

No.

ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Hybrid Meeting held on 16th July, 2024.

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

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

Present: Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby (Chair); Councillor C. Iannucci-Williams (Vice-Chair); Councillors C.E.A. Champion, P. Drake, V.P. Driscoll, M.J. Hooper, J.M. Norman, E. Penn, J. Protheroe and S.T. Wiliam.

Also present: Councillors A. Asbrey, B.E. Brooks (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Sustainable Places), C.P. Franks, G. John (Cabinet Member for Leisure, Sport and Wellbeing), R. Sivagnanam (Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services), N.C. Thomas and E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health).

226 ANNOUNCEMENT –

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

227 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE –

This was received from Councillor A.M. Ernest.

228 MINUTES –

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 18th June, 2024 be approved as a correct record.

229 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

The Chair declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Agenda Item 4 – Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2021-2036 Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report. The nature of her interest was that she was a member of the Cardiff and Vale Health Board which had been involved in the process as a consultee. Due to it being a personal interest only, the Chair remained in the meeting when the agenda item was discussed.

230 VALE OF GLAMORGAN REPLACEMENT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (RLDP) 2021-2036 PREFERRED STRATEGY INITIAL CONSULTATION REPORT (REF) –

The reference from Cabinet was presented by the Head of Sustainable Development (with support from the Director of Place), the purpose of which was for the Committee to consider the appended report and its findings on the Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2021-2036 Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report.

The Preferred Strategy for the RLDP had been subject to a ten-week public consultation between December 2023 and February 2024, extended due to the Christmas Holiday period. The report set out the issues raised as part of that consultation and how the responses had been considered within the report.

A presentation, accompanying the reference and the report, was shared with the Committee, which outlined the key areas of this topic:

- The RLDP Process.
- Consultation on Preferred Strategy.
- Responses to the consultation.
- Structure of the Report.
- Welsh Government (WG) representation and other statutory consultation bodies .
- Infrastructure concerns raised on all key sites.
- Representations on the key sites: North East Barry, St Athan, North of Dinas Powys and Readers Way, Rhoose.
- Structure of the Deposit RLDP.
- Next steps for the RLDP, including seeking endorsement of the actions in the Initial Consultation Report, the Preferred Strategy as the basis for the ongoing preparation of the Deposit Plan.

A number of questions and comments were raised at the meeting on this item, which included the following:

- Councillor Franks, with permission to speak, felt that the concerns raised as part of the consultation process had not been properly addressed, in particular concerning the North East Barry development, which also encompassed Dinas Powys. These concerns included health provision and infrastructure, schools, public transport and potential flooding. He was concerned about the point and rationale of the consultation process when residents, in his opinion, were being given the impression that their feedback was of no consequence. It was explained by the Head of Sustainable Development that this was not the case, and the Council was still in the initial stages of this process, whereby it was looking at the strategic direction of the RLDP. Resident commentary and feedback about these sites were not being ignored, and work on the issues raised about these sites were being looked at and the details on the points raised were being worked out. At the Preferred Strategy stage there was not the level of detail which there would be at the Deposit Plan stage, but

No.

due consideration would be given to any concerns raised. It was extremely useful and valuable to hear residents' comments and insights on health, flooding, traffic and other issues in order to help form the next steps. All of the risks identified would be properly assessed, i.e. Natural Resources Wales (NRW) in respect of flooding had responded positively by indicating there was no clear overriding flood risk in parts of the North East Barry site which the developers had proposed the housing to be located in. The flood risk and surface water management would be something that would be built upon through the Deposit RLDP process.

- On Councillor Hooper's question on how the Council communicated and engaged with its residents, in order to reassure them that their concerns were being addressed, it was explained that the consultation report's appendices detailed the comments received and provided a response to each of those, as well as summarising the nature of these comments and responses. In turn, the report also offered an officer perspective on the balance they had tried to achieve as part of the RLDP process and development in order to achieve an appropriate level of growth. The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Equalities and Regulatory Services, with permission to speak, stated that the consultation was important, but the valuable input from the public also had to be balanced with the assessment from the experts on employment growth and housing. On the point concerning communication with residents on this part of the process, this would be taken back to the Communications team.
- On Councillor Champion's queries on the WG's response that the Vale of Glamorgan Council should be working with other councils and on the rejection of Llandow as a candidate site for the RLDP, it was explained that the WG's view was that new settlements were of a scale which should be considered in strategic development plans which were by their nature cross-boundary and regional in nature than local development plans so that's why the Council was precluded from allocating new settlements. WG's point in respect of the cross-boundary working was that the Council should demonstrate not that it should have done something different to what it was doing but just through this stage of the process and onto deposit the Council should be continuing to work with Cardiff and other neighbours to demonstrate that each of their plans sat satisfactorily next to each other and be at a similar stage.
- Councillor Protheroe referred to infrastructure and on Dwr Cymru's recommendation to the Council that the hydraulic modelling assessments should happen prior to the planning application stage not at the development plan stage for these developments. As part of this, Dwr Cymru had also referred to the Western Vale and Aberthaw Water Treatment Works and their insufficient capacity in this regard. Although there was a 10-year Asset Management Plan in place it was important that the Council did not undertake housing developments in this area prior to sufficient infrastructure and capacity having been put in place for water treatment and management by Dwr Cymru, and that the Council ensured the increase in capacity and timing of this. The Chair added to this by saying about the RLDP and the dependencies that it set around necessary infrastructure (i.e. St Athan with adequate health facilities and to build a train station there) and what happened if these were not met or not deliverable in terms of the RLDP. It was explained that with regard to the circumstances outlined by the Councillor

No.

and the Chair, a reappraisal of the strategy would be needed to ensure that it and the sites concerned remained viable. In terms of St Athan, there were multiple strands to the rationale for development, therefore it was not just about the provision a new train station but also aligning affordable housing with new employment opportunities at Aberthaw and the enterprise zone as well as delivering various services and infrastructure. The larger, more strategic sites had considerable potential, which was a view also shared by WG, and offered a more positive approach towards growth and a more robust level of infrastructure.

- The Vice Chair asked what contingencies were in place should the development at St Athan start but subsequently the Council was told that no train station would be built. It was explained that this was a 'chicken and egg' situation, because to demonstrate the business case for a train station there needed to be housing, etc. being built and developed nearby. If the train station were not to happen, that would not negate the need for the development and the Council would need to look at alternative and sustainable transport provision instead, i.e. explore 'park and ride' options to neighbouring train stations and minimise the need to travel through having significant infrastructure in place at the location. It was important to ensure that as much positive momentum as possible towards a train station continued to be built up. Park and ride could be built into the development if required due to its size which helped in terms of flexibility.
- Councillor Wiliam felt the Council had taken a more 'holistic' approach in terms of the language used, etc. for the RLDP, which was a positive aspect for such an enormous piece of work. He also asked about the timetable of the feasibility study for St Athan and to clarify the meaning of the term 'master planning' with reference to the RLDP. On the timetable, more detail on this was being sought and this would be shared with the Committee in due course. On master planning, this sought to provide more detail on what a new development should look like and thereby give more information and certainty to both developers and local communities on what the development would look like.
- Councillor Driscoll asked about planning permission being granted to the various RLDP sites and, on the two sites at Dinas Powys, the potential for flooding nearby, offsite, as well as what steps would be taken to mitigate this. On planning permission, the adoption of a plan did not represent a site having permission, but it was a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning application and so resembled a form of pre outline consent which would need to be considered as part of any planning application process. On potential flooding offsite near to the Dinas Powys sites, this was considered as part of the RLDP to be as important to on-site flood risks, and consideration had to be given that there was no elevated flood risk on or nearby to the site.
- Councillor Penn stressed that the RLDP was as much about building communities as it was about building houses and infrastructure in order to build sustainable developments with health, education and retail facilities. It was important to move away from building 'bland' and 'homogenised' housing estates and for the Council and developers to be more creative, citing the example of the East Witchell development. Research had shown that the places people lived in had a direct bearing on their life chances and outlook.

No.

What was built was as important as where it was built. It was explained that master planning assisted with developing such communities.

- Councillor Norman asked how the Council and Planning Officers could guarantee that property developers delivered what they proposed, citing previous examples in the Vale of Glamorgan where this had not been the case. In response, it was important to set the bar high in terms of allocating infrastructure and facilities at any given site and as part of future planning application considerations, as well as having robust legal requirements in place to help such infrastructure being delivered at developments. Lessons had also been learned from previous developments, including the need for 'front loading' of the process so that by the development management stage there were robust processes in place for delivering infrastructure.
- Councillor Hooper raised concerns about the previous question raised about insufficient capacity with regard to the Aberthaw Wastewater Treatment Works and whether the related development would be put on hold until this was addressed. He also talked about the lack of discussion on infrastructure mitigation with existing developments and that this should have been included in the report. It was explained that planning permission would not be granted for the relevant development until the necessary infrastructure improvements had been made for drainage / wastewater. However, developments and allocations in themselves did not need to demonstrate that they would be able to overcome existing issues. But, via placemaking work efforts, the relevant parties would be made to improve the situation in these areas and to ensure that all parties had a shared responsibility to address issues around transport, etc.
- The Director of Place also responded to the various matters raised. This included issues with previous developments which had already been addressed via the current planning system and that further improvements to the infrastructure of existing developments were also being addressed. On infrastructure, Section 106 funding and the development contribution system would help at mitigating existing problems where they were possibly exacerbated by new developments as well as looking at active travel plans to help mitigate transport issues. The RLDP, with other related documents, worked to make the infrastructure situation no worse and aimed to make things much better than it currently was.
- Councillor William reiterated the importance of an holistic approach to the RLDP and to avoid the mistakes made in the past with this and as part of the master planning involved. It was explained that key issues and concerns about infrastructure and the environment for new developments were addressed via the master planning stage, the development management policies in the deposit plan and the supplementary planning guidance that sat alongside the policies.
- Council Hooper (whose points were also echoed and endorsed by Councillor Penn) referred to the importance of looking at smaller scale developments as well in helping to address 'gaps' in terms of social housing provision and the Council's relationship with Town and Community Councils and other Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) with regards to this. In response, although a key focus for master planning would be the larger, more strategic housing and community developments, smaller scale developments could tie

No.

in with the Council's development management policies and those on in-field development. The Councillor's points on this would be forwarded to colleagues in Housing to look at the viability of this suggestion, particularly in light of the growing use of modular building using modern methods of construction.

- Councillor Norman stressed the importance and need to focus on single person accommodation in these developments, due to the current need for this type of housing. It was explained that the Council could not be too prescriptive in terms of the appropriate mix of housing sizes but would ensure that this mix represented the demand seen for various types of housing for different numbers of occupants.
- Finally, the Chair asked whether there would be further consultation with Elected Members on the Deposit RLDP, in conjunction with local residents and communities. This was confirmed, and such engagement would also be undertaken with Town and Community Councils.

Councillor Wiliam, seconded by Councillor Hooper, put forward a recommendation as follows –

That the report be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration, due to the concerns raised by some Members at the Committee meeting over the issues surrounding the environment, transport and traffic, flood risks, education and health provision relating to the various developments considered as part of the RLDP.

A Recorded Vote took place on the above proposed recommendation as follows:

Members	For	Against	Abstain
C.E.A. Champion	√		
P. Drake		√	
V.P. Driscoll	√		
A.M. Ernest			
M.J. Hooper	√		
C. Iannucci-Williams		√	
S. Lloyd-Selby		√	
J.M. Norman		√	
E. Penn		√	
J. Protheroe		√	
S.T. Wiliam	√		
TOTAL	4	6	0

The recommendation was not carried and there being no further recommendations proposed a Recorded Vote took place on the original, substantive, recommendation below as follows:

No.

“That the report be noted and referred to the meeting of Full Council on 30th September, 2024 for:

- a) endorsement of the actions set out in the Initial Consultation Report;
- b) approval of the Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) Preferred Strategy as a basis for the ongoing preparation of the Deposit RLDP.

In order to seek approval for the proposed changes to the Preferred Strategy as set out in the Initial Consultation Report and to allow officers to progress with preparation of the Deposit RLDP in accordance with the Council’s approved Delivery Agreement.”

Members	For	Against	Abstain
C.E.A. Champion		√	
P. Drake	√		
V.P. Driscoll		√	
A.M. Ernest			
M.J. Hooper		√	
C. Iannucci-Williams	√		
S. Lloyd-Selby	√		
J.M. Norman	√		
E. Penn	√		
J. Protheroe	√		
S.T. Wiliam		√	
TOTAL	6	4	0

The vote being carried, it was

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the report be noted and referred to the meeting of Full Council on 30th September, 2024 for:

- a) endorsement of the actions set out in the Initial Consultation Report;
- b) approval of the Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) Preferred Strategy as a basis for the ongoing preparation of the Deposit RLDP.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and the discussions at the meeting. Also, in order to seek approval for the proposed changes to the Preferred Strategy as set out in the Initial Consultation Report by Full Council and to allow officers to progress with preparation of the Deposit RLDP in accordance with the Council’s approved Delivery Agreement.

231 VALE OF GLAMORGAN – TOURISM AND EVENTS (DP) –

The report, presented by the Council's Principal Tourism and Marketing Officer (and supported by the Operational Manager, Regeneration), informed the Scrutiny Committee of the latest developments in the tourism sector and events within the Vale of Glamorgan, the impact the tourism industry had on the local economy and of current legislation and how that would impact the industry. A presentation was given to the Committee, outlining the above areas of interest as well as the following:

- The structure of the Council's Tourism and Events Team.
- The statistics on tourism for the Vale of Glamorgan (using the tourism research programme STEAM, a tourism economic impact modelling process).
- Statistics on tourism related accommodation and new legislation.
- The use of social media and digital platforms as well as User Generated Content (UGC).
- The work around holding events within the Vale of Glamorgan (Events Network and the Event Safety Advisory Group (ESAG)).
- Filming opportunities in the Vale.
- Working in partnership with Visit Wales, other local authorities, town councils, local businesses, etc.
- Press and public relations.
- Key challenges facing the tourism industry.

A number of questions and comments were raised at the meeting on this item, which included the following:

- The Chair suggested that the Committee received an annual report on the progress being made with tourism and events within the Vale of Glamorgan.
- Councillor Wiliam was disappointed on the low levels of tourist accommodation in the local area and asked how additional hotel accommodation, etc. could be encouraged to come to the Vale by the Council, as well as about the work of the Council supporting the delivery of a calendar of events, and any schemes that the Council undertook to help third parties with the restoration of buildings for tourism. The Chair raised the impact of attracting new hotels locally and the potential pressures this might put on existing holiday accommodation and asked what their current resilience was like. It was explained that there had been a reduction in occupancy for existing hotels and bed and breakfast accommodation. There was a need to balance attracting new hotels, etc. and ensuring that existing hotel and bed and breakfast accommodation also got their share of overnight stays. Lack of holiday accommodation, particularly in Barry, was impacting the efforts to encourage day visitors to stay overnight or for a number of days. The Council was working with such businesses to market their services and was engaging with new businesses to locate holiday accommodation within Barry. Work was being undertaken and funding provided for cultural and heritage groups to restore buildings and spaces, in conjunction with the new Barry partnership.

No.

- Councillor Penn asked if there had been any research on how much third-party events contributed to the local economy. It was explained that, due to cost, such data was not collated to the level that the Councillor referred to, but the value and benefit of such events could still be seen as having a positive impact on the local economy. Despite limited budgets, the events calendar was still busy, with a significant number of small-scale events, and with the Tourism Team still providing help and advice to third party events. The Councillor agreed that these smaller events added value, but more detailed figures on this would help to quantify this more in order for these small event organisers, etc. to see their value and help to raise their morale.
- Councillor Hooper raised queries about the 3,000 FTE (full time equivalent) in the tourism industry and if this included hotel accommodation for homeless persons, concerns around the impact of the expansion of Airbnb holiday property rentals and how the Council encouraged people to get to events sustainably and with as little ecological impact as possible. On the FTEs, all businesses were taken into consideration that were linked to hospitality, with the STEAM model using multipliers based on numbers of visitors which helped to calculate the number of FTEs. However, accommodation that was used for homeless provision, was also entered into STEAM and then subsequently discounted from the FTE figures. On Airbnb, it was hoped that statutory regulation and greater checks on leasehold and rental contracts would come in to tackle some of the issues generated by Airbnb and help those bona fide rentals which were part of it. On events travel, particularly for the larger events, news and information would be shared with the public on train times, park and ride and on other alternative and more sustainable forms of transport. The Councillor asked for the STEAM methodology used for the tourism statistics for the Vale of Glamorgan to be shared with the Committee, as well as urging the Council and Welsh Government to look at greater regulation around Airbnb and the use of walking trails in order to get the local public and others to events within the Vale of Glamorgan.
- The Chair felt there was a need to make Vale of Glamorgan residents aware of how they could participate in the discussion about how they could support local tourism and events going forward. As part of this, she asked whether there were any plans to engage with residents, and it was confirmed that a resident survey had been undertaken and as part of its findings, greater engagement with local communities had been recommended. Another area that would be looked at was how to mitigate for local communities and tourist businesses potentially negative impacts, such as with climate change.
- On Councillor Driscoll's queries on figures concerning the contribution of Airbnb to the local economy, how new legislation would impact local small tourist businesses and if there had been any developments on the toilet block on Barry Island, the following was outlined. On Airbnb, due to COVID-19 and the costs in collating data, this had not recently been collated. It was noted that there were some professionally run Airbnb accommodation and they were an essential part of the holiday accommodation 'mix.' Airbnb had an important role to play in providing accommodation locally, but statutory registration should drive up standards. On new legislation, it remained to be seen what the impact would be, and this would be reported to the Committee next year. On aspects such as the tourism levy, this could potentially benefit

No.

local tourism. On Barry Island, there were ongoing discussions with the owners of the toilet block on developing this space, which was progressing, but there remained challenges in terms developing the space nearby, which required more consideration as part of a future master planning and placemaking exercise.

- Councillor Wiliam asked that there be more local ward member involvement in tourism related matters on Barry Island. It was explained that the Council was required to involve local Elected Members with placemaking activities. In Cowbridge and Llantwit Major where the plans had been co-commissioned with the Town Councils, local Elected Members were acting as placemaking champions / advocates and feeding into the process.
- Both Councillor Wiliam and Councillor Protheroe raised the issue around better public Wi-Fi connectivity and improving general mobile network connections for Barry Island, the rural Vale, coastal areas, and other tourist sites. Mapping connectivity could help to address this and any subsequent location of additional mobile phone / signal masts, as well as other initiatives in order to support greater connectivity. Councillor Protheroe had spoken to a Welsh Government (WG) lead on this. On Wi-Fi connectivity, it was explained that the public facility for Wi-fi at locations such as Barry Island had been impacted by rising maintenance costs and the public using Wi-fi at local businesses and buildings instead. On mobile network coverage for the Vale, mapping for this already existed and work had been undertaken in areas such as in Cowbridge on improving publicly accessible Wi-fi, with support from local business and the Town Council. As part of this, Councillor Champion referred to a company that could attach a device to local refuse vehicles which could monitor mobile signals locally and he had been in talks with Ofcom on this as well. He would liaise with Councillor Protheroe in order to help her with this. The Director of Place asked if Councillor Protheroe could share the WG lead's details with him or colleagues in order to see if further monitoring was needed for mobile connectivity, although this would be subject to cost. However, it was also important to note that WG also undertook their own review and monitoring in this area.

It was subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

(1) T H A T the report be referred to Cabinet, in order that it can consider and be aware of the comments raised by Committee on this report, including the request for information on, and greater understanding of, the following (to be provided by the relevant Council officers):

- The STEAM methodology used for the tourism statistics for the Vale of Glamorgan.
- The resilience of the tourism sector within the Vale of Glamorgan.
- The impact of the new legislation on this sector.
- How to improve internet, Wi-Fi and overall digital connectivity for the local tourism industry.

No.

- How Vale of Glamorgan residents can participate in the discussion about how they can support local tourism and events going forward.
- How the local tourism industry will be impacted by climate change and how this can be mitigated.

(2) T H A T the Committee receives an annual report on the progress being made with tourism and events within the Vale of Glamorgan, to be added to the Committee's work programme.

Reasons for recommendations

(1) To enable Cabinet to consider the comments of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee, and for the Committee to have further information on the key areas of interest raised in the report and at the meeting from the relevant Council officers.

(2) In order for the Committee to have a regular, annual, report and update on the progress being made in the local tourism industry and the challenges being faced.

232 ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN MONITORING REPORT: QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE 2023/24 (DP) –

The performance report was presented by the Director of Place, outlining the Council's progress at Quarter 4 (Q4) (1st April, 2023 to 31st March, 2024) towards achieving its Annual Delivery Plan (2023/24) commitments as aligned to its Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives. The appended presentation was intended to provide Members with an overview of end of year performance as soon as possible. This was ahead of the more detailed Annual Self-Assessment 2023/24 which would be reported to Cabinet and Full Council prior to publication in December 2024. Key points for Members included the following:

- 3 of the Council's Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives were attributed a Green performance status at Q4 and one Well-being Objective was attributed an Amber performance status (Well-being Objective 1). This reflected the good progress made to date in meeting the Council's Annual Delivery Plan commitments for 2023/24.
- 91% (463 out of 507) of planned activities outlined in the Council's Annual Delivery Plan had been attributed a Green performance rating reflecting the positive progress made in-year, and 9% (44) of planned activities were attributed a Red status.
- Of the 161 performance measures aligned to the Council's Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives, data was reported for 85 measures where a performance status was applicable. 46% (39) measures were attributed a Green performance Status, 14% (12), Amber status and 40% (34), Red status. A performance status was not applicable for 76 measures with 56 of these relating to measures establishing baseline performance for 2023/24, and for 20 measures no data was available.

No.

- In relation to the planned activities within the remit of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee, 90.5% (152 out of 168) were attributed a Green performance status and the final 9.5% (16) were attributed a Red status. Of the 27 measures reported where a RAG was applicable, 59.3% (16) were attributed a Green performance status, 11.1% (3) an Amber status and 29.6% (88) were attributed Red status.
- With reference to Appendix A to the report and the performance for this period as aligned to the remit of the Scrutiny Committee and the Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives, the Committee was given highlights of what had been achieved, the areas for improvement, emerging areas of development and activity, as well as emerging areas of concern.
- For ease of reference, performance exceptions aligned to the Scrutiny Committee's remit highlighted the current status of Red performing actions identified in previous quarters to show direction of travel at end of year. This enabled Members to quickly gauge whether proposed remedial actions had been undertaken in year to progress these actions (Appendix B).

A number of questions and comments were raised at the meeting on this item which included the following:

- Councillor Hooper raised a query on the Making Waves levelling up project. In response it was confirmed that the Council had been awarded the funding and had finally received a Memorandum of Understanding in order to sign with the UK Government. However, due to only receiving this on the day prior to when the general election was called, the Council had not been able to return the Memorandum of Understanding due to the previous government having been dissolved along with parliament. Once the Memorandum of Understanding had been signed by the Council's Chief Executive this would be returned to the new UK Government, with the understanding that the new Government had not changed its position in terms of funding which would still be received. In addition the Council continued to develop work with colleagues in the Associated British Ports concerning the Waterfront site. It was likely the Council itself would now be the project manager for the majority of the works except for the delivery of the marina itself.
- Concerning Councillor Drake's query on the work under Objective 4 achievements concerning the Tree Strategy and what the timeline for completion of it was, as well as the contacts that had been made with private landowners as part of this Strategy, it was explained that the Tree Strategy focused largely on Council owned land and not privately owned areas. However, private landowners could obtain advice around tree coverage and engage within the process. It was the intention to bring the update and report on this back to Committee in due course. The report was currently being prepared on the Strategy with the aim of it going to Cabinet in September following extensive consultation including receiving comments from private land owners. It was explained that there might also be an opportunity for the Council to support private landowners in areas where there were low levels of urban tree canopy, with all parties undertaking to do their bit. However, it was stressed that the Council could only be responsible for its own land, but it would provide advice and some support in areas of low urban tree coverage in

No.

support of private landowners, etc. It was currently believed that the report, following its consideration at Cabinet, would come back to this Committee for further scrutiny, but that awaited to be confirmed.

- Councillor Wiliam raised a number of comments and queries including the current position around the Council's management of trees such as on public land i.e. Romilly Park where they were encroaching onto the roads and whether this was as a result of lower budgets etc. and concerning the large number of public lights now converted to LED as well as when this process had started. It was explained that more funding had been made available in this year's Capital Programme both for tree planting, maintenance and in order to support the Tree Strategy overall. In relation to the LED lighting, this process started approximately three years ago with the majority of it now completed and the only remaining form of lighting to be replaced were the more ornate lanterns and lighting which were more difficult to source. The intention was to complete this process once the relevant technology had improved for this type of lighting and the appropriate lanterns were available in order to replace the small number of non-LED lights that were left. With regard to encroachment of trees in public spaces such as Romilly Park, it was explained that the Council would arrange an inspection and undertaken any maintenance that was required.

It was subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

(1) T H A T the Q4 performance results and progress towards achieving the Annual Delivery Plan 2023/24 commitments, as aligned to the Council's Corporate Plan Wellbeing Objectives within the remit of the Committee, be noted.

(2) T H A T the remedial actions to be taken to address areas of under-performance and to tackle the key challenges identified within the remit of the Committee, be noted.

Reasons for recommendations

(1) Having regard to the contents of the report, discussions at the meeting and to ensure the Council clearly demonstrated the progress being made towards achieving its commitments in the Annual Delivery Plan 2023/24 aimed at making a positive difference to the lives of Vale of Glamorgan citizens.

(2) Having regard to the contents of the report, discussions at the meeting and to help ensure the Council was effectively assessing its performance in line with the requirement to meet its performance requirements as outlined in the Local Government & Elections (Wales) Act 2021 as well as reflecting the requirement of the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 that it maximises its contribution to achieving the well-being goals for Wales.