

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a remote meeting held on 20th September, 2021.

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

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

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

356 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business being transacted, the Mayor read the following statement:

“May I remind everyone present that the meeting will be live streamed as well as recorded via the internet and this recording archived for future viewing”.

357 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors Andrew R.T. Davies, Anthony Hampton, Dr. Ian Johnson and Marguerita Wright.

358 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

There were no declarations received.

359 MINUTES –

(1) T H A T the minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 10th May, 2021 be approved as a correct record.

(2) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 26th July, 2021 be approved as a correct record, subject to the note at the bottom of page 53 being deleted due to an admin error.

Councillor Vince Driscoll, with the permission of the Mayor, made a retrospective personal and prejudicial declaration of interest in respect of Minute No. 290 of the minutes of the meeting of 26th July, 2021 in that he was at the time a Director of the company that owned 50 Holton Road, Barry and one of the tenants had applied for a Pavement Licence.

360 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

(i) The Mayor made the following announcements:

The Mayor took the opportunity to advise that since the last meeting she had undertaken a number of duties as follows:

- signing of the Diverse Council's Declaration with the Deputy Mayor, the Leader and Managing Director
- attended a 100th birthday celebration in Barry
- attended a walking group event in Llantwit Major
- attended a Royal Airforce Association presentation evening
- an Emergency Services Day visit and photoshoot
- Merchant Navy flag raising event at the Civic Offices and
- having attended a virtual opening ceremony of the Bellavista Nursing Home a few months prior actually visited with residents of the nursing home on Monday, 6th September, 2021.

(ii) The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration made the following announcement:

The UK Go Awards reflected the best in public procurement, and as Cabinet Member she was delighted to inform Council that following their success in the Wales Go awards the Council's 21st Century Schools team had triumphed on the UK stage for delivering Social Value such as employment opportunities, community and environmental activities and contracts for local businesses.

This was a richly deserved award for a team that had gone far above and beyond in delivering the £136million 21st Century Schools programme, often trebling even their own ambitious Community Benefits targets. In just over two years 82% of the construction spend had been in Wales 85% of the workforce was from Wales, 48% from the postcode, 154 new full-time jobs had been created, 86 apprenticeships and 99% of waste had been diverted from landfill and 47 community initiatives had been supported.

In congratulating the team the Deputy Leader also thanked the Council's partners ISG, Bouygues, Morgan Sindall and Aecom for their support and commitment to the Council's ambitious goals.

(iii) Councillor Gwyn John, with permission to speak, took the opportunity to thank all Members and Officers for their messages and condolences on the passing of his wife, Gloria.

361 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION (MD) -

The Leader sought Council approval as referred to within the report to amend the Council's Constitution in regard to the following:

- To broaden the Terms of Reference of the Senior Management Appointment Committee to provide delegated authority to appoint more than one Lay Member on the Governance and Audit Committee when the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 comes into force on 5th May, 2022; and
- To amend as at 5th May, 2022 Sections 9 and 13 of the Council's Constitution to reflect the requirements at S116-S118 of the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 so that it referred to the Committee composition being two thirds Members and one third lay members and that the Committee must be Chaired by a lay member and that the Vice-Chair must not be a member of the Executive (Cabinet) or an assistant to the Executive.

Following discussions with the Head of Regional Internal Audit Services relating to the recruitment / appointment process for Lay Members to the Governance and Audit Committee, it was necessary to add an additional recommendation relating to the future Composition of the Committee which had been circulated as supplementary information prior to the meeting.

The Leader advised that this was also necessary due to the timing of the above appointment process which the WLGA recommended all Councils across Wales to commence from early October 2021.

The supplementary information that had been forwarded prior to the meeting detailed a further recommendation relating to the composition of the Committee to reflect the legislative requirements of two thirds (Elected Members), one third (Lay Member) split. It being noted that the current composition of the Committee was a 7/1 split. In light of the required impending recruitment exercise, the Leader proposed that the future composition of the Committee be amended to 6 Elected Members and 3 Lay Members to take effect from the Annual Meeting in May 2022 due to the fact the Committee could not lawfully meet post May 2022 unless one third of its membership were Lay Members. These proposals the Leader stated, would have no effect on the current political balance calculations/ entitlements to the respective Groups until May 2022.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T it be agreed that the Terms of Reference of the Senior Management Appointment Committee be amended to reflect the requirement to

appoint more than one Lay Member on the Audit and Governance Committee with effect from 5th May, 2022, and Section 13 of the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.

(2) T H A T Section 9 and Section 13 (Governance and Audit Committee) of the Council's Constitution and the Terms of Reference of the Governance and Audit Committee be amended to reflect the requirements of Sections 116-118 of the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 to provide for the following from 5th May, 2022:

- The Committee Chair must be a lay person;
- The Vice-Chair must not be a member of the Council's Executive or an assistant to its Executive;
- The composition of the Committee must be two thirds Members and one third Lay Members.

(3) T H A T the future composition of the Governance and Audit Committee be amended to 6 Elected Members and 3 Lay Members to take effect from the Annual Meeting May 2022.

Reasons for decisions

(1) The Local Government and Election (Wales) Act 2021, Section 116 requires the composition of the Governance and Audit Committee to be two thirds and one third Members and Lay Members from 5th May, 2022 and in order for the recruitment exercise of Lay Members to be undertaken.

(2) To comply with the requirements of Sections 116-118 of the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021.

(3) To comply with Part 6 Chapter 2 "Governance & Audit Committees: Membership and Proceedings", Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 by ensuring that the membership of the Governance and Audit Committee shall consist of one third Lay Members.

362 VALE OF GLAMORGAN ANNUAL REPORT (IMPROVEMENT PLAN PART II) 2020/21 (REF) –

The Leader advised that the draft Vale of Glamorgan Annual Report outlined the Council's progress toward achieving its wellbeing improvement objectives. The Leader further advised that the reference from Cabinet that had not been available at the time of the agenda despatch had been sent to all Members prior to the meeting and uploaded to the Council's website. The Annual Report had not been referred to all Scrutiny Committee due to the legislative timetable requirements and was being reported to Full Council for consideration and determination. The Leader highlighted that the report drew attention to the fact that the Council identified an Amber status in his view was reasonable in light of the Covid-19 pandemic.

In conclusion, the Leader took the opportunity to thank staff at all levels of the organisation for the tremendous work undertaken to date as outlined within the report.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the draft Vale of Glamorgan Annual Report (Improvement Plan Part II) 2020/21 (Appendix A to the report) be approved.

(2) T H A T the proposed timetable for producing and publishing the Council's first self-assessment under the new performance provisions outlined in the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 (paragraph 2.22-2.38 of the report) be approved.

Reasons for decisions

(1) To ensure the Council fully discharges its duties under both the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009 to publish an annual review of Council performance against its Well-being (Improvement) Objectives by 31st October as per the statutory timetable.

(2) To ensure the Council met its duty to produce and publish an annual self-assessment report relating to the previous financial year in line with the requirements of the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021.

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

The following responses to Member questions as contained within the agenda were presented:

(i) **Question from Councillor R. Nugent-Finn**

Can the Member please tell me, in terms of preparation and facilitation, of where our Education across the Vale of Glamorgan is regarding the introduction of life saving skills into the curriculum and how many of our schools have access to defibrillators and training for all?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

St. John Ambulance Cymru currently provided training in schools across Wales, giving children the confidence and knowledge, they need to save a life. Pupils could participate either via a school visit providing a 2-hour First Aid Awareness or Public Access Defibrillator Awareness sessions, or through demonstrations during assemblies.

Schools could also participate in the Young Lifesavers Award Scheme and receive teaching resources and information about first aid and its place in the curriculum, enabling staff deliver sessions themselves

Representatives from the regional educational consortia had met with St. John Ambulance Cymru, British Red Cross and British Heart Foundation Cymru to hear about the resources they had on offer to schools. Discussions focused on the Curriculum for Wales and the way in which their organisations could carefully align their work to the statements of what matter and four purposes.

Following a press release earlier in the year, the Cabinet Member was anticipating a revision to the recommendations within the Curriculum for Wales, with all schools in Wales being now required to teach lifesaving skills and first aid under the nation's new curriculum, however, specific details were still awaited about this.

The NHS 111 Wales service provided a comprehensive list of where defibrillators could be found across communities, including a number of schools within the Vale. More details could be found on 111.wales.nhs.uk/.

Supplemental

Councillor Nugent-Finn enquired as to whether the Council would be taking up the offer from St John Ambulance and embedding it in the school curriculum. The Cabinet Member in response advised that there had been a press release from Welsh Government on the matter, but no further details had been received as soon as they had the information it would be made public.

(ii) Question from Councillor R. Nugent-Finn

I understand that the Welsh Government have ordered 30,000 carbon dioxide sensors for schools across Wales to ensure adequate ventilation in classrooms with the aim of reduction of transmission of Covid. When are our schools going to receive them and what as a Local Authority are we doing to ensure they are going to be in our classrooms across the Vale?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

All schools in the Vale had undertaken comprehensive risk assessments, with the support of the Council's Health and Safety team, to mitigate the risk of COVID-19 transmission as far as possible. Risk assessments would continue to evolve as situations changed, and new practices, safety protocols and technologies would be deployed based on the scientific advice and guidance the Council received from Welsh Government.

The Council had been advised that additional carbon dioxide monitors had been procured by Welsh Government and that these were expected to be delivered to Local Authorities during October for onward distribution to schools.

Supplemental

Councillor Nugent-Finn asked what the Council's preparations and impact would be. The Cabinet Member reiterated that all the schools had undertaken risk assessments throughout the pandemic including ventilating buildings and that it would be helpful as winter nears that the carbon monitors are received.

(iii) Question from Councillor R. Nugent-Finn

Can the Member please update me on the revision of the current 'brown signage' policy for hospitality across the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Cabinet Member in response advised that the Brown Tourist sign Policy was currently being reviewed by the Highways and Tourism Teams. A report on a revised Policy was to be considered by Cabinet shortly. The Cabinet Member further advised that he would be happy to advise Councillor Nugent-Finn of the likely date in due course, but that it was imminent.

Supplemental

Councillor Nugent-Finn sought clarity on the difference between arranging new signage for car parking as opposed to hospitality. The Cabinet Member considered this to be an interesting question advising that a review was about to be undertaken and he would ensure that matter was addressed in due course.

(iv) Question from Councillor R. Nugent-Finn

Can you detail the exact plans the Vale of Glamorgan Local Authority has set out in response to Afghanistan evacuation, the availability of appropriate housing, the identification of vacant properties, contingency accommodation planning, Afghan Citizens Resettlement programmes, interpreters, the potential impact on the existing families and individuals currently on the Housing crisis waiting list and how the member will respond and support our Armed Forces Personnel returning to Wales in terms of housing demand, physical and mental health support and resettlement in the civilian life?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Housing and Building Services

The Vale of Glamorgan Council had pledged to provide accommodation and support to two families in the immediate aftermath of the Afghan crisis.

This was a highly complex and rapidly evolving situation and the Authority had responded by working with its local and regional partners to plan for the needs of families which would require immediate access to housing, health care and specialised planning and support.

The Authority already had a contract in place with Taff Housing Association to deliver essential integration support through a team of highly experienced case workers, which includes the provision of translation and interpreters where required so people could communicate when needed.

The Cabinet Member advised that Members would be aware and understand the intense pressures on the social housing market in the Vale of Glamorgan to mitigate the impact on receiving communities, the Council was in discussions with landlords to identify affordable private rented accommodation, including some which had come forward in response to the Leader's recent appeal on Bro Radio. There was clearly a process to follow to ensure accommodation offered was suitable for vulnerable families and appropriate to their specific needs, but there had been positive progress and several leads were currently being explored which the Cabinet Member anticipated would be offered to the Home Office in the coming weeks.

The Council would of course ensure that any returning Armed Forces Personnel that required assistance from the Authority were given the support they needed, in line with the Council's commitments under the Armed Forces Covenant.

Supplemental

Councillor Nugent-Finn enquired as to how many families were involved with the Cabinet Member advising two families.

(v) Question from Councillor J.E. Charles

What action is the Council taking to mitigate any potential impacts of contaminated land during the construction of the new Ysgol Sant Baruc at Barry Waterfront?

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

The works to the new school development were managed by the Barry Waterfront Consortium appointed Project Managers Whitehead Allen who were working with the Vale of Glamorgan Council. The Consortium Team had appointed the contractor Galliford Try to construct the new school development.

Remediation works were planned on the School site and would comprise placing 600mm of clean cover (450mm subsoil and 150mm topsoil) on the grass sports pitches. Testing would be undertaken of the clean cover material once it was imported and placed, and a verification report would be sent to the Council to discharge the enabling works planning condition relating to the remedial works.

The Council would also undertake waste acceptance criteria testing on the remainder of the site, including the school building, car park, hard standing areas, and multi-use games areas, after completion of enabling works and prior to handover to Galliford Try.

Supplemental

Councillor Charles asked the Cabinet Member to provide an assurance that the work on the land would be safe and to provide all information as necessary to ensure all actions taken including the removal of the fill represented no risk to all involved and anyone who may be inadvertently exposed to any contamination.

In response the Cabinet Member advised that planning restrictions were placed on developers and that she would ensure that the level of detail would be made available to residents in the area. She considered that Councillor Charles' comments were inaccurate and to deliberately frighten local residents.

(vi) Question from Councillor J.E. Charles

Will the Cabinet Member please provide an update on the rollout of residents' only parking permits, confirm the number of permit applications that have been received to date and the number of applications that are yet to be processed?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Resident only parking schemes were in place at Barry Island, the Knap, Cosmeston, Ogmere by Sea and Cowbridge. As at 14th September, 2021:

- The overall percentage of properties requesting resident permits in the new residential zones was 81.19%.
- The number of new permits issued in the new permit zones was 2289 from 967 individual properties.
- The average number resident permits per household in the new permit zones was 2.37

As at 14th September 2021 there had been 8 requests outstanding on the Council's system awaiting further information from applicants.

Supplemental

Councillor Charles enquired as to what measures the Council had in place to gauge the productivity and performance of staff in dealing with permits for Country Parks and would the residents be reimbursed if necessary, for them to pay at meetings.

The Cabinet Member advised that Country Parks was the portfolio responsibility of another Cabinet Member but in regard to the matters raised in the original question, he considered over 2,000 permits to be a quick turnaround since implementation.

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

What support is the Council providing to sports clubs and public buildings to increase coverage and access to life saving defibrillators?

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

Defibrillators were located at all Vale of Glamorgan Leisure Centres. They were also installed at the main corporate office buildings, the Civic Offices, Docks Offices and the Alps, as well as various sites in the community

The Council was very supportive of efforts by local sports clubs and other organisations to locate defibrillators at more community locations where they could be accessed by members of the public at all times. To assist with this the Council would continue to pay for the installation costs at such locations as it had done in the past. The most recent example being at the Murchfield Community Centre in Dinas Powys where the device was located on an outside wall and could be accessed by all in an emergency.

Officers were currently investigating funding opportunities for community accessible defibrillators, in an attempt to further increase the network of devices available across the Vale of Glamorgan.

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

What target is the Council setting for the number of families and individuals from Afghanistan and other war-affected countries being rehoused and supported in the Vale in (a) 2021/22 and (b) 2022/23?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Housing and Building Services

(a) The Local Authority had pledged to provide accommodation and support to four refugee families in 2021/22, including two from the current UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS) and two from the current Afghan crisis (ARAP).

(b) The Authority would consult with local and regional stakeholders to determine its capacity to participate in the ongoing resettlement of refugees in 2022 / 2023 and would expect to make a pledge which was commensurate with the availability of resources, including affordable housing and school places.

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

What is the timetable for the development of the 2021-2036 Replacement Local Development Plan and how will it align with the regional Strategic Development Plan?

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

Rather than detail the timetable the Cabinet Member advised that he would draw Councillor Johnson's attention to the report to be considered by Cabinet on 27th September on the issue, which was to be published the following day after the Council meeting. Should Councillor Johnson have any questions following his reading of the report, the Cabinet advised he would be only too happy to answer them.

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

A number of buildings exist in towns such as Barry which play an important role in the development of local community, but are not considered sufficiently important by regulatory bodies to be 'listed'. What powers does the Council hold to ensure that such buildings are preserved for future generations, rather than demolished?

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

The Vale of Glamorgan Council adopted the 'County Treasures' list in 2007. The list included statutorily designated historic assets such as scheduled monuments and listed buildings as well as buildings which were recognised as being of local merit. The inclusion of locally listed buildings on the County Treasures list did not have any immediate effect in law and they were not currently subject to any additional planning controls over alteration or demolition.

The demolition of unlisted buildings and those outside Conservation Areas was permitted, in most cases, under Part 31 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended). Article 4 of the Order may be used to require an application for planning permission for the demolition of an unlisted building outside a conservation area. Compensation may be payable in respect of planning applications made within 12 months beginning on the date the direction took effect where those application were refused.

The Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan had a number of policies of relevance to protect locally listed buildings.

In addition, the Cabinet Member stated that they trusted that Councillor Johnson would agree that the Council had an excellent track record of reusing historic buildings in the Vale of Glamorgan. One needed to only look at the award winning schemes in relation to previously Council owned buildings such as the Pumhouse, the Hood Road Goods Shed and other key Council sites to recognise the role that the Council played in protecting its heritage.

(xi) Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll

Will the Cabinet Member please confirm the total amount of costs the Council occurred in 2019-20 defending appeals of planning decisions taken by the Authority?

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

The Council did not record the cost associated with officer time spent defending appeal decisions. In most cases appeals were dealt with by officers of the Council without the appointment of additional legal or other external expertise.

In the year 2019-20 the Council defended 26 appeals and won 23 (88%). During that year the Council received no 'award of costs' against it and more recently, in the year 2020-21 the Council defended 21 appeals against the refusal of planning permission and won 19 (90%) of these appeals and received no 'award of costs' against us. To date, in the year the Council had defended 15 appeals, won 12 (80%) with 'no award of costs' being received against the Council.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll asked the Cabinet Member to confirm how the matter was allowed to occur and what measures would be put in place in the future to ensure such errors didn't occur.

The Cabinet Member advised that the Council had not been in error or at fault but having sought advice from Counsel, and matters relating to case law that had not been known at the time (not only by the Council but all Local Authorities in Wales) a decision was made not to pursue the judicial review application.

(xii) Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll

Will the Cabinet Member please provide an update on when the planned consultation for residents' permit parking schemes for Spencer Drive, Lewis Road and the Dochdwy Estate in the Llandough ward is likely to take place?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Officers initially concentrated on introducing residential parking controls in areas either affected, by seasonal demand or the introduction of new off-street parking charges. There had been a significant workload associated with preparing the schemes, schedules and legal notices and the physical work on the ground and it was always planned to progress the Llandough scheme following the roll out in these initial areas.

The Council was currently monitoring the success of the roll out of residential parking schemes in the areas so that it could learn any lessons for Llandough. Whilst the Cabinet Member was unable to provide a specific date for the planned consultation for residents' permit parking schemes for Llandough at this time, he

hoped that a suitable scheme could be progressed, including the preparation of schedules and legal notices associated with the Traffic Regulation Orders to advertise the proposed Resident Parking Controls in early 2022. However, the timescale and the viability of any future scheme progression was very much dependent on the outcome of parking and traffic survey works that would be needed.

It was the Cabinet Member's understanding that senior Council officers had recently made contact with Councillor Carroll to arrange a meeting which he thought was scheduled for 7th October, 2021 to discuss the matter in more detail so that Councillor Carroll could be fully apprised of the situation.

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

Will the Leader please provide a ward by ward breakdown of the number of properties currently subject to enforcement action by the Council in relation to driveway access (dropped kerbs) in the Vale of Glamorgan?

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

To date no formal enforcement action had been taken against anybody and it was very much the wish to work with residents on achieving safe and properly constructed footway crossovers; should they wish to continue to cross the public footway after being issued with a letter indicating that no current permission was in place.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands enquired as to whether there were any plans to meet with the Community Group. The Leader in response advised that there were no plans to meet with community groups, as the matters related to personal circumstances, often financial, which could not be discussed in public and although it was not his portfolio area of responsibility advised that any individual affected by a decision who had concerns should get in touch with officers and or the relevant Cabinet Member to discuss matters on an individual, case by case basis.

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

Will the Leader please confirm the total revenues the Council expects to generate from dropped kerb enforcement action across the Vale of Glamorgan and on what the Authority plans to spend these monies?

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

The Leader stated that the matter was not about revenue but about doing the right thing and ensuring that the safety of all highway users was not compromised – whether this related to drivers or pedestrians who used footways.

Based on the number of applications received to date, the Council estimated the amount of income for 2021/22 to be in the region of £11k. The income would only partly contribute to the officers' time associated with the issuing of the licences and monitoring and repeated that it was about ensuring the safety of all highway users. It was also important to note that there was a current budget shortfall in Neighbourhood Services and Transport of some £1.25m.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands commented why it was taking so long to enforce. The Leader stated that it was important to work with residents to achieve safe and properly constructed crossovers and advised residents who had received a letter to speak to the relevant Council officers. The Leader concluded by advising that it was a legal requirement to ensure that public pedestrian crossovers used were safe and legal.

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

Will the Leader outline the total amount of officer time (in hours) has been spent since 2019 in relation to dropped kerb enforcement action across the Vale of Glamorgan?

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

The Council did not hold specific records of the number of hours of Officer time that had been spent on dropped kerb issues. The work was undertaken by a number of Inspectors in conjunction with the many other duties that they regularly undertook to ensure the highway was safe.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands enquired that given that this legislation was long standing why had enforcement not been taken earlier by the Council. In response the Leader advised that it was a legal requirement to ensure everyone complied with the law and safely for both themselves and pedestrians.

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

Will the Leader please provide an update on current and future planned transport projects throughout the Vale of Glamorgan?

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

The Leader in commenting that Councillor Rowlands was asking for an update on road safety schemes added that as the Council carried out numerous road safety improvements throughout the year he asked Councillor Rowlands to e-mail him with regard to a particular scheme and he would reply in writing.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands asked the Leader if the Council had made an application to the Department of Transport regarding a new station at St. Athan Railway. The Leader stated that he wasn't aware that an application had been made as yet but would provide a written response.

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

Will the Cabinet Member give an update on road safety schemes across the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Cabinet Member stated that the Council carried out numerous road safety improvements throughout the year and advised that if Councillor Rowlands could email him with a specific query he would respond in writing.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands asked what the Council was doing about the concerns of residents regarding the St Athan junction by the memorial. In response the Cabinet Member advised that the Council was alert to the issue, was monitoring the situation however funding was required.

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

Will the Cabinet Member give an update on school transport? Local parents have raised concerns about the reliability of some service and the lack of communication from the bus companies to schools.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Cabinet Member stated that as the Council contracted some 195 school transport services throughout the year asked Councillor Rowlands to email him with a specific issue and he would respond in writing.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands asked the Cabinet Member why bus companies were not informing schools when school buses were being cancelled. In response the Cabinet Member advised that the shortage of drivers was a widespread issue but that he would raise the issue of communication. The Leader also commented that COVID 19 had also hit operators significantly.

(xix) Question from Councillor L.O. Rowlands

Now that car parking charges have come to Vale as of September can the Cabinet Member give update on it?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Cabinet Member asked Councillor Rowlands to email a specific question to him and he would respond in writing.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands asked the Cabinet Member to confirm if the car parking charges were generating income. The Cabinet Member advised that he could not confirm at the moment but would in due course.

(xx) Question from Councillor L.O. Rowlands

Will the Cabinet Member for please provide an update on leisure facilities upgrades in Barry?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Arts and Culture

The Cabinet Member advised that upgrades were made to leisure facilities in Barry throughout the year and that if Councillor Rowlands had a specific query, he could email her and she would reply in writing.

Supplemental

Councillor Rowlands sought an update on what was being done to fix the issue of no hot water at the Colcot Sports Centre. In response the Cabinet Member advised that officers were in constant contact regarding issues at the centre and renovations were also being done there.

(xxi) Question from Councillor V.J. Bailey

In light of the recent spate of letters sent to some Vale residents, how did the Vale Council arrive at its chosen contractors to handle dropped kerbs, and is the Cabinet Member aware that some members of the public are receiving quotes

from the approved list only to have them hiked considerably a week or two later when they're not immediately accepted?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The approved contractor list had been reviewed by the team in May 2020. All contractors on the list had been contacted and asked if they wished to remain on the list. All the contractors had confirmed that they wished to remain on the list at that time and currently there were 17 such approved contractors.

The Cabinet Member was not aware of any contractors increasing prices if customers did not accept within an allocated time. However, if Councillor Bailey wished to receive a more detailed response, if he could provide further specific information on the matter by email the Cabinet Member agreed to respond on a case by case basis.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey asked the Cabinet Member if he would meet with residents to discuss enforcement to which the Cabinet Member replied he was unable to do so as the information was confidential and specific to the individual resident's circumstances.

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

What assessment has the Cabinet Member made of the impact that the dropped kerb enforcement notices will have on access in residential areas for its own refuse collections and – more importantly – emergency vehicles; if, as expected, a large number of residents find themselves unable to afford the very high cost of remedial works and instead opt to park on the road as advised?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

It was not for the Cabinet Member or officers to provide such an assessment of impact. Wilful obstruction of the highway was an offence and the individual could be fined by the Police if they prevented traffic from flowing freely. It was up to the driver of the vehicle to ensure that they parked in a safe manner which did not cause an obstruction.

However, and what was clear, was that it was not debatable that all crossovers should be provided in a regulated manner, to an acceptable standard so that pedestrian safety was not compromised and that the infrastructure was adequately maintained to a reasonable standard so that all highway users would be confident of their safety when using highways and footways. This he said was surely not up for debate.

Supplemental

Councillor Bailey asked the Cabinet Member if he would take responsibility if services could not get through. In response the Cabinet Member stated that it was not his responsibility, it was the responsibility of the owner of the vehicle. It was a matter for individuals and each confidential as a result. The Council was working tirelessly to assist each individual case and that was the reason no prosecutions had been brought to date.

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

Although the increase in wildflower beds and uncut grassed areas are a well-received help to nature in Barry, it appears that this year the streets were not treated for weeds. Some may consider this an extra benefit to nature but the growing of roots between the paving stones and braking up the concrete pavements is adding to decay in many areas. Will the pavement weeds be treated next year?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The pavements in Barry had been treated twice already during the year with a third treatment due early in 2022. In Barry the first treatment had taken place in May and the second treatment in July and weed control was planned again for the next financial year.

The Cabinet Member recognised that weed growth on highways across the Vale appeared unchecked in certain locations advising that the contractor was using a new form of treatment that reduced the use of herbicide by 80% when compared to the previous application method. Officers are currently reviewing the viability of this method and other possible weed treatment measures ahead of the contract renewal on 31st March, 2022.

364 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. R. Curtis**

Currently, pesticides and herbicides are sprayed in parks, playgrounds and other green spaces, road verges, pavements and around shopping centres, hospitals, and schools. Almost all of the pesticides used are weedkillers designed to do nothing more than keep places looking “neat and tidy”. These chemicals are linked to an array of health problems including cancer, asthma, and reproductive issues. Vulnerable groups such as children, pregnant mothers and the elderly are particularly at risk. Wildlife such as bees, birds and hedgehogs are increasingly seeking refuge in our towns and cities. However, the overuse of pesticides in urban areas is contaminating the natural resources that they depend upon. Our

pets can also be susceptible to pesticide poisoning. But urban pesticide use is unnecessary. There are many viable and cost-effective non-chemical alternatives available and more than 60 towns and cities across the UK have already taken action to end or significantly reduce their pesticide use. We welcome the council's recent decision to declare a nature emergency and in response to that declaration, we call on the Vale of Glamorgan Council to commit to ending its use of herbicides and pesticides within the next three years?

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

The Council currently treat weeds on its highways three times a year throughout the Vale of Glamorgan during April, July, and September and the contractors used street spraying machinery featuring "Weed-It" technology to deliver a targeted spray to the weed which reduced the amount of chemical needed by up to 80%. Nozzles were within an enclosed canopy and there was a very low risk of any form of drift to other land. Whilst some towns and cities were no longer using Glyphosate it remained the most widely used weed control chemical for Councils in the United Kingdom and had been approved in the EU for use until 15th December 2022.

The Council was the first and as far as the Cabinet Member was aware the first and still the only Council in Wales using the pesticide free "Foamstream" hot water and foam system to treat weeds in its feature and green flag parks. Unfortunately, it was more labour intensive and a lot slower and presently the system would not be suitable for highway/street weed control unless it was for very small areas.

Despite all the press coverage of the dangers possibly associated with glyphosate, it was a very well-regulated pesticide, and much less toxic to wildlife and the environment than many other compounds used daily. For instance, bleach, carpet cleaner, motor oil, air fresheners, oven cleaner, mould, and mildew killers, and many more household and garden consumer products were all much more harmful to both people and the environment, even when used correctly.

There were continual tests on all glyphosate products, and when used properly glyphosate was relatively safe. The Cabinet Member advised that it was inert once it came in contact with soil and was low in toxicity to fish and wildlife. It also binded tightly to soil, so it safeguarded groundwater if applied correctly.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council's current weed control contract was due for renewal in March next year and with the impending likelihood of further Glyphosate controls in 2022, and the concerns being widely expressed regarding the continued use of this chemical, officers would be looking at all available alternatives when putting together the specifications for the new weed control contract to operate from 1st April 2022.

(ii) Question from Mr. A. Miller

There have been many reports on social media of the Council citing "development" as a reason for removing the dumped boats in the old harbour. This in turn has created much speculation as to what development is planned for the old harbour. Could the Council clarify this?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration

The Cabinet Member advised that "you should not believe everything you read on social media." There were currently no plans for development at the Old Harbour. After repeated warnings to the boat owners it had been unfortunately necessary to remove two large illegally moored boats from the Old Harbour as they were an environmental risk and also posed a hazard to shipping, with one of them becoming detached from its mooring lines earlier in the year and being at risk of floating out to sea. At the same time, it had been considered prudent to remove the remaining wrecks that had blighted the Harbour for many years. It was hoped that this would demonstrate to others who may be contemplating dumping unseaworthy vessels in the Harbour that this would not be tolerated in future. The actions had been purely driven by the need to remove abandoned vessels from the harbour in the interests of safety, to protect the environment and to secure a general visual improvement on an important gateway to the island.

(iii) Question from Miss. J. Brunskill

The community of Barry have come together for many years to fight for the health of the town with the Aviva incinerator threatening to pollute our future generations. We have researched and pointed to the many mistakes made, to yourselves, Welsh Government and Natural Resources Wales since 2008. Our unqualified community, have been found to be correct, especially with the lack of EIA. We now find ourselves looking at planning law with no experience but much research. I understand that Regulation 3 of the Town and Country planning regulations 2016 states that there is "Prohibition on granting planning permission or subsequent consent without consideration of environmental information." Without an Environmental Impact Assessment, the incinerator cannot get planning permission for the many additions and the land to the North, as well as the 2015 application. This leads further into the sincere cooperation of the European Laws of an Environmental Impact Assessment which Welsh Government should be looking at. An Environmental Statement is in no way the same as an Environmental Impact Assessment due to the incinerator being already built. This should have been done before building began with companies possibly needing to make changes for Best Available Technology and best for the Environment. This makes the incinerator completely illegal. As a community, we have already researched what is legally required and already know that the Environmental Statement will be completely lacking legality without it having consideration of the many changes and the environmental problems from the use of the land to the north as well as the incinerator being already built. Surely it would be more expedient for the council to put a stop to operations and give the company advice to completely remove the dismal contraption already built and restart the whole process again

with the LEGAL Environmental Impact Assessment. The community have no wish for further air, noise and light pollution, alongside unnecessary greenhouse gases, whilst the legal process is being followed. Given that Aviva has already spent 200 million on their 3 incinerators, <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/.../legal-disputes-pose-threat>... with over £300 billion under their control, and the public paying the future subsidies, we have no reason to worry about their costs which will be peanuts to them but would make a huge difference to the health of the community. Why can't the Council push for a stop notice, temporary or otherwise, with Welsh Government, given that the Barry Community would be 100 percent behind our Council?

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

The Cabinet Member commenced by advising that there was a significant amount of information relating to the matter in the public domain and on the Council's website. The Planning Committee had authorised the service of a legal enforcement notice on the relevant parties at the Planning Committee on 1st September and the report presented to the Committee at that time fully explained the reasoning behind the approach and why enforcement action was recommended. The separate issue of the need or otherwise for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the subsequent Environmental Statement was with Welsh Government and would now be for them to resolve.

It should be noted that the requirement for an EIA was not upheld by the Welsh Government in 2015 when the Council considered the second application for this type of proposal. However, following a letter received in July 21 Welsh Government had now formally changed its opinion and would be resolving the matter directly with the applicants.

The current situation would continue to be monitored to ensure that the applicants had all necessary consents in place and any future action would be considered and if necessary, taken in accordance with the requirements of the relevant legislation.

(iv) **Question from Mr. S. Thorne**

Is it too close to forthcoming elections to have a vote of no confidence in this current VOG Administration?

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

The Council's Constitution at para 5.3.1 (d) addressed the issue of a 'vote of no confidence' which was subject to the time limit relating to Motions on Notice which could be found at para 4.19.1 of the Council's Constitution.

(v) Question from Miss D. Nicholls

When can permit parking be introduced in Glamorgan street? I have one car and continually get frustrated at not being able to park near my house.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Whilst the Council had no statutory responsibility to provide on-street parking, the Council was sympathetic to residential areas that might be adversely impacted by visitor numbers such as in resort or town centre areas and for this reason the new Resident Parking Controls Policy had been introduced in July 2020. Details of the new policy could be found on the Council's website or through enquiries to C1V.

Council officers were currently recording requests for resident only parking in various areas and the Cabinet Member confirmed that he would add Glamorgan Street to this list for future consideration. However, the Cabinet Member further advised that the waiting list was already extensive and given the limited budget available to implement such schemes it was not possible to provide a timescale when such a provision may be provided at Glamorgan Street.

The implementation of a Resident Permit parking scheme would not necessarily enable residents to always park within their street and would certainly not guarantee parking close to a specific household or property, given the general extent of car ownership on residential terraced streets and the limited length of kerbside parking available to accommodate such parking.

(vi) Question from Mr. P. Gibbs

On Friday 30th July 2021 the Vale Council declared a climate emergency which was agreed by the Full Council. You stated that "this would be put at the heart of all decision making" undertaken by the Council. In a recent report by a local reporter concerning a planning application in Bonvilston your Head of Regeneration and Planning is quoted as saying "The declaration of a climate emergency doesn't prevent future development, if it did, we would all be out of a job". He also stated "it's also important we don't use the blasé term "climate emergency" to dismiss all development". As a member of the Vale Community Unite Group can I firstly point out that Climate Emergency isn't a blasé term and is a well recorded fact. We would like to ask does the Council really believe in protecting the community from future major climate problems, if so, why is the planning department continually pushing to build on green spaces when brown field sites are available throughout the Vale and in doing so ignore residents objections giving priority to major developers?

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

The Climate emergency was fully recognised by the Council however, the Council's statutory role in the determination of planning applications means that it must consider all relevant material factors when determining proposals for

development, including a consideration of national and local policies, environmental factors, and the need for new housing. The process of assessment and balance prior to recommendation and determination was set out clearly in the Planning Acts and Regulations.

The fact that a Climate Emergency or a Nature Emergency had been declared did not override the need to consider development proposals that were submitted to the Council by applicants and developers. The Council had a duty to determine such applications and weigh up the acceptability or otherwise of each and every application having regard to a range of material considerations.

(vii) **Question from Mr. R. Brewer**

Why has a very small party, I think there was only 8 people have put planning permission forward regarding destroying model farm, Rhoose. They will be killing a working farm and the Greenland. But then on your twitter and Facebook pages you like to promote that you are protecting the environment. That can't be true as you want to destroy the environment all for money. I think L&G, yourselves are a disgrace to even let this go ahead. The impact it will have on traffic pollution, the roads to and from Rhoose can't cope with it at the moment. Even the road going into the village has more pot holes than Wookey Hole Caves. Please put a stop to this ASAP, there is more to life than money.

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

Referring to a response earlier in the agenda to Mrs Gibbs the Cabinet Member explained the Council had to consider all applications for planning permission that had been submitted to it for consideration.

In the case of the Model Farm development, as was the case with the vast majority of applications for planning permission, the Council was not the applicant and was also not the developer and merely determined the application that had been submitted to it by others.

In the case of Model Farm, the report presented to Planning Committee set out the reasons for the recommendation of approval being noted that the development also formed a key part of the Council's allocation of employment land in the Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan (LDP) 2011-2026. The LDP provided the local planning policy framework for the Vale of Glamorgan and had been adopted by the Council on 28th June 2017. All decisions were to be made in accordance with that Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

It was also important to note the matter relating to the Model Farm application had been subject to an application for a Judicial Review of the Council's decision and this was something that was currently being progressed through the Courts.

(viii) Question from Mrs. L. Rowe

When is Birdcage Walk going to be weeded and opened up again? There is just as much loose concrete on the section that is still in use. Also, the trees have all been cut down so there is no overhanging foliage remaining. It's very dangerous for people to cross the road at the end of Harbour Road, Miskin Street at the junction with Park Avenue as they have to step into the road.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Cabinet Member advised that he had responded to a similar question to the one posed at a Council meeting in July. Unfortunately, due to complicated legal issues involved the Council was not much further forward.

The Council was currently liaising with relevant parties and considering its legal position to determine how best to move forward. In the meantime, the Council was monitoring the situation and managing the necessary removal of vegetation which in some cases was potentially contributing to the structural issues and would prevent future repairs being carried out.

It was therefore necessary to keep Birdcage Walk closed for public safety until the issue of liability was resolved and an appropriate repair scheme implemented. Given this position, it was not possible to provide a timescale to reopen Birdcage Walk at this time.

Whilst other sections of the retaining wall along Broad Street showed some sign of deterioration, they were not adversely affected by additional loading from a private retaining structure above, as had been the case with the closed section. The adjacent footpath routes therefore remained open and safe to use with the adjoining retaining wall being monitored on a regular basis. A zebra crossing was available in the vicinity of the Barry Railway Station and two further zebra crossings were available at the top of Ship Hill and to the west of Miskin Street to assist pedestrians crossing the road in these areas. Whilst this may involve a slight detour and minor inconvenience to access Miskin Street from Harbour Road, it was necessary for public safety due to the above-mentioned structural issues along Birdcage Walk.

(ix) Question from Miss. G. Adams

Why have you granted planning permission for an "airport city" amidst a climate change emergency? Why have you submitted a traffic assessment based on mitigation of people cycling, walking, using public transport and 20% of people working remotely? How popular is your cycle path on the Five Mile Lane realistically?

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

The report presented to Planning Committee set out all the issues relating to the consideration of the application and as had been set out in earlier answers at the meeting. For clarity, the Traffic assessment had not been submitted by the Council, but rather the applicant, which was standard practice. It was the Council's role to determine applications and to assess all the information submitted.

Regarding the use of cycleways, a cycle counter had been placed on the shared use cycleway/footway running alongside the A4226, between Waycock Cross and the Hawking Centre, from 24th October to 30th October 2020. Over the course of the week surveyed, 167 cycle journeys had been made on the path which was relatively high usage for late October.

(x) Question from Mrs. L. Harfoot

Why after receiving a national outcry over food shortages, are farms all over Wales being sold off, and yet again land being turned into industrial use? How can you have a policy of bio diversity and yet destroy more land unnecessarily? Has the public support for farmers and our needs been pushed aside for profiteering companies such as Legal and General? The issue isn't a political one, it's an ethical one. This Council should resign, the Welsh Government should not support or condone your bias towards bending and completely breaking promises to the people of the Vale.

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

Although a number of the points raised were outside the control of the Council the Cabinet Member advised the Council was not responsible for the sale of farmland at or around the airport and that it was not Council land to sell off. However, any person or organisation was entitled to apply for planning permission to develop land and the Council had a legal duty to determine such applications. In considering applications the Council had to consider a range of relevant material considerations and reach a balanced judgement. The process was a complex one and as in most cases, there would be material considerations that supported the proposals whilst others would be of concern. That was why determining proposals for development, especially when those proposals were significant in scale was not always straightforward and why there were almost always conflicting opinions and views.

This hopefully explained the Council's role as an organisation that had to consider and make decisions on proposals. That consideration had also been explained in other answers to similar questions during the meeting and had regard to planning legislation and national and local policy. The report that was presented to the Planning Committee set out the wide range of issues for consideration in the particular case. The need to protect the environment and biodiversity was an important requirement and one that had to be considered and balanced against

other factors. The Cabinet Member did not therefore understand the comment about broken promises, given that the Council had a legal duty to consider proposals submitted to it. There was also lots of information in the Planning report to protect the environment and biodiversity.

(xi) **Question from Mr. M. Warner**

Can we get defibrillator at all sports venues around the Vale please, this is a life-saving machine?

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

Defibrillators are located at all Vale of Glamorgan Leisure Centres as well as various sites in the community.

The Council was very supportive of efforts by local sports clubs to locate defibrillators at more community venues where they could be accessed 24/7 by any persons in need. To assist with this, the Council would continue to pay for the installation costs at such locations as done in the past. The most recent example being at the Murchfield Community Centre in Dinas Powys where the device was located on an outside wall and is accessible by all in an emergency.

(xii) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby**

How much money does DS Properties (Goods Shed) Ltd owe the VoG?

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

The Goods Sheds development had resulted in a multi-million-pound private investment that had transformed the Goods Sheds and created many new jobs for the benefit of Barry and the Vale of Glamorgan during the past few years despite the enormous challenges of the pandemic. In accordance with Cabinet Minute C3416(2) (9th January 2017 Cabinet meeting) the Goods Sheds site was marketed and disposed of by the Council to DS Properties (Goods Sheds) Limited. The financial details of the sale contract were a commercially confidential matter.

A Welsh Government Targeted Regeneration (TRI) loan was provided to DS Properties (Goods Sheds) Limited towards the cost of the Goods Sheds project through the Council. The TRI loan matter was reported to Cabinet under Part II of the agenda on 7th January 2019, with the loan granted in accordance with a confidential report in accordance with Part II Cabinet Minute C545.

(xiii) Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)

The Vale website advised us that Merthyr Street would be closed for 1 or 2 weeks. Could the Council please explain why this road is still closed over a month later as traffic is being diverted through a very heavily congested street?

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

The temporary traffic management arrangements at Merthyr Street were required for Wales and West Utilities to undertake essential works to upgrade some 400m of gas main.

No road closure had been requested by their Contractor and works were to be undertaken between restricted hours of 09.00 – 15.00hrs, these hours had been relaxed over the summer holidays to maximise the working day for the Contractor in efforts to reduce the disruption to residents.

Highway Inspectors regularly attended the site and, following their visits, reported vehicles progressing through the works with no issues. The Inspectors would continue to regularly inspect the site to ensure that the terms and conditions of the works were adhered to

(xiv) Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)

Considering not only the increase of litter at parks and beaches but looking at the increase in street litter, will the Council be employing more street cleaners?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

There was no excuse for littering, and it was highly regrettable and frustrating that there had been some increase in litter and the amount of material placed in litter bins during the year, no doubt in part, due to increased visitor numbers at many of the attractions owing to the difficulty in accessing holidays abroad. The Council was however content that it had managed, in the main, to comply with its statutory duties in dealing with it, within existing resources and with the welcome support of voluntary groups like Beautiful Barry. There were no immediate plans to employ more street cleaners, rather there was a recognition that the Council's cleansing service would need to reconsider its priorities, as demands increased, and behaviours changed. In this regard officers were currently assessing the need for further educational programmes and improving engagement with various stakeholders, to help tackle the extremely anti-social practice.

(xv) Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)

With the extension of accommodation at the Goodsheds being applied for could the Council explain the financial arrangement between the developer, the Council and Newydd Housing Association?

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

Any financial arrangement between the developer and Newydd Housing Association was a commercially confidential matter for those the parties.

In terms of the Council, the Goods Sheds site was marketed and disposed of by virtue of a long lease to DS Properties (Goods Sheds) Limited in accordance with Cabinet Minute C3416(2) following the Cabinet meeting held on 9th January 2017. The financial arrangement of the land transaction was commercially confidential.

(xvi) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

Could the public please be updated with the Council's position regarding the Skate Park at the Knap, the required funding and time scale for completion?

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

The Council remained committed to providing quality skating opportunities across the whole of the Vale of Glamorgan including the skate park located at the Knap. The success of Great Britain in the Skateboarding events at the recent Olympics demonstrated that this was highly likely to be a growth Sport in future years.

An officer had recently met on site with the trustees of the Richard Taylor Memorial Fund and other interested parties to discuss the future of the park. At this meeting it was confirmed that all reasonable work necessary at the site for it to remain open would be undertaken whilst efforts were made to seek a permanent replacement for the facility.

The Richard Taylor Memorial fund trustees were keen to assist in raising funds for a new park and the Council would look to support these efforts, as it did previously, to hopefully enable a new park to be constructed in the future.

(xvii) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

The Buttrills Estate is classed as one of the most deprived areas of Barry. It has seen its play facilities diminish to the point that what has remained for the last ten years are a rusty tiny slide frame and two often out of use swings. Funding was provided for the park yet years on still no movement in its instalment. While a generation of children have grown up with no play facilities while waiting for it to be refurbished. Can you confirm its completion date?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The majority of the equipment at the play area had been installed in 1993, with a minor upgrade undertaken in 2004 when some new equipment was installed, and a carpet overlay added.

It was recognised that the equipment at the location was of an older design and refurbishment schemes were appraised and considered annually based on risk, usage, and the levels of funding available. The team would reevaluate the site on the next round of assessments, but the most recent inspection had allocated a low to medium risk rating for the site, which meant that other play area locations were in greater need of work than this particular site, the Knap Skate Park, for example.

Ideally, the Council would like to have a scheduled plan for replacement of all its play area equipment but regrettably it simply did not have sufficient capital funding for this.

(xviii) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

White Farm Valley has flourished into a Haven for Wildlife but the stream flowing down to the flood control system has been neglected since and prior to it becoming a public space. Can the Council work with Dwr Cymru and maybe invite Cardiff River Group to develop a plan to improve the stream area?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Unfortunately, the Council had limited resources to assist in developing a plan to improve the Cadoxton River corridor at this present time due to ongoing commitments to address flooding throughout the Vale. However, the Council would support and encourage any groups who had an interest and knowledge of such matters, including Cardiff River Group, to put forward viable and detailed proposals, together with an implementation plan to encourage wildlife and biodiversity in key watercourse corridors, such as that at White Farm Valley. The Council was always eager to work with any local groups that sought to enhance the environment of the Vale of Glamorgan.

(xix) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

Now that the boats have been removed, what plans do the Council have for the Old Harbour?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The main focus now for the Old Harbour in Barry was to allow nature to thrive in this area, free from the risks of environmental pollution caused by abandoned boats. The Cabinet Member expressed delight that the Council had taken the opportunity to remove the old wrecks from the harbour and been able to improve

safety and the appearance of the area whilst at the same time removing potential sources of pollution.

(xx) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

Does the Council consider an 8 week wait on the paid collection of bulky waste items to be acceptable, and does this not increase flytipping? How can you improve this paid for service?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

Demands for the bulky waste service could differ throughout the year with some demand peaks in certain locations but at present there was an average of 4-5 weeks wait for a service which was consistent with the Council's normal service standard.

The cost of the service was supported by the charge for collection, £20 for 3 items and £5 for additional items thereafter to a maximum of 5 items per collection (up to £30), but not fully covered.

Customers could also take their own items to either of the Council's two recycling centres located on Atlantic Trading Estate and Llandow, free of charge. Alternatively, there were options such as engaging a private registered company or a charity that collects equipment for reuse.

At present, like many other Councils, driver shortages were being experienced and the Council had limited numbers of the specialist vehicles required for the service. It was unlikely therefore that there would be an option to add additional resources to reduce waiting times at the moment, but this would be kept under review and considered should the future waiting times consistently be in excess of the Council's normal service standards.

(xxi) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

What can the Council do to ensure the safety of visitors, following on from the vehicles being driven on the prom and onto the beach recently?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Council was not aware of any risk to the public caused by the irresponsible act relating to the recent incident involving a car accessing the promenade through the barrier onto the beach. The issue had been promptly dealt with by the Police.

This barrier was open to allow access to the rear of the Western Shelter and for delivery vehicles to drop off to the various commercial premises located under the shelter and along the promenade.

Officers are reviewing the current access arrangements, but did not believe that the current arrangements, which had been in place for many years, was fundamentally unsafe. It was difficult to put measures in place to account for all types of behaviour and would not wish for any controls to be disproportionate to the issue in hand as this could be detrimental to the traders who regularly used the access.

(xxii) **Question from Mrs. G. Sims-Williams**

With respect, please explain how you declared a climate crisis and 100 acres of farmland/flower meadows are going to be concreted over in The Vale? Seriously, please explain, I do not understand the logic.

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

Assuming the question related to the Model Farm development, there had been a number of answers provided in the meeting to very similar points. In summary, when applications for new development were submitted, the Council had to consider the proposals having regard to all relevant material considerations.

The fact that a climate emergency had been declared did not mean that the Council could ignore its legal responsibility for determining proposals for new development. In the same way, the climate emergency declaration did not mean that all proposals for development should be automatically rejected. It was about considering proposals having regard to all relevant factors and was a balance.

(xxiii) **Question from Ms. A. Maidment**

Why are you going to destroy invaluable farmland and protect our wildlife pollution more road distance what is wrong with you people?

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

The Cabinet Member respectfully referred the questioner to his response to a similar question from Mrs. Sims-Williams earlier in the meeting.

(xxiv) **Question from Mrs. A. Reeves**

Why are you destroying Model Farm? It is full of wildlife and we should be protecting our environment not concreting it in, plenty of other places to build on but please save some green space for our children, the rate you are allowing planning we will not have any left, just so sad. I'm beginning to lose all faith in Barry Council, and I've lived here for 56 years.

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

The Cabinet Member again respectfully referred the questioner to a previous response to a similar question given in the meeting.

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

The graffiti on the many buildings in Barry, particularly in Holton Road, is a real eyesore. I understand from the last Council meeting that this was discussed, and it was decided that the culprit was not liable / required to clean his work. I understand that the responsibility was put back on to the affected businesses to carry out the cleaning, and that the Council would offer advice. However, many of the affected premises are empty. Can the Council update us on any progress in supporting the affected businesses? And what is the situation regarding the empty premises? Finally, can the public receive an explanation as to why the culprit is not involved in helping the clean-up of the buildings he has desecrated?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Council and Police continued to work with businesses on the issue of graffiti in the Holton Road area, both in the removal of it and security / preventative solutions going forward. Officers were in the process of identifying the owners of the empty properties in order to discuss the issues of graffiti. Discussions were also ongoing, and had been positive to date, with the Youth Offending Team and Probation Service with the aim of implementing a programme of work to assist in the removal of graffiti from private property.

Due to data protection rules relating to individual offenders the Cabinet Member was unable to answer questions relating to individuals.

(xxvi) **Question from Mrs. C. Ockerby (On Behalf of Beautiful Barry)**

It is very confusing trying to work out what date questions for Full Council need to be in by. Please can you clarify this and give a definitive date and time on the website and social media, and publicise this meeting to encourage more residents to ask questions?

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

Paragraph 3.2 of the Council's Constitution set out the various ways in which members of the public may get involved in Council business. This was further supported by paragraph 4.17 of the Council Constitution regarding 'Questions by the Public' at Full Council Meetings. Advice was available on the Council's Public Website which explained that questions by the public must be received at least 10 working days prior to the meeting.

By way of example, for this 20th September meeting, the deadline for questions had been midnight on Sunday, 5th September allowing 10 working days from Monday 6th – Friday 17th.

However, further consideration to the observations presented in the question would be given in line with the ongoing work associated with the public participation.

(xxvii) **Question from Mrs. J. Hartwell**

Will the Vale of Glamorgan seriously consider an Aire type provision for motorhomes on Barry Island? The top end of Nell's Point Car Park would be perfect. Many Councils throughout the UK are now reaping the benefits of such a provision as commonly seen throughout Europe. If managed well it provides steady income and brings tourists to the town. Barry Island would make an excellent destination and the suggested site would not interfere with anyone's view or enjoyment of their property. VOG please be forward thinking and consider this carefully. Please note this is not a campsite! Stays usually limited to 24/48/72 hours and provisions vary but the best have at least water supply, chemical waste and grey water disposal and EHU a big draw. Usually managed by CCTV and automatic pay machines and barriers or personnel. Let's move with the times in Barry and the Vale!

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport

The Council constantly kept under review the facilities and services it made available at all of its managed sites and all ideas aimed at improving the tourism offer at the Council's sites, including at Barry Island, were welcomed. The question was also currently particularly relevant in view of the rise in staycations.