THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Hybrid meeting held on 29th September, 2025.

The Council agenda is available here.

The meeting recording is available here.

Present: Councillor Naomi Marshallsea (Mayor), Councillors Anne Asbrey, Julie Aviet, Gareth Ball, Rhiannon Birch, Gillian Bruce, Ian Buckley, Lis Burnett, Samantha Campbell, George Carroll, Christine Cave, Charles Champion, Janice Charles, Millie Collins, Pamela Drake, Vincent Driscoll, Anthony Ernest, Robert Fisher, Christopher Franks, Wendy Gilligan, Russell Godfrey, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, William Hennessy, Nic Hodges, Mark Hooper, Catherine Iannucci-Williams, Gwyn John, Dr. Ian Johnson, Susan Lloyd-Selby, Belinda Loveluck-Edwards, Julie Lynch-Wilson, Kevin Mahoney, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Elliot Penn, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Carys Stallard, Neil Thomas, Rhys Thomas, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

336 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business of the Committee, 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”.

337 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors Bronwen Brooks, Marianne Cowpe, Stephen Haines, Sally Hanks and Steffan Wiliam.

338 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interests were received.

339 MINUTES –

RESOLVED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 14th July, 2025 be approved as a correct record.

340 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

The Mayor shared that they had had a busy few months and have attended numerous events they have been honoured to be invited to. These included visiting

Vale Plus, a charity supporting people with learning disabilities through a range of activities, where they were astounded by the care given by staff and encouraged people to visit a future plant sale.

Alongside this, they also attended and participated in a session of the Vale of Glamorgan Wheelchair Rugby Club, called the Rams, which was held at the Amelia Trust Farm, which consisted of both disabled and able-bodied athletes. They also attended a Dog Show held at Southerndown Cricket Club where there were asked to judge and passed on thanks to volunteers.

The Leader made an announcement surrounding Care Inspectorate Wales (CIW) recent review of the Community Resources Service, a partnership with Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (CVUHB) and wanted to pass on thanks and congratulations to all staff involved following a positive inspection, as they were extremely grateful for the work they undertook on behalf of residents.

The Chief Executive indicated that it was the last Full Council meeting for the Director of Environment and Housing, Miles Punter, who was due to retire in the winter following 43 years of service at the Council, with the last 13 years spent as Director. They shared that he had been a valued Director during tough periods, including the COVID-19 pandemic, and they had a significant history within the Council, starting his career in 1982 before becoming Head of Building Services in 2000. They reflected that he had a commitment to public service and the Vale of Glamorgan, with a motivation to succeed and build relationship with colleagues at all levels of the Council and beyond, including the Police and other emergency services through Local Resilience Forum work. They indicated that he was an exemplar for waste and recycling services and had provided advice and ideas to Welsh and National colleagues in this field. The Chief Executive closed wishing him a happy and healthy retirement.

The Director of Environment and Housing responded that they had been proud to work in this position and for the Council, and thanked all Members for their support over the last 42 years. They indicated that they felt that the Vale of Glamorgan Council was one of the best Councils in Wales, if not the UK, and that whilst there were lots of pressures, it was still a fantastic Council.

341 PUBLIC QUESTIONS –

The following questions were submitted in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 5th May, 2010.

(i) **Question from Mr. R. Curtis**

Does the Leader believe that placing a noisy and brightly coloured Aqua Park at Cosmeston Country Park, which is a designated Local Nature Reserve, conducive with the Vale of Glamorgan Council's own declaration of a 'Nature Emergency'?

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

The Aquapark activity was trialled at the country park from 5th July with the aim of testing the suitability of a small section of the Eastern Lake for this type of leisure use. The lake has often been used for water activities in the past including boating, paddle boarding and canoeing and it should be noted that the eastern lake was always envisioned to be used for active recreational purposes in the original plans for the Country Park dating back to the late 1970s.

This trial has also allowed the Council to explore new uses for our important green and blue spaces, which can promote sustainable tourism and well-being, support leisure activities and build upon the previous use of the lake for organised water activities and leisure purposes

Nature conservation and protecting biodiversity are of course very important to the Council which is why we declared a Nature Emergency and why any leisure use must support the future of the park, including rewilding and conservation work that is already underway.

The impact of any pilot activity on wildlife, noise, safety and security was also discussed by the Council's Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee when it considered this matter on 11th March. These points were considered as part of the agreement for a pilot activity in the summer and by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) as part of their separate consenting for an operation within a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

The wildlife and conservation interests of the Country Parks remain paramount to their operation and all ecology and conservation issues were monitored during the pilot and the report provided by the company's ecologist will now be considered by a separate independent ecologist as part of a full assessment. A report will then be presented to the Council's Cabinet for consideration regarding its success or otherwise.

(ii) **Question from Mrs. J. Doble**

I am a regular visitor to Cosmeston Country Park (not Aqua Park), I walk my dog both morning and evening during the past year there are regularly lots of people fishing in all areas around both ponds, some blatantly in broad day light. BBQs are then lit to cook the fish. What measures are being taken to stop this? There are no fishing, BBQs or swimming signs around the lake yet all 3 activities are taking place regularly. Nothing is sacred anymore, this place of calm and beauty is slowly being destroyed.

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

We have been experiencing many issues over recent years and staff are constantly informing members of the public that fires / BBQs, fishing and unsupervised swimming are not permitted onsite. I can confirm Incidents are regularly reported to

the emergency services, Safer Vale and the Council Enforcement Team who conduct routine patrols of the site. The Council holds regular meetings with emergency services to discuss ongoing issues and co-ordinate responses.

(iii) **Question from Mr. J. Ball**

There is clear opposition from local businesses and residents to many of the parking charges introduced in the Vale and the nature of them, with many reasonable counter points around timings, costs, local residency etc. Many people have indicated that the current charging structure will prevent them from using local businesses, a particular challenge in the off season. The Council gains revenue streams from both parking charges and local business rates. Has the Council produced a thorough impact study on the implementation of the current parking proposals, which models the likely combined revenue impacts, including likelihood scenarios for which businesses fail and units are unoccupied, leading to a false economy? If so, what are the findings? If not, why not and would it be prudent to do so before levelling charges?

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

Thank you for your question, Mr. Ball. I would firstly advise that the car park charges at Knap Terrace Car Park, Barry, Bron-Y-Mor, Barry and Penarth Cliff Top have only been on place since 1st September, 2025. I have noted some comments on social media alleging its negative impacts, but I would suggest it is far too early at this stage to draw any meaningful conclusions as regards impacts. Add to this the fact that the charging start date coincided with the end of the school holidays and a period of inclement weather.

I note your comments concerning local business and it is clearly the Council's position not to detrimentally affect local businesses in the vicinity. The Council's budgets are however under significant pressure from the ongoing challenges of providing education and social care services. The Council is quite rightly seeking to support its young people and the most vulnerable in our area with its budget allocations. The provision of 'off street' car parking is a non-statutory service that costs money to provide. Car parks are subject to the payment of national non-domestic rates and have maintenance liabilities. Therefore, considering the Council's many pressing service demands, difficult decisions needed to be made as regards the future of these car parks. Why in this case should all Council taxpayers fund the provision of these car parks, when a number may not drive or use them? Also, there is no payment contribution to their use by visitors to the Vale of Glamorgan if they remain free of charge. It is hoped that the introduction of charges will at least allow these car parks to be cost neutral in their operation. If there are any surplus funds, these will be used to provide front-line highway and environmental management services at our resorts and coastal areas.

I would point out the relatively low fee level when compared to car parks in other Local Authority areas at £2, £4, £6 and £8, the equivalent of £1 per hour. In terms of mitigation of any impact that charging may cause, I would also advise of the availability of permits allowing all users to park at any of our chargeable car parks for

the equivalent of less than 30p per day. Coastal Car Parking Charges – these permits have proved very popular with residents and local businesses with 365 sold in 2024/25 and 211 sold to date this year.

We will shortly be introducing an additional permit which will allow parking at both our Country parks and all our chargeable coastal car parks at a further discounted rate.

The proposals to charge at the new coastal car parks was subject to public consultation with 14 objections being received and duly considered by the Council's Cabinet, prior to the decision to charge being taken. The details of this and other reports explaining the reasoning for introducing new car park charges in the Vale of Glamorgan are publicly available on the Council's website and I would respectfully suggest that you read these reports to obtain a fuller picture as to the reasoning for introducing these new car park charges.

In our experience any new car park charging arrangements do take some time to settle and for any new parking patterns to be established. There is likely to be a certain level of unrest initially, with those who previously parked for free making other arrangements, and advising that they will never visit the areas again etc. However, we have not witnessed this being the longer-term position in our other areas; with our experience suggesting that some visitors return to the now chargeable car parks, with those who do not wish to pay either finding alternative free on-street parking (all the new chargeable areas have free on-street parking options nearby) or using a mix of alternative travel methods to visit the areas. Indeed, a wish to increase active travel and use of public transport is one of the other reasons why car park charging has been introduced.

We do of course intend to review the impact and viability of these charges over time, and we will need at least a full summer season to do this. Our highway officers will also be assessing any related parking displacement. We will also review any comments made to us by residents, visitors and businesses that are related to the car parking changes made in these areas.

(iv) **Question from Dr. S. Evans**

For over three years, I have been in dialogue with the Vale of Glamorgan Council regarding the future of the Knap Lifeguard building. In September 2022, I spoke directly with the Leader of the Council, Lis Burnett, and since then I have maintained contact with officials about this important community asset. I attended Full Council in April 2024, when the Deputy Council Leader responded to my public question by inviting The Reef charity to submit an Expression of Interest for a Community Asset Transfer. We did so in good faith, only to have the application rejected in October 2024 on the grounds that the transfer was "premature" and that the Council itself needed time to consider both the building and the surrounding area. We were told there was no appeals process. Since then, consultants Mott MacDonald have been appointed to develop the Barry Placemaking Plan. At the public consultation, we were surprised to see the Knap Lifeguard building featured in the draft Plan, illustrated with an image taken directly from our own charity's website, alongside text suggesting the building could be brought back into use for coastal recreation?

exactly what we had proposed. Meanwhile, the building itself continues to deteriorate. The Reef charity is already established and stands ready to secure external funding to restore the building and create a Coastal Exploration Centre for the community. With the Council facing a significant budget deficit, it is difficult to see how this work will be achieved without community partnership.

Question – Given that the Council has already acknowledged in its own Draft Placemaking Plan the value of returning the Knap Lifeguard building to community use, what precise reason prevents the Vale of Glamorgan Council, here and now, from declaring the Knap Lifeguard building surplus to requirements and inviting a new Expression of Interest for a Community Asset Transfer, so that a willing and resourced community body can progress restoration without further unnecessary delay? And what is the justification for delaying a Community Asset Transfer and allowing the building to deteriorate further?

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

The Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Group reviewed the expression of interest CAT application in August 2024, considering the local policy context and its alignment with wider Council strategies. Following careful consideration, the Group concluded that the site in question is a valuable Council asset. As such, they recommended that your expression of interest be looked at particularly considering any future plans the Council may have for the area. This included exploring proposals that benefit the broader community and identifying any potential commercial opportunities associated with the site. The CAT Group also recognised that there may be interest in the site from other organisations and businesses outside of the CAT process. With that in mind, and in line with the Council's Place Making Plans, it was felt important to consider all available options before progressing any individual application. As a result, the Group recommended not to move forward with the application at that time. In reaching this decision, the Group considered the wider strategic issues and referred its views to the Council's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) for their awareness. The SLT, reviewed the group's recommendation and considered the Council's Place Making priorities, supported the decision.

Accordingly given the significance of the asset, and its importance in relation the Knap and wider area, the Council will continue to explore future opportunities for the site as part of the development of the Barry Place Making plan. This plan is due to be launched in late Autumn following ongoing consultation and engagement and is likely to feature the Knap and the former lifeguard station as a key project/ opportunity to be taken forward.

(v) **Question from Mr. R. John**

Can the Vale Free WiFi please be improved at its current locations. I run several Digital Champion and Buddies sessions over several sites across the Vale. Each site struggles with connectivity. I have been a Digital volunteer since 2011 and there has been no significant improvement since I started. Digital Poverty is all over the Vale and it needs improving.

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

We continue to review and explore opportunities to improve WiFi provision across council sites. We are grateful for the support of our network of Digital Champions and Digital Buddies in helping residents access online services.

The Public Sector Broadband Aggregation (PSBA) network is being upgraded on an ongoing basis, and we take advantage of these developments whenever possible to enhance local provision. Over the last three years, 175 access points have been upgraded across the Vale, resulting in stronger coverage and signal quality at these locations.

We actively monitor the Vale Free WiFi connection and, to date, usage has not reached any limits that would require us to increase bandwidth. If demand changes in the future, we will act to ensure continuity of service.

Looking ahead, we are starting a project to identify where further opportunities for wider WiFi provision can be delivered, working with both public and private sector partners.

(vi) **Question from Mr. M. Wallis**

In view of the Council's responsibility for Cosmeston Park's legally designated Local Nature Reserve, will the Council release their latest assessment of its progress as an LNR since the 2013 designation and, in default of a formal assessment, issue material on new species established in the LNR, with any losses if known? Would the Council record and publicise Cosmeston Park as a site for positive measures towards nature recovery goals in the Vale?

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

Since the inception of LNR status, the Council has remained committed to enhancing and maintaining the site's biodiversity. The park is managed in accordance with a comprehensive management plan, which outlines clear objectives and actions aligned with our responsibilities under the declared nature emergency.
Recent initiatives include:

- **Reintroduction of Water Voles**: This has been a notable success, with the species now establishing populations beyond the boundaries of the Country Park.
- **Conservation Grazing**: Introduced to improve the grass sward within meadow areas, this has contributed significantly to habitat diversity and ecological resilience.
- **Woodland Enhancement**: Tree planting has been undertaken to expand woodland cover and mitigate the impact of Ash Dieback, ensuring long-term sustainability of the woodland ecosystem.

The Council continues to work in close partnership with Natural Resources Wales (NRW), the Local Nature Partnership (LNP), and other stakeholders to support nature recovery across the Vale of Glamorgan. We are committed to recognising and promoting Cosmeston Lakes Country Park as a key site for positive action towards local and national nature recovery goals.

However, in order to continue this important work the Council is exploring ways that nature recovery can be supported through suitable leisure activities which can provide an income to support re-wilding and nature recovery.

342 DRAFT STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT (REF) –

The Leader presented the Draft Standards Committee Annual Report which the Committee had a statutory responsibility to produce yearly, with the draft amended to incorporate reflection upon the Group Leaders' duties, including their assessment of how Group Leaders had complied with these duties. Following Council noting of this item, the report would be forwarded to Town and Community Councils within the Vale of Glamorgan alongside being shared with the Public Service Ombudsman for Wales (PSOW).

Councillor Perry shared that the role of Standards Committee promoted high standards of ethical conduct among Elected Members, co-opted members which included the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and officers in order to maintain public confidence in Local Government. The Standards Committee also had a responsibility for the code of conduct matters for Town and Community Councils and it should be made clearer that the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and Town and Community Councils were co-opted and the code of conduct applied to them also. They also noted the mention of Church and Parent Governors and they were specifically mentioned as being expected to promote and maintain high standards but felt there was an omission of Local Authority and Teacher Governors, which should be corrected.

They also felt that the section surrounding the term of office should be reworded, as this could easily be misunderstood. They further reflected upon section 1.2 of the report surrounding attendance figures and highlighted that a meeting was only quorate when at least three members were present including the Chair, and at least half of those present were Independent Members, including meetings on 29th July, 21st November and 22nd November, and that the report did not address this point around decisions being made when the Committee was not quorate.

They raised section 3.2(ix), which presented the findings of complaints, PSOW complaints against Councillors, and stated that it appeared that the decision to suspend a Member at the Standards Committee meeting in November was made without being quorate, and there was no indication of how the Independent Adjudication Panel for Wales dealt with the appeal or shared any lessons learned. He requested that the report be sent back to Standards Committee as it was incomplete.

The Leader responded that the Standards Committee was autonomous, and that these queries should be raised with the Committee directly and the Monitoring Officer.

Councillor Dr. Johnson sought clarity whether this was a draft or final version of the report due the item name, and it was clarified by the Leader that this was final version of the report and there would be consideration as to how this was communicated in the future, and that Members needed to forward any further comments to the Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the Annual Report be noted.

(2) T H A T a copy of the finalised report, following presentation to Full Council, be forwarded to each Vale of Glamorgan Town and Community Council Clerks and the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales.

Reason for decisions

(1&2) To update Council and wider stakeholders surrounding the work of Standards Committee.

343 ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2024/25 (REF) –

The Leader presented the Annual Treasury Management Report 2024/25, and highlighted that the Council was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an Annual Treasury Management Review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2024/25. This report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code), the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code) and the Welsh Government (WG) revised guide on Local Government Investments (April 2010). During 2024/25, the Council complied with its legislative and regulatory requirements.

They shared that key actual prudential and treasury indicators detailing the impact of capital expenditure activities during the year were to be found in the main body of this report including the Authorised Limit, Operational Boundary. The Council's prudential indicators had been revised to include the additional long-term liabilities brought onto the Council's balance sheet with the introduction and implementation IFRS16 Leasing from April 2024. The new standard attempted to quantify the additional debt that the Council committed to when it entered into leasing agreements. The Council implemented the leasing standard during 2024/25 and as at 31st March, 2025 the other long term liability relating to leasing was £2.922m. The revised revenue cost was now represented by Minimum Revenue Position and Interest for the leased assets now on the Balance Sheet. As these leases were previously off Balance Sheet and fully charged to revenue, there was no impact on bottom line revenue outturn position

The Council reviewed the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy set out in the 2024/25 Strategy. Two reports were taken to the Governance and Audit Committee on 21st October, 2024 and 16th December, 2024. The amendments were recommended for approval by Cabinet in January 2025 and approved by Full Council on 10th March, 2025.

The Council's borrowing requirement increased £3.364m in 2024/25 giving a total Capital Financing Requirement of £202.156m on 31st March, 2025. At the same date, the Council held £169.851m of Gross External Borrowing and other longer term debt liability of £2.922m. The Council was therefore under borrowed by £29.383m as of 31st March, 2025. The Head of Finance confirmed that borrowing was only undertaken for capital purposes and the statutory borrowing limits (the Authorised and Operational limits), were not breached. The Council's External Borrowing was well within the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary set for 2024/25. The Council had where possible been self-financing new capital expenditure and maturing debt. However, available balances and reserves were now practically exhausted, and the Council was now starting to borrow externally from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB). Due to current high borrowing costs, the Council was borrowing shorter term (up to 7 years) as rates were forecast to fall during this period. The Council borrowed £38.000m with maturity dates ranging from 1 year to 7 years during 2024/25. Of this amount £36.000m was borrowed from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) and £2.000m from a Local Authority (LA). Of the borrowing undertaken £24.000m was in support of capital expenditure for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). These loans were subject to a 60-basis point deduction from the standard interest rate. The Council financed new Capital Expenditure of £3.446m from internal borrowing and £3.537m from prudential borrowing. The Council prematurely repaid the Lenders Option / Borrowers Option (LOBO) loan for £4.000m on 27th August, 2024 as there was an option to repay without penalty.

They shared that the Council's debt following including long term liabilities was £172.7m and that its investment portfolio was £17.2m. They finally reflected that investment interest rates declined at a lot slower pace than originally forecast and therefore the estimated investment income was greater than originally budgeted for. In addition, external borrowing fell well below the original forecasts mainly due to Capital Programme slippage hence borrowing costs were a lot lower than budgeted. Consequently, financing costs as a proportion of net revenue stream for both Council Tax and Housing Rents fell below the 2024/25 originally budgeted amount.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Treasury Management Annual Report for the period 2024/25 be approved

Reason for decision

To update Council surrounding the Council's approach to Treasury Management.

344 SCRUTINY COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORT 2024/25 (DCS) –

Councillor Thomas, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Group, presented the Scrutiny Committees Annual Report, including an Executive Summary version. They reflected that although the Council had, since the new Municipal year this May, been undertaking changes to the way that scrutiny worked in the Vale of Glamorgan, which had been debated in the Chamber in recent times, a large amount of important and positive work was carried out by the five former Scrutiny Committees between May 2024 and April 2025, including examples such as tackling a wide range of critical issues over 53 Scrutiny meetings; collectively making 51 recommendations to Cabinet for their consideration, with just over half being agreed; involving co-opted members of the public on a monthly basis, including Council Housing Tenants and members of the Vale Youth Council and Vale Youth Forum; completing a thorough piece of Task and Finish work on the Council's procurement practices, which helped to inform the item scheduled for later on tonight's agenda; helping to secure additional funding for the Council's CCTV coverage, to support keeping the Vale of Glamorgan's communities safe; and all five Scrutiny Committees contributing to the development of Vale 2030, the Council's new Corporate Plan, which would shape the direction of the Authority over the next five years, whilst also collectively considering the Council's performance and financial position.

They also thanked all members of the public, Councillors, guest speakers and officers who had contributed to the successes of scrutiny in the Vale of Glamorgan during 2024-25.

Councillor Dr. Johnson thanked all Scrutiny Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs for their contribution and reflected that this would be the last report on the previous arrangements. They identified the low number of public speakers in Scrutiny meetings and asked how the Council could improve how it attracted people to speak to the Council, albeit noting that the increased Task and Finish work should help with this.

Councillor Thomas agreed surrounding the disappointing participation and highlighted that the option had always been there but they were hoping increased Task and Finish would enable the Council to reach out to further partners and the wider public, which they hoped would be reflected in the next Scrutiny Annual Report.

RESOLVED – T H A T Council received the Scrutiny Committees Annual Report for 2024/25.

<u>Reason for decision</u>

To receive the Scrutiny Committees Annual Report as required by the Council's Constitution.

345 APPLICATION TO CORRECT THE REGISTER OF COMMON LAND (MO / HLDS) –

Councillor Sivagnanam presented the application to correct the Register of Common Land, which concerned an application to correct the Register of Common Land in respect of Richmond House, Stalling Down, Cowbridge.

They stated that the Council, as Commons Registration Authority, had a legal duty under the Commons Act 2006 to keep the Register accurate. From time to time, historic errors were identified, and the Act allowed the Council to current them.

In this case, Richmond House was mistakenly included in the register of Stalling Down Common back in the 1960s. In fact, the property had already been built in the 1950s, together with its curtilage, and the land had never been subject to rights of common.

Extensive evidence had been provided by the applicant, including Land Registry records, historic conveyances, maps, aerial photographs, and even a finding by a Commons Commissioner in 1987 that the land was wrongly registered. Officers were satisfied that the statutory criteria under the Commons Act 2006 had been fully met.

The application was publicised as required. No objections were received, and while the Open Spaces Society raised some points for clarification, they did not object to the application being granted.

There are no financial or policy implications for the Council and that this is simply a matter of correcting a historic error in the Register.

They finalised that the recommendation before Council is to approve the de-registration of Richmond House from the Register of Common Land.

RESOLVED – T H A T the application to de-register land known as Richmond House, Stalling Down, St. Hilary, Cowbridge be granted.

Reason for decision

To enable the application to be determined and to remove the land known as Richmond House, Stalling Down, Cowbridge from the Register of Common Land.

346 AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION (MO / HLDS) –

The Leader presented the report which proposed a number of changes to the Council's Constitution as outlined within the report; including new additions to Section 4 and Section 10, amendments to Section 7 and 25, alongside the updating of procedural information and provisions within Sections 18, 26 and 27. They also noted that a number of housekeeping amendments as highlighted within Appendix A were due to be made.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the new additions to the Council's Constitution as detailed in paragraph 2.2 of the report be approved and the Constitution be updated accordingly.

(2) T H A T the amendments related to Scrutiny in the Council's Constitution as detailed in paragraph 2.3 of the report be approved and the Constitution be amended accordingly.

(3) T H A T the amendments related to changes in the officer delegations and contract procedure rules in the Council's Constitution as detailed in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.5 of the report be approved and the Constitution be amended accordingly.

(4) T H A T the amendments related to changes in the structuring of Members' Allowance Scheme in the Council's Constitution as detailed in paragraph 2.6 of the report be approved and the Constitution be amended accordingly.

(5) T H A T the minor amendments (Appendix A to the report) made within the Constitution (as supported by the Monitoring Officer's ability to make minor amendments – outlined within 2.6.2 in the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decisions

(1-5) To update the Constitution to reflect amendments as outlined within the report

347 PROCUREMENT POLICY STRATEGY AND REVIEW (REF) -

The Leader presented the amended policy and highlighted that the only amendment was for Council was to consider strengthening the element of social value following the work of the Task and Finish Group.

Councillor Carroll expressed concerns surrounding the Procurement Strategy embedding ethical practices, such as equality, diversity and inclusion, and believed that the focus of procurement should be securing best value for money, to which the Leader responded that the Councillor had had opportunity to raise comments ahead of Cabinet or to use the Scrutiny call-in process.

RESOLVED – T H A T Section 18.12.1 (c) in the Constitution be amended to require Social Value to be a tender requirement at £0.250m for works and above Threshold for Services.

Reason for decision

The current thresholds were too low and a greater focus on social value was required.

348 CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A SUPPORTED DAY CARE SERVICE FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PEOPLE LIVING WITH DEMENTIA IN THE WESTERN VALE (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C62, 17th July, 2025 (as set out in Section 15.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

The reporting of the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure is a requirement of the Council's Constitution.

349 CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A SUPPORTED DAY CARE SERVICE FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PEOPLE LIVING WITH DEMENTIA IN THE WESTERN VALE (PART II) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C69, 17th July, 2025 (as set out in Section 15.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

The reporting of the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure is a requirement of the Council's Constitution.

350 PROCUREMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY REVIEW (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C84, 4th September, 2025 (as set out in Section 15.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

The reporting of the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure is a requirement of the Council's Constitution.

351 FINAL DRAFT VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT 2024/25 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C86, 4th September, 2025 (as set out in Section 15.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

The reporting of the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure is a requirement of the Council's Constitution.

352 QUARTER 1 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING 2025/26 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C89, 4th September, 2025 (as set out in Section 15.14.2(ii) of the Council's Constitution) be noted.

Reason for decision

The reporting of the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure is a requirement of the Council's Constitution.

353 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE OF MOTION [SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS G. CARROLL AND J. CHARLES] –

The below Notice of Motion, moved by Councillor George Carroll and seconded by Councillor Janice Charles at the meeting, was debated.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council:

- Regrets the decision of Labour, Plaid Cymru and Llantwit First councillors to designate the Vale a County of Sanctuary for asylum seekers;
- Recognises that illegal migration places huge pressures on public services and puts our communities at risk from crime;
- Notes that the Council has joined the City of Sanctuary UK Local Authority Network, an organisation that has condemned measures to secure our borders;
- Condemns City of Sanctuary UK's highly inappropriate "Schools of Sanctuary" initiative, through which children as young as five were asked to write Valentine's cards to asylum seekers;
- Calls on the Cabinet to sever all of the Authority's ties with City of Sanctuary UK and revoke the Vale's County of Sanctuary status.

Councillor Carroll presented the Motion, indicating that in 2023, the Council embarked upon seeking County of Sanctuary status, and that the Council was warned of the association with the charity, which held extreme positions, a charter which supported open borders, and had been reported to the Charity Commission over political activity. He further referenced Schools of Sanctuary, which he believed pushed propaganda and led to inappropriate activities. He further indicated that he felt that immigration put additional strain on public services, including increased crime, and that within the Council's position of influence, it should have a zero-tolerance approach which was contrary to the Nation of Sanctuary's position. He closed by emphasising the need to focus the Council's responsibility on improving services for residents.

Councillor Payne stated that Motion needed to be embedded in truth, and dealt with by facts, indicating that the Office for National Statistics had advised that illegal immigration status was not recorded in crime or judicial statistics. She further indicated that schools' programmes such as the Valentine's Day card scheme which received considerable attention were not correct, and that the school in question in Northern Ireland had confirmed it never happened, and that Schools of Sanctuary provided positive, age-appropriate messages like "welcome to our town". She stated that we all needed to welcome everyone in the area who required help and support.

Councillor Dr. Johnson indicated that the Plaid Cymru Group would reject the Motion, as the role of Nation of Sanctuary was to help asylum seekers assimilate into communities, noting that they were usually escaping war and persecution. He also highlighted that of the £55m spent by Welsh Government on the Nation of Sanctuary Scheme, which was £1-2m annually, 85% was spent on Ukrainian refugees, an area previously supported by the Conservative Group, and of which only approximately 7,000 of 6.2m refugees came to Wales. He further added that the Vale of Glamorgan had a proud history of welcoming asylum-seeking groups such as Afghans, Syrians, Ukrainians, building on the legacy of the First World War, and that he was proud to support policy embedding people within the community.

Councillor Perkes stated that Barry had a multi-cultural population, and that in 1881 there were 500 people which increased to 33,000 people in 1911, in part to Barry welcoming people from around the world. She added that Barry was built on migrants and had always been an international area, with American soldiers living there during the Second World War. She further added that County of Sanctuary encouraged people to feel welcome whilst reminding people that the County was a safe haven, and that statistics had been used disingenuously to fear monger people. She closed by emphasised that there were no longer safe routes, and that boats were the only way people we could help reach us, which was an impact of Home Office policy.

The Leader said that she was disappointed to see the Motion, particularly given its lack of accuracy. She emphasised that County of Sanctuary meant the Vale of Glamorgan supported all people, irrespective of their protected characteristics, whether it be age, gender, dementia, ethnicity, hate crime or homelessness. She added that during the Performance Panel Assessment process, the Council was described as values led, which she was proud of, and that this Motion showed who would turn their backs on people in moments of need.

Councillor Norman said that she felt the Conservative Group were jumping on a media bandwagon, and to reflect that many asylum seekers would rather be in their own countries, but they were now too unsafe or at personal risk. She also reflected that these asylum seekers had often supporting British services overseas at risk themselves and family, meaning we had a moral duty to support.

Councillor Campbell stated that she felt that Nation of Sanctuary was largely symbolic, but helped to create strong bases within communities, and created links and often conversations in areas locally, regionally and nationally. She indicated that as Member for Rhoose, where many were currently based, that her local community

had come together to support the entitled persons, whether it be through local clubs, packages of care, access to services or within schools for example. She noted that she now represented these people within the Council's Chamber and had asked for all Members to consider them with empathy moving forward.

Councillor Goodjohn said that the Council had a duty to lead by example, the proposed Motion promoted intolerance and suspicion and that it was important to welcome refuge and support for all in the Vale and to support reducing inequalities, particularly for children, women and others. She added that the Vale of Glamorgan had a strong culture of being welcoming and hospitable, to being a safe space for those seeking refuse, and should proactively support introduction within the community, particularly as towns like Barry were built on immigration.

Councillor Buckley noted that a large driver of crime increases was due to the underfunding of Police, and that the Afghanis settled locally had help save countless lives and were supported locally by troops and veterans. He also expressed disappointment as standing alongside Conservative Members at VJ day, and believed this Motion did not support this.

Councillor Mahoney said that he saw no reason for the Council to be a County of Sanctuary, and noted that the country had a long history of supporting displaced people but felt that the asylum and immigration system had been abused which was leaving public services overwhelmed. He also indicated that he felt there was a politicisation of schools through this scheme, whereas the focus should be upon core skills such as literacy. He finalised by indicating that we should welcome people in danger and hoped people could return to their homelands safely, but welcomed the removal of School of Sanctuary and County of Sanctuary, which he believed to be inappropriate.

Councillor Penn said that the food, custom and culture added locally would help make the Vale of Glamorgan a better place in the future and reflected that Wales had a history of supporting refugees and shared how during his time as Mayor he met local Jewish survivors of the Holocaust. He shared that he had a long family history of supporting people from all over the world, with his family home being a melting pot of languages, smells and beliefs. He closed by noting that we would continue to support welcoming people to Wales and encouraged all Members to view the recent Nation of Sanctuary awards, where they would be able to see the impact of their work first hand.

Councillor Hooper said that he feel that this Motion deliberately misinformed people, and that the Members proposing the Motion knew this, as similar had been seen elsewhere recently, and was a desperate attempt for the Conservative Group to appeal to Reform voters. He indicated his agreement with comments made so far, and added the Motion posed several risks, including other people who were affected, potentially leading to violence, abuse or harassment, he felt that they had not followed the Nolan Principles of honesty and integrity by being deliberately misleading, and that all needed to look how they could resolve problems by avoiding punching down, such as improving housing and NHS services for all. He closed by stating that it was the role of Central Government to control borders and that the Motion presented was divisive, dishonest and dangerous.

Councillor John shared that Llantwit Major had problems surrounding Eagleswell development initially, but residents had supported Ukrainian refugees who now lived within Heol Croeso. He also shared how the area had previously supported Belgium historically, and how local people stood down fascism.

Councillor Loveluck-Edwards noted that the inference from this Motion was that resources directed towards supporting Afghan resettlement were wasteful and misdirected, and noted that no such evidence existed. She shared the Council had a responsibility to face up to human rights responsibilities, and that the Motion offered no alternatives to support those within the global family. She said that the UK hosted less than 1% of the global migrant population, and former Conservative policy was what had driven the need for the Nation of Sanctuary movement, which she emphasised was based upon safety, forgetting a traumatic past and supporting within the community; with the key role of a Councillor being to bring together a community and not to divide them.

Councillor Fisher shared his personal history including his wife being an immigrant and Grandfather being of Polish descent but indicated that the debate had lost sight of the Motion, which was around the alignment of the County of Sanctuary movement, which he felt to be controversial.

Councillor Perry stated that residents were more concerned around areas such as hospital, pathways and the Climate Emergency, and that war still existed globally, alongside political prisoners (some of whom had British passports), who were academics, doctors or worked in health services. He stated that he felt that this Motion was being hyped up for political benefit and would rather Council focus upon progressive positions for issues residents faced which needed addressing.

Councillor Charles said she seconded the Motion as increases in immigration had led to an increase on pressures in public services, including GP waiting times, and that public services did not have the infrastructure or capacity to be able to respond to the additional population. She further stated that this was leading to community division, as residents did not feel consulted upon decisions being made which were having an impact.

Councillor Carroll closed the debate by indicating that he was disappointed to hear comments made in the Chamber and lack of support for the Motion and noted this was out of touch with residents as County of Sanctuary and Nation of Sanctuary had negative views in opinion polls, and that the public wanted to see the schemes scrapped. He considered the link between illegal immigration and crime, and stated that based upon the migration type, it was clear a crime had been committed. He indicated that he was representing a range of people's views, who believed the system was being abused. He also referenced that many Members referred to small boat arrivals coming from France, which was a designated safe route, to which Councillors Penn and Sivagnanam called for a point of order based on the legal status of immigrants and the choice of country of settlement. Councillor Carroll indicated his disappointment in what he felt to be extreme positions held by Members, and noted that they felt there was a feeling amongst the Council of supporting open borders. Councillor Dr. Johnson sought a point of order as he felt

that this final comment misrepresented the debate within the Chamber, to which the Mayor agreed and asked Councillor Carroll to correct the record. Councillor Carroll refused to do so and was subsequently asked to leave the Chamber ahead of the vote. Councillors Charles and Hennessy also left the Chamber alongside Councillor Carroll, alongside several other Conservative Group Members online.

Following a request from a Member for a Recorded Vote the vote took place as follows:

	For	**Against**	**Abstain**
Anne Asbrey		√	
Julie Aviet		√	
Gareth Ball		√	
Rhiannon Birch		√	
Gillian Bruce*			
Ian Buckley		√	
Lis Burnett		√	
Samantha Campbell		√	
George Carroll*			
Christine Cave*			
Charles Champion			√
Janice Charles*			
Amelia Collins		√	
Brandon Dodd	√		
Pamela Drake		√	
Vincent Driscoll	√		
Anthony Ernest	√		
Robert Fisher*			
Christopher Franks		√	

	For	Against	Abstain
Wendy Gilligan		√	
Russell Godfrey			√
Emma Goodjohn		√	
William Hennessy*			
Nic Hodges		√	
Mark Hooper		√	
Catherine Iannucci-Williams		√	
Gwyn John		√	
Ian Johnson		√	
Susan Lloyd-Selby		√	
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards		√	
Julie Lynch-Wilson		√	
Kevin Mahoney			√
Naomi Marshallsea		√	
Michael Morgan		√	
Jayne Norman		√	
Helen Payne		√	
Elliot Penn		√	
Sandra Perkes		√	
Ian Perry		√	
Joanna Protheroe		√	
Ruba Sivagnanam		√	
Carys Stallard		√	

	For	Against	Abstain
Neil Thomas		√	
Rhys Thomas*			
Margaret Wilkinson		√	
Eddie Williams		√	
Mark Wilson		√	
Nicholas Wood*			
Total	**3**	**34**	**3**

* Members indicated left the Meeting and did not participate in the vote.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Motion was lost.

Reason for decision

Following discussions at the meeting and a recorded vote.

354 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 4.19 OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION –

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

(i) Question from Councillor E.J. Goodjohn

What specific plans are the Administration creating for making it easier for people in the Vale to contact the Council to ensure their issues are efficiently resolved?

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

To provide some context, Contact One Vale handles around 175,000 calls and over 50,000 emails each year. We are working on a number of initiatives to make it easier for residents to get in touch with us and to resolve issues more efficiently. These include:

- Website – Over 100 services can already be requested online, and use of these is steadily increasing. We are continuing to expand and improve the range of online services available.
- Voice automation – For many transactional services, residents may not need to speak to an agent. We are identifying which services can be delivered

through an automated phone system, helping us provide 24/7 support for routine requests.

- Web and phone messaging – We know that some residents prefer webchat or phone messaging for convenience. We are exploring these options and plan to trial them in early 2026.
- Phone support – We recognise that our current response times are not where we want them to be. By introducing the new channels such as those outlined, we expect call volumes to reduce, allowing us to focus more on residents who need or prefer to speak to someone directly.

Supplemental

Councillor Goodjohn asked for further information as to how long the web and phone message trial would run and when this information would be available, to which the Leader responded they would need to identify this information from officers.

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

Does the Council regard its decision to open an aqua park at Cosmeston Lakes throughout the summer as a success?

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

A full report will be brought to Cabinet and considered by Scrutiny later in the Autumn when the success of the trial period will be assessed.

(iii) Question from Councillor N.C. Hodges

Earlier this year, traders and Plaid Cymru warned Council that introducing car parking charges would damage businesses. We are only a few weeks in and have already been contacted by those whose businesses have been severely impacted. Livelihoods and the small business fabric of our communities is at risk as a direct reason of this myopic decision making.

Given this real time information, will you reverse the decision with immediate effect?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

I am sure you will appreciate Councillor Hodges, that making a judgement on the impact of new charges introduced at a select few coastal car parks barely a few weeks into the new system is not particularly scientific or helpful. I will certainly not reverse any decision after such a short time period and without any further assessment.

Supplemental

Councillor Hodges asked if the Cabinet Member felt that these new car parking charges helped or hindered shop local schemes, jobs, and amenities, to which the Cabinet Member responded that there would be a period of time to reconsider

changes but the Council needed to go through the process. They further stated that they believed Barry, Cowbridge, Penarth and Llantwit Major to be premium places which required upkeep and supervision as they were accessed by local residents and visitors.

(iv) Question from Councillor E.J. Goodjohn

Given current Council budgets, could you please provide information on the types of procurements that may have capped values when sent out to tender?

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

It is not uncommon to include a budget cap in tenders, however, there is no blanket one size fits all approach. Each procurement would need to be reviewed depending on the requirement, awareness and understanding of the market, potential change in specification and management of demand may be required to meet the cap on budget.

This can form part of our efficiency work when reviewing the contract forward plan to identify opportunities for efficiencies.

Consultancy and service type contracts can be suitable procurements for a budget cap (depending on the criteria above, whilst ensuring any Health and Safety requirements are met and maintained).

Supplemental

Councillor Goodjohn further asked if a review could be arranged to look at capped procurement to understand when and where it was used and if it was being used efficiently, to which the Leader responded that this could be built into any future monitoring arrangements of procurement activity.

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

Of all the advertising contracts entered into by the Council in the past 3 years, what proportion will no longer be permitted under the Authority's new restrictions on high in fat, sugar, and salt advertising?

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

Using an analysis from data relating to November 2022 to July 2024, 25% of all adverts on display were for foods and or drinks high in fat, salt, or sugar and would not have been permitted under the new restrictions.

(vi) Question from Councillor C.P. Franks

What are the implications for the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Cardiff Capital Region of the recent High Court judgement on contracts relating to Aberthaw Power Station?

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

There are no direct implications for the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

Supplemental

Councillor Franks indicated that the legal damages bill for this had increased to £6.16m and sought to understood what was being done to avoid further disputes being avoided, alongside this item being considered by a Scrutiny Committee, to which the Leader responded that this was a matter for Cardiff Capital Region and Corporate Joint Committee to respond to.

(vii) Question from Councillor E.J. Goodjohn

What further actions is the Council considering taking to address schools with deficits significantly exceeding those of comparable schools in terms of size and dynamics?

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

Thank you for your question. As you have alluded to, a minority of primary and secondary schools account for a disproportionate share of the overall schools' deficit. As such, the Council is adopting a phased and targeted approach to deficit management in schools. Support for these schools is ongoing, and in line with Welsh Government's statutory Schools Causing Concern guidance, several schools have received informal warning notices due to the scale of concern and insufficient detail and progress as outlined in their current recovery plans. These schools are required to revise and resubmit their five-year recovery plans by the October half-term, in accordance with Local Authority guidance outlining clear lines of enquiry and challenge, where necessary.

In addition, a thematic review of financial governance and expenditure is planned for schools reporting unrecoverable deficits. This will be conducted by the Council's internal audit team as part of their annual work programme.

For schools requiring more intensive support in aligning curriculum planning with financial sustainability, specialist advisors have been commissioned. These advisors are currently working in schools with school leaders to review financial planning through the lens of teaching, learning, and inclusion. The impact on learners remains the Council's foremost priority, and all sustainability measures must be considered in the context of maintaining high-quality educational provision.

Supplemental

Councillor Goodjohn asked if it would be possible to receive additional information surrounding the specialist advisors, including where they had commissioned from, which schools they had been placed in and for how long. The Leader advised the Start Well Committee would receive information, alongside individual school's governing bodies being kept up to date and information would be targeted to where it was needed.

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

Will the Leader please update the Council on engagement the Authority has had with the Ministry of Defence regarding its use of the Holiday Inn Express in Rhoose to provide housing under the Afghan Resettlement Programme?

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

I refer Councillor Carroll to the Frequently Asked Questions on the Council website which was produced to provide information on the use of the Holiday Inn Express and which also sets out the relationship between this Council and the MoD and, crucially the proposal by the MoD to use the hotel under the Afghan resettlement programme.

(ix) Question from Councillor M.J. Hooper

The last house on the Waterfront development is about to be sold on East Quay. The sale will trigger the start of the transfer of responsibilities for the open spaces from the developing consortium to those residents who are willing to take on liabilities. What is the Council doing to ensure these Council Tax paying residents are suitably protected in these crucial months ahead?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services

As you are aware, regular discussions have continued between myself, senior officers and the Consortium regarding the unfortunate situation that has developed at the Waterfront. These meetings have at least ensured that the Consortium is aware of and has committed to its responsibilities. That said, the management of the open spaces at the Waterfront is fundamentally a matter between the Development Consortium / Management Company and residents, and the Council regrettably not compel transfer of the spaces. Nevertheless, officers will be happy to advise and liaise with residents as required, regarding ongoing planning requirements.

Supplemental

Councillor Hooper shared concerns from residents over the sales pack which had been raised with Trading Standards, but they were yet to respond after 9 months, to which the Cabinet Member agreed to follow up as a matter of urgency.

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

What impacts have the introduction of new charges had on usage at Council car parks to which they apply?

Reply from Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

As I have advised in a previous response it is too early to accurately judge any impacts of the new car parking charges as they have been in place for less than 1 month. The charging start date also coincided with the end of the school summer holidays.

The charges will need time to settle in and will be assessed over a reasonable period of time, which should include at least one full summer season.

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

Recent weeks have seen heavy rainfall, leading to on-street flooding. What proposals does the Cabinet Member have for increasing the number of gully inspections to reduce the numbers which are blocked and leading to this flooding?

Reply from Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

To minimise any future flooding events, the service area is prioritising known flood-prone areas with more frequent checks, particularly as we enter the winter period where there is likely to be more adverse weather conditions and or heavy rainfall events.

In advance of the autumn / winter period, the service area is also aiming to increase its mechanical sweeping capacity to manage the pending leaf fall season and well as encouraging volunteers to help with leaf clearances, to ensure gullies are clear and operating wherever practically possible. In the case of engaging with volunteers, we have excellent examples from areas in Penarth where this has been facilitated and where we are very grateful to volunteer groups who selflessly give their time during the Autumn period, supported by our teams.

I can confirm that during the recent period of heavy rainfall, when a weather warning for wind and rain was in effect (Sunday 14th - Monday 15th September 2025), the Council received a total of 12 out of hours calls. Of these, five were related to flooding. The flooding incidents were predominantly the result of flash flooding or leaves obstructing gullies. A notable example occurred on the Esplanade, Penarth, which demonstrated a typical flash flooding event. In this instance, the highway drainage system was operating as designed, however, due to the exceptional intensity of rainfall within a short period, the system was overwhelmed, resulting in a surcharge of the combined sewer.

The service still maintains an 18-month routine gully inspection and cleansing schedule, which covers both strategic and non-strategic gullies. The service area maintains two gully tankers but also engages a contractor to support the service to ensure that both strategic and non-strategic networks are covered. Additionally, the

service area prioritises ad-hoc work orders generated by inspections and public reports and deploys teams in advance of adverse forecasts of heavy rain, being proactive and reducing reactive callouts.

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

Is the Council confident that Cardiff Capital Region's project to redevelop Aberthaw Power Station will deliver value for money for taxpayers?

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

Yes, and we will be ensuring that the proposals are carefully assessed and considered through the arrangements in place at a regional level.

(xiii) Question from Councillor C.A. Cave

What cost savings measures are the Council proposing in order to reduce already overstretched burdens on Council taxpayers?

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

The Council set out its approach to setting the 2026/27 Budget and 2026/27 to 2030/31 Medium Term Financial Plan in the Financial Strategy approved by Cabinet on 17th July, 2025.

It is of course, worth reminding Members, as set out in the Strategy, the Vale of Glamorgan is the third lowest spending of the 22 Welsh counties.

Question (xiv) from Councillor G. Bruce was withdrawn ahead of the meeting.