

VOG 025 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? Yes

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 026 – Member of the Public

Leave as it as, we do not need more councillors who do nothing for the community but line their own pockets.

VOG 027 – Member of the Public

Review the electoral ward boundary proposals

I object to the proposals for the following reasons

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

VOG 027 – Member of the Public

<No Comment was Made>

VOG 028 – Member of the Public

As a resident of Llandough for over 30 years I would much prefer that Llandough retain its status as an independent entity within the Vale of Glamorgan. I can see no benefit whatsoever of joining a ward in Penarth when we are quite happy with the status quo,

[REDACTED]

VOG 029 – Member of the Public

Dear Sirs

As a resident of Llandough I want to express my view that the Llandough ward should be retained as a separate distinct ward. The village is a separate distinct community with its own issues not least generated by the large hospital within our boundaries. We need specific targeted representation.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

VOG 030 – Member of the Public

Llandough needs our own representative on the Vale council, in order to maintain a councillor who has the best interests of Llandough at heart Thank you

[REDACTED]

VOG 031 – Member of the Public

I would like to express my concerns about the proposal to abolish the Llandough Ward.

There are many issues that require the ward to remain with our local councillor who understands the importance and needs of the village.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

VOG 032 – Member of the Public

It is with regret that the Council yet again want to change the boundaries of Llandough.

I object to these changes for the following reasons:

- We have clear boundaries in place currently for Llandough ward and I see no benefit of changing these.
- The electorate of the Llandough ward is virtually the same as the proposed county average. Retaining it will ensure electoral parity is maintained.
- Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston are rural and/or semi-rural in nature and share many characteristics and community ties. They do not share such characteristics and ties with the larger settlements of Penarth and Dinas Powys.
- I believe that it is in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the community to be served by one councillor in a single member ward.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

VOG 033 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

VOG 034 – Member of the Public

Llandough is a community with its own Community Council.

I see no reason whatsoever to be swallowed up into a Penarth ward.

VOG 035 – Member of the Public

I want the Llandough ward to be RETAINED not merged with any other ward Regards

[REDACTED]

VOG 036 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

VOG 037 – Member of the Public

I understand that again the Commission is looking at local boundaries – I have been a resident of Llandough for over 40years and do not want Llandough to be amalgamated with Penarth.

We have a lovely village with an excellent Councillor who we have great faith in. He is often seen around the village, is very approachable, takes part in village activities and efficiently raises issues affecting Llandough at all levels.

If we were to be amalgamated with Penarth I fear we would lose this vital contact, and be allocated a Councillor like those often seen in local papers publicising hairbrained schemes but rarely seen or active in their actual constituency.

Please do not amalgamate Llandough with Penarth.

[REDACTED]

VOG 038 – Member of the Public

I think it is very important to keep Llandough ward as it is a village which needs personal representation.

VOG 039 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? Yes

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 040 – Member of the Public

Hello Boundary Commission,

Llandough is a village separated from Penarth and Cogan by major roads both at the Barons Court and Merry Harrier, Llandough enjoys a rural aspect and is partially surrounded by fields and greenery.

It has it's own local council and councillors who act principally on behalf of the welfare of the village and it's residents, the people of LLandough wish to remain a village distinct from the rule of either Penarth or Cardiff.

When reviewing the boundaries within the Vale of Glamorgan, would you please take into account the feelings of the majority of residents in the village of Llandough who wish to remain as a separate identity from Penarth and surrounding areas.

Regards

[REDACTED]

VOG 041 – Member of the Public

Have read the draft proposals for revised boundaries I applaud the commission for their recommendation in retaining the Llandough ward as an entity

Thank you

[REDACTED]

VOG 042 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir/Madam

The main reason I would like to retain the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan because of the historic importance to the Vale with our church and the Roman villa and roads which were destroyed by building over them.

Can we really afford to loose our heritage like this by Llandough being swallowed up and loosing another area with its unique independent location which provides a rural breakwater separating huge areas of populations thus helping prevent our our beautiful Vale becoming one big city of treeless concrete boxes with no charm or character whatsoever.

VOG 043 – Member of the Public

Dear Boundary Commission Team,

I am writing to express my full support for the proposal to retain the Llandough ward in your current boundary review.

Llandough is a distinct and well-defined community, clearly separated from neighbouring areas by the Merrie Harrier junction and surrounding farmland. The ward's existing boundaries reflect natural and long-established divisions that make sense geographically and socially.

The current electorate size is in line with the county average, ensuring fair representation and electoral balance. Furthermore, Llandough, Leckwith, and Michaelston share strong rural and semi-rural characteristics, community ties, and local identity. These are very different from the larger, more urban settlements of Penarth and Dinas Powys.

Retaining the Llandough ward will help maintain effective and convenient local government, allowing residents to continue being represented by one councillor who understands the specific needs and priorities of our community.

For these reasons, I strongly support the Commission's proposal to retain the Llandough ward and urge you not to make any changes that would merge or abolish it.
Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 044 – Member of the Public

Dear Boundary Commission Team,

I am writing to express my full support for the proposal to retain the Llandough ward in your current boundary review.

Llandough is a distinct and well-defined community, clearly separated from neighbouring areas by the Merrie Harrier junction and surrounding farmland. The ward's existing boundaries reflect natural and long-established divisions that make sense geographically and socially.

The current electorate size is in line with the county average, ensuring fair representation and electoral balance. Furthermore, Llandough, Leckwith, and Michaelston share strong rural and semi-rural characteristics, community ties, and local identity. These are very different from the larger, more urban settlements of Penarth and Dinas Powys.

Retaining the Llandough ward will help maintain effective and convenient local government, allowing residents to continue being represented by one councillor who understands the specific needs and priorities of our community.

For these reasons, I strongly support the Commission's proposal to retain the Llandough ward and urge you not to make any changes that would merge or abolish it.
Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 045 – Member of the Public

We have always been a village with our own identity. We must retain the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review.

VOG 046 – Member of the Public

I would like to retain Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Thank you .

Respectfully yours,
[REDACTED]

VOG 047 – Member of the Public

We live in Llandough and are very happy with the service we get from our councilor. If we become a larger ward we will lose the personal touch and accountability.

[REDACTED]

VOG 048 – Member of the Public

Good morning,

As a resident of Llandough I feel very strongly about retaining our identity as a village.

I strongly oppose the boundary being moved to incorporate us into Penarth - we are NOT Penarth. I also feel that our councillor, George Carroll works tirelessly to ensure we remain a close knit community, we are all involved in local activities, we have our own Llandough Business Hub which celebrates the people of Llandough (not Penarth) George knows most of our residents by name and is regularly seen in the village, delivering newsletters and helping the Llandough people.

I feel we would all lose out if the boundaries are changed and besides that, where does it end?

Would you then incorporate Cogan and Leckwith?

Please register my objection.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 050 – Member of the Public

Boundaries Commision.

I have been a resident in Llandough for 48yrs and worked at Llandough Hospital as a Registered nurse.

Although there has been a number of housing developments over the years, it still maintains the village atmosphere. There are distinct boundary lines with our larger neighbours of Penarth and Dinas Powis.

Llandough Hospital has over the years, expanded its provision of health care. Over the last few years, this has created increased traffic through the village and problems with parking in residential areas. A single councillor for Llandough is better placed to deal with these problems.

Please retain it as a distinct ward to be represented by a single councillor.

[REDACTED]

VOG 051 – Member of the Public

With respect to changing Cosmeston and Plymouth council wards to Cosmeston Plymouth, I believe this is wrong - historically, Cosmeston has always been separate to Penarth and has always been a part of Lavernock parish

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

VOG 052 – Member of the Public

At present, the local ward is called Sully Sili

An original generic Welsh name adopted from the time of King Henry VII was Abersili which was adopted even by Royal Mail until several years ago when roadsigns were changed to read Sili

The Welsh name Abersili would be far more acceptable since it correctly describes the confluence between Sully Brook and Cadoxton River

Also, I have walked along many metres of Sully Brook and can definitely confirm there is no 'hissing' sound apparently relating to the meaning of the Welsh name Sili

VOG 054 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir/Madam

I have appended my response to this matter that was sent to you in the previous consultation. I believe that the position is essential unchanged save for an increase in housing and population so my views remain the same. I understand that there is yet another proposal to increase the housing stock.

I strongly support the retention of the current Llandough Ward boundaries.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

VOG 055 – Member of the Public

Llandough as a single member ward and the boundaries are clear and distinct; electoral parity will be achieved; local ties will be maintained and it is in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

VOG 056 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

VOG 057 – Member of the Public

Llandough is village with a history of going back to Roman times. It hasn't got the infrastructure for all these flats the Vale are putting in. The roads can't take any more traffic and parking. Only retaining its own ward will it survive as a village and not an appendage of Dinas Powys or Cardiff.

Thank you for listening and hopefully retaking it as its own Ward.

VOG 058 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

[REDACTED]

VOG 059 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

VOG 061 – Member of the Public

Please RETAIN the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review

Please retain.

[REDACTED]

VOG 062 – Member of the Public

To whom it may concern

Please retain the Llandough as a single member ward in the electoral review

We have lived in the area for 35 years and believe we have a strong identify in our own right, with clear boundaries. It is in the best interests of local people as well as effective and convenient local government.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

VOG 065 – Member of the Public

Agreed . [REDACTED]

VOG 067 – Member of the Public

Yes stop wasting money and leave it as it is

VOG 068 – Member of the Public

If its going to cost anything to change it save money and leave it as it is there's no need to waste any more money, how much has this consultation cost and how much that could have gone towards issues that local people want addressed

VOG 069 – Member of the Public

Change for the sake of change - waste of time , money , resources.

Money and resources could be easily spent on current issues / problems - to numerous to mention.

VOG 070 – Member of the Public

The area (Dinas Powys) is too large, whilst there are farms, there is now a substantial increase in population. Therefore the ward is going to be under-represented.

VOG 071 – Member of the Public

To whom it may concern.

As a resident of Llandough please would you retain the Llandough Ward in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

VOG 072 – Member of the Public

[REDACTED] of the opinion that The Llandough should be retained.
[REDACTED]

VOG 073 – Member of the Public

Llandough has natural boundaries and this provides a real feel of community camaraderie between residents. Extending this boundary will make it feel unwieldy and alter the dynamics of the area. The old adage is, if it works why change it.

VOG 076 – Member of the Public

Re: Boundaries Llandough Ward

I AM in favour of RETAINING the existing Llandough ward, because of the following points;

- The distinct boundaries of the current Llandough village and local surrounding area are clearly separate it from other locales.
- The ward of Llandough, with its adjoining environs (Leckwith and Michaelston) are rural and/or semi-rural in character. Their concerns and challenges are vastly different to the urban conurbations of Penarth and Dinas Powys
- The constituency of Llandough is already close to the proposed electoral numbers. Therefore, it does not require any intervention to achieve the desired size of electorate.
- By retaining Llandough as a single member ward it avoids the confuse of which councillor is responsible in specific areas, this adds clarity to local governance. A single councillor also provide a focus (one-stop shop) for resident problems, community projects and cultural events such as VE Day commemorations.

[REDACTED]

VOG 077 – On behalf of a Town or Community Council

Good evening,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft proposals in respect of the existing Cowbridge ward.

That proposed was considered by my Council at its meeting on 6th October 2025.

Council was pleased to note that its request for a new autonomous Penllyn ward, aligned with the Community Council boundary, had been acceded to.

Council looks forward to your draft proposals being confirmed by Welsh Government

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Mr AD Williams
Clerk to the Council
[REDACTED]

VOG 080 – Member of the Public

Dear Sirs,

I write to make known my views on the proposed Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review.

I want to retain the Llandough Ward. We are semi rural in nature and have nothing in common with Penarth Ward. It seems to me to be in the interest of efficiency to local government to have Llandough served by one councillor in a single member ward. This has been very effective so far so why are we trying to change it?

We have clear boundaries which separate us from Penarth and the electorate of the Llandough Ward is virtually the same as the proposed county average.

We work well as a community and it seems to me that it will be of benefit to local government to continue the efficiency of our Llandough Ward, so please retain the ward.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

VOG 084 – Member of the Public – Duplicate Submission from Respondee VoG_069

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 086 – Member of the Public

Dear Sirs

I would suggest that Baruc ward be split into two wards.

The justification for this is that the ward is:

1. Too large as a individual ward.
2. The number of voters at 2021 census was 8663.This is too large a ward.
3. An additional seat was added taking the number of councillors to 3.
4. The ward is geographically too large
5. The ward is diverse in the housing groups being too different.
6. The ward contains a commercial area and tourist area in Barry Island that has different issues to the residential areas.
7. Recent additional housing and increased voters added to the electoral role and the extra new Councillor position necessitate the ward being divided in two to properly allow the residents to be represented on the local issues that effect them.

My main proposal would be for Barry Island and part of the knap to be one ward and the remaining second ward to be Park Road and the Garden Suburb.

In summary Baruc ward should be divided Into two distinct wards.

VOG 087 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 097 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 098 – Member of the Public

To me it doesn't make any logical sense including Llanmaes, St Hilary and Picketston in the Llandow ward. These wards are too big.

Llanmaes is more connected to Llantwit. St Hilary to Cowbridge. And Picketston to St Athan. This is just a numbers game rather than taking account of logical connection.

Already Councillors in the Llandow ward are saying they will step down as they won't be able to take local decisions anymore.

VOG 099 – Local Councillor or other Elected Official

Please see attached letter in respect of your current consultation in respect of the Vale of Glamorgan.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Christine

sent to: consultations@dbcc.wales

Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru
4th Floor
Welsh Government Building
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

2nd November 2025

RE: Electoral Review of the Vale of Glamorgan: Draft Proposals. 02/10/2025 for the future electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Vale of Glamorgan.

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to raise objections to your current consultation proposals for the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan. I am the elected member for the current Llandow electoral ward.

I am raising grave concerns as to the recommendations you have made for the Llandow Ward. In particular, on the 21st of March 2025, Welsh Government accepted, in full, the Commission's Final Recommendations for the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025 despite receiving a number of concerns from all of the Community Councils that sit within the Llandow Ward.

The current electoral review is based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect. The Commission published their Initial Proposals on the 2nd of October 2025 and was consulting until the 12th of November 2025.

I would like to raise a series of concerns as the long standing ward member for Llandow, as follows:

- Five years previously, it was decided that the Llandow Ward was too large and that the areas of Ewenny and Corntown was removed and placed under the Wick area this was against the recommendations of the Ewenny/Corntown CC. I also wrote to you at this time, and pointed out that you were breaking the local ties that have long existed between Ewenny and Corntown and its neighbours, Colwinston and Llandow. However, your current proposals continue to suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan should now also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick. So, it appears that the Llandow Ward is slowly being renamed as Wick, and it was unclear why that would be the case other than the continued break up of the Llandow ward and the continued break up of local connections and ties

- The area of Troese (that has a boundary with Bridgend county borough and Llangan) is not mentioned at all within your report but I know locally there is great mistrust in terms of your reasoning as to why this ward and the Colwinston ward should be moved into the electoral area known as Wick. The communities of Colwinston, Troese, Llangan and St Mary Hill have no connection with the Wick ward and they (like I) fear that you are purposely pursuing a vendetta against the people who I currently represent and that you will not be satisfied until the Llandow Ward becomes consumed by the Wick Ward.
- In presenting the report, the Vale of Glamorgan Council Monitoring Officer referred to local community relationships and those being the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were asking for. However, one of the strongest links in the Llandow community exists between the villages of Llysworney and Colwinston. This was a strong connection due to Members of Llandow Community Council being invited to sit as governors on the new school in Colwinston, following previous school closures, and the arrangement still exists. As such, Llandow had very strong links with Colwinston as children from Llandow and Llangan attend the school in Colwinston and Llangan. The current proposals suggest that these links be severed so that Llandow Community Council Representatives would no longer have a say in the Colwinston School, which was unsatisfactory.
- Your proposals also suggest that as the elected councillor I represent too many people in the Llandow Ward however, I am more than happy with the current workload (and the previous workload that existed prior to the removal of Ewenny and Corntown). I believed you have a responsibility to seek value for money for the hard pressed tax payers of the Vale of Glamorgan, and that you should be focused on removing excessive burdens from the tax payer. In fact, I would welcome the areas of Ewenny and Corntown to rejoin Llandow to give greater value for money and I know that the local Community Council representatives also feel the same. It is unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers are supposed to fund another five more elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan, especially when the currently elected members are saying that they were happy to continue with representing as is.
- No one (apart from yourselves possibly) are of the opinion that there should be more taxpayers money available to fund additional elected members (especially as the current member of the Llandow ward is happy to continue with the current situation).
- In terms of the ratio of population to members, the variance from the county average is 20-50% above. As a consequence, there is potential scope to consider current arrangements with neighbouring wards, not least St Bride's Major. This would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3" suggesting that the remaining area of Llandow was not large enough to be represented properly and should be amalgamated but that was nonsensical. If you are to continue with your approach of slicing up the Llandow Ward, you could at the very least allow the current Communities of Colwinston and Llangan to at least have their own local representative rather than be merged and loss their identity.

- Two area names were missing from the statement contained within paragraph 1.3 as follows: “The remaining Llandow, Llysworney and Llanmihangel and Llanmaes community wards would continue to form an Electoral ward of Llandow with 1 member; and the new areas that you propose to merge with Llandow, namely St. Hilary and Llanmaes, could also have their own elected member.
- The proposals suggests that established local links Colwinston with Llandow and Llangan should be severed and instead replaced with St. Hilary and Llanmaes where no local links exist. This is opposed by all Community Councillors in the current Llandow Ward.
- Llandow has never had a local link with St. Hilary or Llanmaes therefore, the proposals were a mishmash of nonsensical, reimagined, local community connections and there was not one community council that I currently represent that thought the proposals were a good idea and increase democracy within these areas. In fact, the opposite has been suggested, that your proposals are anti-democratic and imposed from the top down instead of reflecting the feelings of the people living and working locally.
- The proposals, if adopted, would result in losing a vast majority of community councillors, who often give their time for free and because of the love of their village that they reside in, not outlying villages. The current situation represents good value for money and good local democracy that everyone living locally believes in.
- The Community Councils of Llandow, Colwinston and Llangan are likely to have to pay for Clerk redundancies if your proposal for a new ‘super community council’ is formed as proposed. There would be at least three to five Clerks applying for the one position, and therefore the amalgamated community councils would be asked to pay redundancy, for which, they had no idea how this might be funded. But once again, it is assumed that the tax payer will foot the bill regardless of the unpopular and undemocratic nature of the proposals. It is of course important to think about proportionality when talking about electoral wards and that financial implications in relation to the proposals but the argument for proportionality is overwhelmed by the argument for local ties to remain intact. Sadly, your current proposals report as presented do not give an accurate reflection of current local ties and if implemented would see imposed an undemocratic and unwanted breakup of the Llandow ward.

I hope that you will be able to reflect on your current plans and reject these proposals by listening instead to those who live and work in the Llandow ward.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours faithfully,

Christine A Cave

Cllr. Christine Cave (GMBPsP)
Llandow Ward / Vale of Glamorgan Council
18 East View,
Llandow Village,
Vale of Glamorgan,
CF71 7NZ.
cacave@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Tel: 07800 806373

VOG 100 – Member of the Public

Please leave Llandough alone, it should not be added to Penarth or Dinas Powys. There is a brilliant community spirit here and it should be supported.

[REDACTED]

Llandough

VOG 103 – On behalf of an Organisation (Private or Public)

Good Afternoon,

I write in my capacity as the Chairman of the Cardiff South & Penarth Conservatives, and as Chairman of the Caerdydd-Penarth Senedd Conservatives.

Our sole and only concern is in respect of your current proposal for the proposed new Ward of Cosmeston Penarth.

Firstly we note that the Commission suggests that "Cosmeston" is already part of the Town of Penarth. It is not - it is a part of Sully-Lavernock Community.

Secondly, we agree with the Commission's proposals for a new/revised Ward with 3 County Councillors, as we consider that the substantial under-representation for the last 10 years or so, has not met with the Commission's more usual requirements in respect of Councillor/Population ratio.

We are in general agreement with the proposed boundary lines for the new Ward.

However we have to disagree with the Commission's proposal for the name of the revised Ward - Cosmeston Plymouth.

The Plymouth Ward has been in existence for at least 40 years, an outcome of the dissolution of the former Penarth Urban District Council, and the coming into being of Penarth Town Council.

Plymouth has c. 4,500 electorate, whilst Cosmeston just a few hundred - in fact the name "Cosmeston" really relates to the large housing estate correctly named Lavernock Park by its developers, and still broadly exactly the same size as when constructed several decades ago. Cosmeston was a mediaeval village - now long gone.

In contrast, **Plymouth** is a close knit ward, with very strong community connections, frequent bus services, several popular schools and a good Travel to Work ethic.

We consider that naming the Ward Cosmeston Penarth undermines the size, prominence and history of the existing Plymouth Ward, and in fact devalues the very existence of a decades old, but successful, Local Government entity.

Our **RECOMMENDATION** to the Commission is that the name of the proposed new Ward be **PLYMOUTH COSMESTON**, and that will both meet with the concerns outlined above, and the Welsh Language Commission's support.

Thank you.

Anthony M. Ernest. F.T.S., M.R.S.G.B.

Chairman.

VOG 105 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 106 – On Behalf of a Local Authority

We took the attached report to CLC on 16.10.25 and the ERO's comments to the initial proposals are included at paragraph 2.3 to 2.11.

The two lots of approved minutes also attached, represent the comments made at both Community Liaison Committee and Full Council.

It was resolved at Full Council that the CLC report along with the minutes of both meetings be forwarded to you as part of our consultation response.

Recommendations

1. That Community Liaison Committee considers the report which contains the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals as set out in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10 and comments on the same.
2. That this report be referred to a Special Council meeting on the 3 November 2025, along with any recommendations from this Committee for consideration.

Reasons for Recommendations

1. To apprise the Community Liaison Committee of the Council's recommended response to the Commission's Initial Proposals of the review and to seek views on the same.
2. To update Council and to approve the Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals.

1. Background

The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru etc. Act 2013 requires the Commission to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area in Wales at least once every 12 years.

On the 21st March 2025 the Cabinet Secretary for Housing and Local Government accepted the Commission's Final Recommendation Report for the Vale of Glamorgan Community Review. The Commission is therefore conducting this electoral review on the basis of those community areas as they will stand once the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025, comes into force.

The Commission's Electoral Review Programme 2025 sets out the Commission's programme and states the Electoral Review for the Vale of Glamorgan will conclude by March 2026 as outlined in the Commission's Electoral Reviews: 2025 Policy and Practice document.

1.3 As part of the Commission's Initial Consultation which commenced on 5 June 2025, Community Liaison Committee noted and agreed on 1 July 2025 the Commission's Electoral Reviews: 2025 Policy and Practice Document, its Council Size Policy and the Council's observations to be submitted in response to the Initial Consultation namely:

In terms of the current Llandow electoral ward, this currently spans an area at the northernmost part of the Vale of Glamorgan in and around Ruthin and St Mary Hill to the rural area to the north

of Llantwit Major (in and around Llanmaes). In terms of the ratio of population to members, the variance from the county average is 20-50% above. As a consequence, there is potential scope to consider current arrangements with neighbouring wards, not least St Bride's Major. This would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3. The remaining Llandow, Llyswoorney and Llanmihangel and Llanmaes community wards would continue to form an Electoral ward of Llandow with 1 member. The result of this change would be to increase representation across the principal area by 1 member. The other alternative is to of course, retain the status quo albeit with a population variance of 20—50%.

In terms of Plymouth, there also exists a population to member variance of 20% - 50% and alongside this, the creation of a new Cosmeston ward at Community level (and forming part of Penarth town Council) has a population to member variance of more than 50% below. It would therefore seem opportune to merge Plymouth and Cosmeston community wards into a larger electoral ward and increasing the number of members to 3 (from 2), thereby increasing the representation for the principal area by a further 1 member. This would seem more rational than the creation of a single member ward for Cosmeston with a significant population variance of more than 50% below.

In terms of Wenvoe, this electoral ward has a population variance of between 20% and 50% above. All surrounding wards are between +/- 10%. In terms of geographical relationship, one solution could be to look at amalgamating Wenvoe and St Nicholas/Llancarfan into a single electoral ward with 2 members. This would create a ward of significant geographical extent, albeit with the advantage of 2 members. This would not increase the number of members in the principal area but rather amalgamate two single member wards. The other solution would be to simply accept the position and retain the status quo.

In terms of other issues, it is worth noting that a new principal area ward will be created at the Waterfront which will have representation in the form of 2 members, and it is also proposed that Dyfan has an increase of 1 member from 2 to 3. This is as set out in the final recommendations of the Community Review from the Boundary Commission, which have already been agreed by Welsh Government and will come in to force at the next Local Government Elections in 2027.

Below is a link to the 1 July 2025 minutes and report

[Minutes](#)

[Democracy Boundary Commission VoG Review](#)

The Council's observations were reported to Council and resolved on 14 July 2025. A link to the minutes can be found [here](#).

2. Key Issues for Consideration

A copy of the Commission's Initial Proposals (**Appendix A**) was published on its website on 2 October 2025. A period of consultation will run from 2 October 2025 to 12 November 2025. The Commission welcomes representations concerning any of the proposals in its Initial Proposals

Report. Evidence based representations are sought and include the postal, email and portal routes.

The report in summary recommends the following changes:

1. The existing Electoral ward of Cadog has the existing Welsh Language name of Cadog, and the existing English Language name of Cadog. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Cadog to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
2. The existing Electoral ward of Illtyd has the existing Welsh Language name of Illtud, and the existing English Language name of Illtyd. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Illtud to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
3. The existing Electoral ward of St Nicholas and Llancarfan has the existing Welsh Language name of Sain Nicolas a Llancarfan, and the existing English language name of St Nicholas and Llancarfan. The Commission proposes to apply the new single name of Sain Nicolas Llancarfan. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name. The Welsh Language Commissioner also suggested that both forms of St Nicholas and Sain Nicolas were acceptable as per the list of Standard Welsh-place names. The Commission recommends a single name based on its naming policy to provide single names where possible.
4. The existing Electoral Ward of Rhoose has the existing Welsh Language name of Y Rhws, and the existing English Language name of Rhoose. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Y Rhws to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
5. The Commission proposes to combine the existing electoral wards of Cosmeston and Plymouth in order to address the levels of variance from the proposed county average in both existing wards. This proposal provides for significant improvements to electoral parity, combines two electoral wards that are part of the same Town Council area and retains the overall number of councillors for the wards at three.
6. The Commission proposes the new single electoral ward name of Cosmeston Plymouth. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed single name for the new ward.
7. The Commission proposes to transfer the Community of Colwinston and Llangan from the Llandow electoral ward into the St Bride's Major electoral ward. The Commission proposes to allocate an additional

county councillor to the St Bride's Major electoral ward, which results in the St Bride's Major electoral ward being represented by three county councillors. This proposal addresses the existing level of variance in the Llandow electoral ward and increases the overall number of county councillors in the area by one.

8. The Commission proposes to create a new single member electoral ward formed of the Community of Penllyn. The Commission also proposes to create a new two-member electoral ward formed of the Town of Cowbridge with Llanblethian.
9. As a result of these proposals the Commission proposes to apply the single electoral ward name of Pen-llin. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed names and advises that Pen-llin is the only standard form recommended in the Standard Welsh Place-names list.
10. As a result of these proposals the recommended number of County Councillors increases from the current 54 to 59 which would take effect for the Local Government Elections in 2027. This represents +1 from the 58 recommended in the Vale of Glamorgan Council Community Review, accepted by WG on the 21st March 2025. The changes can be viewed in the Commission's table of recommendations at (**Appendix B**)

In relation to the proposals, and dealing with each in turn, the following comments are made, firstly in relation to Ward arrangements.

The largest under representation under proposals is Wenvoe (+23%) and largest overrepresentation is Llandow (-19%).

In consideration of the proposed Cosmeston Plymouth ward, this is supported, given the population variance across what would otherwise be two separate wards. This issue is covered in detail on pages 13 and 14 of the Commission's report.

In consideration of the proposals for Pen-llin and Cowbridge / Y Bontfaen, these are also supported. There is, without doubt a logic to the creation of a single member ward for Pen-llin given its geographic extent and rurality, covering as it does the north and north western rural hinterland of what currently is the wider Cowbridge ward. These proposed changes are covered on pages 19 to 21 (inclusive) of the commission's report

The proposals relating to the transfer of Colwinston and Llangan to St Brides Major are set out on pages 15 to 18 inclusive and are also supported given the level of variance in the Llandow ward.

Members will recall that in the earlier consultation there was a proposal to consider amalgamating the Wenvoe ward and the St Nicholas/Llancarfan ward. This has not been progressed.

There are no changes to those proposals as set out earlier for the creation of a new 2 member Waterfront ward in Barry, which has resulted from the community review arrangements already undertaken.

In summary, and in terms of wards and members, 21 wards are unaffected by this review. The changes will result in 26 wards with 59 members, the details of which are included in the report at Appendix 2.

Finally, the Commission's general practice is to recommend single Welsh names where acceptable in English, retaining bilingual forms where the Welsh and English names are distinct. Members may wish to express views on specific names (e.g., Cadog for Cadoc, Illtud for Illtyd, Y Rhws for Rhoose, Sain Nicolas Llancarfan), or to advocate a broader single-Welsh naming approach for consistency (noting pros/cons for voter recognition and electoral materials). The draft Council response takes no position on names beyond accuracy and clarity.

3. How do proposals evidence the Five Ways of Working and contribute to our Well-being Objectives?

The review of Principal area arrangements safeguards the long-term needs of local residents to ensure an effective and convenient local government and electoral equality.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council will be submitting a proposal to the Commission in line with effective collaboration between bodies.

The Commission is undertaking the review, but the Vale of Glamorgan Council will ensure that it will support the Commission in ensuring the relevant notices are published and facilitating presentations to encourage engagement with stakeholders.

4. Climate Change and Nature Implications

There are no direct climate change implications associated with the undertaking of the review.

5. Resources and Legal Considerations

Financial

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Employment

There are no employment implications arising as a result of this report.

Legal (Including Equalities)

Each principal council has a duty to monitor the communities in its area and, where appropriate, the electoral arrangements of such communities for the purpose of considering whether to make or recommend changes. These changes are brought about by means of community boundary reviews under s25 and community electoral reviews under s31 of the Act.

The statutory process for conducting a community review is set out in Part 3 of the Act.

Section 34 of the Act stipulates the 'mandatory consultees' for a community review.

When conducting a community review the principal council must have regard to its statutory obligations – for example obligations under the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, Welsh Language Standards, and the Equality Act 2010, which will all influence and inform the conduct and decisions made during a community review.

The Council will ensure that any submission and subsequent constitutional or procedural changes arising from this report are compliant with the legislation referred to above.

6. Background Papers The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru Draft proposals report

DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION CYMRU – VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS REVIEW –

On behalf of the Council’s Electoral Registration Officer and Chief Executive, the report was presented by the Council’s Monitoring Officer. The purpose of which was to advise Committee that The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru etc. Act 2013 required the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (“The Commission”) to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area in Wales at least once every 12 years.

On the 21st of March 2025, Welsh Government accepted, in full, the Commission’s Final Recommendations for the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025.

The electoral arrangements were defined as:

- The number of Members of the Council for the principal area, in this case the Vale of Glamorgan.
- The number, type, and boundaries of the electoral wards into which the principal area was for the time being divided for the purpose for the election of Members.
- The number of Members to be elected for any electoral ward in the principal area; and
- The name of any electoral ward.

For context, the Monitoring Officer advised that The Commission commenced the Electoral Review for the Vale of Glamorgan on the 5th of June 2025 and would conclude by March 2026. The review follows the completion earlier this year of the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025, which updated community boundaries. The current electoral review was therefore based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect. The Vale of Glamorgan Council commented in brief on the initial consultation undertaken by the Commission, with reports presented to both the Community Liaison Committee and Council.

The Commission published their Initial Proposals on the 2nd of October 2025 and was consulting until the 12th of November 2025. Therefore, it was felt timely to present the report to Committee within the consultation window.

The Commission had encouraged the Vale of Glamorgan Council to provide a scheme of effective representations as part of the consultation by the 12th of November. To this end, the report included a set of ten proposed recommendations from the Boundary Commission, at paragraph 2.2 of the covering report, and the Vale of Glamorgan Council's subsequent responses at paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10, for consideration.

In conclusion, the Monitoring Officer advised that individual Town and Community Councils and indeed any individual member from any Town and Community Council could make representations directly to the Boundary Commission in the same way as any Vale of Glamorgan Elected Member before the 12th of November 2025. The consultation email address was included within the appended Draft Proposals Review Report.

Following the Monitoring Officer's presentation, Councillor Cave raised a series of concerns as the long standing ward member for Llandow, as follows:

- Five years previously, it was decided that the Llandow Ward was too large and that the areas of Ewenny and Corntown be removed and placed under the Wick area. The current proposals suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick. So, it appears that the Llandow Ward is slowly being renamed as Wick, and it was unclear why that would be the case.
- The area of Troes is not mentioned at all within the report.
- In presenting the report, the Monitoring Officer referred to local community

relationships and those being the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were asking for. However, one of the strongest links in the Llandow community exists between the villages of Llysworney and Colwinston. This was a strong connection due to Members of Llandow Community Council being invited to sit as governors on the new school in Colwinston, following previous school closures, and the arrangement still exists. As such, Llandow had very strong links with Colwinston as children from Llandow and Llangan attend the school in Colwinston. The current proposals suggest that the link be severed so that Llandow Community Council Representatives would no longer have a say in the Colwinston School, which was unsatisfactory.

- The proposals also suggest that Councillor Cave represents too many people in the Llandow Ward however, Councillor Cave was happy with their current workload and believed it to be value for money, which was what the Vale of Glamorgan Council should be focused on. In fact, Councillor Cave would welcome the areas of Ewenny and Corntown to rejoin Llandow to give greater value for money.
- It was unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers were supposed to fund five more elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan, especially when the currently elected members were saying that they were happy to continue with representing as is. No one was of the opinion that there was more money available to fund additional elected members.
- The statement contained within paragraph 1.3 of the covering report, "In terms of the current Llandow electoral ward, this currently spans an area at the northernmost part of the Vale of Glamorgan in and around Ruthin and St Mary Hill to the rural area to the north of Llantwit Major (in and around Llanmaes)" was grossly and factually incorrect, and should be corrected, for the following reasons:

- The areas of Ruthin and St Mary Hill were also considered to be rural areas,
- The Llandow Ward was nowhere near Llanmaes and, sitting between Llanmaes and Llandow were other villages.

- Paragraph 1.3 goes on to state “In terms of the ratio of population to members, the variance from the county average is 20-50% above. As a consequence, there is potential scope to consider current arrangements with neighbouring wards, not least St Bride’s Major. This would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride’s Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3” suggesting that the remaining area of Llandow was not large enough to be represented properly and should be amalgamated but that was nonsensical.

- Two area names were missing from the statement contained within paragraph 1.3 as follows: “The remaining Llandow, Llysworney and Llanmihangel and Llanmaes community wards would continue to form an Electoral ward of Llandow with 1 member;” namely St. Hilary and Llampha, therefore the report should be corrected.

- The proposals suggests that there were established local links, but these do not exist. Llandow had never had a local link with St. Hilary or Llanmaes therefore, the proposals were a mishmash of nonsensical, imagined, local community connections and there was not one community council that Councillor Cave currently represented that thought the proposals were a good idea.

- The proposals, if adopted, would result in losing a vast majority of community councillors, and said community councillors give their time for free and because of the love of their village that they reside in, not outlying villages.

- Llandow Community Council was likely to have to pay for Clerk redundancies if the proposal for a new ‘super community council’ was formed as proposed. There would be at least three to five Clerks applying for the one position, and therefore the amalgamated community councils would be asked to pay redundancy, for which, they had no idea how to fund.

Councillor Wilson then added that it was important to think about proportionality when talking about electoral wards and that financial implications in relation to the proposals would be a matter for Welsh Government to consider going forward. In response, Councillor Cave stated that the argument for proportionality would be overwhelmed by the argument for local ties, and the proposal report as presented did not give an accurate reflection of current local ties.

Councillor Perry then referred to pages 7 and 8 of the appended Draft Proposal Report and advised they were unable to gather from the map images provided what the suggested changes were. If consultees could not understand the changes being proposed, then The Commission’s consultation was flawed.

Councillors Summers and Godfrey both expressed how pleased they were to see subsequent changes suggested by The Commission, in response to their previously provided representations on behalf of their respective community councils; Penllyn and Wenvoe.

Following comments raised by the committee, the Monitoring Officer offered the following points of advice:

- In response to any comments raised as to the necessity of the review, the relevant legislation was set out within the covering report.
- In relation to Councillor Cave's comments on the inaccuracies contained within paragraph 1.3 of the covering report, these would be passed to the Electoral Registration Manager for consideration following the meeting and responded to in due course. These references were points which came out of the previous report which was considered by the Committee.
- On the matter of Clerk redundancies, if the proposals were introduced, and any impact these would have, would be a matter for The Commission to consider as part of the consultation.
- The Monitoring Officer was unable to comment on related costs for the review as the review was a legal requirement in line with the Welsh Government Framework, but the Monitoring Officer reiterated that Members should submit their comments and concerns to the Commission.
- In response to Councillor Perry's comments, individual maps were also available on The Commission's website and members were encouraged to raise any queries directly with The Commission.
- It was recognised that Members of the Committee would be experts in their individual ward areas and therefore, they were encouraged to submit representations to The Commission directly before the end of the consultation period on the 12th of November. After which, The Commission would reflect on all submissions received.
- The Monitoring Officer reminded Members that the proposals came out of the earlier Community area review which was completed earlier in the year which updated community boundaries. The current electoral review was therefore based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect.
- Once announced by The Commission, final proposals would be put before the Community Liaison Committee for information.

With no further comments or questions, the Committee subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals, as set out in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.11 of the covering report, be noted.
- (2) T H A T the report be referred to the Special Full Council meeting on 3rd November 2025, including the comments raised by Committee Members at the meeting as part of the supporting reference.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) Having regard to the contents of the report on the Vale of Glamorgan Council's recommended response to the Commission's Initial Proposals of the review.

(2) To update Council and to approve the Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals, having considered the comments of the Community Liaison Committee in advance.

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Special Hybrid meeting held on 3rd November, 2025.

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

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

Present: Councillor Naomi Marshallsea (Mayor); Councillors Anne Asbrey, Julie Aviet, Gareth Ball, Rhiannon Birch, Gillian Bruce, Ian Buckley, Lis Burnett, Samantha Campbell, George Carroll, Christine Cave, Janice Charles, Millie Collins, Marianne Cowpe, Brandon Dodd, Pamela Drake, Anthony Ernest, Robert Fisher, Christopher Franks, Wendy Gilligan, Russell Godfrey, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, Stephen Haines, 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, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Elliot Penn, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Carys Stallard, Neil Thomas, Steffan Wiliam, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

407 ANNOUNCEMENT –

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

408 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors Bronwen Brooks, Charles Champion, Vince Driscoll and Rhys Thomas.

409 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interests were received.

410 DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION CYMRU – VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS (REF) –

The Leader presented the report, a reference from Community Liaison Committee on 16th October, 2025, and shared that the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru Act 2013 required a review of the municipal area once every 12 years, and that this review considered several elements such as the number of Members, Wards, Members within Wards and Ward names for example. She noted that on 5th June, 2025, the initial consultation was published, and the proposals being considered today were published on 2nd October, 2025, with the deadline for responses being 12th November, 2025. The Leader highlighted that Section 2.2 of the report provided a summary of the changes being proposed, and that this was initially shared with Community Liaison Committee on 16th November, 2025, to share their views, which had been included within the agenda.

Councillor Birch, Chair of Community Liaison Committee, shared that they discussed this item thoroughly, that all views that were shared were within the minutes, and that there was very little in terms of the proposals that was not covered during the discussion, including the usage of Welsh naming conventions.

The Leader concluded that the report along with the minutes of both Community Liaison Committee and Council would be shared with the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru, and that individuals and Town and Community Councils were able to submit their own responses to the Commission.

Councillor Carroll shared that the boundary review process did not often interest the wider public as it was highly bureaucratic, but that he was aware of concerns with some of the proposals, including those related to the Western Vale. He indicated that they were rigorously scrutinised at Community Liaison Committee, and it was clear that the proposed arrangements did not serve in the interests of effective local government, and that there should be a range of factors to be balanced when drawing boundaries including population sparsity and electoral parity, whilst ensuring that boundaries were clear and well defined considering local ties. He reflected that St Brides Major and Llandow's proposed boundaries seemed bizarre, including Saint Mary's Hill being incorporated in the same electoral unit as St Donats, Marcross, and Monknash communities, and how Saint Hilary had been included in the Llandow ward. He welcomed many of the draft proposals but indicated they were unable to support this particular element as it was important to represent communities who were dissatisfied with proposals. He further reminded Members of the purpose of democratic representation, where communities should identify with electoral units with a strong sense of place and local identity, and encouraged the Council to relook at these proposals as he felt they did not encourage strong local government.

Councillor Cave reflected on what had happened in the Llandow ward in the last 10 years, and that when they were initially elected, this ward included Ewenny and Colwinston, which were subsequently moved to St Brides ward, and felt that these proposals were looking at Wards being sectioned off again based on being told they were too large, and now being told they are too small. She referred to the previous reorganisation and how she felt that Community Councils were heavily beaten, including the merging of Colwinston and Llangan Community Councils, and that dedicated Members were being asked to consult upon something they were unhappy with, including the possibility of a further merger with St Brides Major, which could impact upon local representation and stop people from feeling part of the democratic process. She noted that one of the drivers for change was due to the area being undemocratic as they did not regularly hold elections, but this was because people knew each other and that individuals who were seeking election were best placed to represent the community, meaning there was no need for others to come forward for a contested election. She further highlighted the lack of representation for Colwinston and Llangan communities, where there were several dedicated people who had worked for communities for a long time were now being told they formed part of the St Brides area, and emphasised that the views represented the Llandow area.

Councillor Mahoney shared that he felt the report was factually inaccurate, highlighting the Commission noting "the existing Cosmeston ward", which did not exist. He referred to the previous consultation, which the public were not aware of, and alerted residents, resulting in residents making 55 replies on behalf of 400 houses, with 53 objecting to the changes. He indicated that the consultation process was a farce, as it would be waved through despite public opposition. They reflected that one of the concerns was being placed within Penarth

Town Council area, which could lead to an increase in their Council Tax, that local representation would be reduced and that the Council should reject the report. He closed that residents felt strongly around the use of the Sully place name of Norman origin, and not to use the Welsh name, Sili.

Councillor Wilson noted that this Consultation was around the Council area as a whole and did not relate directly to communities, which was consulted upon previously. He indicated that the Commission's key area of focus was proportionality, but referenced that all wards were different, unique and with their own interests, but that there was a need to focus the debate upon the whole county area and not local communities.

Councillor Dr. Johnson said that the recommendations were the results of two previous reports, including the desire to merge Community Councils and reduce from 26 to 20 Councils, and following inquiry, increasing the number of Councillors to 59, based on several factors including population, poverty and rurality. He emphasised that Members had talked upon current boundaries, not what had been considered as part of the proposals. He noted that as a group, Plaid Cymru supported the decision to merge Cosmeston and Plymouth areas due to the population size, they had no comment on Dinas Powys and Barry boundary changes and Waterfront ward, did not support the merging of Wenvoe and St Nicholas and Llancafarn and supported the creation of a rural ward North of Cowbridge for local communities. He said that the only controversial changes were in the Western Vale, including Llanmaes not wanting to be part of Llantwit Major area, which would be a geographically significant ward, and that it would have been possibly to combine Llangan, St Mary and Ystradowen to create an area above the A48, but this was not possible due to the rules in dividing a community. He further referenced the meeting of Community Liaison Committee and Councillor Cave's wants to keep the current ward, which would be outside legal processes, and that there had been no alternative solutions offered, and emphasised that these changes related to the 2027 elections, where there could be different elected Members.

Councillor Ernest shared comments surrounding the proposals relating to Cosmeston and Plymouth wards and highlighted how the Plymouth ward was grossly underrepresented, and only had 2 Councillors presently, and that the Commission belatedly recognised the underrepresentation being this the case 10 years ago. He reflected that even with 3 Councillors covering the ward, they would still be stretched as all local Members were hardworking, and that Cosmeston had never been part of Penarth, with closer local ties to Sully and Lavernock.

Councillor Protheroe shared that she was a Councillor in the Western Vale, and highlighted the geographical spread of her ward, covering approximately 12 miles, with several Community Councils and villages. She referenced the potential increase in villages and how they would still maintain their distinct identities and also highlighted how this piece of work was being undertaken by the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru, and not the Council. She highlighted what Elected Members did for their residents, irrespective of urban or rural, which would have an impact and reserved judgement of the value of an additional Councillor within her ward, as this would be dependent upon who was elected, and how they supported their communities.

Councillor Perry highlighted that changes in Town and Community Councils' election cycles alongside changes to the number of elected Members resulted in less democracy, and that there needed to be more effort to increase involvement in democracy and involvement in Community Councils.

Councillor Haines raised the increase in the number of Councillors, which would be less value for money for the taxpayer, and stated disagreement with Councillor Wilson's previous comments surrounding communities, and that there needed to be considerations for historic local areas.

Councillor Goodjohn emphasised that Council was not endorsing the report, but the response to the Commission, based on the contents of this meeting and the previous meeting of Community Liaison Committee, ensuring that everyone's viewpoints were considered.

Councillor Dr. Johnson queried the purpose of the vote, to which the Leader advised this was to agree for consultation responses to be submitted, whilst also emphasising that individuals were entitled to submit their own responses. Councillor Carroll also sought additional clarity as to whether this was voting for the forwarding of all comments from the meetings, or if they were voting to endorse the Commission's proposals, to which the Chief Executive advised that it was for all minutes to be sent the Commission.

The vote took place as follows:

Member	For	Against	Abstain
Anne Asbrey	√		
Julie Aviet	√		
Gareth Ball	√		
Rhiannon Birch	√		
Gillian Bruce		√	
Ian Buckley	√		
Lis Burnett	√		
Samantha Campbell	√		
George Carroll		√	
Christine Cave		√	
Janice Charles		√	
Amelia Collins	√		
Marianne Cowpe	√		
Pamela Drake	√		
Anthony Ernest		√	
Christopher Franks	√		
Wendy Gilligan	√		
Russell Godfrey		√	
Ewan Goodjohn	√		

Member	For	Against	Abstain
Emma Goodjohn	√		
Stephen Haines		√	
Sally Hanks	√		
William Hennessy		√	
Nic Hodges	√		
Mark Hooper	√		
Catherine Iannucci-Williams	√		
Gwyn John	√		
Ian Johnson	√		
Susan Lloyd-Selby	√		
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	√		
Julie Lynch-Wilson	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	
Naomi Marshallsea	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Helen Payne	√		
Elliot Penn	√		
Sandra Perkes	√		
Ian Perry			√
Joanna Protheroe	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
Carys Stallard	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Steffan Wiliam	√		
Margaret Wilkinson	√		
Eddie Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		
Nicholas Wood		√	

Member	For	Against	Abstain
Total	37	10	1

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the draft response to the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru’s initial proposals as outlined within the report be noted.

(2) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council’s formal response for submission to Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru by 12th November, 2025 be approved.

Reason for decisions

(1&2) Having regard to the discussions at the meeting and to enable Council to submit a response to the Consultation.

Meeting of:	Community Liaison Committee
Date of Meeting:	Thursday, 16 October 2025
Relevant Scrutiny Committee:	Corporate Performance and Resources
Report Title:	Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru – Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Arrangements Review
Purpose of Report:	To update the Committee on the Council’s preferred scheme for submission to the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru to consider as part of the Vale of Glamorgan’s Electoral Arrangements Review
Report Owner:	Rob Thomas Electoral Registration Officer
Responsible Officer:	Rob Thomas Electoral Registration Officer
Elected Member and Officer Consultation:	This report has Council wide implications, and all Ward Members have been forwarded a copy of the report
Policy Framework:	This is a matter for resolution by Council
<p>Executive Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru etc. Act 2013 requires the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (“the Commission”) to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area in Wales at least once every 12 years. On the 21st March 2025 Welsh Government accepted, in full, the Commission’s Final Recommendations for the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025. The electoral arrangements are defined as: The number of members of the Council for the principal area, in this case the Vale of Glamorgan; The number, type and boundaries of the electoral wards into which the principal area is for the time being divided for the purpose for the election of members; The number of members to be elected for any electoral ward in the principal area; and The name of any electoral ward. 	

- The Commission commenced the Electoral Review for the Vale of Glamorgan on 5 June 2025 and this Council commented in brief on the initial consultation undertaken by the Commission, with reports presented to Community Liaison Committee and Council.
- The Commission published their Initial Proposals on 2 October 2025 and is consulting until the 12th November 2025.
- The Commission has encouraged the Vale of Glamorgan Council to provide a scheme of effective representations as part of the consultation by 12 November 2025. To this end, this report includes a set of recommendations for consideration of the Boundary Commission.

Recommendations

1. That Community Liaison Committee considers the report which contains the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals as set out in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10 and comments on the same.
2. That this report be referred to a Special Council meeting on the 3 November 2025, along with any recommendations from this Committee for consideration.

Reasons for Recommendations

1. To apprise the Community Liaison Committee of the Council's recommended response to the Commission's Initial Proposals of the review and to seek views on the same.
2. To update Council and to approve the Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru etc. Act 2013 requires the Commission to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area in Wales at least once every 12 years.
- 1.2 On the 21st March 2025 the Cabinet Secretary for Housing and Local Government accepted the Commission's Final Recommendation Report for the Vale of Glamorgan Community Review. The Commission is therefore conducting this electoral review on the basis of those community areas as they will stand once the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025, comes into force.
- 1.3 The Commission's Electoral Review Programme 2025 sets out the Commission's programme and states the Electoral Review for the Vale of Glamorgan will conclude by March 2026 as outlined in the Commission's Electoral Reviews: 2025 Policy and Practice document.

1.3 As part of the Commission's Initial Consultation which commenced on 5 June 2025, Community Liaison Committee noted and agreed on 1 July 2025 the Commission's Electoral Reviews: 2025 Policy and Practice Document, its Council Size Policy and the Council's observations to be submitted in response to the Initial Consultation namely:

In terms of the current Llandow electoral ward, this currently spans an area at the northernmost part of the Vale of Glamorgan in and around Ruthin and St Mary Hill to the rural area to the north of Llantwit Major (in and around Llanmaes). In terms of the ratio of population to members, the variance from the county average is 20-50% above. As a consequence, there is potential scope to consider current arrangements with neighbouring wards, not least St Bride's Major. This would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1)

and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3. The remaining Llandow, Llyswoorney and Llanmihangel and Llanmaes community wards would continue to form an Electoral ward of Llandow with 1 member. The result of this change would be to increase representation across the principal area by 1 member. The other alternative is to of course, retain the status quo albeit with a population variance of 20—50%.

In terms of Plymouth, there also exists a population to member variance of 20% - 50% and alongside this, the creation of a new Cosmeston ward at Community level (and forming part of Penarth town Council) has a population to member variance of more than 50% below. It would therefore seem opportune to merge Plymouth and Cosmeston community wards into a larger electoral ward and increasing the number of members to 3 (from 2), thereby increasing the representation for the principal area by a further 1 member. This would seem more rational than the creation of a single member ward for Cosmeston with a significant population variance of more than 50% below.

In terms of Wenvoe, this electoral ward has a population variance of between 20% and 50% above. All surrounding wards are between +/- 10%. In terms of geographical relationship, one solution could be to look at amalgamating Wenvoe and St Nicholas/Llancarfan into a single electoral ward with 2 members. This would create a ward of significant geographical extent, albeit with the advantage of 2 members. This would not increase the number of members in the principal area but rather amalgamate two single member wards. The other solution would be to simply accept the position and retain the status quo.

In terms of other issues, it is worth noting that a new principal area ward will be created at the Waterfront which will have representation in the form of 2 members, and it is also proposed that Dyfan has an increase of 1 member from 2 to 3. This is as set out in the final recommendations of the Community Review from the Boundary Commission, which have already been agreed by Welsh Government and will come in to force at the next Local Government Elections in 2027.

Below is a link to the 1 July 2025 minutes and report

[Minutes](#)

[Democracy Boundary Commission VoG Review](#)

- 1.4** The Council's observations were reported to Council and resolved on 14 July 2025. A link to the minutes can be found [here](#).

2. Key Issues for Consideration

2.1 A copy of the Commission's Initial Proposals (**Appendix A**) was published on its website on 2 October 2025. A period of consultation will run from 2 October 2025 to 12 November 2025. The Commission welcomes representations concerning any of the proposals in its Initial Proposals Report. Evidence based representations are sought and include the postal, email and portal routes.

2.2 The report in summary recommends the following changes:

1. The existing Electoral ward of Cadoc has the existing Welsh Language name of Cadog, and the existing English Language name of Cadoc. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Cadog to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
2. The existing Electoral ward of Illtyd has the existing Welsh Language name of Illtud, and the existing English Language name of Illtyd. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Illtud to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
3. The existing Electoral ward of St Nicholas and Llancarfan has the existing Welsh Language name of Sain Nicolas a Llancarfan, and the existing English language name of St Nicholas and Llancarfan. The Commission proposes to apply the new single name of Sain Nicolas Llancarfan. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name. The Welsh Language Commissioner also suggested that both forms of St Nicholas and Sain Nicolas were acceptable as per the list of Standard Welsh-place names. The Commission recommends a single name based on its naming policy to provide single names where possible.
4. The existing Electoral Ward of Rhoose has the existing Welsh Language name of Y Rhws, and the existing English Language name of Rhoose. The Commission proposes to apply the single name of Y Rhws to the electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name.
5. The Commission proposes to combine the existing electoral wards of Cosmeston and Plymouth in order to address the levels of variance from the proposed county average in both existing wards. This proposal provides for significant improvements to electoral parity, combines two electoral wards that are part of the same Town Council area and retains the overall number of councillors for the wards at three.

6. The Commission proposes the new single electoral ward name of Cosmeston Plymouth. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed single name for the new ward.
7. The Commission proposes to transfer the Community of Colwinston and Llangan from the Llandow electoral ward into the St Bride's Major electoral ward. The Commission proposes to allocate an additional county councillor to the St Bride's Major electoral ward, which results in the St Bride's Major electoral ward being represented by three county councillors. This proposal addresses the existing level of variance in the Llandow electoral ward and increases the overall number of county councillors in the area by one.
8. The Commission proposes to create a new single member electoral ward formed of the Community of Penllyn. The Commission also proposes to create a new two-member electoral ward formed of the Town of Cowbridge with Llanblethian.
9. As a result of these proposals the Commission proposes to apply the single electoral ward name of Pen-llin. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed names and advises that Pen-llin is the only standard form recommended in the Standard Welsh Place-names list.
10. As a result of these proposals the recommended number of County Councillors increases from the current 54 to 59 which would take effect for the Local Government Elections in 2027. This represents +1 from the 58 recommended in the Vale of Glamorgan Council Community Review, accepted by WG on the 21st March 2025. The changes can be viewed in the Commission's table of recommendations at **(Appendix B)**

- 2.3** In relation to the proposals, and dealing with each in turn, the following comments are made, firstly in relation to Ward arrangements.
- 2.4** The largest under representation under proposals is Wenvoe (+23%) and largest overrepresentation is Llandow (-19%).
- 2.5** In consideration of the proposed Cosmeston Plymouth ward, this is supported, given the population variance across what would otherwise be two separate wards. This issue is covered in detail on pages 13 and 14 of the Commission's report.
- 2.6** In consideration of the proposals for Pen-llin and Cowbridge / Y Bontfaen, these are also supported. There is, without doubt a logic to the creation of a single member ward for Pen-llin given its geographic extent and rurality, covering as it does the north and north western rural hinterland of what currently is the wider Cowbridge ward. These proposed changes are covered on pages 19 to 21 (inclusive) of the commission's report

- 2.7** The proposals relating to the transfer of Colwinston and Llangan to St Brides Major are set out on pages 15 to 18 inclusive and are also supported given the level of variance in the Llandow ward.
- 2.8** Members will recall that in the earlier consultation there was a proposal to consider amalgamating the Wenvoe ward and the St Nicholas/Llancarfan ward. This has not been progressed.
- 2.9** There are no changes to those proposals as set out earlier for the creation of a new 2 member Waterfront ward in Barry, which has resulted from the community review arrangements already undertaken.
- 2.10** In summary, and in terms of wards and members, 21 wards are unaffected by this review. The changes will result in 26 wards with 59 members, the details of which are included in the report at Appendix 2.
- 2.11** Finally, the Commission's general practice is to recommend single Welsh names where acceptable in English, retaining bilingual forms where the Welsh and English names are distinct. Members may wish to express views on specific names (e.g., Cadog for Cadoc, Illtud for Illtyd, Y Rhws for Rhoose, Sain Nicolas Llancarfan), or to advocate a broader single-Welsh naming approach for consistency (noting pros/cons for voter recognition and electoral materials). The draft Council response takes no position on names beyond accuracy and clarity.

3. How do proposals evidence the Five Ways of Working and contribute to our Well-being Objectives?

- 3.1** The review of Principal area arrangements safeguards the long-term needs of local residents to ensure an effective and convenient local government and electoral equality.
- 3.2** The Vale of Glamorgan Council will be submitting a proposal to the Commission in line with effective collaboration between bodies.
- 3.3** The Commission is undertaking the review, but the Vale of Glamorgan Council will ensure that it will support the Commission in ensuring the relevant notices are published and facilitating presentations to encourage engagement with stakeholders.

4. Climate Change and Nature Implications

- 4.1** There are no direct climate change implications associated with the undertaking of the review.

5. Resources and Legal Considerations

Financial

- 5.1** There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Employment

- 5.2** There are no employment implications arising as a result of this report.

Legal (Including Equalities)

- 5.3** Each principal council has a duty to monitor the communities in its area and, where appropriate, the electoral arrangements of such communities for the purpose of considering whether to make or recommend changes. These changes are brought about by means of community boundary reviews under s25 and community electoral reviews under s31 of the Act.
- 5.4** The statutory process for conducting a community review is set out in Part 3 of the Act.
- 5.5** Section 34 of the Act stipulates the ‘mandatory consultees’ for a community review.
- 5.6** When conducting a community review the principal council must have regard to its statutory obligations – for example obligations under the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, Welsh Language Standards, and the Equality Act 2010, which will all influence and inform the conduct and decisions made during a community review.
- 5.7** The Council will ensure that any submission and subsequent constitutional or procedural changes arising from this report are compliant with the legislation referred to above.

6. Background Papers The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru Draft proposals report

DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION CYMRU – VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS REVIEW –

On behalf of the Council's Electoral Registration Officer and Chief Executive, the report was presented by the Council's Monitoring Officer. The purpose of which was to advise Committee that The Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru etc. Act 2013 required the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru ("The Commission") to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area in Wales at least once every 12 years.

On the 21st of March 2025, Welsh Government accepted, in full, the Commission's Final Recommendations for the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025.

The electoral arrangements were defined as:

- The number of Members of the Council for the principal area, in this case the Vale of Glamorgan.
- The number, type, and boundaries of the electoral wards into which the principal area was for the time being divided for the purpose for the election of Members.
- The number of Members to be elected for any electoral ward in the principal area; and
- The name of any electoral ward.

For context, the Monitoring Officer advised that The Commission commenced the Electoral Review for the Vale of Glamorgan on the 5th of June 2025 and would conclude by March 2026. The review follows the completion earlier this year of the Vale of Glamorgan (Communities) Order 2025, which updated community boundaries. The current electoral review was therefore based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect. The Vale of Glamorgan Council commented in brief on the initial consultation undertaken by the Commission, with reports presented to both the Community Liaison Committee and Council.

The Commission published their Initial Proposals on the 2nd of October 2025 and was consulting until the 12th of November 2025. Therefore, it was felt timely to present the report to Committee within the consultation window.

The Commission had encouraged the Vale of Glamorgan Council to provide a scheme of effective representations as part of the consultation by the 12th of November. To this end, the report included a set of ten proposed recommendations from the Boundary Commission, at paragraph 2.2 of the covering report, and the Vale of Glamorgan Council's subsequent responses at paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10, for consideration.

In conclusion, the Monitoring Officer advised that individual Town and Community Councils and indeed any individual member from any Town and Community Council could make representations directly to the Boundary Commission in the same way as any Vale of Glamorgan Elected Member before the 12th of November 2025. The consultation email address was included within the appended Draft Proposals Review Report.

Following the Monitoring Officer's presentation, Councillor Cave raised a series of concerns as the long standing ward member for Llandow, as follows:

- Five years previously, it was decided that the Llandow Ward was too large and that the areas of Ewenny and Corntown be removed and placed under the Wick area. The current proposals suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick. So, it appears that the Llandow Ward is slowly being renamed as Wick, and it was unclear why that would be the case.
- The area of Troes is not mentioned at all within the report.
- In presenting the report, the Monitoring Officer referred to local community relationships and those being the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were asking for. However, one of the strongest links in the Llandow community exists between the villages of Llysworney and Colwinston. This was a strong connection due to Members of Llandow Community Council being invited to sit as governors on the new school in Colwinston, following previous school closures, and the arrangement still exists. As such, Llandow had very strong links with Colwinston as children from Llandow and Llangan attend the school in Colwinston. The current proposals suggest that the link be severed so that Llandow Community Council Representatives would no longer have a say in the Colwinston School, which was unsatisfactory.
- The proposals also suggest that Councillor Cave represents too many people in the Llandow Ward however, Councillor Cave was happy with their current workload and believed it to be value for money, which was what the Vale of Glamorgan Council should be focused on. In fact, Councillor Cave would welcome the areas of Ewenny and Corntown to rejoin Llandow to give greater value for money.
- It was unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers were supposed to fund five more elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan, especially when the currently elected members were saying that they were happy to continue with representing as is. No one was of the opinion that there was more money available to fund additional elected members.
- The statement contained within paragraph 1.3 of the covering report, "In terms of the current Llandow electoral ward, this currently spans an area at the

northernmost part of the Vale of Glamorgan in and around Ruthin and St Mary Hill to the rural area to the north of Llantwit Major (in and around Llanmaes)” was grossly and factually incorrect, and should be corrected, for the following reasons:

- The areas of Ruthin and St Mary Hill were also considered to be rural areas,
- The Llandow Ward was nowhere near Llanmaes and, sitting between Llanmaes and Llandow were other villages.
- Paragraph 1.3 goes on to state “In terms of the ratio of population to members, the variance from the county average is 20-50% above. As a consequence, there is potential scope to consider current arrangements with neighbouring wards, not least St Bride’s Major. This would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride’s Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3” suggesting that the remaining area of Llandow was not large enough to be represented properly and should be amalgamated but that was nonsensical.
- Two area names were missing from the statement contained within paragraph 1.3 as follows: “The remaining Llandow, Llysworney and Llanmihangel and Llanmaes community wards would continue to form an Electoral ward of Llandow with 1 member;” namely St. Hilary and Llampha, therefore the report should be corrected.
- The proposals suggests that there were established local links, but these do not exist. Llandow had never had a local link with St. Hilary or Llanmaes therefore, the proposals were a mishmash of nonsensical, imagined, local community connections and there was not one community council that Councillor Cave currently represented that thought the proposals were a good idea.
- The proposals, if adopted, would result in losing a vast majority of community councillors, and said community councillors give their time for free and because of the love of their village that they reside in, not outlying villages.
- Llandow Community Council was likely to have to pay for Clerk redundancies if the proposal for a new ‘super community council’ was formed as proposed. There would be at least three to five Clerks applying for the one position, and therefore the amalgamated community councils would be asked to pay redundancy, for which, they had no idea how to fund.

Councillor Wilson then added that it was important to think about proportionality when talking about electoral wards and that financial implications in relation to the proposals would be a matter for Welsh Government to consider going forward. In response, Councillor Cave stated that the argument for proportionality would be overwhelmed by the argument for local ties, and the proposal report as presented did not give an accurate reflection of current local ties.

Councillor Perry then referred to pages 7 and 8 of the appended Draft Proposal Report and advised they were unable to gather from the map images provided what the suggested changes were. If consultees could not understand the changes being proposed, then The Commission's consultation was flawed.

Councillors Summers and Godfrey both expressed how pleased they were to see subsequent changes suggested by The Commission, in response to their previously provided representations on behalf of their respective community councils; Penllyn and Wenvoe.

Following comments raised by the committee, the Monitoring Officer offered the following points of advice:

- In response to any comments raised as to the necessity of the review, the relevant legislation was set out within the covering report.
- In relation to Councillor Cave's comments on the inaccuracies contained within paragraph 1.3 of the covering report, these would be passed to the Electoral Registration Manager for consideration following the meeting and responded to in due course. These references were points which came out of the previous report which was considered by the Committee.
- On the matter of Clerk redundancies, if the proposals were introduced, and any impact these would have, would be a matter for The Commission to consider as part of the consultation.
- The Monitoring Officer was unable to comment on related costs for the review as the review was a legal requirement in line with the Welsh Government Framework, but the Monitoring Officer reiterated that Members should submit their comments and concerns to the Commission.
- In response to Councillor Perry's comments, individual maps were also available on The Commission's website and members were encouraged to raise any queries directly with The Commission.
- It was recognised that Members of the Committee would be experts in their individual ward areas and therefore, they were encouraged to submit representations to The Commission directly before the end of the consultation period on the 12th of November. After which, The Commission would reflect on all submissions received.
- The Monitoring Officer reminded Members that the proposals came out of the earlier Community area review which was completed earlier in the year which updated community boundaries. The current electoral review was therefore based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect.
- Once announced by The Commission, final proposals would be put before the Community Liaison Committee for information.

With no further comments or questions, the Committee subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals, as set out in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.11 of the covering report, be noted.
- (2) T H A T the report be referred to the Special Full Council meeting on 3rd November 2025, including the comments raised by Committee Members at the meeting as part of the supporting reference.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) Having regard to the contents of the report on the Vale of Glamorgan Council's recommended response to the Commission's Initial Proposals of the review.
- (2) To update Council and to approve the Council's response to the Commission's Initial Proposals, having considered the comments of the Community Liaison Committee in advance.

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Special Hybrid meeting held on 3rd November, 2025.

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

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

Present: Councillor Naomi Marshallsea (Mayor); Councillors Anne Asbrey, Julie Aviet, Gareth Ball, Rhiannon Birch, Gillian Bruce, Ian Buckley, Lis Burnett, Samantha Campbell, George Carroll, Christine Cave, Janice Charles, Millie Collins, Marianne Cowpe, Brandon Dodd, Pamela Drake, Anthony Ernest, Robert Fisher, Christopher Franks, Wendy Gilligan, Russell Godfrey, Emma Goodjohn, Ewan Goodjohn, Stephen Haines, 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, Michael Morgan, Jayne Norman, Helen Payne, Elliot Penn, Sandra Perkes, Ian Perry, Joanna Protheroe, Ruba Sivagnanam, Carys Stallard, Neil Thomas, Steffan Wiliam, Margaret Wilkinson, Edward Williams, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Wood.

407 ANNOUNCEMENT –

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

408 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

These were received from Councillors Bronwen Brooks, Charles Champion, Vince Driscoll and Rhys Thomas.

409 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interests were received.

410 DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION CYMRU – VALE OF GLAMORGAN ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS (REF) –

The Leader presented the report, a reference from Community Liaison Committee on 16th October, 2025, and shared that the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru Act 2013 required a review of the municipal area once every 12 years, and that this review considered several elements such as the number of Members, Wards, Members within Wards and Ward names for example. She noted that on

5th June, 2025, the initial consultation was published, and the proposals being considered today were published on 2nd October, 2025, with the deadline for responses being 12th November, 2025. The Leader highlighted that Section 2.2 of the report provided a summary of the changes being proposed, and that this was initially shared with Community Liaison Committee on 16th November, 2025, to share their views, which had been included within the agenda.

Councillor Birch, Chair of Community Liaison Committee, shared that they discussed this item thoroughly, that all views that were shared were within the minutes, and that there was very little in terms of the proposals that was not covered during the discussion, including the usage of Welsh naming conventions.

The Leader concluded that the report along with the minutes of both Community Liaison Committee and Council would be shared with the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru, and that individuals and Town and Community Councils were able to submit their own responses to the Commission.

Councillor Carroll shared that the boundary review process did not often interest the wider public as it was highly bureaucratic, but that he was aware of concerns with some of the proposals, including those related to the Western Vale. He indicated that they were rigorously scrutinised at Community Liaison Committee, and it was clear that the proposed arrangements did not serve in the interests of effective local government, and that there should be a range of factors to be balanced when drawing boundaries including population sparsity and electoral parity, whilst ensuring that boundaries were clear and well defined considering local ties. He reflected that St Brides Major and Llandow's proposed boundaries seemed bizarre, including Saint Mary's Hill being incorporated in the same electoral unit as St Donats, Marcross, and Monknash communities, and how Saint Hilary had been included in the Llandow ward. He welcomed many of the draft proposals but indicated they were unable to support this particular element as it was important to represent communities who were dissatisfied with proposals. He further reminded Members of the purpose of democratic representation, where communities should identify with electoral units with a strong sense of place and local identity, and encouraged the Council to relook at these proposals as he felt they did not encourage strong local government.

Councillor Cave reflected on what had happened in the Llandow ward in the last 10 years, and that when they were initially elected, this ward included Ewenny and Colwinston, which were subsequently moved to St Brides ward, and felt that these proposals were looking at Wards being sectioned off again based on being told they were too large, and now being told they are too small. She referred to the previous reorganisation and how she felt that Community Councils were heavily beaten, including the merging of Colwinston and Llangan Community Councils, and that dedicated Members were being asked to consult upon something they were unhappy with, including the possibility of a further merger with St Brides Major, which could impact upon local representation and stop people from feeling part of the democratic process. She noted that one of the drivers for change was due to the area being undemocratic as they did not regularly hold elections, but this was because people knew each other and that individuals who were seeking election were best placed to represent the community, meaning there was no need for others to come forward for a contested election. She further highlighted the lack of representation for

Colwinston and Llangan communities, where there were several dedicated people who had worked for communities for a long time were now being told they formed part of the St Brides area, and emphasised that the views represented the Llandow area.

Councillor Mahoney shared that he felt the report was factually inaccurate, highlighting the Commission noting “the existing Cosmeston ward”, which did not exist. He referred to the previous consultation, which the public were not aware of, and alerted residents, resulting in residents making 55 replies on behalf of 400 houses, with 53 objecting to the changes. He indicated that the consultation process was a farce, as it would be waved through despite public opposition. They reflected that one of the concerns was being placed within Penarth Town Council area, which could lead to an increase in their Council Tax, that local representation would be reduced and that the Council should reject the report. He closed that residents felt strongly around the use of the Sully place name of Norman origin, and not to use the Welsh name, Sili.

Councillor Wilson noted that this Consultation was around the Council area as a whole and did not relate directly to communities, which was consulted upon previously. He indicated that the Commission’s key area of focus was proportionality, but referenced that all wards were different, unique and with their own interests, but that there was a need to focus the debate upon the whole county area and not local communities.

Councillor Dr. Johnson said that the recommendations were the results of two previous reports, including the desire to merge Community Councils and reduce from 26 to 20 Councils, and following inquiry, increasing the number of Councillors to 59, based on several factors including population, poverty and rurality. He emphasised that Members had talked upon current boundaries, not what had been considered as part of the proposals. He noted that as a group, Plaid Cymru supported the decision to merge Cosmeston and Plymouth areas due to the population size, they had no comment on Dinas Powys and Barry boundary changes and Waterfront ward, did not support the merging of Wenvoe and St Nicholas and Llancarfan and supported the creation of a rural ward North of Cowbridge for local communities. He said that the only controversial changes were in the Western Vale, including Llanmaes not wanting to be part of Llantwit Major area, which would be a geographically significant ward, and that it would have been possibly to combine Llangan, St Mary and Ystradowen to create an area above the A48, but this was not possible due to the rules in dividing a community. He further referenced the meeting of Community Liaison Committee and Councillor Cave’s wants to keep the current ward, which would be outside legal processes, and that there had been no alternative solutions offered, and emphasised that these changes related to the 2027 elections, where there could be different elected Members.

Councillor Ernest shared comments surrounding the proposals relating to Cosmeston and Plymouth wards and highlighted how the Plymouth ward was grossly underrepresented, and only had 2 Councillors presently, and that the Commission belatedly recognised the underrepresentation being this the case 10 years ago. He reflected that even with 3 Councillors covering the ward, they would

still be stretched as all local Members were hardworking, and that Cosmeston had never been part of Penarth, with closer local ties to Sully and Lavernock.

Councillor Protheroe shared that she was a Councillor in the Western Vale, and highlighted the geographical spread of her ward, covering approximately 12 miles, with several Community Councils and villages. She referenced the potential increase in villages and how they would still maintain their distinct identities and also highlighted how this piece of work was being undertaken by the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru, and not the Council. She highlighted what Elected Members did for their residents, irrespective of urban or rural, which would have an impact and reserved judgement of the value of an additional Councillor within her ward, as this would be dependent upon who was elected, and how they supported their communities.

Councillor Perry highlighted that changes in Town and Community Councils' election cycles alongside changes to the number of elected Members resulted in less democracy, and that there needed to be more effort to increase involvement in democracy and involvement in Community Councils.

Councillor Haines raised the increase in the number of Councillors, which would be less value for money for the taxpayer, and stated disagreement with Councillor Wilson's previous comments surrounding communities, and that there needed to be considerations for historic local areas.

Councillor Goodjohn emphasised that Council was not endorsing the report, but the response to the Commission, based on the contents of this meeting and the previous meeting of Community Liaison Committee, ensuring that everyone's viewpoints were considered.

Councillor Dr. Johnson queried the purpose of the vote, to which the Leader advised this was to agree for consultation responses to be submitted, whilst also emphasising that individuals were entitled to submit their own responses. Councillor Carroll also sought additional clarity as to whether this was voting for the forwarding of all comments from the meetings, or if they were voting to endorse the Commission's proposals, to which the Chief Executive advised that it was for all minutes to be sent the Commission.

The vote took place as follows:

	For	Against	Abstain
Anne Asbrey	√		
Julie Aviet	√		
Gareth Ball	√		
Rhiannon Birch	√		

	For	Against	Abstain
Gillian Bruce		√	
Ian Buckley	√		
Lis Burnett	√		
Samantha Campbell	√		
George Carroll		√	
Christine Cave		√	
Janice Charles		√	
Amelia Collins	√		
Marianne Cowpe	√		
Pamela Drake	√		
Anthony Ernest		√	
Christopher Franks	√		
Wendy Gilligan	√		
Russell Godfrey		√	
Ewan Goodjohn	√		
Emma Goodjohn	√		
Stephen Haines		√	
Sally Hanks	√		
William Hennessy		√	
Nic Hodges	√		
Mark Hooper	√		
Catherine Iannucci-Williams	√		
Gwyn John	√		

	For	Against	Abstain
Ian Johnson	√		
Susan Lloyd-Selby	√		
Belinda Loveluck-Edwards	√		
Julie Lynch-Wilson	√		
Kevin Mahoney		√	
Naomi Marshallsea	√		
Michael Morgan	√		
Jayne Norman	√		
Helen Payne	√		
Elliot Penn	√		
Sandra Perkes	√		
Ian Perry			√
Joanna Protheroe	√		
Ruba Sivagnanam	√		
Carys Stallard	√		
Neil Thomas	√		
Steffan Wiliam	√		
Margaret Wilkinson	√		
Eddie Williams	√		
Mark Wilson	√		
Nicholas Wood		√	
Total	37	10	1

RESOLVED –

- (1) T H A T the draft response to the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru's initial proposals as outlined within the report be noted.
- (2) T H A T the Vale of Glamorgan Council's formal response for submission to Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru by 12th November, 2025 be approved.

Reason for decisions

(1&2) Having regard to the discussions at the meeting and to enable Council to submit a response to the Consultation.

VOG 107 – Member of the Public

Dear Madam Chairman,

Colwinston is a thriving village on the western fringes of the Vale of Glamorgan. There are a number of active societies/clubs who work hard to unite the community, a school, public house and church. The local Community Council is a force for good within our community and ensures that our village receives the necessary funding to manage various sites within the village which are either poorly served or ignored by the Vale Council. We have strong historic ties with the neighbouring villages of Llandow and Llyswoerney through our school, church, local societies/clubs and village pub.

The village as a whole was affronted by the proposal put forward by the Vale Council that our Community Council should be merged with Llangan Community Council as there is absolutely no connection between our communities. The objection to this proposal was initially upheld but on appeal from the Vale Council the Boundary Commission then agreed with the objection and in time our village will be forced into a merged Community Council. A decision that flies in the face of the wishes of local people and is occurring simply because it fits a political model that frankly is totally unfit for purpose. Democracy it seems is unacceptable unless it fits this ridiculous model.

Our village now faces the prospect of our trusted and hard working Vale Councillor being swept up and becoming part of a super ward based around the Wick area of the Vale. Again a move away from local people and I suspect being proposed because it fits the prevailing political model that ignores community wishes, will prove inefficient and will isolate rural communities. Perhaps in return the Vale Council may consider extracting less revenue from rural communities by reducing the high level of council tax paid by the people of Colwinston and other rural communities. Not surprisingly this 'super ward' proposal will actually increase the cost of running the Vale Council at a time when services are being cut because of insufficient funds. Two much more options are available. Firstly for the 'merged' Community Council to have its own elected councillor in the VOGC secondly for our community to be included in the Llandow 'super' ward' where established connections already exist.

Our elected officials and public servants are charged with the responsibility of acting on the wishes of the electorate, currently many Vale Councillors and the Vale Council are failing in this important duty.

I urge the Boundary Commission to reject the proposal from the Vale Council to create a 'super ward' that takes in my community.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

VOG 109 – On behalf of a Community/Town Council

Good afternoon,

Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council wish to put forward a representation stating that they do not agree with the expenditure of 5 additional Councillors.

Kind regards,

Natasha
Natasha Alexander
Chief Officer

VOG 112 – Member of the Public

Leave them as they are, this proposal will create additional councillors at a cost that the Council can ill afford

Plaid Cymru Vale of Glamorgan (*Rhanbarth Bro Morgannwg Plaid Cymru*)
Response to Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan
Draft Proposals Report

Plaid Cymru note the Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice 2025 review in 2025 which identified 59 councillors as the preferred number of councillors for the Vale of Glamorgan, based on the formula being used by the Commission.

We also note the 2024 Communities Review for the Vale of Glamorgan, which included consequential changes in arrangements for the principal council (the Vale of Glamorgan), and provides the baseline for proposals in this review.

With regard to the Commission's draft recommendations

- We accept the merger of Cosmeston and Plymouth into a single three-member ward, although we would expect this to be reviewed once proposed housing in Cosmeston has been completed
- We support that no further boundary changes are proposed to boundaries in Barry and Dinas Powys subsequent to those proposed and accepted in the 2024 Communities Review.
- We support the proposal not to merge St Nicholas Llancaf fan ward with Wenvoe ward.
- We support the proposal to create a new single member rural ward to the north of Cowbridge, while maintaining a two-member ward based on the boundaries of Cowbridge Town Council
- We have concerns regarding the creation of a three-member ward in St Bride's Major, merging the existing ward with the Colwinston and Llangan community, and removing those from the Llandow ward. This is because we are concerned that geographically large wards impact upon the ability of local council members to carry out their role effectively, and in this case is a more important consideration than electoral parity. This is particularly a factor if elected councillors in a large multi-member ward are from different political groups.

VOG 113 – On behalf of an organisation (Public or Private)

Attached submission from Vale of Glamorgan Plaid Cymru

Plaid Cymru Vale of Glamorgan (*Rhanbarth Bro Morgannwg Plaid Cymru*)

Response to Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan Draft Proposals Report

Plaid Cymru note the Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice 2025 review in 2025 which identified 59 councillors as the preferred number of councillors for the Vale of Glamorgan, based on the formula being used by the Commission.

We also note the 2024 Communities Review for the Vale of Glamorgan, which included consequential changes in arrangements for the principal council (the Vale of Glamorgan), and provides the baseline for proposals in this review.

With regard to the Commission's draft recommendations

- We accept the merger of Cosmeston and Plymouth into a single three-member ward, although we would expect this to be reviewed once proposed housing in Cosmeston has been completed
- We support that no further boundary changes are proposed to boundaries in Barry and Dinas Powys subsequent to those proposed and accepted in the 2024 Communities Review.
- We support the proposal not to merge St Nicholas Llancarfan ward with Wenvoe ward.
- We support the proposal to create a new single member rural ward to the north of Cowbridge, while maintaining a two-member ward based on the boundaries of Cowbridge Town Council
- We have concerns regarding the creation of a three-member ward in St Bride's Major, merging the existing ward with the Colwinston and Llangan community, and removing those from the Llandow ward. This is because we are concerned that geographically large wards impact upon the ability of local council members to carry out their role effectively, and in this case is a more important consideration than electoral parity. This is particularly a factor if elected councillors in a large multi-member ward are from different political groups.

VOG 114 – On behalf of a Community/Town Council

Good afternoon

Attached is the response from Llanmaes Community Council

Kind regards

Wendy Allin

Clerk to Llanmaes Community Council

Llanmaes Community Council Input

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft proposals for The Electoral

Arrangements of

the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan. Llanmaes Community Council has no objections to

what is proposed and thanks the Commission and its officers for reviewing and considering our earlier input.

Yours faithfully etc

VOG 115 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 116 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals. Yours faithfully,

VOG 117 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 118 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

- Llandough is surrounded by farmland and countryside and this gives Llandough specific boundaries separate from places such as Penarth and Dinas Powis.
- The electorate is mainly the same in principal and maintaining this will give Llandough it's own voice and representation
- Llandough, is a separate and individual village with it's own needs and environment. It has it's own culture and community spirit and separate from other towns and villages surrounding it. Having a specific councilor responsible for Llandough makes it more convenient for the local residents to be able to approach and be represented by a named and known councilor

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 119 – Member of the Public

To whom it concerns

It is vital to the Llandough community that Llandough retains the ward of Llandough.

Llandough is truly isolated from Penarth, and Dinas Powys is unique by its separation.

Llandough has issues that only affect Llandough, and our particular issues have no effect on Penarth, for this reason it is so important that Llandough retain the ward of Llandough, our issues have no bearing on Penarth.

Llandough boundaries are clearly defined, an area separated from Dinas Powys, and Penarth.

I have been a resident of Llandough for over fifty years, and have seen the ward of Llandough thrive, it is vital for our community we keep our independence.

Yours most sincerely

[REDACTED]

VOG 120 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 121 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

We are residents of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. We write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 122 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 123 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

Sent from my iPhone

VOG 124 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing as a resident of the Llandough ward in the Vale of Glamorgan to express my strong support for the retention of the Llandough ward in the forthcoming review of electoral boundaries.

There are several compelling reasons why Llandough should remain as a standalone single-member ward:

1. Clear, distinctive boundaries that reflect the community

The existing ward enjoys well-defined natural and built features that separate it from neighbouring areas. To the east lies the Merrie Harrier junction on the A4055/B4267 which provides a recognisable boundary with Penarth, and to the north and west there is a broad belt of farmland separating Llandough from Dinas Powys. These features help to underpin a strong and recognisable community identity, so maintaining the current ward boundary better reflects the lived reality of local residents.

2. Strong alignment with the target electoral-parity objective

The current electorate of Llandough is closely aligned with the county-average number of electors per councillor, meaning that retaining this ward will support the review's objective of equalising representation across the Vale of Glamorgan. In other words, Llandough is already doing the job of providing fair representation, and a change risks disturbing that balance.

3. Cohesive community character and local ties

Llandough, along with neighbouring areas such as Leckwith and Michaelston le Pit and Leckwith, share a semi-rural or village-edge character: lower population densities, open land, a sense of village community, and ties to the local allotments, parks and green space. These shared characteristics differentiate them from larger, more urbanised settlements like Penarth or Dinas Powys. Maintaining Llandough as a distinct ward enables local residents to elect a councillor whose focus is tailored to the specific rural/semi-rural needs of the area.

4. Effective local governance via a single-member ward

Keeping the ward as a single-councillor division is in the interest of clear accountability and simplicity. A single representative can build deep local knowledge, respond swiftly to ward-specific issues (such as planning, green belt pressures, traffic through Leckwith Road/B4267, allotment management and local parks) and thereby deliver more convenient and effective local governance. Splitting or merging the ward might reduce this focus, dilute the voice of the community, and complicate local representation.

5. Established local civic infrastructure and voice

The community of Llandough already possesses strong local structures: the Llandough Community Council explicitly describes its mission as "serving our community, preserving our identity." It engages actively with the Vale of Glamorgan Council's highways and visible services departments and feeds into the Community Liaison Committee. That infrastructure is aligned to the current ward shape and helpfully reinforces the argument for the ward's retention rather than its dilution or merger.

6. Recognising rurality and local distinctiveness in the review criteria

According to the guidance from Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru, when reviewing wards, factors such as rurality and local community ties must be taken into account alongside numerical equality. Llandough's semi-rural character, green open spaces, allotments and village-green amenities mean it fulfils a distinct role in the Vale—not simply as a suburb of a larger town. To merge it into a larger, urbanised ward would be to ignore those defined local distinctions.

7. Local services and identity demand a dedicated voice

Llandough hosts its own local amenities: for example, King George V Playing Field, a community-owned village green, and a 67-plot allotment site. These enhance local pride and community engagement. Given these specific assets, this area is best served by a councillor whose remit is solely focused on this ward rather than one whose responsibilities are diluted across a larger, less coherent geography.

8. Risk of weakening community representation if merged

Were Llandough to be merged with a neighbouring, more populous or urban ward, the unique voice of Llandough residents could potentially be overshadowed by those of larger, more concentrated populations. Retaining the ward as it is ensures that the concerns of this community—such as traffic on the B4267, the preservation of local allotments, village character and the rural fringe—continue to receive appropriate attention.

In conclusion, the existing Llandough ward already meets the key criteria of effective local government: clear, recognisable boundaries; electoral parity; community identity; and alignment with its semi-rural character. To maintain it as a single-member ward will allow continued strong, focused representation for local residents and preserve the integral identity and cohesion of the community of Llandough.

I urge the Commission to accept the case for Llandough as currently defined and to retain it unchanged in the final scheme.

Yours faithfully,
[REDACTED]

VOG 125 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

VOG 126 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

VOG 127 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,
[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

VOG 128 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

There are many reasons why the Llandough ward should be retained:

- The boundaries of the existing Llandough ward are clear and distinct - separated from Penarth by the Merrie Harrier road junction and from Dinas Powys by a broad expanse of farmland.
- The electorate of the Llandough ward is virtually the same as the proposed county average. Retaining it will ensure electoral parity is maintained.
- Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston are rural and/or semi-rural in nature and share many characteristics and community ties. They do not share such characteristics and ties with the larger settlements of Penarth and Dinas Powys.
- It is in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the community to be served by one councillor in a single member ward

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 130 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

VOG 131 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully, [REDACTED]

VOG 137 – Local Councillor or other Elected Official

Dear Commissioners

Re: Vale of Glamorgan: Draft Proposals

I write with regard to the above. I make these representations in my capacity as the elected member of the Vale of Glamorgan Council for the Llandough ward.

At the outset, I wish to make clear that I support the Commission's proposals to retain the Llandough ward. It is the strong preference of Llandough residents that the Community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala is represented by one councillor, in a single member ward coterminous with the community boundaries. This is reflected in the representations submitted during the initial consultation phase by Llandough Community Council and several members of the public.

As I explained in my representations to the initial consultation, the 2025 electorate of the Llandough ward, comprising the Community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala, is 1,801. This represents a 1% variance from the county average, as per the existing council membership. It represents a 3% variance from the county average of the proposed council membership. The Commission's Policy and Practice document states that current electoral figures are those given the greatest weight when considering electoral parity. Consequently, the existing boundaries of the Llandough are justified on the basis of electoral parity alone.

In my initial representations, I explained that, even if electoral parity were not achieved, and the ratio of electors to councillors of the Llandough ward differed significantly from that of the proposed county average, I would still submit that the existing boundaries should be maintained. I remain of this view.

Retaining the existing boundaries is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. Llandough and Cwrtyrala is a distinct community. It is identified as such by residents. Many local people have approached me to express strong support for the existing ward boundaries. They fear the impacts merging Llandough with a larger, neighbouring ward would have on the community. Previous proposals to merge the Llandough ward with Cornerswell were met by strong opposition from residents. Many expressed gratitude to the Commission for taking these concerns seriously and agreeing to maintain the existing boundaries. I congratulate the Commission for recognising this in its Draft Proposals which retain the Llandough ward.

There are distinct local issues affecting the villages of Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston, primarily arising out of the pressures Llandough Hospital places on the area. As such, a single ward member representing these concerns will lead to more effective representation than if the community were represented by councillors covering a larger area with competing priorities to consider.

The existing boundary of Llandough and Cwrtyrala is clear and identifiable. The Community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala is separated from the Town of Penarth by the busy junction of the A4055 and B4267, known locally as the "Merrie Harrier junction". This junction takes its name

from the eponymous public house located at the site. The Community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala comprises three small villages: Llandough, Michaelston-le-Pit and Leckwith. These villages share natural community ties. The local Royal British Legion branch is known as “Llandough and Leckwith Royal British Legion”, while the local village hall is known as “Llandough and Leckwith Institute”. The villages are connected by well used footpaths, which are popular with residents. The Merrie Harrier pub is popular with residents of all three villages.

Given these community ties, it would be logical for the county ward boundaries to be coterminous and reflect those of the Community.

For the reasons outlined above, I support the Commission’s decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Draft Proposals. I reiterate my request that the Commission makes no changes to the existing Llandough ward boundary in the Review. Thank you for taking the time to consider my representations, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Cllr George Carroll

Elected Member
Llandough ward

Vale of Glamorgan Council

VOG 138 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 140 – On behalf of a Community/Town Council

Please see attachment

Wick Community Council opposes the proposed changes to the St Brides Ward Boundaries.

The proposal to merge the communities of Colwinston and Llangan into the ward will make a geographically huge ward. Elected members will be required to cover too many communities and too large an area to do so effectively. This will especially be the case on occasions when the elected members are from different political parties.

It is only just over three years and one election since the ward boundaries were last changed. These frequent boundary changes undermine local democracy, confuses the voting public and serve to disincentivise members of the public from participating.

The proposed changes appear to be based on numbers of residents alone but there is far more to democracy in rural areas than just numbers of voters, moving a few hundred voters in a town means just a few neighbouring streets, doing the same in a rural area involves much larger, unconnected areas. Community leaders in rural communities have strong connections with their local areas which are not easily replicated over larger areas.

Your proposals indicate a lack of understanding on how local democracy works in rural areas. We are already seeing the negative affects of your recent changes to community councils in the Vale, we would urge you not to replicate them when it comes to these proposals.

The boundaries of St Brides ward were only changed one election ago, They should not be changed again.

Conway Hawkins BEM
Clerk
Wick Community Council.

VOG 141 – Member of the Public

Dear Sir or Madam

I am resident of Llandough in the Vale of Glamorgan. I write in support of the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward in its Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals.

Yours faithfully,

Sent from my iPad

VOG 142 – On behalf of a Community/Town Council

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to raise objections to your current consultation proposals for the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan. The current electoral review is based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect.

- your current proposals continue to suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan should now also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick and break local connections and ties
- The communities of Colwinston, Treos, Llangan and St Mary Hill have no connection with the Wick ward.
- The Vale of Glamorgan Council Monitoring Officer referred to local community relationships and those being the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were asking for. However the current proposals suggest that these links be severed and there will be a loss of community.
- It is unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers are supposed to fund another **five** more elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan,
- No one (apart from yourselves possibly) believe that there should be more taxpayers money available to fund additional elected members. The Williams Commission sensibly recommended a reduction in councils and councilors across Wales.
- The proposal would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3. Without sub division Colwinston and Llangan electors will be lost in the larger structure. You could at the very least allow the current Communities of Colwinston and Llangan to have their own local representative rather than be merged and loss their identity.
- The Community Councils of Llandow, Colwinston and Llangan are likely to have to pay for Clerk redundancies if your proposal for a new 'super community council' is formed as proposed. There would be at least three to five Clerks applying for the one position, and therefore the amalgamated community councils would be asked to pay redundancy, for which, they had no idea how this might be funded.

I hope that you will be able to reflect on your current plans and reject these proposals by listening instead to those who live and work in our local communities.

Yours faithfully,

--

Ed Lewis

--

Ed Lewis

Aelod, Cyngor Cymuned Tregolwyn *Member, Colwinston Community Council*

VOG 143 – Local Councillor or Other Elected Official

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to raise objections to your current consultation proposals for the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan. The current electoral review is based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect.

I would like to raise a series of concerns as follows:

- your current proposals continue to suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan should now also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick and break local connections and ties
- The communities of Colwinston, Troes, Llangan and St Mary Hill have no connection with the Wick ward.
- The Vale of Glamorgan Council Monitoring Officer referred to local community relationships and those being the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were asking for. However the current proposals suggest that these links be severed and there will be a loss of community.
- It is unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers are supposed to fund another five more elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan,
- No one (apart from yourselves possibly) believe that there should be more taxpayers money available to fund additional elected members. The Williams Commission sensibly recommended a reduction in councils and councilors across Wales.
- The proposal would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3. Without sub division Colwinston and Llangan electors will be lost in the larger structure. You could at the very least allow the current Communities of Colwinston and Llangan to have their own local representative rather than be merged and loss their identity.
- The Community Councils of Llandow, Colwinston and Llangan are likely to have to pay for Clerk redundancies if your proposal for a new 'super community council' is formed as proposed. There would be at least three to five Clerks applying for the one position, and therefore the amalgamated community councils would be asked to pay redundancy, for which, they had no idea how this might be funded.

I hope that you will be able to reflect on your current plans and reject these proposals by listening instead to those who live and work in our local communities.

Yours faithfully,

Karen Jacobs

Colwinston Community Council

VOG 144 – Member of the Public

Do you agree with the Commissions proposed electoral wards? No

Can you provide further information or provide alternative proposals? No

VOG 146 – Local councillor or other elected official

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to raise objections to your current consultation proposals for the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan. The current electoral review is based on those new community areas as they would stand when the Order took effect.

I would like to raise a number of concerns and queries:

1. Your proposals suggest that Llandow remains too large and that Colwinston and Llangan should now also be removed from the Llandow Ward and placed under Wick and thus break local connections and ties. However, the communities of Colwinston, Treos, Llangan and St Mary Hill have no connections with the Wick ward.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council Monitoring Officer referred to local community relationships and that these were the most important driver for the changes that the Commission were seeking. However the current proposals suggest that these links be severed and there will be a loss of community as noted in the first point.

2. It is unclear how Vale of Glamorgan Taxpayers will fund an extra five elected members in the Vale of Glamorgan. In times of economic hardship this seems to be an unnecessary burden upon taxpayers.

3. The Williams Commission sensibly recommended a reduction in councils and councillors across Wales. Has this been factored into your decision?

4. The proposal would involve the potential community wards of Colwinston (TA0), Llangan (TB0 & TB1) and St Mary Hill (TC0) being amalgamated into the St Bride's Electoral ward with the scope for increasing the number of members to 3. Without sub division the views of Colwinston and Llangan electors will be lost in the larger structure.

Would it not be prudent to allow the current Communities of Colwinston and Llangan to have their own local representative rather than be merged and lose their identity?

There is a strong community ethos in these villages and the possibility of losing this is a real concern.

5. The Clerks of the Community Councils of Llandow, Colwinston and Llangan may all, along with others, apply for the role of Clerk to the new 'super community council' and, presumably, the amalgamated community councils would be asked to make redundancy payments to the unsuccessful candidates. How would this be funded as the current Response to boundary changes re Colwinston and Llangan Community Councils will not have the resources to do so?

I trust that you will give due consideration to the points that I have highlighted and take into account the views of those who live and work in our local communities. I thank you for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Caroline Nightingale
Colwinston Community Councillor.

VOG 151 – On behalf of an Organisation (Public or Private)

Please find attached the Vale of Glamorgan Council Conservative Group's official response to the consultation on the Draft Proposals.

Vale of Glamorgan Council Conservative Group

Consultation response to Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru's Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review Draft Proposals

Introduction

This document constitutes the Vale of Glamorgan Council Conservative Group's consultation response to the Commission's Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County Borough of the Vale of Glamorgan: Draft Proposals Report.

For clarity, we will set out the proposals contained within the Draft Report which we support, along with any comments we may offer. We will then outline those draft proposals we oppose alongside, where relevant, counter proposals relating to the areas in question.

We recognise that the work involved in carrying out electoral reviews is both time consuming and onerous. We therefore wish to take this opportunity to thank everybody involved in the process to date.

Supported proposals

The Town of Barry

During the consultation regarding the Commission's previous Vale of Glamorgan Community Review, we expressed serious concerns regarding the electoral ward boundaries within the Town of Barry. We remain of the view that these boundaries do not reflect community ties, are neither clear nor distinct and do not serve the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore urge the Commission to address this within its next Community Review.

However, we accept that community boundaries must form the building blocks for county electoral wards. As such, the changes we desire are not within the scope of this Review. We therefore support the Commission's Draft Proposals relating to the following wards, but reserve the right to make further recommendations at the next community review:

- Baruc
- Buttrills
- Cadoc
- Castleland
- Court
- Dyfan
- Gibbonsdown
- Illtyd
- Waterfront

The Town of Penarth

In its Community Review, the Commission removed the village of Cosmeston from the Community of Sully and Lavernock and placed it within the Town of Penarth. We recognise there was significant local opposition to this and share many of the concerns expressed. However, reversing this change is out of the scope of this review. We agree with the Commission that there is significant underrepresentation of the Plymouth ward.

We therefore support the Commission's Draft Proposals regarding the following wards, but reserve the right to make further recommendations at the next community review:

- Cornerswell
- St Augustine's
- Cosmeston Plymouth
- Stanwell

Other supported proposals

We also support the Commission's proposals to retain or create the following wards:

- Cowbridge
- Dinas Powys
- Llandough
- Llantwit Major
- Penllyn
- Peterston-super-Ely
- Rhoose
- St Athan
- St Nicholas and Llancarfan
- Sully
- Wenvoe

In particular, we emphasise that the respective wards of St Nicholas and Llancarfan and Wenvoe are clear and distinct. Merging the two, as has been mooted previously, would not serve the interests of effective and convenient local government. We commend the Commission for proposing to retain both wards.

Similarly, we commend the Commission's decision to retain the Llandough ward. We understand there are strong feelings within that community that Llandough and Cwrtyrala does not share ties with either Dinas Powys or Penarth. We would not support a proposal that involved merging the Llandough ward with either of these communities.

While we support the principle of creating separate wards serving the Town of Cowbridge and the Community of Penllyn, we urge the Commission to have regard for the potential impacts of population growth within Cowbridge, and the consequences that reducing the Town's representation to two councillors may have in the long term.

Counter proposals

Western Vale

We have wider concerns regarding the community boundaries in the Western Vale, which are out of the scope of this review. We therefore recognise the potential counter proposals we can suggest are limited. We will outline these concerns in our consultation response in the Commission's next community review.

However, there are steps the Commission could take to mitigate the impacts of the community boundaries on the county wards, which would not require county wards to cross community boundaries. We therefore urge the Commission to take this opportunity.

The proposed 3 member St Brides Major ward would be unprecedented in terms of its geographic size. We do not believe a ward that stretches from St Mary Hill in the north of the county to St Donats in the south serves the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore request that the Commission abandons plans to include the Community of Colwinston and Llangan within the St Brides Major ward. Instead, we counter propose a single member Colwinston Llangan ward comprising that community.

Similarly, we have serious concerns regarding the proposed Llandow ward. The villages of Llandow, Llysworney and Sigingstone (Llanmihangel) do not share ties with the villages of St Hilary, Llanfair and Llanmaes. Unfortunately, as this is an existing community boundary, any such changes are out of the scope of this review. We therefore reluctantly accept the Commission's proposed boundaries for the Llandow ward, which are coterminous with the Llandow, Llanfair and Llanmaes community boundary. We do, however, urge the Commission to address these serious anomalies at its next community review.

To accommodate these changes, we request the existing St Brides Major ward boundaries are retained with the ward represented by two members.

Our counter proposals regarding the Western Vale therefore comprise the following wards:

- **St Brides Major** (2 members – comprising the Community of Eweny and St Brides Major and the Community of St Donats and Wick)
- **Llangan** (1 member – comprising the Community of Colwinston and Llangan)
- **Llandow** (1 member – comprising the Community of Llandow, Llanfair and Llanmaes)