

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Hybrid Meeting held on 13th July 2026.

The meeting papers are available [here](#).

The recording of the meeting is available in [English](#) or [English and Welsh](#).

To view the presentation and subsequent discussion for any Part I agenda item, please click the hyperlink contained in its title below.

Present: Councillor Carys Stallard (Mayor), Councillors Anne Asbrey, Julie Aviet, Gareth Ball, Rhiannon Birch, Bronwen Brooks, Gillian Bruce, Ian Buckley, Lis Burnett, Samantha Campbell, George Carroll, Christine Cave, Charles Champion, Janice Charles, Amelia Collins, Marianne Cowpe, Brandon Dodd, Pamela Drake, Vincent Driscoll, Robert Fisher, Christopher Franks, Russell Godfrey, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, Stephen Haines, Sally Hanks, Nic Hodges, Shirley Hodges, Catherine Iannucci-Williams, Gwyn John, Dr. Ian Johnson, Susan Lloyd-Selby, Belinda Loveluck-Edwards, Julie Lynch-Wilson, Kevin Mahoney, Naomi Marshallsea, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Elliot Penn, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Neil Thomas, Rhys Thomas, Steffan Wiliam, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

135 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”.

136 [APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE](#) –

These were received from Councillors Anthony Ernest, Wendy Gilligan, William Hennessy and Michael Morgan.

137 [DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST](#) –

The following declarations of interest were received:

Councillor A. Asbrey	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – Councillor Asbrey was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
----------------------	--

Councillor J. Aviet	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor R. Birch	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Councillor was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor B. Brooks	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor G. Carroll	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor C. Champion	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Councillor was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor C.M. Cowpe	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Members was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor P. Drake	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – Councillor Drake was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor C. Franks	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor Emma Goodjohn	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Councillor was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor S. Haines	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor N.P. Hodges	Agenda item 12 – Notice of Motion: Evidence of Need – Councillor N. Hodges declared a personal and not prejudicial interest as his wife worked for the Department of Work and Pensions
Councillor S.A. Hodges	Agenda item 12 – Notice of Motion: Evidence of Need – Councillor S. Hodges declared a personal and not prejudicial interest as they worked for the Department of Work and Pensions.
Councillor C. Iannucci-Williams	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby	Agenda item 12 – Notice of Motion: Evidence of Need – Councillor Lloyd-Selby declared a prejudicial interest as an independent member of Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (and left the meeting).

Councillor B. Loveluck-Edwards	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor J. Lynch-Wilson	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Councillor was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor N. Marshallsea	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor H. Payne	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – Councillor Payne was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor E. Penn	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Councillor was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor S. Wiliam	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
Councillor M. Wilkinson	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – Councillor Wilkinson was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor M. Wilson	Agenda item 11 – Notice of Motion: Additional Learning Needs (ALN) fundings – the Member was a School Governor and declared a personal and not prejudicial interest and remained to participate in the debate and vote.
----------------------	---

138 MINUTES –

RESOLVED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 9th March, 2026 and the Annual Meeting held on 13th May, 2026 be approved as a correct record.

139 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

(i) [The Mayor](#)

The Mayor announced they were happy to be chairing their first Full Council, and welcomed Councillor Shirley Hodges, who was elected at the recent Baruc by-election. They reflected that it had been very hot due to recent heatwaves and had attended several Civic events including an event in Dinas Powys, Armed Forces Day and Windrush Day.

(ii) [The Leader and Executive Member for Performance and Resources](#)

The Leader recognised several residents of the Vale of Glamorgan who were recently honoured as part of the King's Birthday Honors including:

- British Empire Medal: Carmen Soraya Kelly and David Gardiner;
- MBE: Roger Charles Lewis, Hywel Thomas Baker, and Christopher Britten;
- OBE: Professor Steven Jolles;
- CBE: Anthony Richard.

They also extended a congratulations were extended to Dame Heather Stevens of the Waterloo Foundation for her appointment as a Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire. The Leader highlighted the Foundation's significant impact since its establishment in 2007, noting its work in child development, health, environmental sustainability, and support for local businesses in the Vale of Glamorgan.

(iii) [Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services](#)

The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services expressed his gratitude toward the Council's frontline staff for their hard work under very challenging weather conditions over the preceding few weeks. They also acknowledged the residents of the Vale for their positive feedback and support regarding the staff's efforts during this difficult period.

140 PUBLIC QUESTIONS –

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

(i) [Question from Andrew Vincent](#)

Have the Vale residents' submissions from the March 2026 RLDP Consultation Process been made "fully" available to all current Vale Councillors (that is unedited by Vale Planning or by any AI software)? If not, why not? Thus can Vale residents be assured that all current Vale Councillors should be fully aware of the unedited contents of all these submissions?

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

The full representations made as part of the Deposit consultation will be made available in full to Vale of Glamorgan Elected Members. However, due to the number and length of representations submitted, it is necessary to summarise them as part of the actual report of consultation.

(ii) [Question from William Hart](#)

I've come across many people who object to the proposed urban sprawl housing developments around Barry and Dinas but none who support them, so why do Councillors think it's in the best interests of the people they represent to force something onto them that they do not want?

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

The Council has a duty to prepare a development plan, and this must balance a range of priorities. This includes responding to housing needs and economic growth in a way that aligns with national policy. The plan must ensure that the right sites are allocated in the right locations, based on robust evidence.

We are pleased with the number of residents that engaged with us on the recent consultation on the Deposit RLDP. Whilst many residents objected to specific sites, we have also received comments from people who support the proposals and who recognise the importance of providing new homes at a time of housing crisis. We are mindful that the feedback received may not reflect the full range of views in the community, and the views of those people most in need of housing may well be under-represented. It is therefore important that when Councillors make decisions, they consider all the evidence alongside the views of communities.

Residents should note that there will be an Examination into the RLDP, where an Independent Planning Inspector will review of all representations received, alongside the evidence underpinning policies and proposals in the Plan.

(iii) [Question from Max Wallis](#)

What changes does Councillor Ruba Sivagnanam propose to the deposit RLDP to bring it into line with the Welsh requirement for new developments to be accompanied by biodiversity enhancement proportionate to their scale and nature (as PPW12). The deposit RLDP uses instead the requirement in England for "net benefit for biodiversity" (cf. SP19). Will the stronger Welsh requirement be applied retrospectively and appropriate corrections to the supporting "Green Infrastructure Strategy" document issued?

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

The RLDP has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Wales with regards to biodiversity. The term 'net benefit for biodiversity' is a Welsh term, referenced repeatedly in Planning Policy Wales. The English terminology is for 'biodiversity net gain.'

The Green Infrastructure Strategy was subject to consultation alongside the RLDP. Consideration is currently being given to any amendments that may be necessary to the document in light of representations received. However, it was prepared in line with the latest edition of Planning Policy Wales and therefore references the most recent biodiversity requirements.

(iv) [Question from Jason Vincent-Newson](#)

Will the RLDP submissions made by residents during the March 2026 consultation period be made available in full (i.e. unedited/unabridged) to the independent planning inspector? If not, why not, and what then will the process be to accurately convey the residents' objections registered during the RLDP consultation process?

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

The full representations made as part of the Deposit consultation will be made available in full to the appointed Independent Planning Inspector. However, due to the number and length of representations submitted, it is necessary to summarise them as part of the actual report of consultation.

(v) [Question from Mary Vincent](#)

In the light of Wales being the "most nature depleted country in the world" (Tir Natur website) why did the Vale RLDP not fully address options for housing development on the remaining brown field sites in Barry instead of making incursion into well-established green wedge farmland at the fringes of town?

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

As part of the RLDP process, two calls for candidate sites were undertaken, enabling

landowners to submit sites for potential inclusion as allocations in the Plan. Each site has been subject to a robust assessment to determine its suitability and deliverability for housing.

As a result of the candidate site assessment process, some brownfield sites have been allocated for housing. However, following the development of Barry Waterfront during the previous plan period, there are now very few large, deliverable brownfield sites remaining in Barry.

The Council has also undertaken an urban capacity study to identify opportunities on previously developed and underutilised land within the Barry settlement boundary. In addition, an allowance for completions on unallocated 'windfall' sites has been factored into the Plan.

Nevertheless, given the significant need for new housing in Barry, including affordable housing on deliverable sites, there has been a need to consider greenfield sites. This position is fully explained in the RLDP evidence base.

(vi) **Question from Rebekah Vincent-Newson**

What future Council meetings (Full Council / partial / Scrutiny Committee specific) are scheduled where any votes might take place which could in any way impact or affect the approval and adoption process of the RLDP?

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

It is anticipated that a report on the RLDP will be presented to Cabinet and Place Scrutiny Committee in November 2026 followed by Full Council in December 2026 seeking approval to submit the RLDP for Independent Examination.

It is important to note that Scrutiny is not a formal decision-making Committee but a space to provide challenge and viewpoints on an apolitical basis ahead of any decisions being made. During Place Scrutiny Committee, a range of Members will consider the Plan, with Committee Members agreeing recommendations that will help inform the longer-term decision-making process ahead of all Members discussing and voting on the issue at Full Council.

(vii) **Question from Catherine Hart**

Will the Council introduce compensation for residents whose properties are significantly devalued as a result of the excessive new housing developments around the Vale?

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

Impact on property value is not generally a material Planning consideration. This is a well-established principle, as planning policies and appeal decisions make clear that

land and house prices are outside the planning system.

(viii) [Question from Maxine Levett](#)

In reviewing public responses to the RLDP, has Councillor Ruba Sivagnanam accepted that calling St Athan area a "strategic growth area" seriously misleads readers, being inconsistent with Future Wales, where St Athan is defined as a rural area. Future Wales contains a policy of growth for local needs or our area. Is the RLDP therefore being amended to assess St Athan's needs and drop the two "key" development sites pending this assessment?

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

The Vale of Glamorgan, including St Athan, is identified within a national growth area in Future Wales, the National Plan 2040. At the local level, the RLDP Strategy defines a 'strategic growth area' which encompasses the main centres of population in the Vale, with St Athan being referenced as a sustainable location where new residential development can be aligned with other uses and where there are current and proposed sustainable transport options to reduce the need to travel by car. St Athan is identified as a primary settlement within the strategic growth area, and it is considered that the level of growth proposed is appropriate given its strategic location in close proximity to two key employment sites.

(ix) [Question from Julia Thompson](#)

All of us will be aware of the widespread concerns regarding the regular, ongoing discharge of sewage into open water (rivers/sea) in and around the Vale of Glamorgan, due to the inability of Welsh Water's infrastructure to cope with the current levels of sewage and wastewater they are responsible for processing. Considering the proposals within the RLDP to add a large number of new houses to the existing sewage infrastructure, what concrete and specific actions are currently being taken, or are planned to be taken by Welsh Water and/or the Vale authority, to bring the current system up to the required standard now, and ensure that the system will be able to cope with the increased demand occurring as a result of future implementation of the RLDP?

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

In preparing the Deposit RLDP, the Council has consulted Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW) to identify sewerage capacity on a site-specific basis. DCWW have a programme of capital investment, which is set out in their Asset Management Plan and over their next programme period improvements have been identified to specific Wastewater Treatment Works serving the Vale. Where there is a need for improvements to take place prior to development, or where additional hydraulic modelling work is necessary, this is set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan prepared as part of the evidence base for the RLDP. DCWW will also be consulted again as standard on all relevant planning applications.

(x) [Question from Stephen Fraser](#)

The Welsh Government have invested large sums of money into improving the existing transport links around the Vale in order to support future expansion of operations at Cardiff Wales Airport. In light of the fact that any future building development in the area of Rhoose and/or north or west Barry will have the effect of significantly increasing traffic delays in the area, in particular along the key A4226 road between Weycock Cross and the airport, have the emergency services been consulted in this matter, and if so, what discussions have taken place? Furthermore, what measures are being taken to fully model the potential impact of the proposed developments on the ability of emergency services to respond to a major incident at Cardiff Airport in the future?

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

Cardiff Airport and the emergency services were consulted on the Deposit RLDP and did not raise objections to the plan.

(xi) [Question from Emma Reed](#)

Will the Cabinet Member please advise if the Objections raised to the Replacement Deposit Local Development Plan in Spring 2026 are to be considered by Council in October 2026 in order to meet the approved RLDP timetable?

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

The approved RLDP Delivery Agreement indicates that the political reporting for the next stage of the RLDP process should take place in October/November 2026. This report will include the report of consultation on representations made to the Deposit RLDP and seek approval to submit the RLDP to Welsh Government for Independent Examination. It is anticipated that the report will be considered by Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee in November 2026 and by Full Council in early December 2026.

(xii) [Question from Dennis Clarke](#)

Would the Leader agree that it is in the Council's interests to fully investigate reasons for the 2 large costs Orders paid to the developers in relation to the attempts at planning permission for the Barry Biomass project of a total of circa £1,000,000.00. The strong criticisms made against the Council by the Inspectors on the two occasions might demonstrate similar issues. It is important when cash is in short supply that the Council learns from errors rather than continue to make the same and/or similar errors on similar planning applications. A committee of Vale Councillors who were not involved in the planning applications could investigate and report back to Cabinet and full Council and, if appropriate, advise on how errors might be avoided going forward.

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

The Council has repeatedly sought to protect Barry and the Vale's communities from unauthorised development at the site of the Biomass plant, and that involved taking enforcement action in the most robust terms possible. The award of costs hinged on a technical matter relating to proposed enforcement, a matter which could have reasonably been accommodated by an amendment to the Notice. It was a highly regrettable decision of Planning and Environment Decisions Wales to determine the matter in the way they did, one which left the Council unjustly facing a costs award. I do not consider it an appropriate use of resources to revisit that matter in the manner requested, given the reasons already stated.

(xiii) Question from Emma Reed

Much has been said over the past 10 years of the implementation of additional rail services on the Vale of Glamorgan Railway Line. The latest iteration of the Local Development Plan promotes massive growth in Rhosee yet its public transport options are woefully inadequate.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that Llantwit Major and Rhosee stations are still to receive an additional train service per hour from December 2026 meaning that they have access to two trains per hour not one?

Also can the Cabinet Member confirm what plans there are to improve the very poor local bus services in Rhosee after the extra Council tax charged to residents in 26/27 for better rural bus services?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

In March 2026, Transport for Wales (TFW) reaffirmed their aim of delivering timetable improvements to achieve two trains per hour for customers travelling between Bridgend and Cardiff on the Vale of Glamorgan Line. TFW have confirmed that significant progress has been made in delivering the infrastructure and fleet changes required. This has included the completion of the electrification of the upper Rhymney line, and work is progressing to secure the necessary permissions to introduce Class 756 tri-mode trains on the line. TFW have confirmed that they require the Class 756 trains to be running reliably before increasing to a full timetable of two trains an hour.

In support of introducing new Class 756 trains on the Vale of Glamorgan Line, TFW is working closely with Network Rail and the VoG to resolve rail operational requirements around existing level crossings. Any material change that impacts either the usage of a level crossing by the public or the frequency of train movements must satisfy a robust level crossing risk assessment process undertaken by National Rail. TFW currently anticipates that subject to resolving both the outstanding rolling stock and level crossing matters, the enhanced timetable will be introduced from 2027.

The Council is due to go to tender for the following 3 rural Vale services:

- V1 - Llantwit Major to Bridgend via Llanmaes, Sigingstone, Llandow, Llanblethian, Cowbridge, Penllyn, Craig Penllyn, Colwinston, Corntown and Ewenny;
- V2 - Llantwit Major to Bridgend via Boverton, St Athan, St Mary Church, St Hilary, Penllyn, Craig Penllyn, Fferm Goch, Llangan, Treoes;
- V3 - Cowbridge to Barry via Welsh St Donats, Tair Onen, Llantrithyd, Llancarfan, Llancadle, Penmark, Fonmon and Rhooose.

The timetables are set for Monday to Saturday services with between four and five services running in each direction per day (a total of eight to ten services daily).

Operators will also be given, as part of the tender, the opportunity to submit their own timetables for consideration. Once the tender results are received and assessed consideration will be given to allocation of the £535k funding. The tender is currently with the Council's procurement body, Ardal, who are undertaking final checks before it goes live. It is envisaged this will happen this month.

Once tender results are received, consideration will also be given to:

- The need to run an enhanced G1 service with Greenlinks as residents would have a "regular" bus services based on the tendered timetables.
- Increasing frequency on the 320 service and adding an additional bus into the 303/304/X2 loop.

141 [AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION \(MO/HLDS\)](#) –

The report requested Council's approval for updates to *Section 14 – Responsibilities for Function – Summary* within the Council's Constitution.

In line with the legislative requirements surrounding political balance, this had been re-calculated based upon the proposed changes identified and there was no requirement for any Groups to identify changes in Committee memberships and balancing of seats in line with proportionality requirements. However, there would be a requirement for the Council's political balance to be updated as a result of the Baruc by-election which was held on Thursday, 9th July 2026.

RESOLVED – T H A T the amendments to the Council's Constitution as detailed in paragraphs 4.2 – 4.7 of the report be approved and that the Constitution be updated accordingly.

Reason for decision

To update the Constitution to reflect amendments as outlined within the report.

142 [REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY 2026-2031](#) (REF) –

The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services presented the report, a reference from Statutory Licensing Committee, and noted that there was a requirement for the Council to publish a Statement of Licensing Policy with respect to the exercise of its licensing functions, which was required to be reviewed on a 5 yearly basis. The Policy was last revised in 2021 and was now due for review.

The report also advised on the consultation responses to the draft Policy and subsequent amendments and sought approval for its adoption.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Statement of Licensing Policy 2026-2031, as detailed in Appendix B to the report, be approved.

Reason for decision

To ensure that the Council fulfilled its duty as a Licensing Authority under the Licensing Act 2003.

143 [HOUSING HEATING INSTALLATIONS SERVICING AND MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORK 2026-29](#) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C252, 26th March, 2026 (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.

144 [LOCAL GROWTH FUND IN WALES – VALE OF GLAMORGAN](#) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C265, 16th April, 2026 (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.

145 [Q4 SICKNESS ABSENCE](#) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C289, 25th May, 2026 (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.

146 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE OF MOTION [SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS L. BURNETT AND R. BIRCH] –

The below Notice of Motion, moved by Councillor L. Burnett and seconded by Councillor R. Birch at the meeting, was debated.

“Additional Learning Needs (ALN) Funding

This Council notes:

The receipt of a ‘one-off’ amount of £322m consequential funding by Welsh Government (WG) relating to additional Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND) spending in England.

- That in England, accumulated high-needs deficits (*estimated at over £3.3 billion by 2025/26*) are now being addressed through national interventions such as the use of a statutory override.
- That the Local Government Association in England has estimated that 8 out of 10 Councils would be bankrupt without such action.

This Council further notes that:

While schools and education services are funded differently in Wales compared to England the challenges and deficits are similar.

- In Wales, these pressures have been absorbed over a sustained period within core local government and education budgets. Unlike England, where high-needs deficits have accumulated separately, Welsh Local Authorities have managed this demand within existing resources, at significant cost to wider services and to financial resilience.
- As a result the equivalent funding shortfall facing Welsh Local Government is at least the same, if not higher than the £322 million consequential.
- The absence of formal deficits does not reflect an absence of pressure; rather, it demonstrates the extent to which Councils and schools have already accommodated growth in need within constrained funding envelopes
- The funding for ALN provision is an enormous budgetary pressure with more than 60% of schools in some areas carrying negative balances.

This Council believes that

- This funding is not only for new provision, but also to address cumulative pressures and to sustain the ALN system and statutory entitlements.

- There is a strong evidence-based case for directing these funds through Councils, where the statutory responsibility and most acute pressures sit.
- A strong Welsh narrative would therefore be that available funding should be directed to Local Authorities where the most acute statutory and system-level pressures sit, and because the wider financial evidence, including the deterioration in school reserves, points to a system that is already absorbing strain rather than one that has capacity to carry more without additional support.

This Council therefore resolves to

- Work with partners across the county, region and nationally who share our determination to deliver support to children and young people with ALN.
- Request the Leader of the Council writes to the First Minister urging the WG to ensure that the full value of any SEND/ALN related consequential funding received from the UK Government are allocated to Local Authorities.
- Request that copies of the letter are sent to all Members of the Senedd and MPs for the Vale of Glamorgan.
- Request that copies of the letter are forwarded to all Members of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, to all schools and to the School Budget Forum.”

The Leader moved the Motion, and highlighted that the Council had been aware of this one-off consequential funding since late March. They expressed deep disappointment with the Welsh Government’s handling of the funding, disputing claims that the deficit was different in Wales compared to England. They emphasised that the funding must be directed to children via Local Authorities and requested a Recorded Vote.

Councillor Birch spoke about the critical need for ALN funding, noting that the Council was finally recognising the needs of young people who were previously disengaged or isolated, and argued that adequate funding was essential for meaningful education.

Councillor Payne supported the Motion framing ALN funding as an equality issue. She noted that underfunding disproportionately impacted female carers, affecting their employment and well-being, and praised the current ALN provision in the Vale of Glamorgan as exemplary.

Councillor Dr. Johnson criticised the Motion as "politicking" by the Labour Group, noting that Labour had been in power in the Senedd for 27 years. They argued that the proposal was unrealistic and suggested a more "reasonable" approach regarding the Welsh Government's current budget proposals. During the debate, they proposed an Amendment to the Motion as follows:

Replacement of bullet point 2: Instead of the original wording, the Council would resolve to "request the Leader of the Council writes to the First Minister welcoming the £120 million of additional ALN funding".

Councillor Carroll indicated that they did not accept the proposed Amendment as they believed the money provided by UK Government for this purpose should be spent in this way. Councillor John agreed with this sentiment.

Councillor S. Hodges argued that the debate was characterised by 'politicking' rather than genuine concern for the children of the Vale, and expressed support for the amendment, criticising the original Motion as being based on 'fantasy figures' and failing to address the long-term history of underfunding in the region.

Councillor N. Hodges reiterated that both education and the NHS had been consistently underfunded by the Welsh Government, which had been led by the opposition party until two months prior. They described the opposition's actions as 'politicking'.

A Recorded Vote on the Amendment to the Motion was undertaken as below:

Member	For	Against	Abstain
A. Asbrey	√		
J. Aviet		√	
G. Ball		√	
R. Birch		√	
B. Brooks		√	
G. Bruce		√	
I. Buckley		√	
L. Burnett		√	
S. Campbell		√	
G. Carroll		√	
C. Cave	Did not Vote		
C. Champion		√	
J. Charles		√	
A. Collins	√		
M. Cowpe	√		
B. Dodd	Did not Vote		
P. Drake		√	
V. Driscoll		√	
R. Fisher		√	
C. Franks	√		
R. Godfrey		√	
Emma Goodjohn		√	

Member	For	Against	Abstain
Ewan Goodjohn		√	
S. Haines		√	
S. Hanks			√
N. Hodges	√		
S. Hodges	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams		√	
G. John		√	
I. Johnson	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby		√	
B. Loveluck-Edwards		√	
J. Lynch-Wilson		√	
K. Mahoney		√	
N. Marshallsea		√	
J. Norman		√	
H. Payne		√	
E. Penn		√	
S. Perkes		√	
I. Perry	Did not Vote		
J. Protheroe		√	
R. Sivagnanam		√	
C. Stallard		√	
N. Thomas		√	
R. Thomas		√	
S. Wiliam	√		
M. Wilkinson		√	
E. Williams		√	
M. Wilson		√	
N. Wood	Did not Vote		
TOTAL	8	37	1

The original Motion was debated. Councillor Carroll expressed his support and emphasised the significant funding pressures currently facing the education sector in the Vale of Glamorgan and argued that it was critical for any money provided by the Westminster Government to Senedd Ministers to be passed directly to schools,

which he described as the ultimate destination for this funding.

Councillor John confirmed support for the Motion, noting that the Council had made significant progress in expanding ALN facilities over the years. They highlighted the growth in provision within their own constituency and stressed that the additional funding was desperately needed to sustain these essential services.

Councillor Asbrey acknowledged the importance of investing in ALN, expressed some disappointment that the Motion did not formally recognise the 'excellent work' already undertaken by members of the Task and Finish Group who investigated ALN resource bases earlier in the year. They argued that an evidence-led approach was crucial for addressing these complex challenges.

Councillor Perkes placed an emphasis upon children and their life chances, and the need for funding sufficiency. They suggested that while others may need to fight for funding elsewhere, the available consequential money must be prioritised for the children who relied on it to succeed in school.

Councillor Goodjohn shared that he was respected devolution and fair funding, but urged for all Members to prioritise young people, including expanding free school meals provision, and improving ALN funding and teacher pay, which could lead to staff industrial action.

The Leader stated that the proposed amendment was unnecessary because the Council was already in constant communication with the Welsh Government through active engagement with Welsh Local Government Association and believed that simply "welcoming" funding did not resolve the underlying issue of how those resources were distributed to children in need. They reiterated that the primary concern was not the political process, but ensuring that consequential funding originating from Westminster was fully passed through to Local Authorities to support Additional Learning Needs as intended, and expressed frustration that this funding had not been adequately protected for its specific purpose.

A Recorded Vote was taken as below –

Member	For	Against	Abstain
A. Asbrey		√	
J. Aviet	√		
G. Ball	√		
R. Birch	√		
B. Brooks	√		
G. Bruce		√	
I. Buckley	√		
L. Burnett	√		
S. Campbell	√		

Member	For	Against	Abstain
G. Carroll	√		
C. Cave	Did not Vote		
C. Champion	√		
J. Charles	√		
A. Collins		√	
M. Cowpe		√	
B. Dodd	Did not Vote		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll	√		
R. Fisher	√		
C. Franks		√	
R. Godfrey	√		
Emma Goodjohn	√		
Ewan Goodjohn	√		
S. Haines	√		
S. Hanks	√		
N. Hodges		√	
S. Hodges		√	
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
G. John	√		
I. Johnson		√	
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
B. Loveluck-Edwards	√		
J. Lynch-Wilson	√		
K. Mahoney	√		
N. Marshallsea	√		
J. Norman	√		
H. Payne	√		
E. Penn	√		
S. Perkes	√		
I. Perry	Did not Vote		
J. Protheroe	√		
R. Sivagnanam	√		

Member	For	Against	Abstain
C. Stallard	√		
N. Thomas	√		
R. Thomas	Did not Vote		
S. Wiliam		√	
M. Wilkinson	√		
E. Williams	√		
M. Wilson	√		
N. Wood	Did not Vote		
TOTAL	36	9	

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the Council work with partners across the county, region and nationally who shared its determination to deliver support to children and young people with Additional Learning Needs (ALN).
- (2) T H A T the Leader of the Council write to the First Minister urging the Welsh Government to ensure that the full value of any SEND/ALN related consequentials received from the UK Government be allocated to Local Authorities.
- (3) T H A T copies of the letter be sent to all Members of the Senedd and MPs for the Vale of Glamorgan.
- (4) T H A T copies of the letter be forwarded to all Members of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, to all schools and to the School Budget Forum.

Reason for decisions

- (1-5) Having regard to the discussions at the meeting.

147 [TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE OF MOTION \[SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS B. LOVELUCK-EDWARDS AND J. PROTHEROE\]](#) –

The below Notice of Motion, moved by Councillor B. Loveluck-Edwards and seconded by Councillor J. Protheroe at the meeting, was debated.

“Evidence of Need

That this Council recognises requiring a person with a Disability or underlying health condition to secure written testimony from a GP (such as to qualify for specific adaptations or adjustments to their Council property), creates some delays as they wait for the information to be processed by their local GP practice, causing anxiety and a cost attached by the GP practice. Recent feedback from GP practices

suggests that drafting and signing letters increasingly takes them away from their core activity. The average charge was £40, most severely impacting those who can least afford it, including those reliant on Welfare.

Therefore this Motion asks that the Council:

1. Review what evidence is required by our departments and why, so that staff and residents are clear on why they are necessary.
2. To wherever possible accept other forms of evidence such as a copy of PIP/Pension Credit correspondence from the DWP.
3. Create a basic guide that explains, in plain language, to residents why we ask for certain evidence.
4. Contact the LMC (Local Medical Committee) a representative body of GPs across Cardiff and Vale Health Board to raise awareness and secure a long-term solution that removes the financial pressures our most vulnerable residents face because of the charges a GP practice may impose."

Councillor Loveluck-Edwards opened the debate by sharing data from the Vale Food Bank, noting that 44% of their users had been charged for GP letters, 86% of whom were disabled. They argued that these requests fell outside core NHS contracts, creating unfair financial barriers for vulnerable residents.

Councillor Protheroe seconded the Motion, emphasising that many residents were in distress and that requiring paid medical letters punished them for being in need. They stressed that a clearer, more efficient system was a matter of both ethics and Local Authority responsibility.

The Leader clarified that GPs were often not the most appropriate professionals to assess specific adaptations; Occupational Therapists were better suited for this. They noted that the Council should focus on evidence of need rather than relying solely on medical letters.

Councillor Hodges highlighted the inconsistency in the quality of GP letters and expressed her support for a policy change that prioritised the testimony and self-reporting of disabled individuals.

Councillor Carroll acknowledged the need for efficiency and a balance between avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy and maintaining proper checks and balances. They supported the call for a review of existing systems to explore alternative evidence.

Councillor Wilson suggested that residents should lobby organisations like Llais to represent patient views on the charging issue, and while they voiced concerns about a "blanket" approach to accepting all claims without verification, they agreed to support the review.

Councillor Mahoney expressed scepticism about the feasibility of the proposal, noting that they would abstain from the vote until more concrete details on the review's scope and proposed changes are presented.

Councillor Perkes supported the Motion from a social housing perspective, noting that it would be beneficial to review what specific types of information from various agencies could satisfy housing evidence requirements.

In her closing, Councillor Loveluck-Edwards addressed concerns by clarifying that the Motion did not propose accepting claims without evidence, but rather focused on a consistent, compassionate approach. She emphasised that many vulnerable residents were already assessed through other established frameworks (like PIP), and the review would aim to identify where the Council could reduce gaps and make the process more accessible and gentler for those in need.

Following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the Council review what evidence was required by its departments and why, so that staff and residents were clear on why they were necessary.
- (2) T H A T the Council, wherever possible, accept other forms of evidence such as a copy of PIP/Pension Credit correspondence from the DWP.
- (3) T H A T the Council create a basic guide that explains, in plain language, to residents why it asks for certain evidence.
- (4) T H A T the Council Contact the LMC (Local Medical Committee) a representative body of GPs across Cardiff and Vale Health Board to raise awareness and secure a long-term solution that removes the financial pressures our most vulnerable residents face because of the charges a GP practice may impose.

Reason for decisions

- (1-4) Having regard to the discussions at the meeting.

148 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 J. Protheroe](#)

How is the Council planning to understand and act upon the need to adapt community buildings and schools to address the impact of climate change?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

As part of our ongoing decarbonisation programme we have retrofitted energy saving technologies into 7 community centres plus CF61 using Ystadau Cymru ACPW3 Capital grants. Our ongoing schools retrofit programme focuses on similar energy

and water efficiency technologies. Alongside this, the Sustainable Communities for Learning Capital Programme follows strict design standards that include net zero carbon in operation and summertime overheating assessments that are BREEAM compliant. Within this, biodiversity enhancements such as green roofs and Sustainable Urban Drainage are features that alleviate high intensity rainfall. We have a high percentage of eco-school sites, and these features enhanced learning opportunities for our pupils.

This work supports our buildings to be more resilient around their energy needs, particularly as demand and cost rises for heating and cooling. Water efficiency fittings and leak detection support lower water use, which is particularly important in times of drought.

During the recent red warning heatwave our understanding of how our built environment responds to periods of prolonged excessive heat became evident. In order to better understand how our buildings and sites are performing, we are running a survey across all schools. In addition, we will be completing a similar exercise with our community centres in relation to climate resilience. Both initiatives will be progressed with our Emergency Planning colleagues and support the recommendations of our recently completed Vale PSB Climate Change Risk Assessment.

In addition to the work in partnership with PSB partners, work has commenced on the Council's climate adaptation planning. Officers have met in recent weeks to begin looking at how the work across the organisation can be co-ordinated and learning shared between teams, as well as opportunities to do things differently in response to the need to continue to decarbonise, and alongside to mitigate, the impacts of climate change. Officers are also working very closely with Welsh Government officials and the Future Generations Commissioner and his team to ensure that our work on all aspects of decarbonisation and climate adaptation align closely with National strategies and policies.

(ii) [Question from Councillor W.A. Hennessy](#)

Will the Cabinet Member please outline the measures the Council has implemented to ensure the safety of its workforce, particularly refuse collection operatives, street cleaning staff, and litter pickers, and whether any further improvements are planned?

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

Many thanks for the question, Councillor. We take the health and safety of all Council colleagues very seriously and have robust policies, procedures and support arrangements in place across the many different departments. These are kept under continuous review, with formal policy updates and communications happening.

In terms of the specific roles you are asking about, the Council has a small health and safety team, with one colleague spending the majority of their time supporting the Environment and Housing Directorate. The team have regular health and safety

catch up meetings where we discuss risk assessments, inspections, accident investigations, well-being, and training.

For refuse and cleansing teams, there are risk assessments in place which the team support. The development of these is reviewed annually by the manager.

In terms of training, there is an ongoing programme of manual handling training for refuse collectors and at the last meeting (01.07.2026) 118 staff had been trained out of 140. The training is combined with conflict management training for cleansing staff. Regular meetings are held with managers, with support being provided around well-being action planning where staff with health issues have reasonable adjustments. The health and safety team have a meeting with drivers and loaders every 6-8 weeks where they discuss any issues and then follow up.

To support the health and safety of cleansing teams, the corporate team has visited and inspected all toilets; and are now monitoring a percentage with a quarterly visit. Recent developments include a review of the needlestick recovery process which went out to staff via supervisors and an update to the induction process.

(iii) Question from Councillor S.T. Wiliam

Councillors recently received presentations from Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water and Natural Resources Wales about the South Central Bathing Waters Project, which aims to better understand the poor-quality water quality rating in some of our local beaches.

What role will the Council be playing in this research project, and how will local Ward Councillors in Baruc be involved?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

The South-Central Bathing Waters Project is a stakeholder group convened to provide strategic leadership, collaboration, and coordination for a whole-catchment approach to improving bathing water quality at Ogmere-by-Sea and Watch House Bay. The Catchment Partnership brings together key organisations including Natural Resources Wales (NRW), Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW) and the Council, with a shared interest in improving bathing water quality and the overall health of the catchment, working collectively to align action and accelerate delivery on improvements. NRW's ambition is to create an integrated approach to catchment resilience. Whilst the immediate priority is addressing bathing water quality, this project aims to bring together wider environmental improvements such as water quality, resilient soils, biodiversity and flood risk management to provide the best opportunity of addressing the many complex issues within the river catchments for these bathing waters. The project will seek to develop a whole-catchment plan that blends traditional engineering with nature-based solutions, driving climate resilience while supporting economic growth and community well-being.

The Council is a statutory partner for this project and with our partners are co-ordinating action across member organisations to reduce duplication, share data and evidence, in order to align interventions with the aim of improving bathing water

quality. A further key role for the Council is to facilitate wider community and public engagement with the Project, sharing key messages on progress. Wider community engagement is actively encouraged, and local Members are advised to contact the NRW project team on bathingwatersSC@naturalresources.wales.

(iv) [Question from Councillor J. Protheroe](#)

How does the Council identify those who are most at risk from the impact of climate change and what is being done to assist the most vulnerable?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

Thank you for the question on this issue which is very timely. The heatwaves that we have been experiencing have brought many challenges and we know that for those who are most vulnerable it can be even more difficult to manage in these hot temperatures. We also know that areas of higher deprivation are more likely to be disproportionately affected by climate change e.g. due to costs of adaptations to housing, rising food costs etc and ability to recover from extreme weather events and this will also be factored into our work.

The Vale Public Services Board (PSB) has recently worked with consultants to undertake a Climate Change Risk Assessment. This has been a partnership approach to considering a number of identified climate risks and how they impact on services and communities. The assessment focused on five key themes including infrastructure and health and wellbeing and highlighted the need for plans for extreme weather to improve resilience, to consider the changes needed to care homes and health facilities and for community outreach with our more vulnerable and isolated residents. We will continue to work with our partners through the PSB to address the risks identified.

With regards to our current practices and to assure you that we are already taking steps to ensure our more vulnerable residents are supported I would like to highlight work in social care and housing.

Where services are commissioned, social services work closely with providers to ensure that they are able to meet people's needs within their own homes, as we know they can be significantly impacted by heat. The commissioning team offer advice and support on working in heat. They also work with providers to ensure they are equipped with the skills to meet vulnerable residents needs which are impacted by heat. During heat waves local and national advice is provided to providers. In extreme events we work with providers to ensure that those with the highest levels of needs are prioritised.

It is also standard practice that when social workers and social care staff undertake Care and Support Assessments they assess the environmental factors that impact upon the individual and their families. This includes living arrangements and the appropriateness of the home environment and where required with the consent of the individual referrals for support are made to the relevant agency to ensure that these assessed needs are met.

Within social services they already have established risk assessments processes for working at hotter temperatures, these are updated each time a major heat event impacts upon services to ensure that they evolve to reflect previous learning and are bespoke enough to respond to the new event. Social Services are also investing in equipment and technology to help support staff working and residents living within hotter climates.

The Welsh Housing Quality Standard (WHQS) already requires landlords to consider extreme heat and to look to mitigate it as part of the standard for existing tenants. Our housing team took steps in the recent heatwave to reach out to those who are most vulnerable and are looking to share learning and experience to be able to plan more for future events. The Housing team are also reviewing sensor data, including from sheltered housing, to understand the heat profile across their estate. This data will help inform adaptation options e.g. looking at shading options, ways to minimise solar gain, boiler work, behavioural work etc.

As part of Project Zero we have already had a number of discussions to consider how we develop our work further around climate adaptation to complement the more developed mitigation works in the climate change challenge plan. This work will involve staff across the organisation including emergency planning and schools as well as other frontline services and will complement the work being undertaken through the PSB and build on existing good practice and learning.

We look for opportunities to communicate important health information at times of extreme weather, sharing information from partners and other sources through a range of different media to provide information and assistance.

Supplemental

Councillor Protheroe asked if the Council would consider climate risk mapping with social care databases to help identify vulnerable and isolated people during periods of heat, to which the Deputy Leader replied that her response outlined how the Council was supporting those in need during the weather conditions.

(v) Question from Councillor S.J. Haines

Would the Cabinet Member clarify what the Council considers to be a reasonable timeframe for a Councillor or member of the public to receive a response to a question asked at Full Council?

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

I would like to take this opportunity to apologise to Councillor Haines for the delay and provide a response to his previous question around brownfield sites at December's Full Council meeting. At this point, I'd like to advise that each proposal must be considered on its merits, so it is not possible to apply a blanket approach to all proposals. However, in principle brownfield land should be prioritised above greenfield land where available, and I am aware that officers have significant

concerns with the Gileston proposal which is due to be reported to Planning Committee in July.

(vi) Question from Councillor N.P. Hodges

The recent heatwave at the end of June led to risk assessments and school closures in the Vale, for example at Romilly Primary School, which affected many children, parents and teachers.

With high temperatures now increasing in frequency, what plans does the Council have for the school estate, in particular, so that this is not repeated?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Education, Arts and the Welsh Language

In order to learn lessons and prepare for future events, I can advise you that Council officers are currently gathering feedback from all schools via an e-survey to understand how they experienced the heatwave during the week commencing 22nd June 2026. This will give us valuable insight into the measures schools implemented to improve comfort levels for both pupils and staff and help inform our future response.

In parallel, we are reviewing live data from sites where classroom sensors are in place, specifically looking at temperature and CO₂ levels. This will support a more evidence-based understanding of how different buildings perform under extreme heat conditions. We recognise that the experience of heat will vary significantly across our school estate, reflecting differences in building age, design, and surrounding environments. Urban settings, for example, may experience higher ambient temperatures compared to schools located near open green spaces or with more extensive outdoor areas.

Supplemental

Councillor Hodges asked if the Cabinet Member envisaged a possible adjustment to term times to suit the change in climate and temperatures, to which the Cabinet Member responded that it would be looked as part of the whole piece in supporting schools in responding to the Climate emergency.

(vii) Question from Councillor E. Penn

The UK Government announced in the last budget the removal of the two-child limit in Universal Credit from April of this year as part of its Child Poverty Strategy. Government analysis estimates that this change will benefit around two million children across the UK and reduce the number of children living in relative poverty by approximately 450,000 by the end of this Parliament.

Given the Vale of Glamorgan Council's commitment to tackling poverty, improving educational attainment and supporting families could the Cabinet Member outline how the Council intends to maximise the positive impact of this policy for eligible families in the Vale.

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

I and my Cabinet colleagues have welcomed the removal of the two-child limit in Universal Credit which will support work on child poverty nationally and locally and most importantly will make a real difference to the lives of many children and their families.

In considering our work to tackle poverty it is worth noting that in the Vale we have 7 LSOAs in the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in Wales according to WIMD 2025 and a further four LSOAs are included in the 10-20% most deprived LSOAs in Wales. There is a consistent correlation between these areas and higher proportions of people on lower incomes, who are in receipt of Universal Credit and in receipt of unemployment support. These groups have also been identified as most vulnerable to the impacts of the cost-of-living crisis and experiences of deprivation.

With regards to Universal Credit, some figures to consider are:

- In January 2026, the latest data available, a total of 15,436 people were in receipt of Universal Credit in the Vale of Glamorgan, 9,977 of those in receipt of Universal Credit were Not in Employment, while 5,434 were In Employment, this represents 8% of total number of people in employment in the Vale of Glamorgan.
- Over 5,400 households, around 10% of households in the Vale of Glamorgan were in receipt of Universal Credit and had a child. Just over 20% of these households had 3 or more children.

In answering this question I would like to draw attention to the draft Annual Self-Assessment report considered by Cabinet on the 9th July which detailed the significant amount of work being undertaken across the Council as part of our commitments in Vale 2030 to prioritise tackling poverty. This report demonstrates that many services across the Council are identifying opportunities to engage with residents and provide information, services and support, building on existing services and utilising grant funding.

The Cabinet report describes work being undertaken across all Directorates including employment and housing support, a review of the information on the Council's cost of living web pages, use of food insecurity and warm spaces funding, support with fuel poverty and the launch of Vale Family Compass as well as a range of activities provided by the Council's Healthy Living Team. This work is integral to delivering our vision of Strong Communities with a Bright Future.

Our work to tackle poverty is mission led and is set out clearly in Vale 2030. Across all 5 objectives in Vale 2030 there are commitments that will deliver our priority of tackling poverty. For example, under the objective 'Giving everyone a good start in life' we commit to 'Focus on families of children living in poverty and help them to increase their income, access food and housing and escape poverty through wraparound support and advice services'. Under the objective 'Supporting and protecting those who need us' we have committed to 'deliver an integrated programme of work to prevent and tackle poverty with a particular focus on our most

deprived communities'. These are just some examples of the ambition set out in Vale 2030.

I am proud of what has already been achieved within the first year of Vale 2030 and the Cabinet report referred to earlier highlights:

- In 2025/26 Communities for Work Plus (CFW+) provided specialist employment advisory and intensive mentoring to support people into employment with 400 participants engaged against a target of 300 (133% of target) and 172 individuals supported into employment against a target of 140 (123% of target).
- The Flying Start childcare offer has expanded across targeted areas of and now supports 934 postcodes, and over 280 children were offered childcare in 2025/26.
- The Vale Family Compass launched in November 2025 as the Integrated Front Door for Early Help and Statutory Children's Services, providing a single, clear point of access for families and professionals.
- The Youth Service targeted projects are supporting young people Eligible for Free School Meals (eFSM), who are referred into the service for wellbeing support, NEET prevention and homelessness prevention support. In 2025/26 167 young people were supported.
- Portable play equipment has supported delivery of community sessions and family fun days across locations in the Vale, providing free play opportunities ideas for no or low-cost play and awareness of local spaces that can be used for play.
- Capital improvements to play spaces have enhanced inclusion, helping to create environments that are welcoming, accessible, and suitable for all children. The work planned in Pencoedtre with improvements to the Splashpark and skate park are further examples of our investment in communities.

Earlier this month I asked the Council's Strategic Leadership Team to reflect on the work being taken forward and consider how we build momentum around this work with a focus on how we make support and services easier to access for our residents and ensure we have an integrated approach.

It is not acceptable that the level of inequalities still exist across the Vale and that is why we are asking teams across the Council to work together and consider what more they can do, how they can connect more with colleagues and how they can work with partners to improve services. We are looking to break down the barriers to accessing services and to build on the great work in our schools, at the Pod, the Family Compass Service, Well-being Matters and many others.

As such, I can assure you that we are developing services locally that, together with changes being made nationally, are supporting our families and are making a difference. A dedicated report on poverty and the cost-of-living crisis will be considered by Cabinet in the coming weeks, too.

(viii) [Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll](#)

Will the Cabinet Member outline the Council's policy regarding the allocation of new build homes within the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Public Sector Housing and Tenant Engagement

The Council's Local Lettings Policy, approved by Cabinet in December 2025, aims to balance the needs of local communities with the need to house those in the greatest housing need. For the first letting of most newly built homes, priority is given to applicants who have both a strong local connection and a high housing need (Gold Plus or Gold). If homes remain available, they are offered to other applicants in priority order based on housing need.

This approach applies only to the initial allocation of new-build properties. Future vacancies are normally allocated through the Council's Homes4U scheme in accordance with the Housing Allocations Policy, where priority is based on housing need.

An exception applies to Rural Exception Sites and Minor Rural Settlements, where local connection requirements continue to apply to both first lets and future relets to help meet local housing needs and support sustainable rural communities.

The policy therefore seeks to support local communities while ensuring that affordable housing is available to those in the greatest need across the Vale.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll asked if the new build allocation would be for asylum seekers, reflecting upon a similar policy in Shropshire, to which the Cabinet Member advised that this was a different question to the original and did not respond on that basis.

(ix) [Question from Councillor A.M. Collins](#)

What recent assessment has been made of the possibility of introducing a one-way system in highly congested streets south of Holton Road such as St Mary's Avenue, Castleland Street, Station Street and Kingsland Crescent?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

The Council has previously considered a request to introduce a one-way system on Kingsland Crescent approximately ten years ago. Following assessment, the proposal was not supported as it was considered likely to increase vehicle speeds, displace traffic onto neighbouring streets and adversely affect local traffic movements.

No recent assessment has been undertaken in relation to one-way traffic arrangements on St Mary's Avenue, Castleland Street, Station Street, Kingsland

Crescent or other streets south of Holton Road, and there are currently no proposals under consideration for such measures.

Supplemental

Councillor Collins shared that the issue had been raised before, and wanted to understand what the threshold for action would be, to which the Cabinet Member responded this would benefit from a more detailed conversation with officers.

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

What action is the Council taking to protect public safety at its country parks?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

The Council manages and runs the Country Parks with the safety of visitors to the park at its core. Health and Safety colleagues are immediately informed of any accidents or safety issues, and the Countryside Manager will ensure any issues are rectified immediately. Rangers are trained in first aid, and defibrillators are available at both Porthkerry and Cosmeston.

Sadly, the parks do on occasion suffer from some poor behaviour from visitors which can lead to health and safety issues. This includes unauthorised and unsafe use of the water, aggressive behaviour to staff and other visitors and misuse and damage to park equipment or facilities.

Rangers work closely with the Council's Enforcement team and the Police to try and manage poor behaviour where possible and when the parks are open. This included recently the Police serving a dispersal order on the park at the request of the Council which sought to disperse a large group of youths who had abused park staff.

The Council is also seeking to secure points where dangerous entry to the water have been created by damage to existing fencing and to try and prevent dangerous behaviour such as jumping from high banks and trees through additional fencing and signage.

Ultimately the Country Parks are there for all to enjoy and all visitors need to respect the ethos of the parks, and while the Council can seek to ensure public safety is paramount to the management of the important green spaces, visitors are also responsible for their own safety and behaviour.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll asked if the decision around the Aqua Park at Cosmeston had an impact upon use of the park and safety, to which the Deputy Leader responded that there is a clear distinction between the authorised and supervised water-based activities that took place at Cosmeston Lakes last summer and recent incidents of unauthorised and unsupervised swimming.

They noted activities on the lake last year operated under strict safety controls, with qualified lifeguards and comprehensive risk management measures in place, including regular safety briefings and the mandatory use of wetsuits and life vests. It was a temporary and managed activity within a small shallow section of the lake, and that by contrast, vast areas of the lake contain hazards that make unsupervised swimming dangerous, including the risk of drowning, cold water shock and ultimately, serious injury and death.

They reflected that unsupervised swimming presents a genuine risk to life. Tragically, there have been a number of fatal incidents across the UK involving people entering open water in unsupervised environments, and that there is no ambiguity about our position on water safety and conflating a temporary and supervised activity with unauthorised swimming risks creating a false impression that the rules and safety advice is somehow unclear.

They further indicated that restrictions, warning signage and enforcement measures are in place for one reason, which is to protect lives. Any suggestion that this distinction is unclear has the potential to undermine vital public safety messaging and place people at risk.

(xi) [Question from Councillor C.M. Cowpe](#)

Dinas Powys used to have three Post Offices, but in a community of 9,000 residents, the last surviving office is likely to close. What can the Vale Council do to support the campaign to ensure that a Post Office service is retained in Dinas Powys?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

From a Planning Permission perspective Post Offices operate either as part of or wholly as an A1 retail store. While the planning policies of the LDP would resist a change of use away from A1 on policy grounds, there is no individual policy protection for a post office, especially when this relates to a closure of an existing counter or store, which in itself does not require planning permission.

However, the Council recognises the vital role that a Post Office plays in a village, particularly for older residents, people without access to transport, small businesses and those who rely on cash and face-to-face services.

The legal position is that the Council cannot require Post Office Ltd to keep a branch open. Decisions about branch closures, relocations or operating models rest with Post Office Ltd within the national framework set by UK Government.

Nonetheless, the Council can support the community in a lawful and practical way. This could include making formal representations to Post Office Ltd, working with Ward Members, the Community Council, MPs and MSs, helping gather evidence of the local impact, encouraging residents to respond to any consultation, and exploring whether an alternative local operator, community facility or outreach model could be viable. The same issue was faced by Cowbridge several years ago, and this saw a local supermarket taking on the service.

On this point, I am aware that the Chief Executive has already made representations to the Post Office expressing concern at the potential closure. The Chief Executive has received a reply which has been shared with local Members.

Accordingly, while the Council cannot compel the Post Office to remain open, it can use its influence, evidence and partnership role to support the local campaign and help the community make the strongest possible case.

Supplemental

Councillor Cowpe asked if the Cabinet Member would be willing to meet Post Office officials alongside local Members, to which the Deputy Leader responded that it would not be appropriate to do so.

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

What assessments did the Council undertake of capacity at the Weycock Cross roundabout before allocation a site adjacent to this junction in its Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

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

The candidate site promotion was supported by a Transport Assessment which modelled the impact of the proposed development at North West Barry on the Weycock Cross roundabout.

In addition, the Council commissioned a Strategic Transport Assessment which considers the cumulative impact of all major housing allocations identified in the RLDP on the strategic highway network.

This assessment utilised data from Transport for Wales' South East Wales Transport Model to consider both the baseline capacity and forecast capacity as a result of RLDP development.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll asked if it was felt that developing on greenfield sites at locations like Weycock Cross and Eastbrook Road in Dinas Powys encroaches upon natural barriers separating communities. He expressed concern that this urbanisation would eventually cause towns and villages to lose their unique identity and character, to which the Cabinet Member disagreed.

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

What action is the Council taking to combat fly-tipping across the Vale of Glamorgan?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

Thank you Councillor Carroll, for your question. Fly-tipping remains a priority issue for the Council, and we continue to take a robust and proactive approach to tackling it through both enforcement and prevention. Our Waste Enforcement Team investigates reported incidents, gathers evidence and, where appropriate, issues Fixed Penalty Notices or pursues prosecutions against those responsible. We also work closely with South Wales Police, Natural Resources Wales, local landowners and Town and Community Councils to share intelligence and focus activity on known hotspots across the Vale.

Alongside enforcement, we are committed to making it as easy as possible for residents to dispose of waste responsibly through our kerbside collection services, Household Waste Recycling Centres and bulky waste collection service. We currently utilise CCTV and targeted monitoring where appropriate and are exploring further investment in digital technology to strengthen our ability to tackle persistent problem locations. In addition, we undertake public awareness campaigns and ensure the prompt removal of fly-tipped waste to reduce its impact on local communities and the environment. We continue to encourage residents to report incidents and to use only licensed waste carriers, as preventing waste from ending up in the hands of rogue operators remains one of the most effective ways of reducing fly-tipping across the Vale.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll asked if the Council would be willing to undertake analysis of high volume locations and look at how they can defer people to prevent future incidents, to which the Cabinet Member agreed to do so.

(xiv) [Question from Councillor G.D.D. Carroll](#)

What is the Council's assessment of the effectiveness of the reforms to Scrutiny arrangements introduced last year?

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

The Council's assessment is that the reforms to the Scrutiny arrangements introduced last year have been broadly effective in strengthening the scrutiny function and aligning it more closely with the Council's corporate priorities and governance objectives. The Annual Scrutiny Report is due to be presented at the next meeting of Full Council, and this provides a range of information surrounding Scrutiny work and the difference it is making, alongside reflections upon the effectiveness of Scrutiny.

As you'll be aware, Audit Wales has also undertaken an external review of the changes, as we promised when proposing the changes initially. Whilst I have not seen the final report, I'm aware the findings are generally positive reflecting the improvements made, whilst identifying some areas for improvement, which we will respond to. The findings are due to be shared at the Joint Performance Scrutiny in a

fortnights time (22nd July) alongside wider reflections on Scrutiny as part of the Annual Self-Assessment process, so you are welcome to share your views then, and at Governance and Audit Committee's consideration of the audit in September.

Finally, it would be remiss of me not to indicate that the success of Scrutiny is the responsibility of all Members within this Chamber, irrespective of their political party.

Supplemental

Councillor Carroll drew on a recent experience at a Resources Scrutiny Committee meeting where he was told by the chair that his probing questions were not a "cross-examination," the Councillor asked if the Leader would introduce changes to ensure that such probing questioning becomes standard practice at all scrutiny meetings, to which the Leader responded that officers are available to have in depth conversations outside of Scrutiny meetings, and it was important to go through the Chair during a debate.