

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Remote Meeting held on 6th March, 2023.

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

The Meeting recording is available [here](#).

Present: Councillor Susan Lloyd Selby (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, Millie Collins, Marianne Cowpe, Pamela Drake, Vincent Driscoll, Anthony Ernest, Robert Fisher, Christopher Franks, Wendy Gilligan, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, Stephen Haines, Howard Hamilton, Sally Hanks, William Hennessy, Nic Hodges, Mark Hooper, Catherine Iannucci, Gwyn John, Dr. Ian Johnson, Belinda Loveluck-Edwards, Julie Lynch-Wilson, Kevin Mahoney, Naomi Marshallsea, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Elliot Penn, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Carys Stallard, Neil Thomas, Rhys Thomas, Steffan Wiliam, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

765 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”.

766 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors R. Godfrey and M.R. Wilkinson.

767 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

The following declarations of interest were received:

Councillor J. Aviet	Agenda Item No. 5 – Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Scrutiny Committee Nominated Deputy	Personal but not prejudicial interest – appointed as the Vale of Glamorgan Council Nominated Deputy on the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Aviet remained in the meeting during consideration of this item.
---------------------	--	--

Councillor J. Aviet	Agenda Item No 9(a) – Housing Revenue Account Business Plan 2023/53; and Agenda Item No 11(c) – Final Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Proposals 2023/24 and Rent Setting 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest as she was a Council tenant but had an exemption under the Members’ Code of Conduct and therefore could speak and vote on this item.
Councillor J. Aviet	Agenda Item No. 9(g) – Pay Policy 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest – family member employed by the Council. Councillor Aviet had a dispensation from the Standards Committee to speak and vote and remained in the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor G. Bruce	Agenda Item No. 9(g) – Pay Policy 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest – family member employed by the Council and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor I. Buckley	Agenda Item Nos. 9(b) and 11(a) – Council Tax Unoccupied Dwellings: 2023/24	Personal and prejudicial interest – Councillor Buckley owned a property and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor S. Campbell	Agenda Item Nos. 9(b) and 11(a) – Council Tax Unoccupied Dwellings: 2023/24	Personal and prejudicial interest – Councillor Campbell owned a property and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor C. Champion	Agenda Item No. 9(g) – Pay Policy 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest – family member employed by the Council and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor J. Charles	Agenda Item Nos. 9(b) and 11(a) – Council Tax Unoccupied Dwellings: 2023/24	Personal and prejudicial interest – Councillor Charles owned a property and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor V. Driscoll	Agenda Item Nos. 9(b) and 11(a) – Council Tax Unoccupied Dwellings: 2023/24	Personal and prejudicial interest – Councillor Driscoll owned a property and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor A. Ernest	Agenda Item No. 9(g) – Pay Policy 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest – family member employed by the Council and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor S. Haines	Agenda Item Nos. 9(b) and 11(a) – Council Tax Unoccupied Dwellings: 2023/24	Personal and prejudicial interest – Councillor Haines owned a property and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.
Councillor W. Hennessy	Agenda Item No 9(a) – Housing Revenue Account Business Plan 2023/53; and Agenda Item No 11(c) – Final Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Proposals 2023/24 and Rent Setting 2023/2024	Personal and prejudicial interest as he was a Council tenant but had an exemption under the Members’ Code of Conduct and therefore could speak and vote on this item.
Councillor G. John	Agenda Item No. 9(f) – Final Budget 2023/24 and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2023/24 to 2028/29	Personal and prejudicial interest as he was a Member of Llantwit Major AFC but had a dispensation granted by the Standards Committee to speak and vote on this item.

768 MINUTES –

RESOLVED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 5th December, 2022 and the Special meetings held on 11th and 30th January, 2023 be approved as a correct record.

769 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

The Mayor indicated that she had attended a further 14 events since the last Council meeting and thanked all those children at the various schools throughout the Vale of Glamorgan who had entered her Christmas Card competition. She had also attended the annual Holocaust Remembrance event which had been held at Art Central Gallery and she had also attended an event to mark the first anniversary of the invasion of Ukraine by Russia where a

minute's silence had been held for those who had lost their lives during the conflict. In concluding, she reminded all Members that the Mayor's Foundation continued to be open for new grant applications for assistance.

Leader's Announcement

The Leader announced the sad passing of former Councillor Anne Moore who was the wife of the former Leader of the Council, former Councillor Neil Moore. Former Councillor Moore had been a much respected fellow Member serving the Vale of Glamorgan Council in its predecessor authority as well as being a former Member of Barry Town Council where she held the position of Mayor. She had also held various Chairmanships of Committees and had been known for her attention to detail, tenacity and fairness. She had represented the Cadoc Ward and its residents and communities for over 28 years; and the Leader offered the heartfelt condolences of all Members and officers of the Council to former Councillor Anne Moore's family at this sad time. The Leader requested that all Members join her in a minute's silence as a mark of respect for former Councillor Anne Moore.

The Political Group Leaders Councillors Carroll, John and Dr. Johnson echoed the sentiments expressed by the Leader and on behalf of their respective Groups extended their sympathy to the family of former Councillor Anne Moore.

A minute's silence was held in a mark of respect.

770 CARDIFF CAPITAL REGION CITY DEAL – JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE NOMINATED DEPUTY (REF) –

The reference from Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee of 13th December, 2022 as contained within the agenda was presented.

RESOLVED – T H A T Councillor J. Aviet be appointed as the nominated deputy to represent the Council on the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for recommendation

To appoint a named deputy representative to the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

771 USE OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S EMERGENCY POWERS (CX) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Chief Executive's Emergency Powers be noted.

Reason for decision

Having regard to the Council's Constitution.

772 CONSULTATION WITH NON-DOMESTIC RATEPAYERS (MO/HLDS) –

In order to comply with the Non-Domestic Ratepayers (Consultation) Regulations 1992 (Statutory Instrument No. 3171) an advertisement inviting non-domestic ratepayers to inspect the Council's expenditure proposals and to submit representations on the same was placed in the Western Mail on 22nd February, 2023.

Copies of the Council's expenditure proposals had been forwarded to local non-domestic ratepayers, who had been invited to submit any comments by 12.00 noon on 6th March, 2023 with any comments received to be reported to the meeting. Following the Leader advising Members that no responses had been received in respect of the consultation, it was subsequently

RESOLVED – T H A T the position be noted as no responses to the consultation had been received.

Reason for decision

To comply with the Non-Domestic Ratepayers (Consultation) Regulations 1992 (Statutory Instrument No. 3171).

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

The report proposed amendments to a number of delegations, the Terms of Reference for the Public Rights of Way Committee and for further clarity and consistency purposes.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the change to the relevant officer delegations as set out at point 1 of Appendix 1 to the report be approved and the Constitution amended accordingly.

(2) T H A T the references to “clear days” for publication of agendas / reports / notices within the Constitution as set out in the table at point 2 of Appendix 1 to the report be approved and the Constitution amended accordingly.

(3) T H A T the Terms of Reference for the Public Rights of Way Sub-Committee be amended as referred to in paragraph 2.5 and point 3 of Appendix 1 to the report, be approved and the Constitution amended accordingly.

Reasons for decisions

(1) To update the Officer Delegation Scheme and relevant provisions within the current Constitution.

(2) To provide clarity.

(3) Having regard to legislation.

774 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN 2023/53 (REF) –

The Leader referred to paragraph 2.4 of the original Cabinet report which outlined new build and acquisition schemes of £236m which would be funded over the 30 year life of the Plan. She considered that the Plan was ambitious and hoped that more could be achieved. She touched upon matters relating to the Welsh Housing Quality Standards, decarbonisation, building safety, the need to optimise retro fitting of existing Council housing stock and homelessness issues within the county and acknowledged that there was a need for 1200 new affordable homes.

She indicated that the report had been considered by the Council's Homes and Safe Communities Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 8th February, 2023 and no comments or questions had been made in regard to the details of the Plan.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan 2023/53 attached to the report to Cabinet on 2nd February, 2023 (Min. No. C215) be approved and submitted to Welsh Government.

Reason for decision

To enable the submission of the above Plan to Welsh Government by the required deadline of 31st March, 2023.

775 COUNCIL TAX UNOCCUPIED DWELLINGS: 2023/24 (REF) –

The Leader presented the reference, the purpose of which was to reaffirm the previous decision not to grant any discount in Council Tax for empty properties and furnished second homes for the 2023/24 financial year.

The report proposed that the Council consulted on the levying of a Council Tax premium in 2023/24 in respect of long-term empty properties and in 2024/25 in respect of second homes. This was in line with the Council's objective to increase the supply of housing in the Vale of Glamorgan. The headline annual need for affordable housing in the Vale of Glamorgan from 2021 to 2026 was 1,205 dwellings.

The Leader outlined both proposals, the first being the charging of premiums on long term empty properties (over 12 months) from 2023/24 financial year and second homes from 2024/25 financial year. She also reminded Members that the Council had published its Empty Homes Strategy in March 2020 the findings indicating that quality rented homes were becoming increasingly difficult to find coupled with increasing prices incentivising landlords to sell and the ever widening gap between local housing allowance rents and market rents. This created a shortage of housing and in terms of underlying need and there was an obvious financial benefit to the Council in introducing premiums which in part

could contribute to greater engagement and enforcement work. She also alluded to the 528 long term empty properties and 402 second homes in the county. She considered that empty homes were a drain on the Council's overall resources and the exemptions meant that the properties affected will be lower than 930 in total. She reminded Members that the Council had consulted on the proposals and 385 responses had been received of around 56% were against the proposals however, just over 40% were in favour of charging a premium at some level.

Councillor Dr. Johnson referred to his comments made at previous Council meetings in regard to the slowness of the Council to charge the premium and was pleased to see it now being put forward. He considered there were obvious benefits which would encourage bringing empty homes into useful use. Referring to the proposals of Cabinet in terms of its recommendations, Councillor Dr. Johnson sought clarification from the Leader as to how the premiums would be agreed beyond the current fixed stepped increase beyond the period set out in the report as he understood it from the legislation, this would require an annual consultation on either or both of the premiums in future years ahead. He also sought clarification as to whether the Chief Executive and the Leader would be reviewing the premiums and setting these under the delegated authority if granted.

Councillor Mahoney referring to the proposals shared concerns regarding empty homes which he felt blighted communities. However, he considered the proposals to be an infringement on civil rights and was of a concern to him as he did not see it was the Council's responsibility to dictate to individuals regarding the use of their property. He was also concerned that the Council was again ignoring the response of the public consultation exercise not for the first time and he had significant reservations regarding this matter.

The Leader, referring to the comments made by Councillor Dr. Johnson, indicated that the recommendations before Council were to provide a reassurance to Members that any review of charges or to change premiums would be brought back to Cabinet and Council for decision and this would also allow the Council to be able to benchmark against other Councils to see how well the initiative worked.

In terms of the comments made by Councillor Mahoney, the Leader indicated that she had no problem with people owning two homes or more. However, they had to be in productive use and if they were not they should be prepared to pay an additional contribution and that was the purpose of establishing the policy.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the following Council Tax premiums be approved:

- A 100% Council Tax premium be levied in 2023/24 in respect of long-term empty properties, a 150% premium in 2024/25 and a 200% premium in 2025/26.

- A 100% Council Tax premium be levied in 2024/25 in respect of second homes.

(2) T H A T delegated authority be granted to the Head of Finance to implement the changes and to notify the owners of all affected properties.

(3) T H A T delegated authority be granted to the Head of Finance to determine applications for an exception under the regulations as set out in paragraph 5.5 of the report (see Cabinet report [16th February, 2023.](#))

(4) T H A T the Chief Executive and Leader review those premiums in future years and bring changes to Cabinet and Council for approval as appropriate.

Reasons for decisions

(1) The Council was required to determine its policy on the introduction of premiums in respect of second homes and long-term empty properties as defined in Sections 12A and 12B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as inserted by the Housing (Wales) Act 2014.

(2) To ensure that all customers impacted by the introduction of premiums were aware of the changes.

(3) To ensure arrangements were put in place to consider exceptions.

(4) To ensure premiums levied were kept under review as appropriate.

(N.B. Councillors Buckley, Campbell, Charles, Driscoll and Haines withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.)

776 DRAFT VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN 2023-24 (REF) –

Cabinet had considered the report on 16th February, 2023 (Minute No. C226 refers) together with the reference from Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee, and had referred the same to Council for consideration and approval.

The report set out how the draft Annual Delivery Plan (the Plan) 2023-24 (Appendix A to the report) had been developed, the outcome of the consultation and the subsequent changes to the Plan, which detailed the activities that would be undertaken in 2023-24 to deliver those objectives. The Plan also detailed three critical challenges which would be a key focus for the organisation in 2023-24, these being cost of living, Project Zero and organisational resilience. The Council's four Well-being Objectives provided the framework for the Annual Delivery Plan 2023-24.

The commitments within the Annual Delivery Plan would be reflected in Annual Service Plans together with a suite of performance measures which would detail

how different Council services would contribute to the delivery of the Council's four Well-being Objectives.

Publishing the Council's Well-being Objectives at the start of the financial year would enable it to meet its statutory obligations under the performance duties of the Local Government and Election (Wales) Act 2021 and the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, both of which placed specific duties on the Council in relation to objective setting and reporting. Under the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, the Council was required to publish its Well-being Objectives by 31st March each year and to keep these under review.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Draft Vale of Glamorgan Council Annual Delivery Plan 2023-24, as attached at Appendix A to the report to Cabinet on 16th February, 2023 (Minute No. C226) be approved.

Reason for decision

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

777 CAPITAL STRATEGY 2023/24 AND FINAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME PROPOSALS 2023/24 TO 2027/28 (REF) –

The Leader, in presenting the report advised that the report had been considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 27th February, 2023 (Minute No. C236 refers) and provided the Council's Capital Strategy for 2023/24 at Appendix 1. The Capital Strategy provided a framework which outlined how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of corporate objectives, along with an overview of how associated risk was managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.

The report set out the Council's proposed Final Capital Programme for the period 2023/24 to 2027/28 at Appendix 2.

The Council was facing significant pressures in relation to price inflation and the cost-of-living crisis which had seen increases in the costs of materials and labour. This had had an impact on the current schemes within the Capital Programme and the funding available to fund new schemes within the Capital Programme. The total value of capital schemes over the next five years was £345m. This included £41m for the Band B Sustainable Communities for Learning Programme (excluding the pipeline schemes) and £167m for the Housing Improvement Programme.

Since the Draft Capital Programme proposals reported in January, a number of changes had been made including the re-profile of the Sustainable Learning Communities schemes, inclusion of the School Maintenance Grant, the inclusion of two pipeline schemes, (as referred to at Appendix 2 to this report, in relation to St. Richard Gwyn Redevelopment and Cowbridge Primary Phase 2 and worked on two Leisure Centre boilers at Llantwit Major and Cowbridge.

Councillor Franks indicated to Members that it was worth considering in the financial year 2021/2022 there had been slippage in the amount of £11.5m and in the current financial year there was a minimum of £8m and therefore he felt that the Administration's track record on fulfilling the Council's Capital Budget had not been good. He highlighted that of the £88.2m which was in the budget for the current year only £42.7m would be spent by the end of January with the £8m of slippage likely to grow further. He felt that these figures highlighted that residents in the Vale of Glamorgan had been badly let down by the Administration and was only one area where there had been a failure to invest funding in social housing. He also referred to the fact that he had challenged a statement that work had been continuing at the Hayes Road site and despite promises that the matter would be investigated he had not received any further information on progress of the site to date. He also touched on other schemes which had underspent or either had slipped. He also felt that schools had been badly let down as maintenance had not been carried out and he also highlighted the condition of roads and pavements and queried why the Council had not allocated additional funding to improve matters. In concluding, he felt that the proposed budget was not credible and that the Administration was failing its communities.

There being no further comments it was subsequently,

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the Capital Strategy 2023/24 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report to Cabinet on 27th February, 2023, be approved.
- (2) T H A T the final Capital Programme for the years 2023/24 to 2027/28 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report to Cabinet on 27th February, 2023, be approved.
- (3) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to or from the 2023/24 to 2027/28 Housing Improvement Programme as appropriate.
- (4) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to or from the 2023/24 to 2027/28 Asset Renewal budgets as appropriate.
- (5) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to S106 funded schemes subject to Member consultation as required under the existing process.
- (6) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to or from Energy Management Schemes.

(7) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to or from the Building Strong Communities Fund schemes.

(8) T H A T the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, be granted delegated authority to make additions, deletions or transfers to or from the Sustainable Communities for Learning Band B programme (Previously 21st Century Schools schemes).

Reasons for decisions

- (1) To approve the Capital Strategy for 2023/24.
- (2) To set and approve future Capital Programmes to 2027/28.
- (3) To enable the Housing Capital budget to be managed effectively.
- (4) To enable the Asset Renewal budgets to be managed effectively.
- (5) To enable S106 schemes to be managed effectively.
- (6) To enable the Energy Management Schemes to be managed effectively.
- (7) To enable the Building Stronger Communities Fund to be managed effectively.
- (8) To enable the Sustainable Communities for Learning Band B programme to be managed effectively.

778 TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2023/24 AND UPDATE 202223 (REF) –

The report, which had been considered by Cabinet on 27th February, 2023 (Minute No. C237 refers) provided an update on the Council's Treasury Management operations for the period 1st April to 31st December, 2022. All activities were in accordance with the Council's approved strategy on Treasury Management. Details of monies borrowed and repaid and those invested were outlined in the report.

The report presented the proposed 2023/24 Treasury Management and Investment Strategy at Appendix 1.

The Council needed to ensure that the Prudential Code was complied with, which had been developed by CIPFA as a professional code of practice and recently revised in December 2021. To demonstrate the Council had fulfilled these objectives, the Code set out prudential indicators that should be used and the factors that had to be considered. These were shown in Appendix 1 as part of the Strategy.

The Council also had a legal requirement to comply with the Welsh Government Guidance on Investments and had taken this into consideration when developing the Strategy.

New Borrowing in the period was expected to be £127m for new Capital Expenditure and a further £24m of borrowing to replace maturing loans and reflected the Council's reducing ability to internally borrow over the period.

Capital expenditure when financed by long term debt incurred two elements of cost, interest and repayment of the principal sum borrowed. The resources the Council must put aside in each year to repay the principal sum borrowed was known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) and the Council's policy for the calculation was detailed in the report.

The Treasury Management Policy Statement for 2023/24 was attached at Appendix 2 to the report.

The Council was required to keep its Treasury Management Practices (attached at Appendix 3 to the report) up to date and these procedures for management of Treasury Management processes were kept under regular review by the team.

The Leader confirmed that there were 12 management practices that the Council was required to address and these were set out in the Appendix. The Council's Treasury Management Practices had been compiled in line with the Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice and Cross-Sectional Guidance Notes (2021 edition). These had been written in conjunction with the Council's Treasury Management Policy Statement (TMPS) and Investment Strategy for 2023/24. The TMPS set out the way the Council would seek to achieve its Treasury Management Policies and objectives and how it would manage and control those activities. She reminded all Members that the Financial Management Code was the collective responsibility of all Elected Members.

Councillor Champion referred to a recent report that had been submitted to the Welsh Church Act Estate Committee which had led to a request to officers to investigate investing in green funds and to move away from fossil fuel companies. He acknowledged that it may not get the best return by investing in these companies, but the Council needed to demonstrate that it was moving towards this.

Councillor Dr. Johnson referred to the recent and important training provided on Treasury Management and acknowledged that the subject matter was not easy to understand. He was pleased to see, for the first time since he had been a Member of the Council, investment income being received as previously this had been limited. Referring to Councillor Champion's comments, it was his understanding from the training that much of the Council's income and investments was linked to the Council's risk appetite and therefore investments were generally made to organisations that had high credit rating given that the funds invested were tax payers' money. He alluded to recent revenue forecast reported where income was likely to be £75k in the next financial year, but the

most fundamental part of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy was to hold tax payers' money safely and that it could be used when the Council required it.

The Leader, in response, indicated that it was a matter of balancing the need to get a return on investments against the likely risk to that investment. She was glad to see that the Council was getting a return on its investments, but acknowledged that she would like to see the Strategy be as ethical as possible. She hoped that Members would become more engaged in how the Council developed its Strategy on its investments, what the Council was doing with those investments and how it would benefit local residents.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the policy for making Minimum Revenue Provision in 2023/24 be approved.

(2) T H A T the proposed 2023/24 Treasury Management and Investment Strategy, including the following specific resolution (detailed in Appendix 1 to the report), be approved:

- The Authorised Limit for External Debt be set at £225.439m for 2022/23, £247.141m for 2023/24, £276.773m for 2024/25 and £305.927m for 2025/26
- The Operational Boundary for External Debt be set at £212.292m for 2022/23, £234.021m for 2023/24, £263.349m for 2024/25 and £292.295m for 2025/26.
- The Section 151 Officer be given delegated authority within the total Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary as estimated for individual years to effect movement between the separately agreed limits for borrowing and other long term liabilities.
- An upper limit of £10m for 2022/23, £10m for 2023/24, £10m in 2024/25 and £10m in 2025/26 is set for total principal sums invested for over 364 days.
- The amount of projected borrowing that is fixed rate maturing in each period as a percentage of total projected borrowing that is fixed rate for 2023/24 be set as:

	Upper Limit	Lower Limit
Under 12 months	20%	0%
12 months and within 24 months	20%	0%
24 months and within 5 years	30%	0%
5 years and within 10 years	40%	0%
10 years and above	100%	0%

- T H A T the Prudential Indicators set out in Appendix 1 to the report to Cabinet on 27th February, 2023, be approved.

- T H A T the Treasury Management Policy Statement set out in Appendix 2 to the report to Cabinet on 27th February, 2023, be approved.

Reasons for decisions

- (1) To agree the basis of the Minimum Revenue Provision calculation for 2023/24.
- (2) The Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy is prepared as required by the Local Government Act 2003.

779 FINAL BUDGET 2023/24 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (MTFP) 2023/24 TO 2028/29 (REF) –

The Council was facing significant demographic and inflationary pressures in 2023/24 and into the medium term. Cabinet had approved the Financial Strategy and update of the Medium Term Financial Plan in October, at which time there was a funding gap of £28m in 2023/24 and £50m across the Medium Term.

Officers reviewed those pressures and funding assumptions in light of the Chancellor's Budget in November and the Welsh Government Settlement announcement on Tuesday, 13th December, 2022. Pressures had been managed downwards with few of the investment proposals from October 2022 taken forwards which then stood at £1.010m, but managing the inflationary pressures down was more challenging and it was determined appropriate to support the utility based pressures through the temporary use of reserves in the expectation that prices did reduce over the longer term.

There was better than expected news in the Settlement. £227m was made available across Wales over and above the 3.5% commitment in last year's settlement.

Consequently, the Council faced a reduced funding gap of £9.255m and following the approval of Cabinet on 19th January, 2023 consulted on a savings package of £6.055m after the one off use of reserves of £3.2m.

Pressures and funding had continued to be reviewed alongside comments from the Scrutiny Committees and public and wider consultation. There had been further grants received to support Homelessness alongside a recognition of the need to make greater provision for pay awards.

There was a proposed increase in Council Tax of 4.9%. For a Band D property this was the equivalent of £1.32 per week and maintained Council Tax at the mean of Welsh Authorities.

There was a £7.378m savings and efficiencies programme for which Equality Impact Assessments had been undertaken, tracking and management arrangements had already been put in place to ensure delivery.

As part of the budget deliberations there had been a fundamental review of the Council's reserves. The reserves had been realigned with the Council's overall objectives and risks and had been streamlined to provide greater transparency and ease of management.

The comments from the public consultation and scrutiny review of the January Budget for consultation had been considered in formulating the final proposals.

The Section 151 Officer had assessed the robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves and was satisfied with both.

A supplementary report was presented to Council following the receipt of the Final Settlement from Welsh Government published on 28th February, 2023.

The Vale of Glamorgan's Final Settlement was £202.797, this was an increase of £16.782m in the Aggregate External Finance (AEF), providing an additional £0.178m compared to the Provisional Settlement announced on 14th December, 2022.

The overall impact was on the funding side of the budget only with a £0.178m increase in the AEF and a £0.178m reduction in Council Tax through a revision downwards of the income assumed from the premiums on Council Tax for long term empty properties.

The Leader reminded Members that the Council was legally required to agree a balanced budget and how that was achieved depended upon the outcome of the debate on the budget. She reminded Members of the challenges detailed in the report previously considered by the Cabinet and Scrutiny Committees and reiterated that it had been a particularly difficult budget round, there had been a huge amount of uncertainty given the challenging economic climate and it made it difficult to financially plan especially, when taking into consideration the last Autumn and setting a financial strategy during the chaos caused by the mini fiscal event by the U.K. government. In all the Council was facing a £28m funding gap. The Leader also reminded Members, that as reported in January, the provisional settlement in December 2022 was much better than expected, but there still remained a sizeable gap. It had been necessary to manage a number of priorities to bring forward a balanced budget. This included notional funding for social care and schools which were uplifted by 5.1% and 7.0% respectively by Welsh Government. The Council was being totally transparent with the level of pressures faced in these services and referred to, for example, in relation to social care there was an additional £8m within the budget, significantly over the Government uplift to ensure that the Council could commission to necessary domiciliary care with the needs of the residential care sector that was experiencing similar inflationary pressures to the Council. In regard to schools an extra £10.4m, a rise of in excess of 9% had been included in the budget recognising all of the inflationary costs being faced, but accepted that there would still need to be some efficiencies. She also felt that it was also important to have regard to the fact that the Council's Council Tax level was below the average for Wales and the 4.9% proposed increase would see that position maintained, particularly given that some Welsh authorities were setting

increases of 2 or 3 points higher. There had also been a difficult choice to be made in identifying a savings package of £4.6m, but the Council was taking the right action. Fees and charges had to go up in line with rising costs and it was therefore essential that the Council covered its own costs.

The Leader's attention then turned to the question of the use of Council reserves and highlighted that there had been a fundamental review of the Council's reserves. She felt it was important to note that these had been reduced as a result of inflation impacting on the Council's investments. Pressures remained and therefore it was likely that reserves may have to be used over the next financial year.

In concluding, she referred to the various appendices attached to the report, Appendix D related to reserves, Appendix E included an appraisal of the Section 151 Officer of estimates and reserves, Appendix F referred to the budget consultation outcome and Appendix G related to the Equality Impact Assessment. She thanked all those Members who had contributed to the budget consultation exercise and in particular thanked the Council's finance officers for preparing the reports.

The Leader moved the following Motion:

- (1) That the Final Budget be updated in recognition that the Final Aggregate External Finance figure had increased to £202.797m which was an increase of £16.782m and an improvement on the £6.604m Provisional Settlement figure contained in the report published on 28th February, 2023 as set out in the Supplementary Report circulated prior to the meeting.
- (2) That a Council Tax increase of 4.9% be approved.
- (3) That the Budget for 2023/24 be approved.

This was duly seconded by the Deputy Leader.

Councillor Carroll indicated that the setting of the budget was the single most important decision that the Authority would take in each year. Therefore, he considered it outrageous that the meeting was being held remotely when the meeting should be held in person discussing the matter in the Council Chamber. He considered it a failure of leadership on the part of the Administration that he was unable to do so. He did not consider the failure in leadership to be contained to this matter. When looking at the budget there were a number of other examples. He found it unacceptable that the Administration was proposing an increase in Council Tax by 4.9%, but at the same time cutting services. He cited examples such as black bag collections moving to a three weekly cycle, fees to be introduced for garden waste collection service and other examples of fees and charges increasing. He was particularly concerned regarding the levels of reserves that the Council held referring to the Council's General Reserve being at £11m. Acknowledging that the Council required reserves he was disputing the level of those reserves held when taking account of levels of reserves held by neighbouring Authorities.

In the context of reserves held by the Council he considered that the proposed Council Tax rise was not necessary and the Council could freeze Council Tax for the forthcoming financial year with the cost being borne by the Council from its General Reserves.

Councillor Carroll moved the following amendment:

That £4.239m be taken out of the Council's General Reserve to freeze Council Tax for 2023/24.

This was duly seconded by Councillor Charles.

Councillor Dr. Johnson responding to the amendment felt that it was fair that nobody would take the Conservatives seriously on financial matters they put forward. He was concerned that the proposed amendment had been costed only in the sense that there was some money available, but did not inform Members what would happen in the future and consequently not a particularly sensible way of discussing the matter. He considered the amendment nothing more than grandstanding. It was his view that the Conservatives were particularly problematic given the fiscal event which crashed the economy in the Autumn 2022 and beyond that the slow strangulation of public services which had taken place over the last decade. Having been a Councillor elected to the Council for 11 years he had seen in that time the hollowing out of public services through underfunding as part of austerity, the uncertainty brought about by the economic disaster or Brexit, all of which had fed into the current cost of living crisis. Whilst the Conservative Party had been in power at Westminster, the Labour Party had also been responsible, in his opinion, having spent two thirds of his life with a Tory Government that Wales did not elect and a Labour Party that propped up the Conservative Government by wedding themselves to the constitutional system of unionism, this meant that the Conservative Party were in charge more often than not. This had led to budgets being decreased and underfunding leading to substandard services for ordinary people in Wales at the same time the cost of local services had been transferred from central Government to tax payers and this had resulted in above inflation Council Tax increase over the past decade and were paying more for fewer services. The proposed Council Tax rise was low within the context of inflation and in the middle across Wales, but it was clear that most households would get less services than in previous years. He was also concerned about proposals to introduce charges for garden waste, Council house rents that had risen on average by £300 and the intention to move to a three week black bag collection service. He signalled that he could not support the amendment proposed by the Conservatives as it was unfunded and unexplained.

Councillor John considered that the Conservative Group had been asleep since last Autumn Budget which had left the U.K. in a mess. He thanked the Chief Executive and officers for their efforts to reduce the likely impact of the economic challenges faced by the Council as without their intervention the Council could have been facing an increase similar to that of Conwy of 9.9%. He also reminded Members that the Council was currently 15th out of 22 Authorities that would be setting its Council Tax at 4.9% and considered the amendment to be disrespectful to the Council's Management Team who had

brought the budget together with the Members on the Cabinet during a very worrying time. He accepted that nobody liked to pay Council Tax, but it was the only solution to allow the Council to set a balanced budget and he indicated that he would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Haines referring to the previous comments felt that some Members had not noticed how the Vale of Glamorgan had deteriorated in previous years and felt that the Labour Administration had hit residents doubly by increasing Council Tax but at the same time cutting services. He did not see any reason why the Council held excessive reserves to a greater extent than similar Authorities in Wales. The Council could reduce its reserves and protect the residents particularly those worst off and this should be something the Council's Administration and its officers should consider. He was particularly concerned with the proposals to extend black bag waste collections and the impact this would have on residents with clinical health issues as they would have to store waste products longer. He indicated that he would be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Wilson expressed concern in regard to the proposed amendment taking account of the challenges faced by the Council with it just emerging from the Covid pandemic and now dealing with the implications of the Ukrainian war and the ongoing implications of Brexit. He considered the Council's approach to reserves held as prudent and did not consider these to be huge amounts held in its General Reserve given the challenges faced by the Council in its recent past and present. He reminded all Members that reserves could only be spent once.

Councillor R. Thomas viewed the proposals as giving residents of the Vale a double whammy in that Council Tax would be hiked and services cut. He echoed the comments of his Group Leader in regard to proposed fees to be introduced for garden waste collections and other fee increases, this at the same time that the Council held £11m in its General Reserves which was not an insignificant amount of money proportionately when compared to other Authorities like Cardiff. He felt that reserves should be used to much better use by bolstering services and keeping other charges as low as possible.

Councillor Ewan Goodjohn referred to the previous comments made by Councillor Dr. Johnson in regard to the Conservatives being taken seriously on matters such as finances and he considered that to be true. He considered that the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Conservative Group as remarkable. By their own figures put forward, the Council would have utilised its reserves to fund similar cost pressures in three years. He could only conclude that the Conservatives would either be proposing an alternative for the next year which they had not yet set out or that they were proposing on top of the Council Tax increase that would be needed next year whatever that may be, an extra 4.9% on that year which would mean that residents would face even higher Council Tax bills over coming years. He considered the amendment to be extremely irresponsible.

Councillor Brooks considered that the comments made by the Conservative Members as reckless given the situation that the Council was facing. Alluding to 12 years of cuts from a Conservative U.K. Government which to a certain extent

in Wales, Councils had been protected by the Welsh Government, but when looking over the border at the budgets set in England it was notable that some Councils were facing bankruptcy. The Conservative Group demonstrated a lack of understanding regarding the Council's reserves and their use. A significant amount of work had gone into planning to obtain a balanced budget and to protect the most vulnerable residents within the Vale of Glamorgan. Statutory services had to be at the forefront and she indicated that she would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Charles considered that the proposed increase in Council Tax would hit the most vulnerable residents. At the same time they were also facing other financial challenges and she felt that during these difficult times the objective was to save money on the unnecessary and referred to the appointment of additional Directors to the Council. She was also concerned about the proposals to introduce charges for garden waste collections and this would have the biggest impact on people on low income and the most vulnerable and the elderly who did not have vehicles to take their recycling to waste centres. She was concerned that would see an increase in fly tipping. She also indicated that she did not support the proposed increase of 67% in allotment rentals. She indicated that she would be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Perry described the Council Tax as not being particularly fair and acknowledged that the Council was in a difficult position, pointing out that Councils in England were facing potential bankruptcy or financial difficulties, some more challenging than the Council's. He felt that the policies of the U.K. Government over the last 13 years had contributed to the situation that the Council was facing. If the Council did not increase Council Tax it was likely that it would have implications elsewhere for example, the loss of jobs and acknowledged that reserves could only be spent once. He had no doubt if the Council agreed to freeze the Council Tax for the next financial year it was almost certain that it would have to increase it by a larger amount in the subsequent financial year. He considered that the proposed amendment was short sighted and that the political groups should stop playing politics and collaborate more for the benefit of the Vale's communities.

Councillor Hennessy echoed the previous comments of Councillors Carroll and Charles in regard to the appointment of additional Directors and the proposed increase of 4.9% when the most vulnerable would find it difficult to find the funds to pay for green waste collections. He indicated that he would be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Fisher referred to the comments made by Councillor Dr. Johnson in regard to the state of the economy at the current time and the impact upon residents which he agreed with, but felt this was the reason why Members needed to consider approving the amendment as it would help residents of the Vale and he indicated that he would be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Perkes echoed the comments of Councillor Brooks in regard to the implications of using further reserves and to the impact the previous 12 years of austerity had on local authorities in Wales. She felt that the Conservative U.K. Government had mismanaged the U.K. budget and economy and felt that the

Conservative Group were in no position to criticise the proposals and indicated that she would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Penn considered that if the Conservatives were in charge they would play fast and loose with the Council finances and he was pleased that they were not. Referring to the proposed amendment he enquired as to how this would be funded, which services would be cut and how Council Tax would increase in future years to come. He considered the amendment short sighted with no view to the future, a headline today and financially irresponsible. He indicated that he would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Driscoll felt that it had been easy to criticise the Conservative Party over the previous 12 years and acknowledged that they had not done themselves any favours. However, he felt that those criticising the Conservatives should look more closely at some of the mistakes that had been made by the Welsh Government and referred to the £155m wasted on the M4 Relief Road. In real terms he considered that residents of the Vale of Glamorgan were paying the third highest Council Tax in Wales. He indicated that he would be supporting the amendment.

The Leader in summing up, referred to the amendment which had clearly not been based upon any financial projections or any of the financial information contained in the reports discussed over the previous six months. She drew Members' attention to Appendix E of the report and the Head of Finance/Section 151 Officer's report on the robustness of estimates and the sufficiency of the Council's reserves. She also reminded Members that the Council's policy on General Reserves was to hold a minimum prudent level which was currently set at £10m, the projected level of General Fund balance would be 3.91% of net revenue budget at the beginning of 2023/24 dropping to 3.74% and it was considered that this remained an appropriate level. She reminded the Conservative Group that it was not a game and alluded to the fact that the Group had imploded in 2019 due to the types of suggestions that the amendment was proposing now. She also highlighted that the budget had gone through Scrutiny Committees and not a single suggestion on the budget had come forward that could be looked at. She signalled that she would be voting against the amendment.

A Vote took place on Councillor Carroll's amendment (as seconded by Councillor Charles) to freeze Council Tax for 2023/24 and to take a further £4.239m out of general reserves to support the budget.

The Amendment was not carried.

Councillor Dr. Johnson alluding to the earlier debate in relation to the Conservative Group's proposed amendment and their comments regarding the impact of an increase in Council Tax and considered the comments made by both the Conservative Group and Labour Group had not recognised the impact the increase in Council house rents of roughly £300 would have on Council tenants. The proposals to increase Council Tax was actually less than the impact of rent rises on Council tenants. He indicated unlike the Conservative Group he would set out how an increase of around 2% in Council Tax could be

achieved through the use of a smoothing motion of around £2m. He explained that this was clearly affordable as the Council consistently over collected the anticipated amount of Council Tax by circa £1.5m to £2m each year. Alluding to a recent Revenue Monitoring report in relation to the current financial year this reported that it was anticipated to over collect Council Tax by an amount approximately £1.5m. In the previous financial year the Council had over collected Council Tax by £2m. Whilst he could see the benefit for the Council of having extra money he did not believe that it was right that the Council deliberately each year over collected. He considered it unfair to take this bonus, but then not include it in the Council's normal financial systems. He also touched upon the introduction of the Garden Waste collection service and the intention for it to be a fee paying subscription. He did not necessarily support the proposal as a service change. He had been concerned that there had been no discussion in relation to biodiversity in the context of the Council's Nature Emergency Declaration and that a charge for the service could lead to large amounts of uncollected garden waste. He also thought that the proposal, in his view, also underestimated the amounts that would be collected from the service and thought the uptake of the subscription service would be higher than the estimated 20% as reported. If it was the case, that subscriptions would be higher and the Council would benefit from increased income.

In concluding, he drew attention to the amount of investment income that the Council was likely to receive alluding to some £150k of investment income in the most recent forecast for the next financial year. Referring to the supplementary report circulated to Members he made reference to the additional funding in the amount of £178k received from the Welsh Government as part of the Council's final budget settlement. He had no doubt that this additional funding could also be used to lower the proposed Council Tax increase.

Councillor Dr. Johnson moved the following Amendment:

That the Council Tax increase for 2023/24 be set at 2%. The amendment was duly seconded by Councillor Hooper.

Councillor Dr. Johnson also requested that a Recorded Vote on the matter and the requisite number of Members signalled their support for it.

Councillor Franks referring to the technical report put forward by officers in consultation with the Cabinet considered the proposals being deliberated ignored reality and alluded to his earlier comments made in reference to the failures of the Cabinet and previous Administrations. He referred to the proposed cuts to the education service of £2m and considered the Leader's earlier response to his question in terms of the implications of cuts to schools as nebulous. The comments of the Leader were also at odds with other statements made that they wished to protect statutory services. He considered that the Vale of Glamorgan was in decline and that the Cabinet was failing to respond to poor standards and whilst he agreed with the Leader's comments that all Members had a responsibility for finance he did not need to be lectured on it and he had no faith in the proposed budget.

Councillor Ewan Goodjohn acknowledged that the proposed amendment was an attempt to find the middle ground between the Cabinet's proposed budget and the Conservative's failed amendment. Referring to Councillor Dr. Johnson's explanation in support of his amendment and in particular to the proposed charge for garden waste collection, there was no guarantee that the uptake in subscriptions would be greater than that reported to the Scrutiny Committee and reminded Members that the Council required to be prudent and that there was no guarantee that the Council would collect a greater amount of Council Tax in future years. He further reminded Members that the proposals were already using a smoothing mechanism by the use of reserves of approximately £4.5m, any further use of reserves would be irresponsible and only a temporary solution with it likely that Council Tax levels would need to be increased further in subsequent years and he indicated that he would not be supporting the amendment.

Both Councillors Carroll and Haines signalled that they would be supporting the amendment as they would sooner see a rise of 2% rather than the proposed increase of 4.9%.

Councillor Wilson referred to the budget process and the preparation of the same which had been undertaken over a period of months and difficult decisions had to be made particularly in regard to introducing charges for providing Council services. In all reality, Members and the Council as a whole were facing a £9m budget deficit. He considered this in part due to the fact that the Westminster Government had reduced the Welsh Government's budget which had then impacted on local authorities in Wales and therefore the Council had no luxury as it had to balance its budget. Failure to do so could lead to the Council being surcharged and the U.K. Government Autumn Budget had not helped. He also flagged the Section 151 Officer's comments in regard to the sustainability of Council reserves and also echoed the previous comments of Councillor Ewan Goodjohn in regard to collecting Council Tax to the levels the Council had previously done and an uptake in the garden waste subscription. He considered that the proposed amendment relied on optimism, therefore, he indicated that he would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Perry referring to the level of reserves that the Council had built up over time. It appeared to him that the problem was that the Council sometimes did not spend funding on delivering things that residents would like to see and referred to the condition of road surfaces throughout the county which required repair.

Councillor Hodges alluding to the fact that the budget reporting process had been to various Committees it was clear to him that inflation had had a significant impact on the Council and whilst the Council had reserves the value of that was slowly decreasing. Whilst he acknowledged that these would only spend it once, he felt that it was better to spend some of it. He considered that the proposed amendment was prudent and suggested that it was time the Council radically looked at how it operated services rather than adjusting the budget every year. He felt that it was time that the Council decided how it wanted to operate its services not only the services that were provided but how these were paid for. He indicated that he would be supporting the amendment.

The Leader, in summing up referred to the comments regarding the use of reserves as a smoothing mechanism and reminded Members that the proposed budget was in fact using reserves to reduce the Council Tax increase by utilising £2.8m of the General Reserve and also reminded Members that Council funding had already been used to off-set existing budget pressures referring to homelessness issues and energy price increases and therefore it was clear that the Council was already taking action to assist and protect its services. She acknowledged that there were earmarked reserves however, these would be reduced in coming years as projects were delivered. She also reminded Members that when Cabinet was undertaking the budget process it did look at the possibility of using additional reserves as they were mindful of the pressures residents within the Vale of Glamorgan were facing. However, those same pressures were also impacting on the Council and the proposals put forward by the Cabinet would see an increase in Council Tax less than half the rate of inflation. She signalled that she would not be supporting the amendment.

A Recorded Vote took place on Councillor Dr. Johnson's amendment Motion (as seconded by Councillor Hooper) to increase Council Tax by 2% for 2023/24.

Members	For	Against	Abstain
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	√		
Millie Collins	√		

Marianne Cowpe	√		
Pamela Drake		√	
Vincent Driscoll	√		
Anthony Ernest	√		
Robert Fisher	√		
Christopher Franks	√		
Wendy Gilligan		√	
Emma Goodjohn		√	
Ewan Goodjohn		√	
Stephen Haines	√		
Howard Hamilton		√	
Sally Hanks		√	
William Hennessy	√		
Nic Hodges	√		
Mark Hooper	√		
Catherine Iannucci		√	
Gwyn John		√	
Dr. Ian Johnson	√		
Susan Lloyd-Selby		√	
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards		√	
Julie Lynch-Wilson		√	
Kevin Mahoney	√		
Naomi Marshallsea		√	
Michael Morgan		√	
Jayne Norman		√	

Helen Payne		√	
Elliot Penn		√	
Sandra Perkes		√	
Ian Perry		√	
Joanna Protheroe		√	
Ruba Sivagnanam		√	
Carys Stallard		√	
Neil Thomas		√	
Rhys Thomas	√		
Steffan Wiliam	√		
Eddie Williams		√	
Mark Wilson		√	
Nicholas Wood	√		
TOTAL	22	30	

The Amendment was not carried.

Councillor Hooper was disappointed that the amendment had not been supported. He hoped that the wider budget process could be improved next year as he believed that the process contained flaws when taking account of the Council's Corporate Plan and its associated priorities. It was his view that the full cost recovery of Council services should be dealt with under the Corporate Plan mechanism and the proposed increases contained in the proposed budget should have been done over a longer period of time. The budget for next year from his perspective would be largely set as a cost plus basis on the year's expected outturn and he considered this to be inefficient, maintained bottlenecks and discouraged departmental innovation. He was also pleased to hear that some moves had been made to budget from a zero base according to needs and plans, but there was still insufficient resources available to undertake a full zero based budget exercise across the Council which had been a point he had made previously at Scrutiny Committees and at the Governance and Audit Committees, but acknowledged that the Leader had responded to him on the matter previously.

Councillor Ewan Goodjohn quoted inflation increases since 1997 based on statistics in Wales and from the Office of National Statistics. Whilst he

acknowledged that certain Members wished to see the increase in Council Tax to be lower, the fact of the matter was that Council Tax was an unfair tax as it did not distinguish between those who rented a home or those who owned or had a mortgage. The Council was in a difficult position as the Council Tax could not be decreased if Welsh Government did not receive adequate funding from the U.K. Government that did not reflect the increase in the Council's costs. It was his view that the proposed increase was one of the lowest in the Council's history, but to go lower would be irresponsible unless it could be properly funded. The Council had to retain a realistic level of reserves to address future challenges.

Councillor Cowpe was concerned that the Council was not listening to the responses to the budget consultation nor to the responses of the Scrutiny Committees and therefore nothing had changed with the budget remaining as proposed. She asked that in future online consultations should provide for an option for a response to be provided via email. She was also disappointed that the Council had decided to go ahead and increase the cost of black storage caddies which were used largely for nappies, hygiene waste. She was concerned that there would be a reluctance to buy the hygiene caddies which would lead to these type of waste products being disposed of in black bags and this should be seen as unacceptable in a modern day Wales and likely to have the biggest impact on vulnerable families and particularly single parent families who were headed by a female. The proposals to charge would also disproportionately impact on females as they were likely to be the main users due to various health and wellbeing issues. She felt the proposed charge was totally unacceptable and a tax on women and she sought clarification on what equality impact assessment had been undertaken on the matter. She was also concerned regarding the communication by the Council regarding the use of purple bags and this needed to be addressed. She had been made aware that residents were being discouraged to apply for additional purple bags which meant that they were less inclined to recycle. She hoped that the Council would address this by encouraging residents to register and apply for a purple bag so that each household could be properly assessed based on their needs. She was aware that officers did visit and advise households and she expressed her thanks for this being done. However, she would like to see visits extended to include existing households who were potentially abusing the system by placing multiple purple bags out for kerbside collection.

Councillor Wilson in response to Councillor Cowpe' comments indicated that it was the intention to encourage residents to recycle more and this was part of the Council's Strategy and not simply about raising funds, but more about saving money by increasing participation and recycling rates. He acknowledged that there were larger family units that required additional assistance who found it difficult to recycle their waste. In terms of the Council's purple bag service, a balance had to be achieved in terms of encouraging residents to access the service, but also not wishing it to be abused.

Councillor Dr. Johnson suggested that his amendment had not been taken on board as Members had misinterpreted his rationale for a 2% increase as he had provided an explanation how the Council could fund a 2% increase in Council Tax. He reminded Members that the settlement received from Welsh

Government had seen an increase of approximately 9% which was the third highest in Wales and approximately £10m more than anticipated. However, the discussions in regard to the budget had not moved on from when it was originally thought the Council was facing dire consequences and potential massive cuts in services. The fact was the Council was not in great financial difficulties and at the end of last financial year it held £128m in usable reserves. He was also disappointed with the consultation on the budget and felt that Councillors and the Scrutiny process had been disrespected. Some 773 responses by residents to the consultation in his view had been dismissed in minutes when the Cabinet considered the final budget at its meeting in February which he had attended.

Referring to changes in fees and charges, with the Council keen on full cost recovery, it was important that the public needed to see that the Council was using the additional income wisely. He was also concerned there had been a lost opportunity to revisit many of the proposed small cuts to services given the additional funding received in the final settlement and referred to the Warm Space Libraries and cuts to provision of sand bags for residents who were threatened by flooding. Instead, the decision had been made to bank the money rather than use it for the benefit of residents or reduce the proposed Council Tax rise. It was notable that 33 Equality Impact Assessments were still awaited on proposed charges and increased charges for Council services, reiterating the concern expressed by Councillor Cowpe in relation to the hygiene caddies and the particular impact that increase would have on women and those on low incomes. He hoped that the Cabinet and officers would revisit these issues taking account of the Equality Impact Assessments once available and reconsider proposed charges. He signalled that he would be voting against the proposed budget.

Councillor Mahoney referred to the continual blame culture between the U.K. Government and the Welsh Government in relation to provision of funding to local government in Wales. As far as he was concerned both were as equally to blame for the financial circumstances affecting the Council. He considered that both the U.K. Conservative Government and Labour Welsh Government were equally culpable of wasting public money when at the same time the residents were unable to heat their own homes adequately. He also expressed concern regarding the Council's recycling targets. As he understood it, if the agreed tonnage target in relation to black bag waste was not met the Council would be penalised financially. He also did not believe in the creation of the new Directors roles when at the same time the Council was making the case that it had insufficient funding. He indicated that he would not be supporting the budget.

Councillor Sivagnanam indicated that it was a simple choice for the Council in that its budget intended to protect the most vulnerable residents and at the same time to maintain statutory services. She acknowledged that the budget was about a political choice and it was a choice that the Cabinet and the Administration were prepared to make. She accepted the points made by Councillor Cowpe in regard to the hygiene caddies and the purple bag waste service. She gave Councillor Cowpe an assurance that this was something that

the Cabinet would be monitoring and hoped that would signal the Cabinet was responsive particularly when it came to equality issues.

In summing up, Leader acknowledged that up to a point the Council could do more, but she believed the next step moving forward would be to see greater constructive discussion when the budget was being discussed at the Council's Scrutiny Committees in the future. There was very little at present. In regard to Councillor Cowpe's comment in relation to charging for hygiene caddies she indicated that the Cabinet did look at the issue in some depth, but it was a reasonable stance taken by the Council in an effort to cover its costs. She was also mindful that households with lower incomes could potentially pay more and she was open to a discussion about how residents could be supported further. She acknowledged that it may be something that needed looking at in the future.

In terms of departmental innovation raised by Councillor Hooper, it was clear that the Council was addressing this issue and referred to the Big Fresh Catering Company. She hoped to see similar initiatives particularly under the guise of the Reshaping Services agenda. She reiterated her previous points relating to Council reserves.

Turning to Councillor Mahoney's comment regarding Welsh Government funding, there was evidence that local government in England was not being afforded the same level of protection that was being provided in Wales to Councils by the Welsh Government. She would not want to be in their position and was very happy to be in Wales.

A Recorded Vote took place on the recommendations as contained within the report and supplementary report, having been moved by the Leader and seconded by Councillor Brooks.

Members	For	Against	Abstain
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		√	
Millie Collins		√	
Marianne Cowpe		√	
Pamela Drake	√		
Vincent Driscoll		√	
Anthony Ernest		√	
Robert Fisher		√	
Christopher Franks		√	
Wendy Gilligan	√		
Emma Goodjohn	√		
Ewan Goodjohn	√		
Stephen Haines		√	
Howard Hamilton	√		
Sally Hanks	√		
William Hennessy		√	
Nic Hodges		√	
Mark Hooper		√	
Catherine Iannucci	√		
Gwyn John	√		
Dr. Ian Johnson		√	
Susan Lloyd-Selby	√		
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	√		

Julie Lynch-Wilson	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	
Naomi Marshallsea	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Helen Payne	√		
Elliot Penn	√		
Sandra Perkes	√		
Ian Perry	√		
Joanna Protheroe	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
Carys Stallard	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Rhys Thomas		√	
Steffan Wiliam		√	
Eddie Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		
Nicholas Wood		√	
TOTAL	30	22	

The Motion was carried with it subsequently being

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T approval be given to update the Final Budget in recognition that the final Aggregate External Finance figure had increased to £202.797m which was an increase of £16.782m, and an improvement on the £16.604m Provisional Settlement figure contained in the report published on 28th February, 2023 as detailed in the Supplementary Report circulated prior to the meeting.

(2) T H A T a Council Tax increase of 4.9% be approved.

(3) T H A T the Budget for 2023/24 be approved.

Reasons for decisions

(1) To update the Budget following the receipt of the Final Settlement from Welsh Government published on 28th February, 2023.

(2) Setting the annual rate of Council Tax was a key policy decision for Council.

(3) Setting a balanced budget was a statutory responsibility and decision for Council.

780 PAY POLICY 2023/2024 (REF) –

The Council had a statutory requirement under the Localism Act 2011 to prepare a pay policy statement for the new financial year 2023/24. The statement needed to be approved and published by 31st March, 2023. The document provided a framework for ensuring that employees were rewarded fairly and objectively, in accordance with the service needs of the Council and that there was openness and transparency in relation to the process.

The Pay Policy had been incrementally developed since 2012 to incorporate the following:

- Guidance from Welsh Government as contained in the document “Pay Accountabilities in Local Government in Wales” as updated November 2021;
- Changes as prescribed by the Local Authorities Standing Orders (Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 which took effect from 1st July, 2014;
- Changes as prescribed by the Local Government (Wales) Act 2015 to ensure that any proposed changes to the salary of Chief Officers (as defined in the Localism Act 2011) were made following consultation with the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales;
- Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 had been taken into account as part of the annual Pay Policy Statement;
- Necessary refinements as a result of changes to the Council’s senior management structure over recent years;
- The effects of national and locally negotiated pay and associated benefit awards along with the provisions of the National Living Wage.

The Leader referred to Section 12 of Appendix A which was attached to the original report to Cabinet and drew Members’ attention to the differentials in pay between the top and bottom grades of the organisation which was quite flat and should be seen as a positive. She also drew Members’ attention to the progress made in regard to the gender pay gap.

RESOLVED – T H A T the Council's Pay Policy as attached at Appendix A to the report to Cabinet on 2nd February, 2023 (Minute No C213) be approved.

Reason for decision

To respond to the legal requirement under the Localism Act 2011 and to provide openness and accountability in relation to how the Council rewards its staff.

(N.B. Councillors Aviet, Bruce, Champion and Ernest declared an interest in the above matter and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.)

781 CHIEF OFFICER APPRAISAL SCHEME – PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (REF) –

The Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 15th February, 2023 where there had been a detailed discussion of the matter where some had supported more regular appraisals and there had been discussion concerning peer reviews.

Cabinet at its meeting on 16th February, 2023 had endorsed the report and referred it to Council for approval in order to introduce the new scheme from 1st April, 2023.

The Leader reminded Members that the matter before Council had been initially referred from the Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee to the Cabinet and was now being reported to Council for approval. Referring to the proposed modifications she indicated that these were minor adjustments and had been initially considered by the Council's Strategic Leadership Team, the relevant recognised Trade Unions and diversity networks who were briefed in November 2022 in addition to Chief Officer Heads of Service who were briefed on the proposed changes in January 2023. She indicated that the modified scheme contained SMART objectives and targets reflected a competency profile which included coaching discussions linked to strength based improvements encompassing a rounded view of performance through peer reviews and 360 degree feedback which she considered was a much more constructive way of undertaking appraisals. She hoped that the proposed modifications would be seen in a positive and constructive way. The objective was to introduce the revised scheme by 1st April, 2023.

Councillor Haines supported the principles behind the modifications but suggested the Council needed to have a clearer understanding of the definition of productivity and the appropriate techniques to increase the same within the work place. At present, as he understood it, productivity of an individual was only measured on an annual review. However, the issue of productivity was an ongoing matter and was the easiest way to save money and increase the performance of officers and suggested that this should have been included as part of the modifications to the existing scheme.

RESOLVED – T H A T the proposed modifications for Chief Officer Appraisals as reported to Cabinet on 16th February, 2023 (Minute No C223) be approved in order to introduce the new scheme from 1st April, 2023.

Reason for decision

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

(N.B. All Chief Officers withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the Pay Policy 2023/2024 and Chief Officer Appraisal Scheme – Proposed Modifications items with the exception of the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development who remained to provide advice and then withdrew from the meeting prior to a final decision being made on these items.)

782 TO SET THE COUNCIL TAX 2023/24 –

The Leader referred to the amended Council Tax resolution that had been emailed to Members prior to the meeting.

A Recorded Vote took place on the recommendations as set out within the report and supplemental report, having been moved by the Leader and seconded by Councillor Brooks

Members	For	Against	Abstain
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		√	
Millie Collins		√	
Marianne Cowpe		√	
Pamela Drake	√		
Vincent Driscoll		√	
Anthony Ernest		√	
Robert Fisher		√	
Christopher Franks		√	
Wendy Gilligan	√		
Emma Goodjohn	√		
Ewan Goodjohn	√		
Stephen Haines		√	
Howard Hamilton	√		
Sally Hanks	√		
William Hennessy		√	
Nic Hodges		√	
Mark Hooper		√	
Catherine Iannucci	√		
Gwyn John	√		
Dr. Ian Johnson		√	
Susan Lloyd-Selby	√		
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	√		
Julie Lynch-Wilson	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	

Naomi Marshallsea	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Helen Payne	√		
Elliot Penn	√		
Sandra Perkes	√		
Ian Perry	√		
Joanna Protheroe	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
Carys Stallard	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Rhys Thomas		√	
Steffan Wiliam		√	
Eddie Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		
Nicholas Wood		√	
TOTAL	30	22	

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T it be noted that at its meeting on 15th December 2022, Cabinet (the Executive) calculated the following amounts for the year 2023/24 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

(a) 62,334 being the amount calculated by Cabinet (the Executive) in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (Wales) Regulations 1995, as amended, as its council tax base for the year.

(b) Part of the Council's area

Barry	20,914
Colwinston	375
Cowbridge with Llanblethian	2,839
Dinas Powys	4,028
Ewenny	450
Llancarfan	486
Llandough	951
Llandow	441
Llanfair	384
Llangan	464
Llanmaes	261
Llantwit Major	4,305
Michaelston	241
Penarth	11,643
Pendoylan	352
Penllyn	1,065
Peterston-Super-Ely	553
St. Athan	1,601
St. Brides Major	1,434
St. Donats	205
St. Georges and St. Brides-Super-Ely	241
St. Nicholas and Bonvilston	742
Sully and Lavernock	2,706
Welsh St. Donats	325
Wenvoe	1,564
Wick	535
Total Council Tax Base Town and Community Councils	59,105
Rhosee	3,229
Total Council Tax Base	62,334

being the amounts calculated by Cabinet (the Executive), in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as amended, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(2) T H A T the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|
| (a) | Aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (2) (a) to (d) and (2A) of the Act (including Town / Community Council Precepts totalling £3,406,510) | £456,106,214 |
|-----|--|--------------|

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|
| (b) | Aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3) (a), (aa) and (c), and (3A) of the Act | £158,889,000 |
| (c) | Amount by which the aggregate at (2)(a) above exceeds the aggregate at (2)(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year. | £297,217,214 |
| (d) | Aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its Council Fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant, its council tax reduction scheme, additional grant or special grant less certain Discretionary Non-Domestic Rate Reliefs | £202,506,977 |
| (e) | The amount at (2)(c) above less the amount at (2)(d) above, all divided by the amount at (1)(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. | £1,519.40 |
| (f) | Aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. | £3,406,510 |
| (g) | Amount at (2)(e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (2)(f) above by the amount at (1)(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates. | £1,464.75 |

(h)	<u>Part of the Council's area</u>	<u>£</u>
	Barry	1,524.95
	Colwinston	1,512.52
	Cowbridge with Llanblethian	1,552.72
	Dinas Powys	1,497.82
	Ewenny	1,515.86
	Llancarfan	1,492.73
	Llandough	1,516.72
	Llandow	1,487.43
	Llanfair	1,479.81
	Llangan	1,488.97
	Llanmaes	1,518.12
	Llantwit Major	1,526.12

Michaelston	1,494.50
Penarth	1,549.73
Pendoylan	1,487.48
Penllyn	1,477.47
Peterston-Super-Ely	1,506.34
St. Athan	1,508.85
St. Brides Major	1,480.75
St. Donats	1,489.20
St. Georges and St. Brides-Super-Ely	1,490.57
St. Nicholas and Bonvilston	1,539.02
Sully and Lavernock	1,501.48
Welsh St. Donats	1,486.29
Wenvoe	1,489.64
Wick	1,481.57

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (2)(g) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at (1)(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(i) Part of the Council's Area

	Valuation Bands									
	£	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Barry		1,016.63	1,186.07	1,355.51	1,524.95	1,863.83	2,202.71	2,541.58	3,049.90	3,558.22
Colwinston		1,008.35	1,176.40	1,344.46	1,512.52	1,848.64	2,184.75	2,520.87	3,025.04	3,529.21
Cowbridge with Llanblethian		1,035.15	1,207.67	1,380.20	1,552.72	1,897.77	2,242.82	2,587.87	3,105.44	3,623.01
Dinas Powys		998.55	1,164.97	1,331.40	1,497.82	1,830.67	2,163.52	2,496.37	2,995.64	3,494.91
Ewenny		1,010.57	1,179.00	1,347.43	1,515.86	1,852.72	2,189.58	2,526.43	3,031.72	3,537.01
Llancarfan		995.15	1,161.01	1,326.87	1,492.73	1,824.45	2,156.17	2,487.88	2,985.46	3,483.04
Llandough		1,011.15	1,179.67	1,348.20	1,516.72	1,853.77	2,190.82	2,527.87	3,033.44	3,539.01
Llandow		991.62	1,156.89	1,322.16	1,487.43	1,817.97	2,148.51	2,479.05	2,974.86	3,470.67
Llanfair		986.54	1,150.96	1,315.39	1,479.81	1,808.66	2,137.50	2,466.35	2,959.62	3,452.89
Llangan		992.65	1,158.09	1,323.53	1,488.97	1,819.85	2,150.73	2,481.62	2,977.94	3,474.26
Llanmaes		1,012.08	1,180.76	1,349.44	1,518.12	1,855.48	2,192.84	2,530.20	3,036.24	3,542.28
Llantwit Major		1,017.41	1,186.98	1,356.55	1,526.12	1,865.26	2,204.40	2,543.53	3,052.24	3,560.95
Michaelston		996.33	1,162.39	1,328.44	1,494.50	1,826.61	2,158.72	2,490.83	2,989.00	3,487.17
Penarth		1,033.15	1,205.35	1,377.54	1,549.73	1,894.11	2,238.50	2,582.88	3,099.46	3,616.04
Pendoylan		991.65	1,156.93	1,322.20	1,487.48	1,818.03	2,148.58	2,479.13	2,974.96	3,470.79
Penllyn		984.98	1,149.14	1,313.31	1,477.47	1,805.80	2,134.12	2,462.45	2,954.94	3,447.43
Peterston-Super-Ely		1,004.23	1,171.60	1,338.97	1,506.34	1,841.08	2,175.82	2,510.57	3,012.68	3,514.79
Rhoose		976.50	1,139.25	1,302.00	1,464.75	1,790.25	2,115.75	2,441.25	2,929.50	3,417.75
St. Athan		1,005.90	1,173.55	1,341.20	1,508.85	1,844.15	2,179.45	2,514.75	3,017.70	3,520.65
St. Brides Major		987.17	1,151.69	1,316.22	1,480.75	1,809.81	2,138.86	2,467.92	2,961.50	3,455.08
St. Donats		992.80	1,158.27	1,323.73	1,489.20	1,820.13	2,151.07	2,482.00	2,978.40	3,474.80
St. Georges & St. Brides-Super-Ely		993.71	1,159.33	1,324.95	1,490.57	1,821.81	2,153.05	2,484.28	2,981.14	3,478.00
St. Nicholas and Bonvilston		1,026.01	1,197.02	1,368.02	1,539.02	1,881.02	2,223.03	2,565.03	3,078.04	3,591.05
Sully and Lavernock		1,000.99	1,167.82	1,334.65	1,501.48	1,835.14	2,168.80	2,502.47	3,002.96	3,503.45
Welsh St. Donats		990.86	1,156.00	1,321.15	1,486.29	1,816.58	2,146.86	2,477.15	2,972.58	3,468.01
Wenvoe		993.09	1,158.61	1,324.12	1,489.64	1,820.67	2,151.70	2,482.73	2,979.28	3,475.83
Wick		987.71	1,152.33	1,316.95	1,481.57	1,810.81	2,140.05	2,469.28	2,963.14	3,457.00

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (2)(g) and (2)(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5 (1/1A) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36 (1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

(3). T H A T it be noted that for the year 2023/24 the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Wales has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

£	Valuation Bands								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	216.31	252.37	288.42	324.47	396.57	468.68	540.78	648.94	757.10

Part of the Council's Area	Valuation Bands									
	£	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Barry	£	1,232.94	1,438.44	1,643.93	1,849.42	2,260.40	2,671.39	3,082.36	3,698.84	4,315.32
Colwinston		1,224.66	1,428.77	1,632.88	1,836.99	2,245.21	2,653.43	3,061.65	3,673.98	4,286.31
Cowbridge with Llanblethian		1,251.46	1,460.04	1,668.62	1,877.19	2,294.34	2,711.50	3,128.65	3,754.38	4,380.11
Dinas Powys		1,214.86	1,417.34	1,619.82	1,822.29	2,227.24	2,632.20	3,037.15	3,644.58	4,252.01
Ewenny		1,226.88	1,431.37	1,635.85	1,840.33	2,249.29	2,658.26	3,067.21	3,680.66	4,294.11
Llancarfan		1,211.46	1,413.38	1,615.29	1,817.20	2,221.02	2,624.85	3,028.66	3,634.40	4,240.14
Llandough		1,227.46	1,432.04	1,636.62	1,841.19	2,250.34	2,659.50	3,068.65	3,682.38	4,296.11
Llandow		1,207.93	1,409.26	1,610.58	1,811.90	2,214.54	2,617.19	3,019.83	3,623.80	4,227.77
Llanfair		1,202.85	1,403.33	1,603.81	1,804.28	2,205.23	2,606.18	3,007.13	3,608.56	4,209.99
Llangan		1,208.96	1,410.46	1,611.95	1,813.44	2,216.42	2,619.41	3,022.40	3,626.88	4,231.36
Llanmaes		1,228.39	1,433.13	1,637.86	1,842.59	2,252.05	2,661.52	3,070.98	3,685.18	4,299.38
Llantwit Major		1,233.72	1,439.35	1,644.97	1,850.59	2,261.83	2,673.08	3,084.31	3,701.18	4,318.05
Michaelston		1,212.64	1,414.76	1,616.86	1,818.97	2,223.18	2,627.40	3,031.61	3,637.94	4,244.27
Penarth		1,249.46	1,457.72	1,665.96	1,874.20	2,290.68	2,707.18	3,123.66	3,748.40	4,373.14
Pendoylan		1,207.96	1,409.30	1,610.62	1,811.95	2,214.60	2,617.26	3,019.91	3,623.90	4,227.89
Penllyn		1,201.29	1,401.51	1,601.73	1,801.94	2,202.37	2,602.80	3,003.23	3,603.88	4,204.53
Peterston-Super-Ely		1,220.54	1,423.97	1,627.39	1,830.81	2,237.65	2,644.50	3,051.35	3,661.62	4,271.89
Rhose		1,192.81	1,391.62	1,590.42	1,789.22	2,186.82	2,584.43	2,982.03	3,578.44	4,174.85
St. Athan		1,222.21	1,425.92	1,629.62	1,833.32	2,240.72	2,648.13	3,055.53	3,666.64	4,277.75
St. Brides Major		1,203.48	1,404.06	1,604.64	1,805.22	2,206.38	2,607.54	3,008.70	3,610.44	4,212.18
St. Donats		1,209.11	1,410.64	1,612.15	1,813.67	2,216.70	2,619.75	3,022.78	3,627.34	4,231.90
St. Georges & St. Brides-Super-Ely		1,210.02	1,411.70	1,613.37	1,815.04	2,218.38	2,621.73	3,025.06	3,630.08	4,235.10
St. Nicholas and Bonvilston		1,242.32	1,449.39	1,656.44	1,863.49	2,277.59	2,691.71	3,105.81	3,726.98	4,348.15
Sully and Lavernock		1,217.30	1,420.19	1,623.07	1,825.95	2,231.71	2,637.48	3,043.25	3,651.90	4,260.55
Welsh St. Donats		1,207.17	1,408.37	1,609.57	1,810.76	2,213.15	2,615.54	3,017.93	3,621.52	4,225.11
Wenvoe		1,209.40	1,410.98	1,612.54	1,814.11	2,217.24	2,620.38	3,023.51	3,628.22	4,232.93
Wick		1,204.02	1,404.70	1,605.37	1,806.04	2,207.38	2,608.73	3,010.06	3,612.08	4,214.10

(4).T H A T, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (2)(i) and (3) above , The Vale of Glamorgan County Borough Council , in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2023/24.

- (5) T H A T discount for prompt payment of the Council Tax be not granted.
- (6) T H A T the Common Seal be affixed to the said Council Tax.
- (7) T H A T notices of the making of the said Council Taxes signed by the Managing Director be given by advertisement in the local press under Section 38 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Reason for decisions

(1-7) In order to set the Council Tax for 2023/24.

(N.B. A Supplementary Report containing an updated Council Tax Resolution was circulated to all Councillors in advance and prior to the meeting.)

783 COUNCIL TAX UNOCCUPIED DWELLINGS: 2023/24 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C158, 1st December, 2022 (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.

784 COUNCIL TAX BASE: 2023/24 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C168, 15th December, 2022 (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.

785 FINAL HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUDGET PROPOSALS AND 2023/24 AND RENT SETTING 2023/2024 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C176, 5th January, 2023 (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.

786 PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER SPECIALIST RESOURCE BASE AT LLANDOUGH PRIMARY TO YSGOL Y DDRAIG (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C177, 5th January, 2023 (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.

787 BUDGET 2023/24 FOR CONSULTATION AND FURTHER MTFP UPDATE (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C189, 19th January, 2023 (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.

788 DRAFT TRANSGENDER INCLUSION TOOLKIT AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND OTHER SETTINGS (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C193, 19th January, 2023 (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.

789 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE WELSH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION: ELECTORAL ADMINISTRATION AND REFORM WHITE PAPER (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C200, 19th January, 2023 (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.

790 DRAFT VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN 2023-24 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C226, 16th February, 2023 (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.

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

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

(i) **Question from Councillor W.A. Hennessy**

Has the Council recognised that development on Model Farm goes counter to the Vale's commitment to take action on the Nature Emergency, so that there is a need to reassess the designation in revisiting the LDP?

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

The Current planning application for Model Farm was considered by the Planning committee on 1st March when a full assessment of the development against both National and Local policies and all other material considerations were considered.

The Council's current Local Development Plan does not expire until 2026 and remains a key material consideration in the determination of this application.

The application has been made subject to a Holding Direction from Welsh Government (WG), which restricts the grant of permission until WG decide whether the application should be referred to the Welsh Ministers for their decision. WG have indicated that they are awaiting an updated report and recommendation from the Council prior to making that decision.

(ii) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

In May last year, Welsh Labour and Llantwit First received 38% of votes cast at the election and a slim majority of seats. The fine margin has been transferred to 100% of seats at the Cabinet table for members of these two political parties – excluding talent and expertise from important roles and imbedding party politics into decision-making.

Proportional representation results in a more inclusive system of governance and encourages Elected Members to collaborate, compromise and work together for the betterment of our communities.

At Cabinet level, should we be considering more inclusive, equitable and representative systems of Governance for the Vale of Glamorgan Council?

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

The simple fact is, the current electoral system is not based on proportional representation and the voice of the Vale of Glamorgan electorate spoke at the May 2022 LG Elections delivering 25 Labour seats, with Llantwit Major First Independents again took 4 seats to represent Llantwit Major. Is this not a Democratic outcome? You, Councillor Perry, were elected under the very same arrangements.

As the largest Political Group following those Elections, the Labour Group entered into discussions with the Llantwit Major First Independents and the independent Member Councillor Morgan and agreed to enter into a joint coalition to form an Administration and to lead the Council, as it was rightly entitled to do.

The Local Government Act 2000 introduced Executive (or Cabinet) arrangements and, as Councillor Perry will recall, at the Annual Meeting last year following those May 2022 Local Government Elections, the relevant report detailed the Council's Constitutional requirements to appoint a Leader and Deputy Leader and establish a Cabinet.

The current Cabinet, as in previous Labour led Administrations has been and is, one of the most diverse and inclusive in local government in Wales. You refer to collaboration and working together in your question, yet you fail to acknowledge that the current (and previous) Labour led coalition has been and will continue to be very collaborative in its deliberations and will continue to work together and in partnership with a range of other organisations and agencies to deliver vital Council services to its residents and communities.

(iii) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

Nothing appears to have come of the 'Reshaping Services' initiative, leaving participants from Town and Community Councils feeling that their time, effort and money was wasted. Management of grass cutting, Local Areas for Play and Local Equipped Areas for Play, etc. remain with the Vale Council.

Will 'Reshaping Services' be rebooted or left in the gutter?

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

Firstly 'Reshaping' and our approach to transformation has never been in 'the gutter' as you put it. To suggest this, is in ignorance of the significant transformation undertaken within the Council in the way services are delivered.

I am aware that you are shortly going to be meeting with the Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources in your Community Council area to discuss potential opportunities to work closer together. This demonstrates the Council's appetite continues to work with our communities, organisations and Town and Community Councils on new ways of providing services.

You will recall that Reshaping Services as a programme was introduced at a time of financial austerity and in its initial phases delivered millions of pounds of savings, whilst protecting key services. The programme developed during the pandemic to place greater emphasis on new ways of working, in particular to support people in food poverty, for staff to adopt new ways of working and making connections with key partnership work.

As we have discussed tonight, the budget for the coming years will be incredibly tight and will require a very tightly managed savings programme. However, we have also seen in the Annual Delivery Plan for the coming year that there is a continued willingness and intention to be ambitious about delivering for residents of the Vale and we will do this in creative ways and also working in partnership with a range of organisations. I look forward to hearing from colleagues how your meeting progresses and would again extend the offer to all Town and Community Councils to approach the Council with any ideas they may have.

(iv) **Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry**

Should the Vale of Glamorgan follow Carmarthenshire County Council, Monmouthshire County Council, Neath Port Talbot Council, Swansea Council, Wrexham County Borough Council and sign the Placemaking Wales Charter?

The Placemaking Wales Charter has been developed by Welsh Government and the Design Commission for Wales in collaboration with the Placemaking Wales Partnership – a multi-disciplinary group representing professions and organisations working within the built and natural environment.

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

The Council has been working with Welsh Government in developing its Placemaking agenda and took part in the Design Commission for Wales work in establishing the Charter. The Waterfront development was included within the

Design Commission for Wales “Placemaking guide” as a good example of a mixed-use development and the Council continued to work with Welsh Government who has linked their Transforming Towns grant and loan funding programme to the development of Placemaking plans.

Work on the Place Making Plan for Barry has already started, and it is planned to hold engagement events in the Spring which will feed into the plan’s development. This engagement will involve stakeholders including both the community and local businesses.

(v) **Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry**

I am disappointed to hear that the Vale Council continues to use building products made from uPVC by default rather than less environmentally harmful alternatives (e.g. products made from wood / aluminium).

The production of uPVC is energy intensive and requires the use of chlorine gas. uPVC decomposes very slowly and as a waste product it contains environmentally dangerous substances such as cadmium and lead based stabilisers. Recycling of PVC is a complex, expensive procedure due to the presence of the associated polymers and reinforcement materials.

Given the Council’s apparent commitment to the climate emergency, environment and nature emergency, shouldn’t the Council set an example by procuring the most sustainable building materials available or transparently balance cost with environmental impact?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

Teams across the Council are investigating options for more environmentally friendly window solutions for building projects generally, however the use of such alternatives does come with cost implications, from both a capital (installation) and revenue (future maintenance) perspective. UPVC is significantly more cost effective over the life of the product in terms of future maintenance costs and is usually the most cost-effective choice from a capital perspective, especially where resources are limited for such projects. In instances where there is a site-specific justification for a different material (for example where there are Heritage implications) consideration will be given to use of other materials as required. However, the Sustainable Communities for Learning Programme has delivered three comprehensive schools, two primary schools (one Net Zero Carbon in Operation and one All Electric) and a nursery unit (a Modern Method of Construction delivery) none of which include uPVC windows/doors. The key delivery for the programme is to provide sustainable, low environmental impact, thermally efficient buildings which is achieved through the selection of the correct products and working methods for construction. The Council tries to evolve its practices in terms of environmental impact by procuring the most sustainable building materials available but also balancing this within the constraints of available budgets. This matter will be highlighted at the Council’s Project Zero Board for further discussion and consideration also.

(vi) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

I saw a frustrated and embarrassed tenant of the Vale Council highlighting a maintenance backlog at their home on social media. What can you tell us of the maintenance backlog for socially rented dwellings and when might this backlog be resolved?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

Our current response times for repairs are being achieved in the main, though there are some non-urgent repairs being batched to make best use of the resources available. For information, the response times are:

- Emergency Repairs – 24 Hrs
- Urgent Repairs – 5 Working Days
- Routine Repairs – 37 Working days
- Batched repairs – 6 Months

At present the service is working to the scheduled response times.

(vii) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

What Tenant Engagement is occurring to ensure tenants of the Vale of Glamorgan Council are living in well maintained buildings?

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

The Council has a Tenant and Leaseholder Participation Strategy which sets out key objectives and actions designed to drive further tenant engagement in housing and building services. There are a number of ways tenants can get involved, including via Tenants and Residents Associations, the Quality Design Forum (a group of tenants who are consulted on capital improvements) and the Working Group (who meet with senior Officers and discuss a range of tenancy related services). As well as these groups, the Service Quality Assessors are a new group of tenants who carry out reviews and mystery shopping type exercises. In addition a small group of tenants are represented on the Homes and Safe Communities Scrutiny Committee.

In further support of our desire to ensure that our tenants live in well maintained homes, Tenant Liaison Officers are employed within the Building Services team and play a key role in delivering capital improvements. Their role includes consultation with tenants before, during and after work, acting as a conduit between the tenant and contractors, to ensure that works are completed to a high standard, on time and with minimal disruption to the tenant.

(viii) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

Residents complain that the surfaces of rural roads are reduced to a patchwork of multiple rough repair patches with very little of the original surface surviving. In other places, the surface has crumbled away to hardcore, but fails to meet the definition of a pothole which is at least 40mm deep **AND** 300mm in length. Residents clearly believe we have got the definition of what constitutes a pothole wrong.

Would you, as the Cabinet Member responsible for Highway Maintenance, investigate redefining potholes and switching to prevention of potholes through resurfacing of areas of road, rather than reacting to new holes, and bring options and costings to a meeting of the Full Council by this autumn?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

We have a clear definition as to what constitutes a pothole, we have regular reviews of our road system and an inspection and intervention policy. As a result there is no need for a redefinition to Council.

Supplemental

Councillor Perry enquired if the Council should be looking at resurfacing roads as opposed to making patching repairs.

The Cabinet Member indicated that the Council did not have unlimited resources in relation to its resurfacing programme and if the Member had any specific roads that required attention he asked Councillor Perry to bring these to the attention of officers who would assess them in accordance with the agreed policy.

(ix) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

Following on from my supplemental question at the meeting of the Full Council on 5th December, 2022.

The Community Liaison Committee was told that Road Noise and associated health and wellbeing is not a criteria for selecting roads for highway resurfacing and at the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee held on 12th July, 2022 when considering the latest Resurfacing Plan, the Head of Neighbourhood Services and Transport confirmed that Road Noise is not considered when selecting roads for resurfacing.

Can we now agree that Road Noise is not a criteria for deciding which roads will be resurfaced and given the negative impact on the sleep and wellbeing of people living near excessively noisy roads can we agree that roads identified in the Noise and Soundscape Action Plan for **Priority Action** in 2012 need urgent intervention by the Vale of Glamorgan Council to reduce road noise and road noise must become a key/priority criteria for future highway maintenance and repair?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

I am aware that you have previously been advised that, within the Welsh Government Noise and Soundscape Action Plan (2018-2023), there is no explicit legal requirement on Local Authorities to implement or prioritise resurfacing works solely to reduce road noise.

However, I accept that noise is a factor in well-being and as such I am happy to confirm that any resurfacing works which are identified by the Council's Highway Maintenance 3 year plan will specify the use of appropriate materials in order to minimise the potential impact of road noise on local communities, and to assist us continuing to meet the Council's duty under the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act.

Supplemental

Councillor Perry asked if the Cabinet Member could look to increase the resurfacing budget in future years.

The Cabinet Member indicated that would be a matter for consideration by the Cabinet in the context of available resources.

(x) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

The Community Liaison Committee was informed at its meeting held on 25th January 2022 that there is an under-provision of Public Open Space in the rural Vale of Glamorgan and participants at the meeting expressed their concerns about this shortfall.

The 10-mile-long St Nicholas and Llancarfan Ward is largely reliant on one grazing Common for its provision – which is not in easy reach of many residents of the ward. Three areas of public open space within this ward have either been lost entirely or diminished already this decade by unpopular decisions. Provision of public open space contributes to the Welsh Government's Well-being Goals.

How is the Vale of Glamorgan Council going to address this issue of under-provision of public open space across the rural Vale?

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

The assessment of open space provision was undertaken as part of the background work to the preparation of both the current LDP and the forthcoming Replacement LDP. Council will be further assessing levels of open space as part of the Replacement LDP Green Infrastructure (GI) assessment, and this will form part of the GI appraisal background paper for the Deposit Plan.

Alongside this, housing allocations, development management policies and the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance will set robust standards for levels of open space to be delivered as part of new developments.

(xi) **Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry**

Visitors to the St Nicholas CIW School site will note that the current layby in front of the school (already designated for footway when the new building opens) can provide a sufficient area of footway for parents to wait outside for their children each afternoon and retaining the established hedge to the road along the rest of the frontage would preserve the rural character of School Lane and Conservation Area.

Also, it's most disappointing that the two prominent mature trees at the front of St Nicholas CIW School, in the Conservation Area, will be removed due to the problem of them shedding their leaves each autumn.

Perhaps some additional thought could now be given to retaining the existing hedging and prominent trees at the front of the school?

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

Despite Councillor Perry's insinuation, to the contrary, the original planning application for a new school was submitted in July 2020, and this was refused at Planning Committee in January 2021. Further to that determination, a significant amount of time was spent engaging with consultees including the Council's Highways officers, to design a scheme which was considered to deal with the reason for refusal. The subsequent application was not submitted until January 2022, and was determined by the Planning Committee in April 2022. I believe this demonstrates the level of time and work that went into designing a scheme which as far as possible, overcame the local and consultee concerns, while still meeting the educational needs.

To reflect some of the concerns expressed during the consultation, specifically in relation to parents continually parking within the village, the number of parking spaces allocated for this size/type of build was expanded upon. The inclusion of the parent drop off is not typically included in build programs such as this, however it was included in this programme in response to community concerns to mitigate impact. Similarly, a hedge line has been maintained along with new grass/plants and the inclusion of new trees within the parking area. These new trees were included and considered as part of the planning application to reflect that this area falls within conservation boundaries. The car park itself is permeable and has been designed to contribute to the SAB compliant drainage solution for the site.

(xii) Question from Councillor I.A.N. Perry

It seems that a political statement might have been published in place of the answer to my question at last December's Full Council meeting on the Green at Bonvilston. In December I said:

There was surprise to read in the Final Report for 8 dwellings to replace much of the green space:

The 'do nothing' approach is not especially desirable. Evidence shows that the land is not needed as public open space, and if it were left undeveloped it might become unsightly over time, particularly the area where the garages used to be. Furthermore, vacant land would not have the same positive social and economic effects as the development proposal.

This statement suggests that the Community Council was considered incapable of maintaining this area of Public Open Space by the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

So, I ask again, does the wording in the Final Report for the development in place of the much-desired Public Open Space at Bonvilston that suggests the Community Council in ownership of the Green would not be capable of maintaining (and improving) the Village Green as a visual, social and play amenity give cause for the Vale Council to apologise to St Nicholas with Bonvilston Community Council?

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

I would refer the Councillor to my answer to him at the Council meeting on 5th December, 2022. As the Councillor is fully aware, the claim of a village green on the land in question failed after the relevant public inquiry and was not relevant to the consideration of this planning application.

The Planning Committee report which dealt with the provision of much needed Council Housing on this site did not infer that the Community Council would be incapable of maintaining the land, but rather it considers the potential impacts if nothing were done with the land should it be left undeveloped.

(xiii) Question from Councillor A.M. Ernest

Will the Leader explain why, on at least two recent occasions, visits have been made by the Leader, and a Welsh Government Minister, into the Plymouth Ward of Penarth, which I and my honourable colleague represent, for the purpose of promoting grants to, and investment in, buildings and areas of our Ward, without the knowledge of the Ward Members concerned, let alone an invitation to join the delegation on the day?

And will the Leader also apologise for this appalling lack of courtesy to the Local Members, and ensure that in future any such visits are not only notified in advance to

the appropriate Ward Members, but also in line with common convention and Best Practice, ensure that relevant officers are also aware of the requirement to advise and inform Local Members of any future such visits, by both Vale Council, and external visitors, to their respective Wards, and that appropriate invitations are sent to the Ward Members concerned.

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

I make no apologies for regularly visiting many areas of the Vale of Glamorgan as Leader and for also regularly meeting with Welsh Government Ministers on issues of mutual interest, wherever those meetings take place at either my or their invitation.

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

Over a number of years, I have asked questions at Full Council about this Council's support for refugees and asylum seekers.

I would like to confirm my group's full support for the proposals at Eagleswell in Llantwit Major. This is the right thing to do.

How is the Council supporting existing and future refugees and asylum seekers in the county to successfully integrate and participate in community life in the Vale?

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

The Council employs specialist support workers to provide essential support to refugees moving into the Vale of Glamorgan. This support is person centred so staff can support refugees to access meaningful opportunities within their communities.

These opportunities and a focus on nurturing support networks wherever possible, for example through our Arts for Well-Being course, are recognised as vital to successful integration. Information is shared about specific advocacy forums for refugees and asylum seekers to ensure their voices are heard locally and with decision-makers on the issues and experiences they face. A crucial aspect of our support is supporting those newly arrived to understand local and wider systems and processes so they have a sense of control and understanding of the community / Local Authority / Country they have arrived into. Language support is used in person wherever possible to ensure communication is meaningful and effective.

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

What is the Vale of Glamorgan Council doing to promote Fairtrade, particularly during Fairtrade Fortnight?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

The Council is aware of the good work that goes on across the County by Town and Community Councils to support Fairtrade and I would like to thank them for what is being done. I attended one at Barry Town Council last Friday for the Fairtrade coffee morning at which you spoke. It was very interesting to hear of the work being done by Town Councillors such as yourself as the Chair of Fairtrade.

During Fairtrade fortnight which runs 27th February to 12th March this year, the Council is sharing information on its social media and we have also produced information for staff. There are important considerations for us all in the choices we make, including the food we buy and this is consistent with our commitments in the Project Zero Challenge Plan.

Thank you to Councillor Dr. Johnson for highlighting this important cause and it is something I fully support.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson enquired in terms of promotion of Fairtrade foods within the Council whether it was appropriate for it to use its purchasing power or to use its purchasing networks for example the Big Fresh Catering Company to promote and use Fairtrade produce where possible.

The Cabinet Member indicated that she was unable to give a full response to the question, but it was something that she was happy to explore.

(xvi) Question from Councillor M.J. Hooper

In light of the Council's various commitments to Project Zero and its declaration of a climate emergency, can you please outline the policy associated with the replacement of urban street trees across the Baruc ward, and elsewhere?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

As you will be aware, my Parks Officers are responsible for the day to day maintenance of urban street trees on the adopted highway and in parks and public open spaces. Trees are maintained to ensure that any risk to public, vehicles, transport infrastructure or property is as low as reasonably practicable.

When trees are lost or removed from the highway it would be unlikely they would be replaced within the same street due to various highway constraints, but every effort will be made to replace losses on a two for one basis somewhere within the local environment.

If there is a specific tree or trees that you would like to discuss further in the Baruc ward please do contact me direct.

Supplemental

Councillor Hooper referred to two trees at Romilly Road and Birch Grove, Barry which had been brought to his attention and expressed concern of the importance of these trees in regard to the Council's Project Zero commitments and asked the Cabinet Member if there was a reason for a difference between what the Council was doing in regards to Project Zero and replacement of trees with budgets overtaking the policy.

The Cabinet Member indicated that this was not the case.

(xvii) Question from Councillor M.J. Hooper

Given the sometimes concerning predictions regarding sea level rises due to climate breakdown, can you please outline the Council's strategies to mitigate against flood risk? I would be grateful for particular consideration to the dockside developments, both residential and industrial.

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

A number of different organisations have key roles and responsibilities relating to the management of flood and coastal risk in Wales. The [National Strategy for Flood and Coastal Risk Management in Wales](#) (Welsh Government, October 2020) provides a detailed summary of these roles and responsibilities which vary according to the source of flooding. Natural Resources Wales (NRW) has a strategic oversight role for all flood and coastal erosion risk management matters in Wales whilst NRW, all Local Authorities, DCWW and Welsh Government act as risk management authorities with more specific functions relating to the management of different flood risks.

Given the nature of the question, I would want to do the answer justice with his agreement, I am happy to write to him setting out in detail the response to his question. To do otherwise would simply summarise the position.

792 PUBLIC QUESTIONS –

The following question was submitted and replied to as shown, in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 5th May, 2010.

(i) Question from Mr. R. Curtis

Would the Council be willing to adopt a “Low Carbon Advertising and Sponsorship Policy” advertising fuels the climate crisis by creating demand for high-carbon products, such as polluting flights and fuel-hungry SUVs, as well as promoting fossil fuel companies like Shell and BP? Just as tobacco advertising was prohibited when we realised the harms caused by smoking, many Local Authorities are now taking action to end advertising for high carbon products in light of the climate emergency. Liverpool, Norwich and North Somerset Councils have passed Motions to restrict

advertising for environmentally damaging products on ad sites those Councils control. In August 2022, Sydney Council in Australia banned advertising for coal, oil and gas and France passed national legislation prohibiting fossil advertising too. Amsterdam and five other Dutch cities have also implemented tobacco-style restrictions on polluting adverts. Local Authorities have control over the advertising billboards and digital screens located on Council-owned land. Passenger Transport Executives often control advertising policies for bus stop and rail advertising. A template Council Motion for a Low Carbon Advertising Policy can be found here: <http://badverts.org/s/Model-motion-for-Low-Carbon-Advertising-Policies-Badvertising-2022.pdf>. Would you be willing to propose this Motion at a future meeting?

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

I am happy to confirm that the Council will consider this as part of work that is underway currently to look at adopting a healthier advertising clause in the Council's advertising and sponsorship protocol that would restrict the advertising of products that are high in fat, sugar and salt on Council owned or operated land and assets as part of our regional work on the Move More, Eat Well Plan with colleagues in Cardiff & Vale University Health Board.

As part of reviewing the potential to include further reference to low carbon advertising, we will look at the information contained in the draft Motion Mr. Curtis has shared as some of this information may not be applicable in a Welsh context.

The Council may not decide a Motion is required if action is to be taken, rather a change to our advertising protocol and associated procurement documents. This work will be undertaken in the coming months.

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

In December 2022, Newyddion S4C reported about 2 children - aged 8 and 11 - from Ukraine who had successfully learnt Welsh at an immersion unit in Ynys Mon in advance of them becoming pupils at one of the Island's local Welsh Medium Primary Schools. In both policy and practical terms, what has the Vale of Glamorgan Council done to replicate this success in our County so that children arriving from elsewhere in the world can continue their multi-lingual journey in a Welsh Medium setting? What outcomes have been achieved in the last year in relation to those who have arrived in the County from elsewhere in the world?

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

The Canolfan Iaith based at Ysgol Gwaun Y Nant has had a fantastic first year with 5 pupils having already successfully transferred to Welsh Medium primary education after a term of Welsh language immersion. The Centre is committed to working with all pupils regardless of the home language and has already supported the transition of one pupil who speaks Spanish as well as English at home into Welsh Medium primary education. You may have recently seen media coverage of this pupil visiting

the Senedd where she met with the Children's Commissioner for Wales, Rocio Cifuentes and the Minister for Education and the Welsh Language, Jeremy Miles.

Another pupil who joined the Canolfan Iaith this term before transferring to a Welsh Medium Primary School in the summer, originates from Nigeria and speaks English as a second language.

Our admissions team raise awareness of the option of both Welsh and English Medium education to all families arriving in the Vale from both inside and outside the UK, including our Ukrainian and Syrian guests and families are advised that Welsh Language immersion services are available.

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

Visitors to Romilly park, the Knap Gardens and the Knap café quarter are increasingly facing danger from the increasing volume of traffic and badly parked cars. In order to prevent an accident involving pedestrians, would the Vale of Glamorgan Council please carry out traffic surveys with the aim of installing two zebra crossings between the Knap Gardens and the popular cafés along Bron y Mor and also the junction of Romilly Park Road and Lakeside leading to Romilly Park (adjacent the public toilets)?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

The Council receives regular requests to provide crossings to facilitate safer access to bus stops and services, given increased traffic.

Such requests are always considered in the context of safety of road users and as a result, liaison with the Police who record personal injury collision cases.

PIC records for the three-year period up to 29th December, 2021 (the latest data supplied to us by Welsh Government) for the areas referred to at Bron y Mor and Romilly Park Road indicate that during that period of time, there have been no personal injury collisions at the aforementioned locations, which would suggest that a reasonable level of road safety pertains.

With regards to parking, I would advise that the majority of Bron y Mor and Lakeside Roads adjoining the Knap Gardens as well as the area at the junction of Romilly Park Road and Lakeside fronting the public toilets and access gate to Romilly Park is protected by parking restrictions, which assist in preventing inappropriate parking.

The Council's parking enforcement team carry out scheduled patrols to ensure compliance with these parking restrictions as far as reasonably practicable.

Taking all this into consideration, there is no evidence of the need for further safety interventions or controlled crossing facilities at this time, although I can confirm that we will, as always, continue to monitor the situation and take any action deemed appropriate to deal with any safety issues that become apparent.

(iv) Question from Mrs. K. Glover

Please can I ask does this Council recognise that Allotments are used to grow food for our tables, to assist with our mental health and provide companionship for lonely older and vulnerable people? How does the Council feel it's justified to increase the allotment rent by 72% when we are in a cost of living crisis, mental health crisis and loneliness crisis? Why can't any increases be made over a 5 year incremental plan? What will this Council do to protect rental increase on this scale going forward?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

I am very aware of the social value provided by allotments and we have certainly not taken a decision to increase the current fees lightly. As it stands the Council is subsidising the Barry and Rhoose allotments, as the fees charged do not cover the cost of their upkeep. The income from these allotments is circa. £20k, where the costs to provide and maintain them is circa. £34k. Unfortunately, this position is unsustainable at this time.

The Authority has made its stark financial position clear recently during discussions on the 2023/24 budget. We are facing a financial shortfall of around £9 million, and in order to make allotments self-sustaining, it is proposed to increase the perch fee from £6.50 to £11.20 per year. This is in line with the Council's Allotments in Cowbridge, where fees are currently £14 per perch per year. Most allotments are made up of 10 perches, so for Barry and Rhoose, this works out as an additional 90p per week per allotment.

The Council has no wish to subject anyone to financial hardship. Allotment holders are able to request that their allotment size be reduced by 50 per cent, in which case their allotment fees would be less than that paid for 2022/23. Alternatively, allotment holders could approach the Council with a proposal to set up an Allotment Association. This would involve taking over the management and maintenance of the site from the Council, in which case no fees would be charged. All associated costs would be picked up by the Association, as would the responsibility for lettings.

(v) Question from Mrs. K. Glover

Please can I ask why steps are being made to ensure Cowbridge residents are not deterred from contributing to make the Vale Greener, yet the rest of the Vale are not being given the same consideration? Why is the risk of reduced demand for allotments more important in Cowbridge than in the rest of the vale? It clearly states in the budget proposal that Cowbridge is being given preferential treatment, this is highly unfair.

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

Thank you for your further question Mrs. Glover. We want all our allotment holders to continue to contribute to making the Vale of Glamorgan a greener place. Allotment holders at our Cowbridge site are certainly not being given preferential

treatment in this regard. The allotment costs at this location are not increasing as they are already higher than the price point required for a break even position for our allotments Barry and Rhoose.

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

The proposed 67% allotment rent hike in Barry and Rhoose will mean many poorer allotment holders, who have often tended their plot for many years, will be forced to surrender their allotment due to the increased cost. I believe that this level of rent rise is not proportionate with other Council charge increases such as car parking, Council house rents or Council Tax and will hurt those on the lowest incomes most. Allotments have never been meant to be rented at an economic rent, they were and are a social and environmental benefit. Increasing rents in line with inflation would be reasonable but making allotment holders plug Council finances is simply wrong. The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 sets out a clear obligation for public bodies to enable positive change that leads to a more resilient, sustainable, secure and healthy Wales. The Guidance for Local Authorities, Town and Community Councils issued by the Welsh Government clearly states on page 8 under Costs and charges: "The rent charged for an allotment plot 'shall be let at such rent as a tenant may reasonably be expected to pay for the land' (Allotments Act 1950 section 10). While the temptation may be to increase rents to cover the cost of providing allotments, this may exclude the very people who need them most. Rents should be in line with the national average of approximately £45 a year for a full plot (correct as at April 2020) and it's at the Authority's discretion if they have concessionary rates." In light of the above, would the Council stop the proposed increase in allotment rents and instead increase rents in line with inflation?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

Thank you Mr. Curtis for your question. The proposal to increase the current allotment fees in Barry and Rhoose is not aimed at 'plugging' the Council's finances. The increases will permit the service to be self-funding thereby better guaranteeing them as a valuable resource for our future generations. It should be noted that most allotments are made up of 10 perches, so for Barry and Rhoose, the fee change works out as an additional 90p per week.

We already have concessionary rates for residents who are 65 years of age and older, where the fee is reduced by 25% and this concession will continue. The Council has no wish to subject anyone to financial hardship. Allotment holders are able to request that their allotment size be reduced by 50 per cent, in which case their allotment fees would be less than that paid for 2022/23. We have allotments comprising of between 3 to 12 perches currently, with the majority being 10 perches.

As I have already advised when responding to earlier questions on the same topic, an alternative to paying an increased fee or amending their allotment plot area, allotment holders could approach the Council with a proposal to set up an Allotment Association. This would involve taking over the management and maintenance of the site from the Council, in which case no fees would be charged. All associated costs would be picked up by the Association, as would the responsibility for lettings.

(vii) Question from Mrs. N. Chivers

Please can you advise when CCTV will be operational in Barry? I am constantly requested by SWP to view my CCTV equipment which I do not think is my responsibility. Possibly putting myself and staff at risk. It should not be relied upon by a member of the public to source coverage especially when there are CCTV cameras placed in Broad Street and other areas of the Town. It would help to disburse the immense drug dealing, anti-social behaviour amongst other crimes that happen on Broad Street alone. Please advise when they will be operational? I have been speaking to SWP who say they are merely waiting for VOG? Is this correct?

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

Thank you for your question Mrs. Chivers. Unfortunately, the information you appeared to have been given by SWP is not correct. The CCTV cameras in the Broad Street / High Street area have all been upgraded and are fully operational. The cameras are monitored 24/7 by qualified and experienced CCTV operators, who have a direct radio link with local Police. It is Police practice to check all available CCTV, including retail, residential, dash cams footage etc. if an incident takes place within range as this assists Police with their investigation. It is not an indication of any failure with the Council's CCTV system.

(viii) Question from Mr. P. Britton

Are there any plans to upscale Barry's already poor public electric car charging capacity? Currently Barry has only 3 fast chargers. Many residents of Barry don't have the luxury of owning their own drive to charge electric cars. Are the Council going to open up the chargers they recently put in next to Barry Leisure for residents to use? Why are some charging points in Barry still out of order months after being installed?

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

The Council is committed to exploring opportunities to reduce emissions from transport and the Council's current strategy is to work in conjunction with the Cardiff Capital Region (CCR) on key EV Charger installations.

Our work initially focused on the provision of 8 No. EV charging points for taxis in key locations within Barry and the Council is currently working on the installation of 18 No. public EV charging points located primarily within its off-street car parks throughout the Vale. This includes 10 locations in Barry and town centre areas and Barry Island resort – a number of these installations are still waiting programmed electric connections before going live. With regard to the specific chargers recently installed at the Civic Offices, these are currently intended for the Council's electric

vehicle fleet. However we are looking at options and the logistics of allowing staff and the public to use the charge points in due course.

Phase 2 of the roll out of EV Chargers at various local community centre sites throughout the Vale. The Council is currently undertaking a consultation exercise on these locations. There are also a further 10 locations identified within Barry for such installations, however, these are dependent on the outcome of the consultation process.

The Council has previously completed a project funded by Welsh Government to assess on-street charging best practice and identify potential locations for the future on-street charging infrastructure. This project will help us shape availability and provision of safe and accessible EV charging capabilities throughout the Vale, including Barry, especially in areas of terraced properties with no off-road parking.

The overall policy aim will be to ensure EV charging availability and equipment for residents is generally convenient, appropriate, equitable, accessible and robust for Vale of Glamorgan residents.

(ix) **Question from Mrs. L. Hay**

How traders and the Council can work better together. When will they have a meeting with the traders to work together and to make us aware of future plans? Having support from traders is important.

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

Traders' meetings across all the towns in the Vale have regularly been attended by Officers from the Regeneration Team of the Council, and this gives a chance for two-way discussion and information sharing.

The Council is also planning on signing up to the Welsh Government Place Making Charter which will see Place Making Plans created for each of the 4 Town Centres in the Vale. Work on the Place Making Plan for Barry has already started, and it is planned to hold engagement events in the spring which will feed into the plan's development. This engagement will involve both the community and local businesses.

Finally, subject to funding being agreed, the Council will support plans for events for each Town and discussions will take place with Town Councils and trade bodies following the securing of funding to support this.

I would like to add that I have received 2 invitations to meet with business people which I will hopefully be fulfilling in the next couple of weeks.

(x) **Question from Mrs. L. Hay**

Who is creating a regeneration plan for Holton Road? Why isn't there a local business person representing the Town Centre locally and can traders have a meeting with the Council to hear our concerns.

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

The Council has, over a number of years, sought to improve the both the appearance and character of Holton Road, through the installation of both hard and soft landscaping. Work has also been undertaken develop opportunities for the greening of Holton Road and this has involved meeting and liaising with businesses and traders.

Looking forward, the Place Making Plan will highlight the town centre as a priority area, and this would include Holton Road. Engagement and consultation concerning the development of the plan will take place in the coming months. When developing Place Making Plans we recognise that we might be covering all town centres, but all town centres are very different and those plans will need to reflect that difference as well.

(xi) **Question from Mrs. L. Hay**

When will Holton Road be improved?

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

Holton Road has seen investment in the public realm and green infrastructure both before and during the pandemic. In addition, grant funding is available via the Transforming Town fund to renovate empty and underused properties and we have seen several examples of this in recent years and are currently working with property owners on a number of schemes for the next financial year.

A new market provider has begun operating on Kings Square and on the back of this it is hoped to attract other events to the square.

Finally, the Town Centre that includes Holton Road is a priority area within the emerging Barry Place-Making Plan, but it must be noted that any proposed improvements will be subject to securing funding.

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

Now that specialist assessments of the East Quays development site, of the Coal-hoist site and of the Barry Biomass site are agreeing on the flood-risk level of 8.8 to 9.0metres AOD, will the Council advise NRW that their new Flood Map for Planning

should use this figure in respect of the Barry docklands as a whole instead of their level of about 7.8 metres?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

It is not the Council's responsibility to advise NRW what levels they should be using for the Flood Map for Planning, and this enquiry should be directed to NRW, who are the statutory body for commenting on flood risk.

(xiii) **Question from Mr. D. Clarke**

In the Vale Council's various documents submitted in the Planning Appeal against the enforcement notice there is no acceptance that the facility on Woodham Road owned by a subsidiary of Aviva comes within the definition of Incinerator and at no time does the Council confirm that the facility needed to have a full Environmental Impact Assessment. Can the Council make it clear to the residents of Barry that the Vale of Glamorgan Council fully accepts the facility is an incinerator and it has always needed an Environmental Impact Assessment?

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

The appellant's appeal submissions are supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment, following a screening direction issued by PEDW on 13th January, 2022. This direction relates to the development as constructed (subject of the enforcement appeal).

There is a complex history to screening directions associated with previous planning applications, at which time Welsh Government screened the proposals as not being EIA development. Whether the previous proposals were EIA development is not fundamental to the merits of the current development or the ongoing appeal.

(xiv) **Question from Mr. D. Clarke**

Within the Appeal proceedings following the Council's service of the Enforcement Notice on the Incinerator on Woodham Road, the Vale of Glamorgan Council has agreed with the owners of the Incinerator that: "The principle of a wood fired renewable energy plant on the Appeal Site was established by the 2010 Permission and re-established by the 2015 Permission." Could the Council confirm that the agreement it has reached with the owners of the incinerator does not amount to an agreement that the principle of an incinerator on this site was established in 2010 and 2015 bearing in mind that no Environmental Impact Assessment was demanded albeit required for these decisions to be lawfully made? Please explain the basis for the decision if the Council does not agree with this proposition?

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

The Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) refers to the principle of a 'wood fired renewable energy plant', and the SOCG does not discuss whether the development as constructed (or previous specific proposals) are or were EIA development. An energy development may (depending on the very specific nature of it, the size of input per day, for example) not be EIA development.

Consequently, the SOCG does not infer any conclusion about whether the previous applications should have been accompanied by EIAs, and any agreement about the broad principle of an industrial development of this kind in an industrial location, is not considered to be dependent on whether EIA is/was required. The content of the SOCG does not prejudice the Council's position in respect of the development that has been built, or pre-judge whether the environmental impacts are acceptable.

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

On behalf of Beautiful Barry When will the bollards be repaired on King Square to stop cars and vans from parking on there every day?

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

Following the damage due to vandalism of some of the existing bollards, replacements have been ordered, and will be installed as soon as they are delivered. Once the new bollards are installed, they will only be lowered for Market access and Parks Staff. No other vehicular access to the Square will be permitted.

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

On behalf of Beautiful Barry – We are aware that the Council will only remove graffiti in certain circumstances, but with the increase in graffiti around the town, is it possible the Council could contact business owners regarding removing graffiti from their premises, with the offer of support re removal options?

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

The Council will remove, or cover up, racist or otherwise offensive graffiti from any property within 24 hours. We are also prepared to remove other graffiti from private property with the agreement of the building owner, but only in specific circumstances.

Protection of private property is essentially the responsibility of the private property owner and it would not be appropriate to use Council Tax payers' funds to undertake such work when the private property owner may have the necessary means to arrange this work for themselves. In the event that we do undertake such work we

would require the private property owner to provide us with an indemnity against any possible loss or damage.

To request this service, a business should contact the Council's Call Centre and an Officer will liaise with that business directly and assess the graffiti and where possible, a removal service or suitable advice will be offered. Unfortunately we simply do not have the resources to contact private property owners to proactively offer this service. Often, in addition to officer time, this would mean paying a fee to the Land Registry to establish land ownership details.

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

What is the current cleaning regime for Holton Road, and could it be enhanced to address the persistent issue of dog mess and cigarette butts which are blighting the town and creating a terrible impression for visitors? The persistent litter around the Leisure Centre and Civic Offices is also very concerning and doesn't seem to be cleared at all, with no action being taken to stop this from happening. Who is responsible for this area of town?

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

The Council provides a street cleaning service in accordance with Welsh Government's Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse. This sets out areas in pre-determined zones that specify different levels of cleaning and response.

Under this regime, the town centre is cleaned daily by Council staff supported by mechanical sweeping. The areas around the Leisure Centre and Civic Offices are on a lesser frequency but are cleaned weekly.

In light of your comments Mrs. Ockerby, I have requested that the Council's Cleaning Department inspects all these areas to ensure that the current cleaning and enforcement arrangements are sufficient.

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

Why did the Leader refer to the Tavistock Clinic story as "a different kettle of fish" in introducing the draft Transgender Inclusion Toolkit, when the Cass Review under the leading paediatrician Hilary Cass, which links the two, is quoted in the Toolkit, though not integrating the Cass cautions on social transition into its prescriptions is problematic?

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

The draft Trans Inclusion Schools Toolkit is guidance and aimed at professionals working in our Education settings in supporting young people and their families, and does not seek to resolve matters relating to social transition. The draft Toolkit is

being widely consulted on. The Consultation ends on 17th March, 2023 and we welcome contributions during the consultation process.

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

On behalf of Beautiful Barry – What plans are the Council putting in place for the summer season to prevent littering at Barry Island and other resorts, promote use of bins, and publicise use of Enforcement Officers and penalties for littering offences?

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

Leading up to the bathing season the Council intends to run a social media campaign highlighting the impacts of litter on our beaches and to encourage the use of litter bins, as well as improving local recycling facilities. Additionally, as there is positively more active voluntary litter picking groups contributing to beach and resort cleaning, the Council aims to work with these more closely and have more engagement with visitors to prevent and minimise littering. I will admit it is a huge challenge and drain on resources both financial and human.

Also, the Council's Enforcement Team has recently set up an active Waste Crime Unit as part of its strategic approach to litter and fly tipping and intends to have a more regular officer presence at beach and resort locations this year.