

No.

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Hybrid meeting held on 15th July, 2024.

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

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

Present: Councillor Elliot Penn (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, Russell Godfrey, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, Sally Hanks, William Hennessy, Nic Hodges, Mark Hooper, Catherine Iannucci-Williams, Gwyn John, Dr. Ian Johnson, Susan Lloyd-Selby, Belinda Loveluck-Edwards, Julie Lynch-Wilson, Kevin Mahoney, Naomi Marshallsea, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Carys Stallard, Neil Thomas, Rhys Thomas, Steffan Wiliam, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

201 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of business, the Mayor drew attention to a number of housekeeping issues and made 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”.

202 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors S.J. Haines and H.C. Hamilton.

203 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

Councillor C.M. Cowpe declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 in that she was a trustee of the Dinas Powys library where the support group provided the service from and that she had a dispensation from the Standards Committee to speak and vote on general matters relating to the library.

Councillor C.P Franks declared a personal interest in agenda item 6, in that he was a trustee of the Dinas Powys library where the support group provided a service from. He also had a dispensation to speak on matters relating to Dinas Powys library from the Standards Committee and as the support group were not financially aligned to the library it was not considered to be a prejudicial interest.

Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 6, in that she was a Member of the Cardiff and Vale UHB appointed by the Vale

No.

of Glamorgan Council and, as the Board may be considering the matter in the future, would leave the meeting when the matter was to be discussed.

204 MINUTES –

RESOLVED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 20th April, 2024 and the Annual Meeting held on 8th May, 2024 be approved as a correct record.

205 ANNOUNCEMENTS –

The Mayor commenced by congratulating the new Member of Parliament, Kanishka Narayan, for the Vale of Glamorgan on his success in the recent Parliamentary elections and offered his best wishes and hope for success to Alun Cairns in whatever plans he had for the future. The Mayor also congratulated the Member of Parliament for Cardiff and Penarth, Stephen Doughty, on his re-election. In referring to his engagements since the Annual Meeting, the Mayor informed Council that he had attended 12 engagements which had included awarding the Honorary Freeman and Freewomen Award to the Royal National Lifeboat Institute at the Festival of the Seas weekend on Barry Island, which had been extremely well attended. He had also attended the 80th anniversary event of the D Day landings, hosted a twinning event with Fécamp, one of the Vale's twins towns, who had also come over from France for the Festival of the Seas. The Mayor said he had also raised the Pride flag in Cowbridge, attended the parade, attended two recent award ceremonies – one being the Refugee Council of Wales Nation of Sanctuary Awards and the Bro Radio Community Awards which were awards to volunteers for their work in the communities. In conclusion the Mayor took the opportunity to thank the Deputy Mayor for stepping in for him at a number of events as a result of his recent COVID infection.

206 PUBLIC QUESTIONS –

The following questions were submitted, it being noted that two questions noted in the agenda had been withdrawn, and replied to as shown, in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 5th May, 2010.

(i) **Question from Mr. L. Jones**

Do you all Truly Comprehend the dangers behind excess EMF exposure? i.e. all the 3, 4 and 5G mobile telecommunications masts? Who is signing off on the planning and safety as they are liable for damages? Who is signing off on these being installed on top of school buildings hospitals etc. or even being anywhere close to our children's schools? Application for installation of 5G telecoms masts has been given by non-registered OFCOM register of persons with power under the electronics communications code. I strongly advise you and colleges to visit this website and read all the scientific evidence showing the dangers of over exposure before people are held personally responsible for damages.

<https://aches.international/uk-projects-against-mobile-masts/> Radiofrequency

No.

electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are used to enable a number of modern devices, including mobile telecommunications infrastructure and phones, Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth. As radiofrequency EMFs at sufficiently high power levels can adversely affect health, ICNIRP published Guidelines in 1998 for human exposure to time-varying EMFs up to 300 GHz, which included the radiofrequency EMF spectrum. Since that time, there has been a considerable body of science further addressing the relation between radiofrequency EMFs and adverse health outcomes, as well as significant developments in the technologies that use radiofrequency EMFs. Accordingly, ICNIRP has updated the radiofrequency EMF part of the 1998 Guidelines. This document presents these revised Guidelines, which provide protection for humans from exposure to EMFs from 100 kHz to 300 GHz.

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

While some forms of telecommunications developments require planning permission, others are permitted development and others are only subject to a prior notification procedure. When considering Planning proposals, the Council must have regard to Planning Policy Wales which states (at paragraphs 5.2.18 and 5.2.19) "Provided that the development meets the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines, planning authorities should not consider the health aspects of mobile telecommunication equipment. All new base stations are expected to meet the ICNIRP guidelines." "Planning authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies, such as imposing a ban or moratorium on new telecommunications development or insisting on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development."

In addition, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) would be the enforcing authority for concerns about electromagnetic radiation in the telecommunications sector and I am aware that Public Health Wales has previously produced public health information on the subject, and there is also UK guidance available.

(ii) Question from Mr. J. Brown

The Marina is a great idea however there need to be pleasure boat trips incorporated on The Mole and water to afford members of public trips to Flatholm / Cardiff Bay for example. Will this service be part of any Mole regeneration plans?

Reply from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places

The Barry Making Waves Levelling Up Project is intended to provide a catalyst to open up the Waterfront to leisure uses and create a great environment for both locals and visitors to Barry. The nearly £20m of funding supports a package of projects over £30m including a new watersports centre on The Mole and the conversion of the historic Dock Offices into a space for businesses and employment.

This will create the conditions for further growth and investment, opening The Mole up to the public and improving access to the water via a new marina. It will also see significant investment in the heritage and history of Barry through the refurbishment of the iconic Dock Offices for employment purposes.

No.

In terms of pleasure trips and other such activity, the Marina will be a privately run venture and as part of the regeneration project, the lock gates to the dock will be upgraded so that yachts and boats can exit and leave without draining the dock itself. This would allow any operators of boat based services to use the Marina once it is in operation although that will clearly be a decision for those operators at the time.

207 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE OF MOTION [SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS M. COWPE AND DR. I.J. JOHNSON] –

The below Notice of Motion, moved by Councillor Cowpe and seconded by Councillor Dr. Johnson at the meeting, was debated.

“Removal of Specialist Health Visiting Support for Breast or Combination Feeding

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes with concern the proposals by Cardiff and Vale University Health Board to remove specialist health visiting support from the only drop-in service in the Vale of Glamorgan for parents who are breast or combination feeding, which is located in Dinas Powys.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council resolves to write to Cardiff and Vale UHB asking them to reconsider this proposal and to maintain the current level of service.”

The Leader of the Council, seconded by Councillor B.E. Brooks, put forward an Amended Motion as follows –

“That the Council notes the importance of specialist support for breast feeding and therefore resolves to ask the Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the Health Board to explain the rationale for the decision and their future support for breast feeding and those Members would then be able to make an informed decision on any recommendations.”

The Leader, in addressing the Council, advised that she shared Councillor Cowpe’s view that there should be adequate support however, as the Council did not know the rationale of the UHB for the decision nor how they intended to provide support going forward, suggested an amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor B.E. Brooks. The amendment being that the Council notes the importance of specialist support for breast feeding and therefore resolves to ask the Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the Health Board to explain the rationale for the decision and their future support for breast feeding and those Members would then be able to make an informed decision on any recommendations.

Councillor Cowpe, in response, stated that she was aware that there would be less support and that there was contradictory information being circulated in the public domain, with it being noted that the current level of support would be removed.

No.

Councillor Dr. Johnson stated that there was no reason why the Scrutiny Committee could not review the report and was aware that the Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee had previously invited the Health Board to meetings but they had not attended.

Councillor Charles also commented that, in her view, there was no reason that the Committee could not undertake the request, however she did state that she had on many occasions invited the UHB to come to answer queries, but it was very difficult to get a representative to attend.

Councillor Carroll also stated that the Conservative Group welcomed the Motion by Councillor Cowpe and said the Council could actually agree the Amendment and also the Motion and was happy to agree the Amendment and the Motion itself and that it was important to write to the UHB whether a decision had been made or not.

Councillor Ernest also stated that he supported Councillor Cowpe's Motion.

A Recorded Vote took place on the above Amended Motion as follows:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Anne Asbrey		X	
Julie Aviet	X		
Gareth Ball	X		
Rhiannon Birch	X		
Bronwen Brooks	X		
Gillian Bruce		X	
Ian Buckley	X		
Lis Burnett	X		
Samantha Campbell		X	
George Carroll		X	
Christine Cave		X	
Charles Champion		X	
Janice Charles		X	
Millie Collins		X	

No.

Marianne Cowpe		X	
Pamela Drake	X		
Vincent Driscoll		X	
Anthony Ernest		X	
Robert Fisher		X	
Christopher Franks		X	
Wendy Gilligan	X		
Russell Godfrey		X	
Emma Goodjohn			X
Ewan Goodjohn	X		
Sally Hanks	X		
William Hennessy		X	
Nic Hodges		X	
Mrk Hooper		X	
Catherine Iannucci- Williams	X		
Gwyn John	X		
Dr. Ian Johnson		X	
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	X		
Julie Lynch-Wilson	X		
Kevin Mahoney		X	
Naomi Marshallsea	X		
Michael Morgan			X
Jayne Norman	X		
Helen Payne	X		

No.

Elliot Penn	X		
Sandra Perkes	X		
Ian Perry		X	
Joanna Protheroe	X		
Ruba Sivagnanam	X		
Carys Stallard	X		
Neil Thomas	X		
Rhys Thomas		X	
Steffan Wiliam		X	
Margaret Wilkinson	X		
Eddie Williams	X		
Mark Wilson	X		
Nicholas Wood		X	
TOTAL	25	23	2

The Amendment was carried and there being no further amendments proposed, a recorded vote took place on the Substantive Motion –

“That the Council notes the importance of specialist support for breast feeding and therefore resolves to ask the Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the Health Board to explain the rationale for the decision and their future support for breast feeding and those Members would then be able to make an informed decision on any recommendations”

as follows:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Anne Asbrey	X		
Julie Aviet	X		
Gareth Ball	X		

No.

Rhiannon Birch	X		
Bronwen Brooks	X		
Gillian Bruce			X
Ian Buckley	X		
Lis Burnett	X		
Samantha Campbell			X
George Carroll			X
Christine Cave			X
Charles Champion		X	
Janice Charles			X
Millie Collins	X		
Marianne Cowpe	X		
Pamela Drake	X		
Vincent Driscoll			X
Anthony Ernest		X	
Robert Fisher			X
Christopher Franks	X		
Wendy Gilligan	X		
Russell Godfrey			X
Emma Goodjohn			X
Ewan Goodjohn	X		
Sally Hanks	X		
William Hennessy			X
Nic Hodges	X		

No.

Mrk Hooper	X		
Catherine Iannucci- Williams	X		
Gwyn John	X		
Dr. Ian Johnson	X		
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	X		
Julie Lynch-Wilson	X		
Kevin Mahoney	X		
Naomi Marshallsea	X		
Michael Morgan			X
Jayne Norman	X		
Helen Payne	X		
Elliot Penn	X		
Sandra Perkes	X		
Ian Perry			X
Joanna Protheroe	X		
Ruba Sivagnanam	X		
Carys Stallard	X		
Neil Thomas	X		
Rhys Thomas			X
Steffan Wiliam	X		
Margaret Wilkinson	X		
Eddie Williams	X		
Nicholas Wood			X
TOTAL	33	2	14

No.

The vote being carried, it was

RESOLVED – T H A T the Council notes the importance of specialist support for breast feeding and therefore resolves to ask the Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the Health Board to explain the rationale for the decision and their future support for breast feeding and those Members would then be able to make an informed decision on any recommendations.

N.B. Councillor Lloyd-Selby was not present for the item following a declaration of interest earlier in the meeting.

208 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE OF MOTION [SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS M.J. HOOPER AND DR. I.J. JOHNSON] –

“Consultation on the Voting System used for Principal Council Elections

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes the provisions within the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 which allow for principal councils to change their voting system to adopt the single transferable vote system.

In order for Council to make an informed decision as to whether or not to adopt this voting system, Council agrees to open a consultation, under section 8 of the Act, with local electors, community councils within the area and such other persons as appropriate, so that Council can reach a decision prior to November 15th 2024 as to whether to enact any change ahead of the 2027 elections.”

Councillor Hooper, in presenting his Motion, said that the Motion had been presented in order for the Vale Council to consider amending the local voting system to a fairer system in order that every vote counted when submitted at the ballot box. He noted that on 4th July too many votes did not count under the first past the post system. Although he was aware that at local level too few members of the public had voted at such elections, he concurred that the Council should be responsible to the electorate that did vote and more effort be made to highlight the purpose of voting and urged the Council to consider the single transferable vote process which was currently applied within the Senedd.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, seconding the Motion, reserved his right to reply.

Councillor Carroll however stated that there were many issues that the Local Authority should prioritise and that in his view, having regard to the Council’s budget, procurement, etc., this was not seen to be an urgent priority. In his view there were more important things that should be top of the list as opposed to dealing with the single transferable vote consultation, although acknowledging that the first past the post system could be brutal, it should not be understated and it placed power in the hands of the public not the candidates and that his Group would not be supporting the Motion.

No.

Councillor Morgan raised concern about the timing of the Motion, advising that it was impractical at this stage to change the voting system. There were at least 12 weeks for the consultation to be undertaken then to allow officers to prepare a paper to come before Council before 15th November, 2024, the timescales would not allow for that. It was further noted that all Group Leaders had been informed of the single transferable vote provision within the Local Government & Elections (Wales) Act and Members had been also emailed about this by the Chief Executive previously with no responses having been received and it was his real concern that the consultation would not be meaningful in the timescale required. He recognised that the issues for single transferable vote were also complicated and would need to be well presented and also having regard to the substantial costs that could occur in undertaking this work that had not been budgeted for, he stated that these were main reasons why he would not be voting for the Motion. He was however not against the concept but it needed to be addressed in a timely manner.

Councillor Brooks stated that she concurred with Councillor Morgan that there were advantages and disadvantages. It was important to have conversations with the residents and again she stated that she could not support this Motion due to the lack of time.

Councillor Dr. Johnson, in addressing the Council, stated that he noted Councillor Carroll's comments about what other things were required to be undertaken within the Council, but he said that he had not heard from him what they should be. The Local Government Act provided the provision to hold a consultation and, as far as he was concerned, also in listening to Councillors Morgan and Brooks' comments there was the opportunity to consult with the public in a timely manner before 15th November in his view. He felt that members of the public were capable of considering such matters in a timely manner in order that the Council could analyse the findings before 15th November.

In response, the Leader reiterated that Members had received the information on 25th November, 2022 and subsequently in October 2023. This would have allowed plenty of time in order for the consultation and the findings to be reported. Even if a report had been submitted to the March 2024 meeting following a Council question on the very subject, this could have also been undertaken at that time. Some detailed consultation was undertaken with the electorate and key stakeholders. Over 63 households would need to be consulted together with media and social media campaigns. The costs incurred would be substantial, it being noted that the Council had just agreed a very difficult budget and had to scale back services and in some instances stop services. No budget had therefore been allocated for such a provision and therefore she would not be supporting the Motion.

Councillor Perry stated that as far as he was concerned the Senedd had not properly thought this provision through whereas they should be concentrating more on encouraging people to vote.

Councillor Mahoney, having regard to an issue in relation to Cosmeston where, in his view, no consultation had been undertaken, said why would you worry about consultation now.

No.

Councillor Cowpe was also surprised that constituents had not raised this issue before, noting that emails had been sent to Councillors previously, however she said encouraging people to vote was very important and that the Council should have undertaken the consultation and noted that there were currently still 18 weeks to do so.

Councillor Hodges in response said he could not see why the Council should delay as the consultation could still be undertaken in the required timescale and that, in his view, the single transferrable vote system was the way forward.

Councillor Franks stated that he heard the concerns of people and he noted the expense and resources involved and referred to the recent election which had been called at short notice and which had managed to be undertaken in that limited time.

Councillor Williams however commented that it was important for the Council to undertake meaningful consultation and therefore it should be given more time.

Councillor Hooper in response thanked everyone for contributing to the debate and referred to a number of spoilt ballot papers at the last election where it had been noted on the ballot paper people's disinterest in the current system. He was also concerned about people's lack of engagement with the political process and considered that this Motion would assist with that. He also concurred with Councillor Dr. Johnson that the view that there was not enough time was not the answer.

A Recorded Vote took place on the Motion as follows:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
Julie Aviet		X	
Gareth Ball		X	
Rhiannon Birch		X	
Bronwen Brooks		X	
Gillian Bruce		X	
Ian Buckley		X	
Lis Burnett		X	
George Carroll		X	
Christine Cave		X	
Charles Champion		X	

No.

Janice Charles		X	
Millie Collins	X		
Marianne Cowpe	X		
Pamela Drake		X	
Vincent Driscoll		X	
Anthony Ernest		X	
Robert Fisher		X	
Christopher Franks	X		
Wendy Gilligan		X	
Russell Godfrey		X	
Emma Goodjohn	X		
Ewan Goodjohn	X		
Sally Hanks		X	
William Hennessy		X	
Nic Hodges	X		
Mrk Hooper	X		
Catherine Iannucci- Williams		X	
Gwyn John		X	
Dr. Ian Johnson	X		
Susan Lloyd-Selby		X	
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards		X	
Julie Lynch-Wilson		X	
Kevin Mahoney		X	
Naomi Marshallsea		X	

No.

Michael Morgan		X	
Jayne Norman		X	
Helen Payne		X	
Elliot Penn		X	
Sandra Perkes		X	
Ian Perry	X		
Joanna Protheroe		X	
Ruba Sivagnanam		X	
Carys Stallard		X	
Neil Thomas		X	
Rhys Thomas		X	
Steffan Wiliam	X		
Margaret Wilkinson		X	
Eddie Williams		X	
Mark Wilson		X	
Nicholas Wood		X	
TOTAL	10	40	

RESOLVED – T H A T the Motion was lost.

Reason for decision

Having regard to the debate at the meeting.

209 DRAFT STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT (REF) –

The reference from Standards Committee of 10th June, 2024 as contained within the agenda was presented by the Leader, it being noted that under Section 63 of the Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 the Standards Committee, as soon as reasonably practicable after the end of each financial year, must make an annual report for the Authority in respect of that year. Attached as an appendix to

No.

the reference was the Standards Committee Annual Report for consideration. It was subsequently

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the draft Standards Committee Annual Report attached at Appendix 1 to the reference from Standards Committee be noted.
- (2) T H A T the Standards Committee Annual Report for 2023/2024 be forwarded to the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales and all Town and Community Councils within the Vale of Glamorgan for information.

Reasons for decisions

- (1) Having regard to the contents of the report.
- (2) For information.

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

The Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee of 18th June, 2024 had referred its recommendations for the appointment of Councillor Iannucci-Williams to be the nominated deputy to represent the Council at meetings of the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It was also recommended that Councillor Iannucci-Williams be the named deputy and be entitled to vote at meetings of the Joint Scrutiny Committee in the absence of the Chair of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.

The Leader presented the reference, with it subsequently being

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T Councillor Iannucci-Williams be appointed as the nominated deputy to represent the Council at meetings of the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal – Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (2) T H A T Councillor Iannucci-Williams, the named deputy, be entitled to vote at meetings of the Joint Scrutiny Committee in the absence of the Chair of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for decisions

- (1&2) Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

No.

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

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

Reason for decision

Having regard to the Council's Constitution.

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

RESOLVED – T H A T the changes to the relevant officer delegations as set out in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 of the report be approved and Section 26 of the Constitution be amended accordingly.

Reason for decision

To update the Officer Delegation Scheme within the current Constitution.

213 RENEWAL OF PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS FOR THE PREVENTION OF ALCOHOL RELATED ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR (REF) –

The Leader, in presenting the report, advised that the Orders that were being put in place were being suggested as measures to tackle alcohol related anti-social behaviour. Consultation had been undertaken and there were 12 new sites recommended within the report for Orders, it being noted that Alexandra Park had been requested to be removed with an 84% response being received. The Leader referred to the fact that the matter had been considered by Cabinet on 11th July, 2024 and the references noted on the agendas as "To Follow" had been sent to Members prior to the Council meeting and uploaded to the Council's website.

Councillor Ernest, in referring to page 4, paragraph 2.11 of the report, stated that with regard to the Penarth Athletic Ground, his understanding was that the park was now going to be leased to Penarth Athletic Club who would have control of the ground and it would not be a place for the Council to consider after that, therefore that the Order be implemented subject to the agreement of the Penarth Athletic Association.

Councillor Dr. Johnson said that he supported the principles of the Orders which had been considered by Council on a number of occasions, and welcomed the new areas that had been added, however he said that with regard to Port Road, it did not include the lane at the back of the estate next to the railway line which had been causing a number of issues in his Ward and, in his view, all of the Waterfront should be included. He also noted that Central Park in Kings Square had been suggested but it did not include Holton Road. Furthermore for the future, he asked if officers would consider standardising the two types of anti-social behaviour i.e. dog orders and anti-social behaviour as they were linked.

No.

Councillor Ernest also mentioned The Kymin which had been duplicated and that Penarth Head Park was not shown, which again was where trouble had existed.

The Leader in response advised that in referring to paragraph 2.11 stated that these were the new areas that had been included and that the existing areas were still included following previous consultation. She also accepted that it was important to have a separate conversation regarding the Waterfront which Councillor Dr. Johnson was happy to have a further conversation on.

Councillor Dr. Johnson also commented on Clos LLawhaden stating that he wished that the name be checked and correctly spelled in the document going forward.

Councillor Ernest commented that he took on board what the Leader had said that additional places could be added later and requested that this be covered.

The Mayor, in conclusion, advised that it was important for the Members to take up their concerns with the officers after the meeting, with it subsequently being

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the proposal of renewing the existing Public Space Protection Orders for controlled alcohol zones be agreed.
- (2) T H A T the contents of the public consultation results and the inclusion of new restricted areas be noted.
- (3) T H A T the proposed additional areas as part of the renewal process be agreed and incorporated into the Orders.
- (4) T H A T the resolutions of Cabinet as regards the report be noted and agreed.

Reasons for decisions

- (1) To assist the Council to robustly manage alcohol related Anti-Social Behaviour at its Resorts, Town centres and Public Open Spaces.
- (2) To ensure the Council has considered the views of the public and other stakeholders and the Orders reflected current issues.
- (3) To ensure the Council and Police had the appropriate powers to protect the quality of lives of those who lived, worked and visited restricted areas and to permit the majority of the law-abiding citizens to use and enjoy public spaces, safe from anti-social behaviour.
- (4) The introduction and renewal of Public Space Protection Orders was a matter for determination by Full Council and to ensure their prompt introduction.

No.

214 RENEWAL OF PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS – DOG CONTROLS (REF) –

In presenting the report, the Leader advised that there were some very specific issues in terms of dog control and the anti-social behaviour by their owners. She noted that all highways and footways were covered in these Orders and referred to the extra recommendation that had been agreed by Cabinet relating to Llantwit Major Recreation Ground.

Councillor Franks enquired as to how the Orders were likely to be enforced and what resources would be available and requested that the boundary of Murchfield be clearly identified, together with Highgate Place play area. The Leader said that she would request a copy of the boundaries for all Members and they would assist enforcement going forward. She reiterated that Members had had a number of opportunities to respond to consultation in respect of this report and that such conversations should have been undertaken at that time.

Councillor Mahoney also commented on how enforcement would go forward, in particular he said having regard to sports fields. The Leader commented that the rules and procedures relating to sports fields was specific to those areas and where they were gated it was noted that the level of dog fouling had increased. It was the fact that dog owners were not controlling their dogs and it was noticeable that when the nights closed in this was becoming far more of an issue.

Councillor Carroll welcomed the report, acknowledging that it was vital that enforcement took place, suggesting that plain clothed enforcement officers be a good idea.

Councillor Protheroe recorded her thanks for the inclusion of dogs to be on leads for Ogmore and Southerndown and referred to the number of dog attacks on sheep that had been happening on the Ogmore and Southerndown common. In her view the Orders were terribly important, timely and vitally important to educate people and suggested that further signs be placed on the common, it being noted that the common was not a country park.

The Leader said it would have been useful if Members who had concerns or issues had raised them earlier and had engaged in the consultation process, however, she asked that if any Member had any further details that they wished to share that they contact the relevant officers.

Councillor Dr. Johnson concurred with the Leader that there had been a significantly long period of consultation on the matter. Councillor Morgan wished it to be noted in the record that there were a number of responsible dog owners who behaved appropriately and irresponsible dog owners, in his view, were few and far between.

Having considered the matter, it was subsequently

No.

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the proposal of renewing the existing Public Space Protection Orders for dog controls be endorsed.
- (2) T H A T the contents of the public consultation results be noted.
- (3) T H A T the proposed new additional areas as part of the renewal process be agreed and incorporated into the Orders.
- (4) T H A T the resolutions of Cabinet in respect of the report be noted and agreed.
- (5) T H A T subject to formal agreement with Llantwit Major Town Council, Llantwit Major Recreation Ground be added to the proposals with enforcement subject to the agreement of Llantwit Major Town Council who own the land.

Reasons for decisions

- (1) In order that the Council had robust Orders in place for dog controls on adopted highways, footpaths, resorts/beaches, town centres, sports pitches and public open spaces.
- (2) To ensure the views of the public and other stakeholders were considered and the Orders reflected current issues.
- (3) To ensure the Council had appropriate powers to protect the quality of lives of those who lived, worked and visited the Vale.
- (4) The renewal and introduction of Public Space Protection Orders were a matter for determination by Full Council.
- (5) To include Llantwit Major Recreation Ground to the proposals, with the support of the local ward Members and in agreement with Llantwit Major Town Council.

215 2024 UPDATE TO THE HOUSING SUPPORT GRANT DELIVERY PLAN 2022-2025 (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C13, 23rd May, 2024 (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.

No.

216 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME – LAND AT UPPER
COSMESTON FARM, PENARTH (PART I) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C30, 6th June, 2024 (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.

217 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME – LAND AT UPPER
COSMESTON FARM, PENARTH (PART II) (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C35, 6th June, 2024 (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.

218 RENEW OF PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS FOR THE
PREVENTION OF ALCOHOL RELATED ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C66, 11th July, 2024 (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.

219 RENEWAL OF PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS – DOG
CONTROLS (REF) –

RESOLVED – T H A T the use of the Urgent Decision Procedure (Cabinet Minute No. C67, 11th July, 2024 (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.

No.

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

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

(i) **Question from Councillor M.J. Hooper**

What process does the Council follow to investigate commercial disposal of waste at our Household Waste Recycling Centres, and how many investigations have taken place in the last five years?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

There have been no investigations recorded in the last 5 years, but the service area has processes in place to minimise potential abuse and it will investigate individual circumstances should evidence be presented, or suspicious activity reported.

This can be challenging as you cannot stop or identify commercial waste disposal in small cars especially if the waste is similar to domestic or DIY waste, therefore restrictions focus on commercial vehicles, patterns of use and advice is provided through the Council's website and site signage.

For background purposes, the Council's sites are managed by FCC Environment and the Environmental Permit regulating the site conditions of use is in their name and they ultimately have legal responsibility. However, there is a partnership approach to prevent commercial waste being disposed of at both sites (Barry and Llandow).

A notice is displayed on the Council's website when navigating the page to make a booking, advising that the sites are for domestic use only, and there is signage on site advising the same.

The greatest risk is from the use of commercial vehicles that have capacity to carry large quantities of waste and the service area has a permit system in place that manages and regulates use. It also records the frequency of use and the address of the carrier, and the type of vehicle used. Whilst requesting a permit, you will be asked if the waste is commercial, if yes, you will not be able to proceed. Additionally, permits are restricted to one per month to minimise potential abuse.

There are also staff processes in place such as meet and greet and staff monitoring as well as CCTV. Staff are vigilant and if they notice the same vehicle / person coming on site on a regular basis then this information is passed to the service area, for investigation. Initially the booking system is interrogated and if there are suspicious circumstances, a home visit would be scheduled to assess where the waste originated from and to discuss the volume or types of wastes being brought to the site.

No.

(ii) Question from Councillor C.P. Franks

What are the estimated number of schools in the Vale of Glamorgan who ended the last financial year with a deficit budget, the number of schools who have been asked to provide a financial recovery plan, and the aggregate total deficit of those schools?

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

22 schools in the Vale of Glamorgan outturned in a deficit for the 23/24 financial year, and all schools in deficit are required to submit a recovery plan or business case on how these will be addressed. The aggregate total deficits in these schools was £3.2m. The total balance for the remaining 31 schools was a surplus of £5.5m, meaning schools collectively ended the financial year within a surplus of £2.3m.

Supplemental

Councillor Franks queried what the impact would be for the Vale to fully fund the schools going forward?

In response the Leader advised that the budget process had commenced and that she would look into the matter and provide a response.

(iii) Question from Councillor A.M. Collins

How many green garden waste collections were collected (a) one or more days after the scheduled date, and (b) three or more days after the scheduled date, between March and June 2024?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood and Building Services

This information is not recorded.

However, there is an acceptance that the service area occasionally runs late, and there are influences that affect the service such as the weather, bank holidays and other seasonal variations that vary capacity levels.

The recycling team provide an average based resource for this service and when experiencing capacity issues, it usually catches up within 24-48 hours.

It is not written within the existing terms and conditions, but the standard for this service is to reach every subscriber on their scheduled day wherever possible, or within 72 hours if there are circumstances affecting our ability to collect on the scheduled collection day.

Supplemental

Councillor Collins asked why people were waiting more than two weeks for their green waste to be collected?

No.

In response the Leader advised that she had never known a special collection not to be collected and she asked Councillor Collins to provide her concerns in detail regarding the delays, to the Director who would look into the matter.

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

What progress has been made on identifying a location for a second Welsh medium comprehensive school in the Vale of Glamorgan?

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

From September 2027, the projected intake into Year 7 at Ysgol Gymraeg Bro Morgannwg will start to exceed the school's admission number although the school will still be under capacity overall due to smaller cohorts in older year groups.

The Council's Learning and Skills team are currently working with Planning colleagues as part of the Replacement Local Development Plan process, to consider whether any of the candidate sites being promoted would be suitable to meet this need. In addition, a number of other planning activities have been undertaken relating to location, financial and pupil place planning and projections as well as other relevant feasibility studies. A number of pre consultation planning meetings have also taken place with a view to formulating a clear proposal for consultation during the academic year 2024/25.

Supplemental

Councillor Dr. Johnson queried whether there was a decision or tendency towards any location for a further Welsh comprehensive school and he commented that he wished the Council should note the success of Ysgol Bro Morgannwg.

The Leader in response advised that currently the Council did not have any land available but discussions were ongoing.