

## COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

Decision Notice –Remote Meeting, 5<sup>th</sup> October, 2023.

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

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

Present: Councillor S.M. Hanks (Chair); Councillor M.R. Wilson (Vice-Chair); Councillors A. Asbrey, R.M. Birch, W. Gilligan, S.J. Haines, N.P. Hodges, H.M. Payne, S.D. Perks and R.R. Thomas.

Representing Town and Community Councils: Councillors S. Hodges (Barry Town Council); A. Trousdell (Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council); M. Cuddy (Penarth Town Council); B. Morris (Colwinston Community Council); M. Phillips (Substitute) (Dinas Powys Community Council); J. Radcliffe (Ewenny Community Council); H. Osbourne (Llancarfan Community Council); D. Hackett (Substitute) (Llandow Community Council); S. Bonnar (Llanfair Community Council); J. Sykes (Substitute) (Llangan Community Council); M. Narusberg (Llanmaes Community Council); P. Summers (Penllyn Community Council); S.M. Toker (Substitute) (St. Athan Community Council); S. Roberts (St. Brides Major Community Council); I. Perry (St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council); N. Parry (Sully and Lavernock Community Council), C. Hawkins (Wick Community Council).

Also present: Councillor G. Bruce, W.A. Hennessy, Dr. I.J. Johnson and E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health).

### AGENDA ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors S. Campbell and C.A. Cave (Vale of Glamorgan Council) and Community Councillors G. Thomas (Llantwit Major Town Council); K. Hatton (Dinas Powys Community Council); J. Shaw (Llandow Community Council); P. Wilson (Llangan Community Council), S. Harries (St. Athan Community Council) and A. Thomas (Welsh St. Donats Community Council).

### AGENDA ITEM 2. MINUTES –

AGREED –

(1) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2023 be approved as a correct record subject to it being noted that the reference to loss of ‘salary’ within bullet point three of Recommendation (2) (Min. No. 874) also refers to the loss of Clerk ‘jobs’ as raised by Councillor Cave.

(2) T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2023 be approved as a correct record.

AGENDA ITEM 3.                   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interest were received.

AGENDA ITEM 4.                   SOUTH WALES POLICE SERVICE - VERBAL UPDATE -

AGREED – T H A T Inspector Childs be thanked for their time and verbal update.

AGENDA ITEM 5.                   SOUTH WALES FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE –  
VERBAL UPDATE -

AGREED – T H A T Group Manager Treherne be thanked for their time and verbal update.

AGENDA ITEM 6.                   VALE OF GLAMORGAN COMMUNITY REVIEW (CX) –

AGREED – T H A T Committee notes the Vale of Glamorgan's draft response to the Boundary Commission's draft proposals, Cabinet's suggested response and deliberations on the proposals at its 5th October meeting, along with the following comments of the Committee on the suggestions raised within the report to be forwarded to Cabinet, as follows:

- **Dinas Powys Community Council** - The proposed changes to the Dinas Powys Community Ward boundaries were acceptable to the Council on the whole, as it avoided the Community Council having to create a 5th ward. However, the Community Council was concerned by the proposed transfer of houses along Sully Road. It was deemed quite illogical and unacceptable to move said houses into Penarth.
- **Llanfair Community Council** - Concerns had previously been raised by the Council in relation to future proposals meaning a loss in rural identity should it merge with the larger Cowbridge Town Council. Having considered the electoral numbers, close proximity to Llanmaes Community Council, as well as the similar community makeup of other nearby villages such as Llysworney (that currently sat under Llandow Community Council), it was deemed appropriate to have a discussion with the other two Community Councils to see whether any other alternative proposals could be presented to the Commission.
- **Ewenny and Corntown Community Council** -The Community Council was looking to make representation to the Boundary Commission voicing its displeasure at the proposals. It was the Community Council's view that the suggested merging with St. Brides Major and Ogmere would not enable the residents of Ewenny to be properly represented. The Council felt it was geographically separate from St.Brides and Ogmere and had been a long-established Community Council with its own specific needs and requirements in the area, which would not be best serviced by joining with another. The proposals would be a dissolution of the democratic process because it would

move further away from the area currently administered by the Community Council. The proposals were based on a mathematical calculation rather than local identity and local politics.

- **Llandow Community Council** - It was the intention of the Community Council to put together a detailed proposal and objection for the Boundary Commission on the basis that, as it stood, Llandow should stay the size and makeup that it currently was to avoid dilution of local village representation and identity.
- **Colwinston Community Council** - The Boundary Commission had looked at the community review in detail and had found that it made sense for Colwinston and Llangan to remain separate even though the individual electorate numbers did not reach 1000. Therefore, the only issue with keeping the two councils separate laid with the Vale of Glamorgan Council. Llangan and Colwinston were six miles apart, considerably different, separate villages, with nothing in common so the suggested merging did not make sense.
- **Llangan Community Council** - The Community Council bordered with a very different local authority, Bridgend County Borough Council therefore, the Community Council's issues were completely separate and irrelevant to the residents living in Colwinston. The Llangan community area may be a very small area geographically, but its issues were completely different to Colwinston.
- **Llanmaes Community Council** - The Community Council was thankful that the Boundary Commission had not proposed to merge Llanmaes with Llantwit Major Town Council as originally suggested. However, it was disappointing to hear that the Vale of Glamorgan Council would be supporting the Boundary Commission's proposal for changes to the Llanmaes Community boundary due to the fact that the changes involved only 2 properties, housing 5 individuals, who considered themselves to live in a rural area and therefore wished to remain under a community rather than town council. The existing boundaries were based on water course, which in many instances was logical for setting boundaries. However, the boundary change now being suggested was as a result of boundaries following a road boundary rather than a water course which was disappointing.
- **Barry Town Council** - The proposals relevant to Barry Town Council seemed logical moving forward. The only minor criticism is that the Cadoc Ward in Barry was potentially too large and therefore it could be suggested to split the Cadoc ward in to two. Democracy was really healthy in Barry and every seat was contested by multiple parties at elections. Therefore, it was hoped that the proposals put by the Commission would help to promote democracy in smaller communities across the Vale of Glamorgan by encouraging and holding elections, as many seats were often uncontested in the Community Councils.
- **Wenvoe Community Council** - The Community Council had held a meeting to discuss the proposals and it was bitterly opposed to the proposals put forward. The Wenvoe Community was a close-knit community, and the proposals made no sense at all. One of the main reasons for objection was in relation to the playing fields and allotments based in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, which were owned by Wenvoe Community Council and bequeathed to the Council some time ago for the use of people living in the Wenvoe community. A petition had been organised by Councillor Russell Godfrey amongst the residents of Dyffryn, St. Lythans and Twyn-yr-Odyn and not one resident expressed a wish to move out of the Wenvoe community. Prior to the last Town and Community Council

election, the Wenvoe community lost the St. Nicholas with Bonvilston ward to the Llancarfan ward and therefore Wenvoe Community Council did not want any further changes. St. Nicholas and Bonvilston were developing areas, with residential property development ongoing, and therefore looking to increase its number of residents but, this should not be to the detriment of the Wenvoe community.

- **Penllyn Community Council** - The Community Council was very pleased to see that both the Boundary Commission and the Vale of Glamorgan Council's cross party working group had supported the Community Council's proposals in terms of the Penllyn area, especially in terms of the area that would be affected by the Darren Farm residential development. The Community Council was concerned about the reduction in the number of councillors that was being proposed as, being a relatively dispersed area, the council found that the current numbers of councillors worked very well. Therefore, the council would be making a recommendation to the Commission that councillor numbers were not reduced taking account of the fact that the sizing policy was for guidance only.
- **St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council** – The Council and the relevant ward member did not wish Twyn-Yr-Odyn to join with St. Nicholas so, that point was misinformation in the public domain. In terms of the Playing fields and allotments in Twyn-Yr-Odyn, those facilities could remain within the area for Wenvoe Community Council, and this was endorsed by the St. Nicholas and Bonvilston Community Council.
- **Wick Community Council** - The comments raised by councillors at Town level demonstrated a lack of understanding on how democracy worked in smaller communities. To suggest there was a democratic deficit within Community Councils, if there had not been an election, was wrong. The council would be writing to the Commission to oppose the proposals.
- **Councillor Haines** – 1) Reducing the number of councillors representing the smaller communities would result in the councils losing what they were as a community.  
2) Basing proposals on making assumptions on what would be included or not within the Council's Local Development Plan or what would happen or not with a community in the future could lead to unfulfilled promises for the area which was best avoided. Therefore, it was important for the Vale Council to really think about what it recommended to the Commission.
- **Councillor Wilson** – 1) for the 2022 elections, there were a number of Community Councils that did not have elections and therefore individuals were co-opted which was a concern because there were not enough individuals standing for the number of seats available. To a certain extent, the Cabinet report and subsequent recommendations of the Vale of Glamorgan Council tried to address this issue. There was a collective wish for democracy to work well in the Vale of Glamorgan area as a whole and not just in the main towns.  
2) When communities worked together, this did not mean that the communities diminished, rather they grew stronger and increased their capacity to do things because of pooling finances and resources as well as more likely to be heard at a county council level.  
3) Community reviews happened rarely and therefore there was a need to think

ahead to future proof communities for how they would develop over the subsequent decade until the next review was undertaken.

- **Councillor Dr. Johnson** – 1) the political situation was clearly different in some of the more urban areas than it was in some of the more rural areas of the Vale of Glamorgan.  
2) There were currently 26 Town and Community Councils in the Vale of Glamorgan and, out of that number, only six held elections in 2022 to his knowledge, so this represented a democratic deficit when people were setting local taxes without being elected by local people.
- **Councillor Hodges** - The size of some of the Community Council budgets were very small especially once clerk salaries were accounted for. This meant that there was very little money to do anything with and effecting change in the community using the precept available to a council was most important.  
2) Increasing the size and population of a community could increase the chances of constituents engaging in local elections as well as the money available to it to effect meaningful change.

#### Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the Cabinet report on the Community Review to ensure that Community Liaison Committee has the opportunity make any representations to Cabinet.

#### AGENDA ITEM 7. VALE OF GLAMORGAN PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2022-23 (REF) -

AGREED - T H A T both the Committee reference and appended Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Annual Report 2022-23 be noted.

#### Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of both the Committee reference and appended Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Annual Report 2022-23 to provide an overview of the fifth year of progress in delivering the Well-being Objectives and actions set by the Vale Public Services Board (PSB) in its Well-being Plan 2018-2023.