

PLACE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Hybrid meeting held on 18th November, 2025.

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

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

Present: Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby (Chair); Councillor C. Iannucci-Williams (Vice-Chair); Councillors C.E.A. Champion, P. Drake, V.P. Driscoll, M.J. Hooper, J.M. Norman, I.A.N. Perry and C. Stallard.

Also present: M. Blackmore (Tenant Working Group / Panel Representatives); O. Carroll (Citizens Advice Cardiff and Vale); and Councillors G. Bruce, L. Burnett (Executive Leader and Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources), J.E. Charles, B. Dodd, C.P. Franks, S.M. Hanks, G. John (Cabinet Member for Leisure, Sport and Wellbeing), B. Loveluck-Edwards, N.B. Marshallsea, S.D. Perkes (Cabinet Member for Public Sector Housing and Tenant Engagement), S. Sivagnanam (Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services), E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health) and M.R. Wilson (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services).

440 ANNOUNCEMENT –

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

441 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors G.M. Ball, A.M. Ernest, E. Penn and S.T. Wiliam; G. Doyle, K. Mitchell and G. Niblett (Tenant Working Group / Panel Representatives).

442 MINUTES–

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 16th September, 2025 be approved as a correct record.

443 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

The Chair, Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby, declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in respect of Agenda Item 5 – Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2021-2036 – Housing Growth in Barry Consultation

Report. The nature of her interest was that she was an independent member of the Cardiff and Vale Health Board which had been involved in this process as a statutory consultee. Due to this being a personal interest only, the Chair remained in the meeting when the agenda item was discussed.

444 LOCAL LETTINGS POLICIES (CX) –

The report was presented by the Operational Manager – Public Housing Services, the purpose of which was to consider an approach to local lettings in rural areas which balanced the need to support existing communities with the Council's obligations to rehouse households which were in greatest need. The Operational Manager – Public Housing Services also shared a presentation with the Committee at the meeting, highlighting and reinforcing key areas of the policy proposals and report, which included the following points:

- Setting out what local lettings policies (LLPs) were;
- Where LLPs were applied;
- The case for change / review of LLPs;
- The impact of LLPs – who were getting housed;
- The proposed approach was described;
- The cascaded / managed approach was set out;
- The key points around the proposal / policy changes;
- Members were asked to consider the approach regarding local lettings policies and finalise a proposal to go back to Cabinet for approval.

Following the presentation, Councillor Hooper raised several questions and points, including:

- Had any modelling been done to compare current percentages achieved with the existing policy with those expected under the new cascade process. For example, if the current success rate was 90% without cascade, what would it be with the cascade proposal. If no modelling had been undertaken, then it was suggested that it should be.
- Concern was raised about Silver band applicants, with most allocations now going to Gold Plus and Gold under the new policy proposal. It appeared that Silver band applicants would increasingly struggle to secure housing, and he asked whether there was any data on how many might be affected.
- He welcomed and supported what appeared to be the intent, on the part of the proposals, to help keep local rural communities together.

In response to the above points, the Operational Manager – Public Housing Services stated that both the presentation and the main report detailed how the current system was working across all the housing stock and examples of where the Council had looked at a number of schemes and had tried to drill down into these to see how these schemes and policies were working. He was not currently in a position to give specific numbers of how many different applicants in the various bands would be successful or affected. Due to the revised proposal and the new managed approach, the Gold Plus and Gold applicants (particularly those with a local

connection, followed by those applicants in high housing need without a local connection), would be prioritised. This would mean there would be fewer instances of Silver band applicants being housed and even less so for those under the Bronze banding, due to their lesser housing need, than were currently being housed under the present policy and system.

On Councillor Champion's query about the banding system (Gold Plus through to Bronze), it was explained by the Operational Manager – Public Housing Services that Gold Plus represented the most extreme or acute housing need, such as homeless persons and households living within temporary accommodation, people with acute medical conditions that their current housing could not meet or support through to victims of domestic abuse. Gold represented people in acute need, with Silver band applicants typically being people in overcrowded conditions or lacking facilities, through to Bronze where people's housing needs were generally being met in their current accommodation but wished to move. Details could also be found in the Homes4U policy.

Councillor Stallard welcomed the attempts to address homelessness via these proposals, and as an Elected Member for a rural ward, also welcomed that this policy would continue to prioritise local connections within rural areas for housing. This would maintain local support networks and ensure these communities remained viable.

The Chair welcomed the proposed LLP and highlighted its potential benefits, including the cascaded approach, but asked why this was only being applied to the first phase and not in perpetuity. The Operational Manager – Public Housing Services cited the legislation and accompanying code of guidance for housing allocations, which specifically referred to LLPs, and essentially made the case that LLPs should be by exception and should not overly determine or dominate the Council's housing allocation scheme(s). Therefore, there should not be a disproportionate number of total lettings made via LLPs. They should also be time limited in most instances, and subject to regular review. The other point on this was when a development was new, that was a critical stage because there would be many people and households moving into new homes at the same time and that the balanced communities argument would be important then so that people knitted together and helped to build that community. The turnover of properties was very low in rural areas. Therefore, the re-lets would become available only infrequently. That would not be seen necessarily as a threat to the existing balance of communities because that would be very much a drip feed of new families moving into new developments. As a result, the LLP would apply or help in that first instance in terms of creating that community, but subsequently because of the low turnover there would be less risk of that being threatened as time went on.

Following the discussions and scrutiny on this report, Committee

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the approaches to classifying rural housing developments and the use of local lettings policies be noted.

(2) T H A T the proposal, that in future, local lettings policies should continue to be applied on rural exception sites and in minor rural settlements and these policies remain in perpetuity i.e. for future relets of existing social rented homes, be noted.

(3) T H A T the merits of a cascaded / staged approach to be utilised in future for all new lets which were not on rural exception sites or within minor rural settlements, be noted.

(4) T H A T although there was no formal feedback to Cabinet, the Committee did support the policies and proposals concerned.

(5) T H A T the list of minor rural settlements where local lettings policies would apply, be reviewed following the adoption of the Replacement Local Development Plan.

Reason for recommendations

(1-5) Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting, following scrutiny by the Committee of the proposed approach to local lettings.

445 VALE OF GLAMORGAN REPLACEMENT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (RLDP) 2021-2036 – HOUSING GROWTH IN BARRY CONSULTATION REPORT (REF) –

The purpose of the reference / report from Cabinet was for the Committee to consider and scrutinise the issues raised through representations received during the public consultation exercise undertaken between 16th June, 2025 and 14th July, 2025 in respect of future housing growth in Barry, and to forward any recommendations to Cabinet. The accompanying presentation highlighted the key points of consideration for these proposals, including:

- The fundamentals of the RLDP Strategy and the background / context for housing growth in Barry.
- The outline of the candidate sites and process for considering these in the Barry area. Details were also given on the final three sites proposed: land at Neptune Road, Barry Waterfront; land at Hayes Lane, The Bendricks and land in Northwest Barry. As part of this, details were also given about the infrastructure considerations for the proposed sites.
- In conclusion, several points were raised, which included:
 - This consultation was concerned with the principle of replacing the key site in Northeast Barry with others in Barry including at Northwest Barry.
 - Mixed public views on the sites with some support as well as objections. Overall, there were significantly less objections to Northwest Barry than to the previous site at Northeast Barry.
 - Concerns raised by the public were valid and the issues would be considered further. Whilst these concerns were duly noted, there was an expectation that Barry delivered new housing commensurate with its position and addressed the acute need for affordable housing.

- Options were available for mitigation at Weycock Cross roundabout, and Section 106 contributions would be secured to ensure mitigation was achieved.
- Therefore, on balance, it was recommended that the proposed three sites in Barry be taken forward into the Deposit RLDP.
- Next steps were also discussed: any recommendations by Committee would be considered by Cabinet, and then in turn these and the Cabinet recommendations would be considered by Full Council on 1st December, 2025. Then, if approved, the Deposit Plan would be reported politically at the end of this year / early 2026 for approval to proceed to consultation and then on to an Independent Planning Inspector for consideration.

Subsequently, the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services reiterated that these proposals were not just about providing houses, but also the provision of homes at sustainable locations, with a range of mitigations and improvements that could be used to support these and take these proposals forward successfully. If one or more sites were not approved / removed, then alternative sites would have to be found (further afield in the County and potentially at less suitable sites) due to Barry being an area of growth.

The Chair referred to the written representation from Porthkerry Wildlife Group (raising concerns on the proposed Weycock Cross development and the impact on the nearby flora and fauna at Porthkerry Country Park) which had been shared with the Committee prior to the meeting and would be considered as part of the meeting tonight.

There were several public speakers in attendance, who wished to speak on these proposals:

- D. Holloman expressed concern that the proposed Northwest site in Barry was relatively isolated, limiting walkability and potentially increasing reliance on public and private transport as well as the impact on car parking at nearby train stations. He referred to the need for consideration of older people i.e. the proposed development should include the provision of suitable accommodation for older persons, which could free up accommodation for others elsewhere. He also raised the issues around sewage such as at Millwood stream and flooding at Porthkerry Park, as well as other water issues. Responsibility for the cost of managing the ponds and surface water after the "lifetime sum" had been spent needed to be considered by the Council as well as the potential impact of the Council breaking through the 'green wedge' as part of this development. He referred to the impact of this proposal to traffic locally, citing the 2014 findings from the previous planning application which concluded that development of the site would be detrimental to the capacity and free flow of traffic on the strategically important A4226 which linked directly to Cardiff airport.
- W. Hart highlighted that the development at Weycock Cross would take away from the public part of the natural landscape in the area and the increased housing and higher density would have a negative impact on the existing low density, local community already living nearby, with what he felt would be a housing developer's scant regard for the locality. The impact on the local

flood plain, drainage and sewage management were also outlined. The challenges concerning the proposed development's location and transportation links, as well as access to shops, schools and other facilities were raised, and the subsequent impact on local roads and services. He also cited the private developers involved, and their perceived drive for profit over anything else, a concern which he felt had been shared by Members of the Council's Administration as well, previously.

- A. Vincent referred to the Northwest Barry proposal in the context of the Placemaking Wales Charter and its principles, which the Vale of Glamorgan Council was a part of, and the redefinition of the green wedge in connection with the Weycock Cross site, following the failure to develop land on the previously proposed site at Northeast Barry. The annex / response to residents within the report also seemed to be contradictory and confusing in terms of the green wedge and urban coalescence between Barry and Rhoose. He concluded by saying that however configured, the proposed Northwest Barry site would inevitably create urban coalescence and destroy the green wedge between Barry and Rhoose, as well as increase local traffic congestion, which would fail to realise the Placemaking principle of developing high quality places that work for the benefit the local community.
- R. Vincent-Newson also referred to Placemaking principles in relation to prioritising the health and wellbeing of people and that new housing developments, etc. should protect or enhance a sense of community. There had been insufficient mitigation suggested in the Council's response to local concerns on the impact on health care and other related infrastructure or services due to the proposed development in Northwest Barry. Similarly, concerns raised locally around air and noise pollution, increased travel times and traffic congestion as well as limited transport links at Weycock Cross had not been adequately addressed, nor had the Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) modelling. The Placemaking principle of identity would not be upheld by undertaking the proposed development, which would remove the unique characteristics of the location.
- J. Vincent-Newson spoke through the lens of the Placemaking principles and charter, referring to new developments promoting the planning, design and management of new and existing places. He wished to highlight the shortcomings of the Council's response to local resident concerns over Northwest Barry such as on increased traffic congestion. The placemaking principle of location, etc. had not been adhered to, and the potential for the proposed development to cause significant additional traffic congestion in the area was recognised under previously unsuccessful planning applications. The Council's current response to these same considerations was to simply refer to the interim findings of the recent STA, which suggested that congestion issues could be managed and mitigated through a balanced package of measures, including targeted highway improvements and initiatives to encourage more sustainable travel, which were felt to be optimistic at best and disingenuous at worst. Finally, regarding travel for commuting purposes, the Placemaking principle of movement could not be easily applied to the Northwest site as there would be clear challenges to walking, cycling, and using public transport and this would mean increased private motor vehicle traffic. Therefore, the proposed development was in

direct contravention of the Placemaking Charter principles and the Council's responses in the report had done little to address this.

In response to the points raised by the public speakers, the Head of Sustainable Development stated that:

- On the location / travel options, of the proposed Northwest site and access to education, health and retail facilities, sustainability was not a binary concept but rather should be a 'sliding scale' approach and realistic or practical decision making had to be undertaken on the land developed and its location to nearby amenities and facilities. Active travel options, such as walking or bicycling to and from the site remained a reasonable option, even if all future residents did not undertake these, and any trips by motor vehicle to amenities would still be short compared to alternative sites further out in the Rural Vale. As well as the main train station, there was also the one at Barry Docks, with ample car parking space. This meant there was a wide range of options for residents of the future development making journeys to and from the site. The Northwest site was as sustainable as any of the other proposed sites and the previous Northeast site. It was considered deliverable and fundamentally acceptable in in planning terms.
- In terms of traffic congestion, the STA was robust in terms of addressing even the most challenging or worst-case scenarios. The new Plan would help provide a strategic framework to mitigate traffic and other issues across the multiple sites, including Weycock Cross / Northwest Barry.
- In terms of older persons' accommodation, if there was a need for this either via the private market or identified need in terms of Council and social housing then this would be met, but did not in itself negate the need for the proposed site at Northwest Barry as currently conceived.
- On the water / sewage situation and the local pumping station, this could be addressed as part of a planning application in conjunction with Welsh Water. Similarly, for the ongoing management of the ponds and surface water, this could also be addressed in connection with planning permission. On the green wedge and preventing urban coalescence, as well as the impact on natural landscapes, these remained important principles but consideration had to be given to developing future housing need in urban 'fringe' locations and greenfield sites such as Northwest Barry but these principles would still exist in terms of there still being a significant 'gap' and greenspace between Barry and Rhosee.
- There was not considered to be a fundamental flood risk at the Northwest site, and the assessment on this was robust.
- In terms of densities, the RLDP had to promote higher densities for housing development to use the relatively limited land available as efficiently as possible and without encroaching even further on greenfield areas than needed. Current projected housing densities were not considered unduly high at the proposed sites.
- In terms of the points raised concerning the Placemaking Charter, considerations around RLDP proposed sites had to take in a myriad of factors from a planning as well as Placemaking perspective in addressing community and housing needs in an area of growth, which were also factors in helping to satisfy Placemaking principles.

- There had been clear benefits to the proposed Northeast site, but due to fundamental reasons identified, this could not be progressed or delivered.

Subsequently, non-Committee Elected Members were invited to speak on the proposals detailed in the reference and report:

- Councillor Dodd raised residents' concerns around the perceived limited data and assessment underpinning the proposed Northwest Barry site and the environmental mitigation measures put forward, as well as the impact on biodiversity (referring to the Welsh Government principle that development should provide a net benefit for biodiversity with no subsequent loss for habitats) and concerns about the transport / mitigation measures, costs and timeframes.
- Councillor Bruce asked that the removal of the proposed Northwest Barry development be considered, due to the potential increase in traffic and congestion as a result and as seen at other recent developments. The proposed measures to mitigate this would not be sufficient and would impact public transport as well. The impact on local nature and wildlife should also be considered.
- Councillor Marshallsea raised concerns made by local residents about the proposed Northwest Barry site. Whilst she understood the need for additional housing, her concerns and that of her constituents centred around transport and traffic pressures at Weycock Cross and nearby, including road safety and traffic pollution fears as well as the limitations of active travel / public transport at the location due to its layout and distance. Secondly, the impact and increased pressure on local services such as schools and medical care, as well as shops. Finally, the potential negative impact on the green wedge and wider environment, with the proposed site removing the boundary between green and urban spaces that currently existed at this location.
- Councillor Charles referred to and challenged the report's points on managing and mitigating projected traffic congestion at the proposed sites, and alternative sustainable forms of transport as well as citing the impact of greater traffic congestion for the wider Barry area and Vale of Glamorgan because of the Northwest Barry development. She also referred to the potential issues with drainage, flooding and sewage nearby at Porthkerry Park, regarding Northwest Barry. Echoing Councillor Marshallsea, she said additional housing was required for Barry and the Vale of Glamorgan but this had to be done more sustainably and logically than was currently proposed, in her opinion.

In response to the points raised by the non-Committee Elected Members, the Head of Sustainable Development stated that:

- Net benefit remained a fundamental part of planning policy and developing greenfield spaces could in fact achieve this, as well as providing the scope to develop a more diverse range of habitats.
- On improvements / mitigation for traffic congestion, etc. at Weycock Cross, these did not rely on third party land and therefore they could be delivered within the scope of the adopted highway and would be as comprehensive as possible. The viability work undertaken suggested that the cost for these could

be met by the various developments and therefore, could be funded straightforwardly. Planning policy aimed at a balance whereby people were encouraged to change their travel habits and move away from private motor vehicles, etc. but accepted that this had to remain an option for residents, etc.

- The strength of public feeling and concern around the proposed sites, particularly Northwest Barry was appreciated, but this had to be balanced with the need for additional housing within Barry and the County.

Following this, Members of the Committee raised comments and questions, including:

- Councillor Perry contrasted the relevant Cabinet Member's perceived aspiration for growth with his aspiration for efficiency when it came to housing and the resources around it, by maximising the use of existing housing stock. Extra housing would benefit developers due to increased profits but had significant environmental impacts. He reiterated the key points and concerns raised by previous speakers, such as the '15-minute city' model (Councillor Marshallsea), which highlighted the need to put in the infrastructure and transport networks required and integrate these locally before housing was put into such developments. He also cited the potential increase in traffic congestion, the need for heightened flood water management as part of housing development due to climate change, amongst other concerns. His questions concerned the impact of increased population and housing in the Barry area on Council revenue and the cost of additional services, and how did new housing developments impact the Council's commitment to reducing the carbon footprint in the County. It was explained by the Head of Sustainable Development that some of the costs would be mitigated by the developments concerned, including S106 funding. Delivering for growth and meeting housing need was not about generating Council Tax or other revenue but about housing people and addressing growth. The Council was already being proactive about net zero considerations for buildings and housing developments, as part of considering their carbon footprint, subject to viability considerations and in fact going beyond building regulations regarding this as part of its planning policy.
- Councillor Hooper raised several issues concerning the three proposed sites, which could be summarised as follows:
 - The 'Good': the proposed development at Neptune Road, Barry Waterfront with its potential to deliver 100% affordable housing.
 - The 'Bad': the land at Hayes Lane, The Bendricks. Many of the concerns raised about the Northwest site could also be applied to this site as well, with the additional issue of The Bendricks being an area of high deprivation. Key issues included accessibility to transport, with limited bus services and routes and issues with accessing local train stations i.e. the need to walk through Associated British Port land to get to the Docks station. There would be the benefit of affordable housing at the proposed site, but the relevant services, etc. needed to be in place in the first instance rather than the other way round; otherwise, it impacted upon public trust and support of these developments and on the lives of residents living at these.

- The 'Ugly': the proposed site at Northwest Barry. Proposals for this site had been pushed back on previously. There would be a negative impact on the green wedge at the location. He felt this was a profit driven development, with the majority of houses potentially going to commuters working outside the County and a smaller number (i.e. 30%) of properties being classed as affordable housing, which was insufficient. Other issues, already raised by others, included transport links, etc.
- He felt that other developments could have been included in the RLDP, such as by the college development at Colcot Road and at the Western Gateway. He also referred to high density new developments and open spaces managed by external parties, as seen at Barry Waterfront, which had not worked well.

In response to the above, the Head of Sustainable Development stated that for Hayes Road / The Bendricks, there was a need to build and improve the connectivity already in place at the location, which already included bus and walking routes, with other options such as possible cycle routes, in connection with building a stronger sense of community and to develop housing there as part of this. On Weycock Cross versus other sites that could have been included in the RLDP, factors around this included allocations and 'windfall' developments, and this meant that the other options listed by the Councillor would not be sufficiently viable alternatives to replace Northwest Barry. On open spaces management he appreciated the frustration felt about these at locations such as at the Waterfront. There were currently no powers in place to encourage or incentivise developers to transfer these to Council ownership and have a management plan in place to enforce this. On the makeup of housing on the Northwest Barry site, although not all housing there would be affordable type housing, 30% of these would be, which was significant.

- The Chair asked about the shortage of brownfield sites within the Barry area and what impact this might have on green wedge areas if they were not wholly protected from development. The Head of Sustainable Development explained that future Local Development Plans may need to look at green spaces in terms of development and housing need, particularly the supply of affordable housing, whilst trying to protect green spaces as much as possible.
- The Chair's other question concerned environmental issues and the submission by Natural Resources Wales in 2023 about the need to ensure that environmental survey requirements were undertaken at sites in liaison with the Local Authority ecologist and if this position had now been filled by the Council to ensure local expertise in this area could be applied. It was confirmed that the post was not vacant and the current ecologist would be in place until the end of year, when the newly appointed postholder would takeover. The new ecologist was experienced and had considerable local knowledge.
- Councillor Norman stated that although there were challenges with the proposed sites, particularly Northwest Barry, there were little in the way of alternatives to these sites other than going further into the Rural Vale, which would not be suitable for persons wishing to stay and live in Barry and would take housing away from people living in the more rural parts of the County.
- The Chair queried why the Northwest site was considered the preferred option despite Taylor Wimpey and Avant Homes having suggested other candidate

sites / options, which, consequently, would not be progressed at this time. The Head of Sustainable Development explained that the Taylor Wimpey option potentially referred to a third phase development at Sully but this could be challenged due to it being on agricultural / versatile land. The Avant Homes option related to a possible development at St. Athan. Again, there would be challenges in terms of Council led allocations at St. Athan being developed there as well and the need to avoid 'overloading' in this area. It would therefore be wrong, on balance, to push more housing to St. Athan when there was housing need at Barry as well.

A Motion and recommendation were suggested, by Councillor Hooper, to remove the proposed Northwest Barry site from the RLDP, which was subsequently voted on, via a Recorded Vote:

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake		√	
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams		√	
S. Lloyd-Selby		√	
J. Norman		√	
I. Perry	√		
C. Stallard		√	
TOTAL	3	5	

Therefore, the Motion and recommendation were not passed.

The below recommendations were voted on by the Committee, following its scrutiny and discussions on the reference and report. Following a request from a Committee Member for a Recorded Vote for each of these recommendations, the votes took place as follows:

RECOMMENDED –

(1) T H A T the Committee was concerned about the potential for increased and inappropriate use of protected environmental sites in the vicinity of the proposed Northwest Barry site. It was recommended that suitable accessible natural greenspaces be provided as part of any site development to benefit wider biodiversity interests and species in the area.

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper		√	
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J. Norman	√		

I. Perry	√		
C. Stallard	√		
TOTAL	7	1	0

Therefore, the vote, and recommendation, was carried.

(2) T H A T Committee was concerned to note that the modelling showed the outline proposed improvements to Weycock Cross junction indicated adverse impacts on traffic congestion. The Strategic Transport Assessment must identify mitigating action which significantly addressed traffic congestion and minimised the impact of additional traffic on nearby feeder routes. This mitigation should include improved public transport and support for Active Travel.

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J. Norman	√		
I. Perry			√
C. Stallard	√		
TOTAL	7	0	1

Therefore, the vote, and recommendation, was carried.

(3) T H A T the Committee, regarding the Northwest Barry site, noted that the report referred to the need for increased school places and potential additional health capacity. It was therefore recommended that any additional development must not impact negatively on current provision for residents. Committee noted that more detailed information would be provided at the Deposit Plan stage – these must include specific steps that would be taken to protect and improve educational and health capacity.

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J. Norman	√		
I. Perry			√
C. Stallard	√		
TOTAL	7	0	1

Therefore, the vote, and recommendation, was carried.

(4) T H A T, at the appropriate time, there must be a management plan in place to incentivise the transfer of open spaces from new developments (such as the three potential sites in Barry) to local Council / public sector control.

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J. Norman	√		
I. Perry	√		
C. Stallard	√		
TOTAL	8	0	0

Therefore, the vote, and recommendation, was carried.

(5) T H A T a community needs assessment be undertaken to identify infrastructure and transport needs in relation to the Bendricks development, and this should include consultation with local Elected Ward Members and current residents. The scope should encompass the Strategic Transport Assessment which should identify mitigating action to improve accessibility to public transport, Active Travel and Wimbourne Road.

Name	For	Against	Abstain
C. Champion	√		
P. Drake	√		
V. Driscoll			
M. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J. Norman	√		
I. Perry	√		
C. Stallard	√		
TOTAL	8	0	0

Therefore, the vote, and recommendation, was carried.

Reason for recommendations

(1-5) Having regard to the contents of the report and reference, as well as the discussions at the meeting and for Cabinet to consider these prior to referring this report to Full Council (1st December, 2025) for consideration and approval.

446 UPDATED FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME SCHEDULE 2025/26 (DCR) –

The report, presented by the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer, asked Committee to agree the Updated Forward Work Programme Schedule for 2025/26 (attached at Appendix A to the report) and that a summary of the Decision Tracking Data relevant to the Place Scrutiny Committee be presented to the Committee as part of the biannual Forward Work Programme Monitoring Reports going forward. As part of this, the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer set out several key issues for consideration, including:

- Since the Committee's approval of the FWP on 20th May, 2025, the work programme had been maintained by Democratic Services in consultation with Service Area Officers in preparation for Member consideration.
- The Committee had established a Task and Finish Working Group to look at providing greater accessibility to beaches in the Vale of Glamorgan for people with limited accessibility. The Group had met on four occasions so far and was working towards presenting its findings to the Committee in early 2026.
- The Committee had considered eight proposal reports, including references from Cabinet and Full Council and been provided with two For Information reports so far on separate topics.
- Tracking of the Committee's decisions and subsequent impact continued to be monitored by Democratic Services. A new automated system had been developed to record and publish Scrutiny Committee recommendations more efficiently. Decision tracking data had been compiled into a PowerBI format and was now continuously available to Members, via MemberNet, at any time. This data would be regularly updated by Democratic Services as and when updates arose. Therefore, Members no longer needed to wait for decision tracking information to be formally reported to Committee and may raise queries with Democratic Services at any time.
- Democratic Services had been working with ICT colleagues to ensure that the same decision tracking data was available to members of the public via the Council's Scrutiny Webpage.
- Now that decision tracking data was readily available, it was proposed that the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officers would provide a summary on Committee decisions within the biannual Forward Work Programme reports going forward.

Subsequently, Councillor Champion asked when the update from Welsh Water would be coming to the Committee, as it was not clear from the Work Programme. It was explained that Welsh Water would be consulted on, or invited to contribute to, the "Bathing water quality at designated bathing beaches" report / update currently scheduled in January 2026, with contributions from Council officers and Natural Resources Wales also invited to do so.

Councillor Hooper welcomed the report and the new format for presenting and sharing decision tracking data but also wanted to ensure that this data was readily accessible to the public and that they were engaging with this new format, in order to ensure that it was as clear and accessible as possible. The Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer would take this suggestion back to his supervisor and Operational Manager to see how a monitoring regime for public interaction and use of the

PowerBI to access decision tracking could be implemented and any relevant improvements made.

On the Chair's follow up question about the format / type of data reported back to Members as part of the biannual decision tracking report, including the use of the various graphs and metrics seen in the PowerBI reporting, it was explained that these would be part of the summary of the Decision Tracking Data as part of the biannual Forward Work Programme Monitoring Reports going forward, as well as part of the MemberNet and public facing versions of the PowerBI reporting on recommendations and decision tracking for Scrutiny Committees online.

Following the discussions and scrutiny on this report, Committee

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the Committee's Forward Work Programme Schedule for 2025/26, as attached at Appendix A to the report, be agreed.
- (2) T H A T a summary of the Decision Tracking Data relevant to the Place Scrutiny Committee be presented to the Committee as part of the biannual Forward Work Programme Monitoring Reports going forward.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) In order that the items, topics, and delivery methods that the Place Scrutiny Committee would consider for the remainder of the 2025/26 Municipal year be agreed, and to update the Forward Work Programme published on the Council's website.
- (2) In order to provide a six-monthly update to Committee Members, on the data readily available, and to maintain an understanding of the Committee's impact in supporting the Council's decision-making processes.