The Vale of Glamorgan

Comments (published, complete) received during the initial consultation period

DBCC-2 On behalf of a Community/Town council

Members agreed with the proposals outlined. They also felt that retaining the existing boundaries would help in the future should the total number of Councillors across the Vale of Glamorgan be increased.

DBCC-4 On behalf of a Community/Town council

The Community Council has recently given consideration to this consultation. On its behalf I am making the following observations on the review: a) The Community Council considers that Llandough should have its own ward member on the Vale of Glamorgan Council. A copy of our submission on a previous review is attached for your reference. b) It should be pointed out that the population of Llandough has grown since the previous review with a new flats development in Leckwith Road. A further possible flats development in Leckwith Road and a large scale housing development off Llandough Hill which has received outline planning permission will add to the population and in turn the number of electors. c)The review of the community boundary of Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston community councils will change in May 2027 when a new Council named Llandough and Cwrtyrala Community Council will be created – it is considered that the ward of Llandough should include the areas covered by the new community council area.

See attachment separately

DBCC-5 On behalf of a Community/Town council

Sir / Madam, In response to your request for comments related to this review, my Council has resolved to respond as set out below. The existing arrangement with 3 councillors representing a mixed town and rural ward 'Cowbridge' is overtly biased towards the need of the town and does not provide or ensure effective and convenient local government or effective representation for all clearly identifiable communities. My Council therefore proposes that the existing Cowbridge Ward be divided in two, in line with the current Town / Community Council Wards, vis: (i)Cowbridge with Llanblethian (based on the Cowbridge Town Council community wards) with 2 Councillors, and (ii)Penllyn (based on the Penllyn Community Council community wards) with 1 Councillor. This proposal remains fully compliant with the proposed electoral ratios, whilst ensuring that there is a Vale of Glamorgan Councillor directly representing and accountable to the electorate of the Penllyn, Ystradowen & Llansannor Communities, as well as two for Cowbridge Town and the notably different needs of both those Communities and the Cowbridge Town are properly represented and heard at the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

DBCC-7 On behalf of a Community/Town council

Dear Sir or Madam Llanfair Community Council considered the document relating to the above item. The Members discussed the document and would recommend that the new ward of Llandow, which will cover the communities of Colwinston, Llangan, Llandow, Llanfair, Llanmaes, Llysworney, Sigingston and St Hilary with only one Councillor to cover that ward, would be insufficient for this sizeable rural ward. Therefore the Community Council would suggest that a minimum of at least two Councillors should be elected to cover this area.

DBCC-9 Member of the public

Dear Sir/Madam With regards to the Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review. I am a long time resident of the community of Llandough and Cwrt y Ala and I ask that this forms a single member electoral on the county council. Our community boundaries are distinct being separated from Penarth by a busy main road junction at the Merry Harrier public house and from Dinas Powys by fields. The electorate of the community of Llandough and Cwrt y Ala is in line with the proposed county average. As such, a single member member ward covering the villages of Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston-le- Pit would ensure that residents are well represented. It is important to allow us to keep the rural and semi rural nature of our villages. Yours faithfully

DBCC-10 Member of the public

To whom it may concern, To introduce myself, I am REDACTED Llandough, Vale of Glamorgan. My purpose in writing is to make representations on the upcoming review of ward boundaries in the Vale of Glamorgan. As a resident of Llandough, I believe it is vitally important the existing boundaries affecting our community are maintained. Looking at the consultation documents, it's clear Llandough currently has the correct number of voters to councillors. However, even if this were not the case, and there were some variation, I would submit that Llandough should still retain its existing boundaries. Community ties are incredibly important when it comes to drawing the boundaries. They should look natural and reflect the communities they serve. Llandough is a quiet village. We are distinct from Penarth, Barry, Dinas Powys and Cardiff. The issues affecting us, particularly parking problems around Llandough Hosptial, do not affect those other towns and villages. We need a representative who can devote proper attention to this. The villages of Llandough, Leckwith and Michaelston, by contrast, share many local ties. Our boundaries are clear. The busy road at the Merrie Harrier junction poses many dangers. There have been several near misses on the pedestrian crossing. By contrast, there are quite, pedestrian lanes linking Llandough with Leckwith and Michalston. I therefore request that the boundaries of the Llandough ward, comprising the community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala, remain unchanged following the review. Regards,

DBCC-11 Member of the public

Dear Sir or Madam, Re: Vale of Glamorgan Electoral Review We write with regard to the above, concerning ward boundary changes in the Vale of Glamorgan. We are longstanding residents of Llandough,REDACTED. Our community is a compact, close knitted village, with a semi rural feel. Like the neighbouring villages of Leckwith and Michaelston-le-Pit, we are distinct from the settlements of Dinas Powys and Penarth, which both have many thousands of residents. The electorate of our community, by contrast, is well under 2,000. We are concerned that any attempt to change the existing ward boundaries will lead to our community being subsumed. We are served well as a single member ward, with one councillor dedicated to our concerns. While multi-member wards may be more appropriate for larger settlements like those of Penarth and Dinas Powys, where the community boundaries are too large to accommodate single member wards, that is not the case in Llandough. We are and should remain a one member ward. A previous proposal to merge Llandough with the Cornerswell ward in Penarth was met by significant opposition within the village. Any similar proposal would face similar objections. We are grateful to the Boundary Commission for listening to our representations on that occasion and urge you to do so again. Please allow Llandough to retain its identity and retain the existing boundaries. Thank you for taking the time to read our representations, and we look forward to hearing from you. Yours faithfully, REDACTED

DBCC-14 On behalf of a Community/Town council

The future alignment of the current Community of Llanmaes - Llanmaes Community Council strongly supports this proposal to make the alignment of our community consistent with that of the soon to be

merged community councils of Llanmaes, Llanfair and Landow while simultaneously noting the same councillor will also have to cover the enlarged Community of Cosmeston and Llangan. We are all rural communities in the Western Vale of Glamorgan and as such have similar priorities and concerns. In addition, focusing responsibility on one single Principal Authority Councillor rather than diffusing it through 4 councillors (the current situation for Llanmaes) is a much better practice and leads to clear accountability and responsibility. We do note that our proposed ward covers two enlarged Community Councils and has the highest elector to councillor ratio in the Vale of Glamorgan. This may be something you wish to address however any proposals that would peel away and split parts of either of the two new Community Councils in terms of representation would not be supported.

DBCC-15 On behalf of a Community/Town council

Llanmaes Community Council expresses concern over the continued widespread prevalence of multi member wards throughout the Vale of Glamorgan. While we recognise that these are difficult issues to manage we are strongly of the opinion that multi member wards lead to dilution of accountability and responsibility and should be avoided and eliminated as soon as possible. We acknowledge that in your report you have set out to ensure that these do not encompass rural and urban areas which is a fantastic first step and will only be of benefit moving forward to the Community of Llanmaes and other rural communities. More specifically the current Community of Llanmaes is currently represented by 4 Vale of Glamorgan councillors and to all intents and purposes this has led to a situation where the majority of these councillors (with one outstanding exception) have simply not engaged with our community since the last election and it is a massive stretch to even consider they represent our community at all. The rationale of the non-engagers is that they are a group and are entitled to give responsibility for our community to one councillor but this is a completely absurd premise, both legally and practically. Informal arrangements that may or may not have been agreed to have no legal standing and their responsibilities are to all electors not just the ones they claim to actually 'be responsible for'. For this reason, we would encourage the elimination of the practice of having multi member wards with the minimum of delay. These same councillors although have no hesitation in voting on issues affecting our community which has created a lot of disquiet locally.

DBCC-16 Local councillor or other elected official

having now read the report,the suggestion of joining Wenvoe and St Nicolas makes no sense at all, all this would mean is that two councillors would be covering a huge area, rather than one Councillor covering a smaller area, which allows you to have a greater impact and deal with issues more efficiently, this also eliminates a duplication of two Councillors dealing with the same issue, if they are from different parties, also in the recent boundary commission review, St Lythans and Duffryn were taken out of the Wenvoe Ward, at the previous review St Nicholas and Bonvilston were taken out of the Wenvoe Ward, now you are suggesting they all come under the same ward, this makes no sense at all and would not benefit the residents. Inconclusion the recommendation to leave things as they are, is I believe the sensible way forward Russell Godfrey Councillor

DBCC-17 Local councillor or other elected official

Dear Commissioners I write to make representations regarding with the above. To clarify, I am writing in my capacity as the elected member for the Llandough ward. The table of existing arrangements provided by the Commission demonstrates that the electorate of the Llandough ward, comprising the Community of Llandough and Cwrtyrala, is 1,801. This represents a 1% variance from the proposed county average. 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. However, I would submit that, even were this not the case, 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. It would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to do so. 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. 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 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

DBCC-18 On behalf of a local authority

Good afternoon, Apologies for the late submission. Please see below, the Vale of Glamorgan Councils observations that were put before full council on Monday 14th July. There were no objections to these observations. - Set out below are the observations from the Vale of Glamorgan Council for submission to the Commission in response to their initial consultation. It is worth noting that the recent Community Review included an increase in members by virtue of an increase in members in Dyfan from 2 members to 3 members and the provision of 2 additional members for the new Waterfront ward in Barry and an additional single member because of the creation of a new Cosmeston ward at Community level. These changes would have already increased member numbers from 54 to 58. These changes, all as a consequence and arising out of the Community Review are tabulated at (Appendix 3 & 4). - 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, Llysworney 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 (Appendix 3), which have already been agreed by Welsh Government. - As stated above and within the Executive Summary, the commentary in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 are set out as observations only at this initial stage. All those with an interest in the matter can also make their own representations and this includes political groups and existing Town and Community Councils as well as all council members. Kind regards

DBCC-19 Member of the public

Dear all I'm emailing as a resident of REDACTED in the Vale of Glamorgan Council Llandough ward. I wish for the existing ward boundaries in Llandough to be maintained. Llandough is a natural community with a defined boundary. It is separate from Penarth and Dinas Powys and does not share community ties with either. Llandough has sufficient electors to justify a ward in its own right and I politely request this arrangement continues. Yours sincerely, REDACTED

DBCC-20 Member of the public

Dear Sir/Madam, Further to your consultation to review the electoral arrangements of the Vale of Glamorgan with a view to considering and formulating proposals for future arrangements. Members of Barry Town Council's Planning Committee consider the consultation at their meeting on 1 July 2025. They broadly support the proposals and requested that the number of Councillors on each Ward of Barry Town Council be the same number of Councillors on the same Ward on the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Council. Therefore, giving the electorate parity on the number of Councillors in each ward on both Councils. Kind regards, Prif Swyddog Dros-dro Acting Chief Officer

DBCC-23 On behalf of a Community/Town council

Good afternoon, Thank you for allowing us additional time to consider this matter at our Full Council meeting yesterday following the closure of the consultation deadline. On behalf of Cowbridge Town Council, I confirm that there have been no comments raised to put forward. Kind regards,

DBCC-24 On behalf of a Community/Town council

For the attention of Ms Beverley Smith Chair. Dear Ms Smith, The Vale of Glamorgan Council has drawn together some proposals for changes to the electoral arrangement in our area. For some reason this Community Council was not notified of this activity and as such, we were not informed of the Review or the deadline for representations. I would like to request that you accept our late representation on this. We have previously been in contact with Jane Hutt our Senedd member with our concerns over the changes proposed which directly involve our Community. You will be aware

that we made representations during that process and the initial Draft from the Commission kept Colwinston and Llangan as separate communities. The Vale Council in response to your Draft still pushed for the amalgamation of our communities which your Commission accepted. The more recent Review conducted by the Vale of Glamorgan do not make matters any easier for our community in that what is proposed by the Vale Council is a change to the Llandow Ward of which we are a part and amalgamating Colwinston, Llangan and St Mary Hill with the St Brides ward of the Vale. We believe that whilst this will give the potential of an additional Member for the proposed Ward, the size of this proposed ward will be significant bearing in mind the rural nature of our area and will make it problematic for our local electorate to have close links with the County Members. Our preference is for this not to happen. Should you decide that it is a valid option, may we suggest that the "new" St Brides Ward be subdivided so at least Colwinston, Llangan and St Mary Hill have a separate Councillor? the Vale proposals do not take account of the rural nature of these communities with the main trunk road the A48 effectively dividing the area up. I assumed, perhaps wrongly, that your Commission was focused on effective and convenient local government. The Vale of Glamorgan proposals are going in the opposite direction to this. Yours faithfully REDACTED -- REDACTED Aelod, Cyngor Cymuned Tregolwyn Member, Colwinston Community Council