the Cardiff Capital Region Strategic Development Plan.

(5) **T H A T** the Vale of Glamorgan Council endorses that the Strategic Planning Area should comprise the 10 Local Planning Authority areas within the Cardiff Capital Region as shown on the map at Appendix A to the report.

(6) **T H A T** the Vale of Glamorgan Council authorises relevant officers to engage with the Welsh Government in drafting the Strategic Development Plan Regulations to deliver the following governance arrangements for the SDP and Strategic Planning Panel:

- (i) **That the Strategic Planning Panel will be comprised of 10 Members, one from each constituent Local Authority with the weighting of votes for each constituent Local Authority being based on its population and geographical area as follows:**

Local Authority	No. of Members on the Strategic Planning Panel	Weighting of Vote for Constituent LA
Blaenau Gwent	1	1
Bridgend	1	2
Caerphilly	1	3
Cardiff	1	5
Merthyr Tydfil	1	1
Monmouthshire	1	3
Newport	1	2
Rhondda Cynon Taff	1	3
Torfaen	1	1
Vale of Glamorgan	1	2
Total	10	23
Nominated non-voting Panel Members	5	N/A

- (ii) **That constituent Councils will be engaged through a prior consultation process as set out in Figure 1 and the Strategic**

Planning Panel shall have full regard to the comments of constituent Councils;

- (iii) That decisions made on the Strategic Development Plan by the Strategic Planning Panel shall require a 70% quorum of voting Members on the Panel and decisions shall require a 70% majority vote of a quorate meeting.

(7) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council endorses the setting up of an Interim Strategic Planning Panel prior to the formal establishment of the Strategic Planning Panel and the nominated Member below represent the Vale of Glamorgan Council on the Interim Strategic Planning Panel with delegated authority to take initial decisions on the preparation of the SDP (with a vote weighted in accordance with the table at Recommendation 6(i)) and thereafter on the Strategic Planning Panel. The Vale of Glamorgan Council nominate:

Councillor Lis Burnett, Vale of Glamorgan Council.

(8) T H A T in the event that Member is no longer able to sit on Interim Strategic Planning Panel, delegated powers be granted to the Managing Director, following consultation with the Leader of the Council, to nominate a new Member to represent the Council on the Interim Strategic Planning Panel and Strategic Planning Panel.

(9) T H A T a Regional Strategic Development Plan Officer Team be established to progress the preparation of the Strategic Development Plan to be appointed by representatives of the Interim Strategic Planning Panel, with appropriate human resource support from the Responsible Authority.

(10) T H A T the cost of preparing the Strategic Development Plan be shared across the 10 Authorities on a proportional cost based on the voting representation on the Strategic Planning Panel, to be reviewed on an annual basis, and an initial contribution of £50,005 be paid to cover the start-up costs likely to be incurred in this financial year 2019/20, divided as follows:

Local Authority	% Cost Based on SSP Votes	£
Blaenau Gwent	4.35	2,175
Bridgend	8.7	4,350
Caerphilly	13.04	6,520
Cardiff	21.74	10,870
Merthyr Tydfil	4.35	2,175
Monmouthshire	13.04	6,520
Newport	8.7	4,350
Rhondda Cynon Taff	13.04	6,520
Torfaen	4.35	2,175
Vale of Glamorgan	8.7	4,350
TOTAL	100.01	50,005

=====

No.

Councillor Bailey, referring to the item and to the fact that the Council would be taking on the role of Responsible Authority which had been agreed by the nine other City Deal Authorities, expressed concern in regard to the voting arrangements for making decisions. Whilst his Group had no objection to the wider principles of the SDP including, the investment that the City Deal would create, he did not however agree with the principle that all parties involved would not have an equal say. He considered this to be particularly relevant given the earlier comments made by the Leader in regard to the potential for a joint LDP with Cardiff to be forced on the Council. He considered that the proposals in front of Council for consideration represented a bad deal and consequently moved an Amendment as follows:

That the Council support the principles of the creation of a Strategic Development Plan but that it believes that the Cabinet should reject the current proposals for voting and demand the principle of "one member one vote" before a Strategic Development Plan offer is ratified.

The Amendment was duly seconded by Councillor Driscoll.

Councillor Robertson, echoing concerns expressed by Councillor Bailey, suggested that if the proposals were approved that it was likely that Cardiff Council would pay little attention to any concerns the Council would have given that they viewed the County as a potential housing development. He had significant reservations regarding the proposals and accordingly the Council was likely to be outvoted on every issue given the proposed voting arrangements.

Councillor Davies, referring to his recent attendance at two meetings the previous week, one of which was a briefing on the proposal, the other was the Scrutiny Committee to consider the matter, echoed the concerns raised by Councillor Bailey regarding the voting arrangements and separately was further concerned with what he considered to be inadequate scrutiny arrangements of the City Deal generally. Alluding to the Leader's earlier comments regarding the potential for a joint LDP with Cardiff Council as misleading, urged Members to support the Amendment given the inequitable voting arrangements proposed across the 10 Authorities forming the City Deal region. He further urged the Cabinet to fight tooth and nail to restore the principle of parity so that the Council did not go into future meetings with one arm tied behind its back.

The Leader, clarifying Councillor Davies' comments, indicated that if the Council took the decision not to approve the SDP as each of the 10 Authorities were required to do, would result in the current LDP requiring replacing. Alluding to a similar situation for Cardiff, it was likely that the Council would be forced to join Cardiff to create a joint LDP. It was his view that the SDP was likely to provide greater protection for the Vale of Glamorgan not less. The rationale for the SDP across the whole of the 10 Authorities region was based on a combination of factors, e.g. the Metro, given its links with the valley communities. In addition, house builders had indicated that they would not be prepared to build future housing development above the "snow line" as they called it as they wished to concentrate in the development south. The intention of a future SDP would be to signal to developers that Local Authorities were working together and that future housing development was in fact required in valley

No.

communities. The proposals in front of Council had taken two years to develop, which included discussions regarding geographical areas and the subsequent link to voting entitlement. He also reminded Members that any decision taken in regard to the SDP, when considered by the Panel, would require a 70% attendance in terms of quorum and require 70% majority vote.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, in an attempt to clarify the position regarding voting arrangements, cited for example hypothetical voting patterns which could potentially leave Authorities vulnerable where consensus could not be reached and therefore he had concerns regarding the proposals for voting.

Councillor John Thomas alluded to his previous involvement as the former Leader over the previous two years indicating that there had been significant work that had gone into negotiating the arrangements under consideration. It was his view that this was the only deal on the table and also acknowledged that when the matter was being negotiated that many Authorities did wish to have one Authority one vote. However, given the requirements of the Welsh Government legislation to have the SDP, if the Council failed to agree the proposal it was likely that Welsh Government would impose its own arrangements without the Council having any steer or influence over it in the future. Referring to certain Members' earlier comments regarding the insistence of a unanimous vote, he advised Members that at that time, Counsel's opinion had been sought on the very issue and had been ruled out as it would not be lawful. Echoing the comments of the Leader regarding the potential for the Council to be required to undertake a joint LDP with Cardiff, he also reminded Members that certain Authorities had already been instructed to do just that. Failure to agree the proposals would likely see a joint LDP with Cardiff. Cardiff and the Vale had avoided such circumstances given that their respective LDPs had been adopted at a later date than the other Authorities. Agreement on this had been made with Welsh Government on the basis that the SDP would be taken forward. Failure to approve the proposals would almost certainly see the requirement of the Council to enter into a joint LDP with Cardiff.

Upon being put to a vote, the Amendment was lost.

Councillor Driscoll, in referring to one of the strategies behind the development of an SDP was to encourage house builders to build in the Blaenau Gwent and Torfaen areas. It was his view that it was unlikely that house builders would be convinced to build in these areas.

Councillor Burnett, addressing many of the speakers that had preceded her, reminded Members that the SDP was not just about housing but also about transport, employment and infrastructure provision. It was important to have the SDP as it covered the whole region and that the Vale and its infrastructure did not simply stop at its boundaries. She did not accept the arguments presented as a simply win or lose situation, with it being more likely that 10 Local Authorities working together could achieve much more regardless of its political position.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, referring to the potential of the joint LDP with Cardiff being used as a stick against the Council, was disappointed that the Labour Administration and a Labour Welsh Government would do something against the Council's best

No.

interests. Referring to his time on the Council prior to 2017 and previous iterations of the then LDP, it was his view that residents felt that they were not being listened to and whilst he supported the necessity for strategic regional working, there was a difference between that concept and how that actually played out. He also referred to other joint working arrangements that the Authority was currently involved with and it was clear to him that individuals had little say in such matters. He sought an assurance that appropriate safeguards were in place within the proposed arrangements to allow for Elected Members to have a sufficient say on developments so that they felt part of any future process. He also reminded Members that any final SDP would be approved by the Welsh Government Planning Inspectorate. Having regard to the SDP and the lifespan that this would have, Councillor Dr. Johnson felt that it was important to remember the context of earlier discussions that evening regarding climate change and what the Council was proposing to do by 2030. Any SDP would have to quickly evolve taking account of the Council's targets on climate change, but primarily he was concerned that any future SDP would cater for Cardiff's economic growth. Whilst he acknowledged the Leader and former Leader's comments regarding the two year period that it had taken to develop the proposal, he as a local political group Leader felt that he had not been part of that process regardless of the fact that the report to Cabinet had been made recently and a briefing to Members which he considered to be a whirlwind tour of the Council's position which was, in his view, insufficient period of time to give proper consideration and support on the issue.

Voting then took place as indicated below on the Cabinet's original recommendations as set out in the report.

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Julie Aviet	√		
Vince Bailey		√	
Rhiannon Birch	√		
Jonathan Bird	√		
Bronwen Brooks	√		
Lis Burnett	√		
George Carroll		√	
Christine Cave		√	
Janice Charles		√	
Millie Collins		√	
Geoff Cox	√		
Robert Crowley		√	
Andrew Davies		√	
Pamela Drake	√		
Vince Driscoll		√	

No.

Stewart Edwards		√	
Ben Gray	√		
Owen Griffiths	√		
Stephen Griffiths		√	
Nic Hodges		√	
Hunter Jarvie	√		
Ian Johnson		√	
Gordon Kemp		√	
Peter King	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	
Kathryn McCaffer	√		
Anne Moore	√		
Neil Moore	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Rachel Nugent-Finn		√	
Andrew Parker	√		
Bob Penrose		√	
Sandra Perkes	√		
Andy Robertson		√	
Leighton Rowlands		√	
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
John Thomas	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Margaret Wilkinson	√		
Edward Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		
Marguerita Wright		√	
TOTAL	24	19	0

RESOLVED – T H A T the Cabinet proposals as set out in Cabinet Minute No. 44, 15th July, 2019 be approved.

Reason for decision

For the reasons set out in the above Cabinet Minute.

No.

216 LOCAL DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES –
VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS REVIEW (REF) –

The Cabinet, at its meeting held on 15th July, 2019 had considered the above matter which included the Council's duty under Section 29 of the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area at least once every ten years.

Cabinet at that time had noted that the Commission had commenced its review of the Vale of Glamorgan Council on 8th May, 2019, and had invited the Council to provide proposals as part of the first stage of the review by 30th July, 2019.

In light of the matters that the Commission would consider and would have regard to as part of the review, Cabinet had agreed proposals for the Council's consideration which were set out within paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4 of the original Cabinet report for submission to the Commission as part of their electoral arrangement review.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Cabinet proposals as set out in Cabinet Minute No. C45, 15th July, 2019 be approved.

Reason for decision

For the reasons set out in the above Cabinet minute.

217 21ST CENTURY SCHOOLS PROGRAMME - BAND B UPDATE (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C39(5)), 15th July, 2019 (as set out in Section 14.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

To make a determination to allow the Council to submit the Strategic Outline Programme to Welsh Government as soon as possible in order to minimise risk to the Council when progressing individual elements of the above Programme.

218 LOCAL DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES -
VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS REVIEW (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C45(3)), 15th July, 2019 (as set out in Section 14.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

To meet the deadline set by the Commission of 30th July, 2019.

No.

219 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 4.18 OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION –

Due notice had been given of the following questions:

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

What actions have this Administration taken to reduce 'holiday hunger' in the school Summer Holidays?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

Thank you for your question.

The Council actively participates in the WLGA's School Holiday Enrichment Programme (SHEP). SHEP is a WLGA and Council match funded school-based programme that provides healthy meals, food and nutrition education, physical activity and enrichment sessions to children in areas of social deprivation during the summer holidays. The scheme was offered to 5 primary schools within the Vale of Glamorgan, which met the criterion of having Free School Meals of 16% or greater.

Each setting of 40 pupils costs £10k, with the Council's contribution of £5k currently being funded by the Learning and Skills Directorate.

Of the five schools contacted, only one school, Cadoxton Primary, requested the scheme to run. This will be the second year that the school has hosted SHEP.

Cadoxton Primary hosted two sessions for a total of 80 pupils. A number of pupils from other local schools in the area attended, including pupils from Oakfield, Colcot and Jenner Park.

The scheme began on 23rd July and will run for four days per week for the first three weeks of the summer holidays from 10am to 3pm.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson, indicating his disappointment at the take-up enquired as to why the Council was not included in one of the 13 Authorities mentioned as part of the recent Welsh Government Minister's launch of a pilot initiative relating to Holiday Hunger.

The Cabinet Member indicated that he was unaware of the information that Councillor Dr. Johnson was referring to and stated that the Council was indeed one of the 13 Authorities involved in the Welsh Government pilot and that the Council separately, was linking it to another initiative, Families First and Healthy, Active and Outdoor Play for the summer.

No.

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

What is the timetable for reaching a decision on the Car Parking Strategy consulted upon by the previous Administration in July 2018, with specific reference to town centre car parks in Barry?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

I aim to be in a position to report to Cabinet on this matter prior to the end of this calendar year.

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

What discussions have this Administration held regarding the Barry Docks Incinerator since coming to power?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services

This is ultimately a matter for the Welsh Government and the regulators. That said, the Leader I know has raised the matter with Welsh Government at ministerial and local level and I know the matter has been raised with NRW. I also continue to be updated by officers as to the current position.

However, as stated, and as all in this Chamber are aware, this is a matter that is in the hands of the Welsh Government.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson, referring to the Cabinet Member's reply enquired what powers the Council had to revoke the planning permissions that existed.

Alluding to the Planning Inspectorate granting of planning permission following the appeal in 2010 and the subsequent approval of planning permission for an amended development in 2015 and noting at that time, and prior to the determination of the application, the Cabinet Member reminded Members that the Welsh Government confirmed, following a request by a third party, that they did not consider that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was required and did not object to the application being determined.

Referring to the receipt of the new planning application (2017/01080/FUL), he also reminded Members that Welsh Government indicated that it was minded to consider the proposed development as Schedule 1, EIA development, but invited comments from the Applicant. He also touched upon the Welsh Government's statement of May 2019 which advised that contrary to its previous decision in 2015, it now considered that an EIA was needed for the 2015 application and that they were requesting the Applicant submit the same to them voluntarily.

No.

In the light of the above, the Cabinet Member indicated that the Council's consideration of application 2017/01080/FUL would only proceed once the matters surrounding the original 2015 application had been resolved.

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

Increases in teachers' pension contributions were classed as a £1.8m cost pressure to the Vale Council in the 2019/20 Budget, passed on to taxpayers through a 4.9% Council Tax increase. The Vale Council has since received funding from Welsh Government intended to meet much of this additional expense. What amount has been received from Welsh Government, and what has happened to that money?

Reply from the Executive Leader

I can confirm that we received confirmation in April that Welsh Government is funding the increased costs associated with the Teachers' Pension in the form of a grant for 2019/20. This Authority will receive £1,725,073 during the financial year. This money has not yet been received as the pension increases commence in September 2019. The letter states that the funding will be paid from September.

The funding arrangements for this expense in future years will be part of the discussions around the comprehensive spending review.

(v) **Question from Councillor Miss. A.M. Collins**

Given recent reports of public toilets in Barry being closed due to incidents involving drug use and antisocial behaviour, what measures do the Council propose to prevent this in future, and ensure that public toilets are available for people who need them?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to prevent anti-social behaviour and illegal behaviour, such as drug taking, in our toilets due to most of our toilets not being staffed. We are working with our Community Safety Team to establish if appropriate support mechanisms are in place for those who feel it necessary to use our facilities in this way, and our officers will also work with the Police on this matter as necessary.

The Court Road Multi-Storey Car Park toilets were closed to protect the public and to break the cycle of illegal activities at this location and we will review this position in the light of intelligence received from our Community Safety Team and the Police, as part of the work that is ongoing on our recently agreed Toilet Strategy.

In the same way, the Council previously had to close the public toilets in the Civic Offices for the same reason. Since forming the new Administration the Leader has taken the steps to re-open that toilet for public use, on the proviso that it will need to close if it again suffers from inappropriate use.

No.

Supplemental

Councillor Collins, referring to the Cabinet Member's comments that there had been discussions held, enquired if there was a possibility of arranging further patrols in the area utilising PCSOs to check local toilets.

The Cabinet Member, indicating that he had not been personally involved with specific discussions and given the issue of resources affecting the Police, thought it was unlikely that any approach from the Council would be met favourably. That said, he would ask and provide further information to the Member.

(vi) **Question from Councillor V.J. Bailey**

Will Cabinet provide an update on plans to improve transport links between the M4 and Cardiff Airport?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

You will be aware a detailed update on the current position with this project was provided to the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee at its meeting of 25th June, 2019. The views of that Committee as regards this report were also considered by Cabinet earlier today. I suggest that the papers are the best possible resource to give a full update as to the current position. They are available to all with an interest.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey, referring to the overwhelming evidence that journey times between J34 and the M4 could be improved without building a new road and by upgrading the existing infrastructure and noting the recent Welsh Government's decision to scrap plans for an M4 relief road, enquired if the Cabinet Member was prepared to follow suite and look again at the project and instead make a Dinas Powys bypass a top priority for the Administration.

The Cabinet Member indicated that he was not prepared to do so. It was his view that the purpose of conducting the WeITAG Study was to gather evidence upon which an informed decision could be made.

(vii) **Question from Councillor V.J. Bailey**

What discussions has the new Leader of the Council had with Ministers and officials at Welsh Government about the proposed incinerator in Barry Docks?

Reply from the Leader

As has been given in an earlier answer, this is ultimately a matter for Welsh Government. It is for this reason that I have met with the Minister and Deputy Minister and raised the issues with them at a face to face level. I have raised the

No.

matter with the local A.M. who is continuing to chase it too. The answers are consistent in that issue is being progressed by Welsh Government and a decision will be made at some time.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey, referring to the Cabinet Member's previous response to Councillor Dr. Johnson's question and given the seriousness of the issue, enquired if the Cabinet Member was prepared to speak to colleagues in Cardiff Bay to remind them that it was not acceptable to keep delaying a decision on the matter.

The Leader confirmed that he had written to the NRW and he had done so also as an Elected Member of the Council prior to becoming Leader and received the same response. He had also written to the then Minister and received a reply in December or January which in effect referred him to the same statement made by the Deputy Minister. However, since then, he had an opportunity to speak to the Minister who politely reminded the Leader that it was a matter for her to decide. He had also taken an opportunity to speak to the local AM who, as he understood it, was following the matter up. He had also made further enquiries the previous week and again he was still awaiting a response to that correspondence.

(viii) Question from Councillor V.J. Bailey

Does the Council Leader believe that the Welsh Labour Government's acquisition of Cardiff Airport for a reported £52 million represented value for money for taxpayers?

Reply from the Leader

Yes.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey, alluding the annual losses made by the Airport of more than £6m per year, enquired if the Cabinet regretted the lack of progress made by his colleagues in restoring Cardiff Airport to profitability and to private ownership.

The Leader presumed that Councillor Bailey was referring to the Assembly Member Daren Millar's statement that the Airport was overvalued, under-performing and to be a vanity project. The Leader corrected Councillor Bailey's assumption and referred him to the Wales Audit Office's report which found no fault in the manner in which Welsh Government negotiated the purchase price for the Airport, taking account of a number of factors. As he understood it, presently the airport was in a positive position with passenger figures growing, new routes coming on line including Qatar Airways and consequently this it was the right decision by Welsh Government to acquire it.

No.

(ix) **Question from Councillor V.J. Bailey**

Does the Leader share the concerns of White Farm residents over the poor state of infrastructure on the estate, and what reassurances can he provide them that the Council will continue to press Persimmon to make the improvements necessary so that the Council can adopt White Farm at the earliest opportunity?

Reply from the Leader

Yes I do think they have had a bad deal and yes I will.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey enquired if there were any other options open to the Council to ensure that the developer met their responsibility under the application approved by the Planning Committee.

Referring to any action that could be taken was dependent upon planning regulations and the conditions attached to the planning permission. The Leader was well aware that there had been many meetings over the previous 18 months and as far as he was concerned, the Council would continue to do so taking account of the conditions attached to the planning permission and he would do his best to move the matter forward.

(x) **Question from Councillor A.R.T. Davies**

Will the Cabinet Member please make a statement in relation to the Council's grass verge cutting policy across the Vale?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Yes we will continue to cut the grass.

Supplemental

Councillor Davies, referring to the current hazard in rural lanes and in particular cyclist road safety, enquired if the Cabinet Member could confirm that he and officers would make an assessment of the more narrow lanes in the rural Vale which warranted more maintenance.

Referring to the environmental and ecological arguments which the Council had to balance with the view to protecting nesting birds, the timing of which was quite critical, the Cabinet Member indicated that there was only one scheduled cut of non-strategic routes following the bird nesting period.

No.

(xi) **Question from Councillor A.R.T. Davies**

Will the Cabinet Member please make a statement on how the Council plans to deal with any planning application that may come forward in relation to Model Farm and land adjacent to Porthkerry Park?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services

As with all planning applications, any planning application for this site, should one be submitted will be determined following careful consideration of all material planning factors and having regard to the views and opinions of a range of consultees. As the Councillor will know decisions are delegated to the Planning Committee.

While the Council is not currently considering any planning application for the land identified, it is aware that a formal pre-application consultation has been undertaken by the lands owners, Legal and General.

Should a planning application be received, it will be assessed against relevant National policies and guidance including Planning Policy Wales and policies contained within the Council's Local Development Plan, as well as any other relevant material considerations. As part of planning process the Council will of course carry out a consultation exercise with relevant statutory consultees and will notify nearby residents in accordance with the Planning Act.

Supplemental

Councillor Davies, referring to the potential for an application to come before Council and being aware that the application site sat within the LDP and associated strategic development relating to the airport with the Council itself having retained land there, enquired of the Cabinet Member if subject to any future planning application being approved, would unlock the Council's own land and if any proposals were forthcoming to develop the site, this would be subject to a comprehensive transport survey and transport impact assessment.

The Cabinet Member reminded Councillor Davies that the matters he referred to were subject to the planning application process and any matters of development would be a consideration by the Planning Committee taking account of a number of factors.

(xii) **Question from Councillor A.R.T. Davies**

Will the Cabinet Member please make a statement in relation to the Council's management of the old quarry site at Rhoose Point?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services

The Council manages this area as informal public open space with significant emphasis on its ecology, hence the area is not intensively maintained.

No.

Supplemental

Making reference to some years previous to a tragedy resulting from a death from “tombstoning” on the site which was still continuing, Councillor Davies enquired if the Cabinet Member would commit officers, who he was aware were currently working with residents within the community, to assist in developing a comprehensive plan to ensure the site was put to better use as a leisure site.

The Cabinet Member, referring to his awareness of meetings that had been held with residents and other parties regarding their concerns about breaches in bye-laws, reminded Councillor Davies that the Head of Neighbourhood Services and Transport had provided him with a detailed schedule of planned enforcement activities to be undertaken by Council employees during the period 19th July, 2019 to 2nd September, 2019. Officers would continue to use their best endeavours to enforce the bye-laws. In addition, work was currently taking place on a new enforcement policy with the view to improving bye-law enforcement capabilities for 2020 and beyond and enforcement activities would be taken back in-house at the end of the current financial year. This would provide additional enforcement capacity and would provide greater flexibility enabling the Council to prioritise the allocation of staff towards the areas of greatest need.

(xiii) **Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll**

Will the Leader please make a statement on the support the Council provides to reduce staff sickness absences within the Authority?

Reply from the Leader

Along it seems to me with the many questions tonight, we keep being asked to make a statement and not answer a question, so I’ll make a statement in relation to staff sickness absences. All the information you need to know is in our Management of Attendance Policy available on the website.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll, alluding to the full time equivalent days lost in 2019 within the Council, which was below the Local Government average but higher than the public sector average of 8.4 and more than double the private sector average of 4.4, asked the Leader what action the Council would be taking to further reduce the number of full time equivalent days lost to sickness absence.

Referring to his awareness that Councillor Carroll was a Member of the relevant Committee that received such information, the Leader referred Councillor Carroll to a report that had been considered by Cabinet earlier in the day. He also pointed out that comparisons used to assess information often varied from one organisation to the other. Alluding to the various support mechanisms the Council had in place to support staff during periods of sickness absence, indicated that the Council would continue to do so in order to support staff. The Council’s sickness absence was also below the average for other Welsh Local Authorities.

No.

(xiv) **Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll**

Will the Leader please confirm how much the Council plans to spend on external consultancy services within the current financial year?

Reply from the Leader

You will be aware that this Council only uses external consultants where we require expert professional advice that we do not have available to use internally.

The current level of spend in the current financial year is £73,000. As this spend is determined by issues that arise in the year, it is not possible to predict likely spend for the rest of this financial year.

Supplemental

Referring to recent Capita reports on proposed car parking charges, Councillor Carroll asked the Leader what action he would be taking to ensure the Council received a good service and value for money out of the expert consultancy services that the Council used.

Referring to the fact that the use of external services were historically always scrutinised, the Leader accepted that on occasions there was a need to use external consultants such as Capita. The spend in previous years for comparison purposes was in 2017/2018 £230,141 and £147,728 in 2018/2019. During the current financial year to date, the figure was £73,000.

(xv) **Question from Councillor S.J. Griffiths**

What discussions has the new Council Leader had with the Welsh Government regarding funding for the Vale of Glamorgan Council?

Reply from the Leader

I have taken the time since becoming Leader to appreciate the current and future issues for the Council, which we should all be aware of and which obviously includes the financial position. I am now in a position to engage to have informed discussions and, to that end, I can confirm that the Minister for Finance and Trefnydd is visiting the Vale in August to discuss issues regarding the budget together with the priorities and concerns that the Council has going forward.

Supplemental

Councillor Griffiths, referring to the cut in the Council's budget for 2019/20 and being under no doubt it would be the same in the next financial year, asked the Leader if he agreed that a fairer funding settlement for the Council was one of the top priorities

No.

for his Administration and that he would lobby Welsh Government for a fairer mechanism for Council funding.

The Leader indicated that he was indeed looking at the funding levels for the Council and acknowledged that there were also issues regarding the level of funding for Local Government in Wales generally which had to be considered. He was currently working with WLGA colleagues and other Leaders across Wales to agree key messages to relay to the Welsh Government regarding pressures on services across Local Authorities in the current year and for coming years. He would also continue to talk to colleagues through the WLGA Financial Panel who met regularly to continue to press home the matter and he would be talking to Ministers wherever possible to press home the issue.

(xvi) **Question from Councillor Mrs. J.E. Charles**

Does the Cabinet Member agree that CCTV in Holton Road is a vital asset in Crime prevention and detection?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services

I agree.

Supplemental

Councillor Charles, alluding to CCTV being a vital tool in the prevention and prosecution of crime, sought an assurance that there would not be a reduction in CCTV coverage in Barry.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to advise that Cabinet had recently allocated £350k to replace the CCTV system with a modern digital HD system and to that end a project team was already set up to design the new system. He also indicated that the Council would be engaging with the Police to how best to manage the CCTV in the future, with the aim of having the most effective system and the best way of accessing crime data.

(xvii) **Question from Councillor Mrs. J.E. Charles**

Will the Cabinet Member confirm the number of agency / temporary workers currently working in the Social Services Department and the current number of staff vacancies in the department?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health

My answer is still correct. As of today the number of agency workers working within the Social Services Directorate is 28.4 (FTE).

The number of staff vacancies is 27.6 (FTE).

No.

This represents a Social Services vacancy rate of 6.6% versus a Council wide (excluding schools) rate of 10.5%.

Supplemental

Being aware that the Directorate was facing serious challenges, including her awareness of proposals to close the Sam Davies Ward and noting the level of agency staff employed and the high number of vacancies, Councillor Charles asked if the Cabinet Member was prepared to commit to a review of current staffing arrangements and separately lobby Welsh Government not to close the Sam Davies Ward.

The Cabinet Member, indicating that he was prepared to respond to the supplementary question on staffing issues as it related to the original question, indicated that he would continue to make sure that officers ensured that the Directorate full time establishment of employees was adequate and pointed out that there was always a necessity for agency staff to be engaged due to the award of grant funding. Where vacancies have been proved difficult to appoint to, the Directorate continued to work with corporate colleagues to improve its advertising and to review the terms and conditions of other roles.

(xviii) Question from Councillor Mrs. J.E. Charles

Vulnerable patients continue to face long waits for discharge exacerbating the so called issue of bed blocking and harming patient welfare. What steps are being taken by Social Services in conjunction with the local Health Board to speed this up and unblock the system?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health

Clearly staying in hospital any longer than is medically necessary is frustrating for the patient and their families.

However it is widely acknowledged that the figures for Delayed Transfers of Care (known as DToCs) are much improved within the region when compared with previous years.

The total number of DToCs for June 2019 is 10% lower than the same period last year, and at a recent meeting, the Health Minister acknowledged that DToCs in the Cardiff and Vale region are less problematic than the remainder of Wales and that this region has made significant progress in this area.

Overall our responses to support patients requiring discharge remain good, with our social work assessments being completed in a timely and strengths based manner.

However, the Vale of Glamorgan Council has issues with the capacity of the domiciliary care market, in particular in the Western Vale, and with our internal brokerage service. This is the primary reason for the DToC figures we have for Vale residents in the past year.

No.

I am very pleased we have managed to secure funding from the Integrated Care Fund to develop an innovative solution to this particular issue that we are facing in the Western Vale. You will of course be aware that I took a report on the commissioning of this new development to Cabinet this morning.

Supplemental

Councillor Charles, referring to affects of bed blocking, enquired if the Cabinet Member had an opportunity to speak to the Leader seeking him to raise the issue with the Welsh Government Health Minister to ensure that the matter was maintained high on the Welsh Government agenda.

The Cabinet Member indicated that he himself had held meetings with the Welsh Government Health Minister on the matter, in particular discussing the subject of how arrangements were deployed to support health and social care issues. Alluding to the Regional Partnership Board who were working to reduce DToCs where possible and the relevant teams had responded in order to address this through the continued attendance at weekly DToC meetings with the Head of Integrated Care, continued attendance at monthly Get Me Home workstream meetings, secure additional funding by ICF slippage to pay for agency staff to support the brokerage function within the Council, held workshops with all practitioners to revise processes in order to ensure efficient processes were in place to reduce the administrative burden, ongoing discussions with domiciliary care providers regarding the issues they had in operating in the current market and providing solutions and support where possible, and additional grant investment in the Reablement Services to increase capacity and trial new ways of working to reduce the time individuals were in hospital, or prevent them from being admitted.

He suggested that it was not just about talking about the issues, but actually fixing the issue and working together to do so.

(xix) **Question from Councillor G.C. Kemp**

Does the Leader condone the expressed intentions of The Vale Independents to retain their seats rather than resign and stand in a by election?

Reply from the Leader

That is a matter that should be addressed to the Councillors in question rather than myself. But this is not a unique issue.

Supplemental

Referring the Leader to his comments made to the media in 2010 regarding former Councillor Richard Bertin who had then resigned as a Labour Councillor to become an independent Councillor, asked the Leader if his position was still the same as it seemed to him that the Leader was now contradicting that principle.

No.

The Leader, being more than happy to answer the question, reminded Councillor Kemp that he did not ask Councillor Bertin to resign, he had merely asked him to consider his position. He also referred Councillor Kemp to historical resignations that had taken place over previous years with Members leaving political groups to become independent Members. Therefore, it was not something new and on every occasion there had not been a by-election. As far as he was concerned, it was a matter for the individual to decide and his position on that had not changed.

(xx) **Question from Councillor A.R.T. Davies**

Will the Cabinet Member please make a statement on the roadworks currently being undertaken at Weycock Cross junction?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

In commenting on the statement made and in guessing it was a device to ask another question, the cabinet Member advised that the works being undertaken at Weycock Cross junction were primarily associated with the essential highway improvements necessary to complete the ongoing Five Mile Lane project which aimed to improve safety along the existing A4226 (Five Mile Lane) road between the A48, Sycamore Cross junction and Weycock Cross in Barry.

Supplemental

Councillor Davies sought confirmation if the works were on track for completion by September 2019.

Unable to provide an assurance as he was not in the position to do so given that the matters currently affecting the delays related to Dwr Cymu Welsh Water and Western Power Distribution, the Cabinet Member indicated that the works being undertaken by the Council would be.

(xxi) **Question from Councillor L.O. Rowlands**

Will the new Administration review the decision to remove Penarth's Victorian street lights, recognising the importance of heritage to the local environment?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Yes and I have.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands called upon the Cabinet Member to commit to preserving the cast iron lamp posts.

Councillor King reminded Councillor Rowlands that the structures had been removed as they were dangerous.