

**Raglan Community Council**  
**Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on Wednesday 27 February 2019**  
**at Raglan School**  
**at 7.00 pm**

Present

<b>4634</b>	Cllr Charlotte Exton Cllr Helen Tilley Cllr Penny Jones	Cllr Sylvia Price Cllr Brian Willott (Chairman) Cllr Richard Moorby
-------------	---	---

In attendance: Adrian Edwards Clerk

**4635**      **Agenda 1:** - Apologies for absence.

Cllr's Martine Dorey, Chris Butler-Donnelly, Adrian Merrett, Dave Bevan & Hazel Davies

**4636**      **Agenda 2:** - Declarations of interest.

No declarations made

**4637**      **Agenda 3:** - Gwent Police update.

Officers were unable to attend

**4638**      **Agenda 4:** - 15 minutes set aside for Community interaction and members of the community to ask the Chairman or Council questions of local interest. **Any questions should be submitted to the clerk 3 working days before the meeting**

No members of the public in attendance

**4639**      **Agenda 5:** - To receive and if appropriate to adopt the Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 30 January 2019

Cllr Jones asked about minute 4629 and explained that there was some confusion with regard to the minute. Cllr Jones asked for this minute to be amended. *"It was explained that the candidate sites will be published shortly and the deposit plan will go for public consultation in 2020 not May.*

**Proposed** by Cllr Price seconded by Cllr Moorby the minutes are accepted and signed as a true and accurate record following the amendment.

**All those present agreed**

**4640**      **Agenda 6:** - Matters to report.

The clerk explained that this hard copy which the chairman handed to members relating to minute **4632**, should have been sent to the clerk for inclusion in the minutes, and not for the chairman to hand a draft copy to members on the evening. The chairman explained that he had endeavoured to respect the staff in confidence nature of the document. Further detailed discussion took place with a number of views expressed. After further consideration it was:

**Proposed** by Cllr Moorby seconded by Cllr Jones the minute is accepted, and the matter is closed.

Cllr Jones stated that everything must be recorded in the appropriate way

**All those present agreed**

**4641            Agenda 7: - Planning applications**

Cllr Moorby gave a verbal explanation about the report from the Welsh Governments Planning Inspectors findings relating to 6 Castrory Avenue. Cllr Moorby believes the report from the inspector is not a reflection of the proposed application. Some further detailed discussion took place with a range of views expressed by members. It was:

**Resolved:** the clerk should write to the Planning Inspectorate expressing the community councils' observations.

**All those present agreed**

**4642            Agenda 8: - Reports from the County Councillor**

Cllr Jones gave those present a verbal report on a number of topics.

- The proposed development of the 111 dwellings on Monmouth Road. A discussion took place with a range of views being expressed.
- The current LDP process.
- Candidate sites.
- Transport links.
- Local Infrastructure.
- Where the community plan sits in the LDP process.
- Democracy and Boundary changes. Some discussion took place with a range of views being expressed about the proposed changes.
- Consultation for schools and the distance some pupils are travelling. It was explained that consultations are going to take place.

**4643            Agenda 9: - Consider a date for reviewing Monmouthshire County Councils LDP candidate sites.**

There was some discussion, about the review of the County Councils LDP. It was explained that consultation meetings will take place, and all the candidate sites will be published, everyone will have the opportunity to make observations. There was some discussion about preferred sites. It was explained that some site will be removed and other candidate sites could be included following the consultation.

**4644            Agenda 10: - To consider meeting date for the following special council meetings.**

- 10a) Monmouthshire County Council LDP process,
- 10b) Local Democracy and Boundary Commission's Report

10c) Community meeting

10d) WG outcome on the 111 dwellings on Monmouth Road

Those members present discussed the following items.

10a) Monmouthshire County Council LDP process; this matter will be considered when the draft deposit plan is published.

This item was discussed and recorded above in the minutes

10b) Local Democracy and Boundary Commission's Report

The clerk provided members with a report relating to the background to this process, along with a draft letter for members to consider. A discussion took place with a range of views being expressed. It was:

**Resolved:** that the clerk write and express the community councils' views and to reiterate some of the observations made previously.

Appendix 1below:

10c) Community meeting

A detailed discussion took place with a range of views being expressed, and after some time it was:

**Resolved:** to convene a meeting in October

10d) WG outcome on the 111 dwellings on Monmouth Road

Those present discussed this item, and a number of views were expressed, and it was:

**Resolved:** to wait and see if the Planning Inspectorate publishes a report.

**4645**      **Agenda 11:** - To note finance matters, including Income & Expenditure

Payments Jan & Feb 2019	Amount
<b>Money in hand January meeting</b>	<b>£48,615.53</b>
Merlin Waste	60.00
Adrian Edwards & HMRC	
One Voice Wales renewal	287.00
One Voice Wales	40.00
ICO renewal	35.00
Balance	<b>£47,878.12</b>
<b>Grant applications 2019/20</b>	

It was: **proposed** by Cllr Jones seconded by Cllr Exton the invoices are paid. All invoices were available for inspection

**All those present agreed**

**4646 Agenda 12:** - Items of correspondence.

**Welsh Government:**

1. None

**Correspondence**

2. Monmouthshire GovTech Zipabout project Accounts to be paid not on Agenda
3. Armed Forces Day event- Please pass to your networks
4. Boundary changes
5. Climate Change, Environment and Rural Affairs Committee - Inquiry into allotments
6. Monmouthshire County Council has listened to residents and is considering Council budget changes
7. Residents urged to register for garden waste collection
8. Monmouthshire's communities combine to back Fairtrade Fortnight
9. LDP time line
10. Review of Community/Town Councils arrangements in Monmouthshire
11. March 4th for recycling review changes

The above correspondence was noted and accepted

**4647 Agenda 13:** Reports from members on outside bodies

Cllr Moorby gave members a verbal report following the last Village Hall committee meeting.

**4648** The Chairman thanked everyone for attending. The meeting closed at 20.55 hrs.

The date of the next meeting 20 March 2019

Signed by \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman Date 20 March 2019

# Note

**Date: 22 February 2019**

**Subject: Reply to Local Government Democracy Team Democracy,**

Local Government Democracy Team Democracy,  
Diversity and Remuneration Division  
Welsh Government  
Cathays Park  
Cardiff  
CF10 3NQ

## **Re: Review of Community/Town Councils arrangements in Monmouthshire**

This is in response to a letter received from the Democracy Services Manager at Monmouthshire County Council (MCC) on the 5 February 2019. This reply is relating to the boundary changes that MCC have proposed following their consultation in 2013/14.

The members of the Community Council in the first instance would like to express concern, as this process was suspended by MCC in 2017. This suspension was introduced as 2017 was an election year. On behalf of the Community Council I contacted the Democracy Services Manager asking when the consultation was going to be reopened, as since the first round of consultation there has been an election and the community council has a new administration. An extract from the response I received from the Democracy Services Manager was:

*"Whilst it was my intention to re-run the consultation on the draft proposals so that new members elected in 2017 would have opportunity to engage in the process, it was recommended to us from the Boundary Commission that as the process is prescribed in the Local Government Act any variation from that process (i.e adding another level of consultation in to the process) may have null and voided the entire program when it is considered by the Welsh Government and their legal team".*

The current administration believes that local democracy has been ignored and the local electorate is not able to have a say in the proposals after they have taken so long to determine. Members of the Community Council find it difficult to understand why the Democracy Services Manager from MCC explained that the Boundary Commission would convene a consultation and that would be around twelve weeks. You will note Raglan Community Council was notified on the 5 February and a reply must be with Welsh Government by the 14 March 2019.

At present the current community arrangements within United Raglan consist of three wards: Llandenny, Pen-y-Clawdd and Raglan village. The community council has a total electorate of around 1,585 and is represented by 11 community councillors. The electorate per ward and number of councillors is as follows:

<b>Community</b>	<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Raglan	1120	8
Llandenny	366	2
Pen-y-Clawdd	99	1

Concern must be expressed about transferring the small community of Cuckoos Row from Raglan to Mitchel Troy.

The Council raised concerns at reducing the number of councillors and at the transfer of Cuckoos Row and the Warrage to the electoral ward of Mitchel Troy. This small community has no links or ties to Mitchel Troy. Residents naturally migrate to the main shopping amenities which are in Raglan high street, like the Post Office, convenience store and Pharmacy along with other recreational facilities.

The recommendations from the 5-year-old consultation is to dissolve the Community of Gwehelog Fawr and merge it with two neighbouring community areas, Llanarth and Raglan. MCC proposed that the area east of Llancayo Hill, is transferred into the ward of Raglan. The other electoral ward of Gwehelog will be transferred to the Llandenny ward. MCC has stated that the areas have stronger links to the Raglan Community via Usk Road. This proposed change will affect 223 electors.

Members of the community council are unable to see the relevance of transferring sections of Gwehelog Fawr identified on page 179 of the report, when the distance from the main conurbation area of Llanarth is further away than Raglan village. If areas 8,9 and 10, identified on page 179, were transferred to Raglan village this would give residents a presence of well-being and community, and not splitting the current community into different community council areas.

The main principle for these transfers and changes is to make community councils more effective and provide more affordable delivery of service which is reflective to the electorate. The IRP is indicating small Community Councils should become more viable to provide service delivery. Raglan is already a hub providing amenities and facilities, and shopping outlets. If the areas identified above were to become part of Raglan village, that would support the IRPs recommendations. Splitting a current community would appear to have the adverse effect.

MCC is also proposing to transfer one area from the Community of Llanarth (*Bryngwyn ward*) into the Raglan ward

MCC is also proposing to transfer one area from the Community of Llanarth (*Clytha ward*) into the Raglan ward

MCC is also proposing to transfer the electoral ward of Pen-y-Clawdd into the Community of Mitchell Troy. This rural community has no strong links or ties to Mitchel Troy. It's clear that residents naturally migrate to Raglan village as this is where the main shopping facilities and commercial businesses for the farming community are located. Raglan high street, has many shops and businesses that serve the immediate community along with communities like Pen-y-Clawdd.

Mitchell Troy, as a small rural community doesn't have the business and commercial facilities which Raglan has. Residents of Pen-y-Clawdd will continue to visit Raglan and enjoy the amenities and facilities Raglan provides. Raglan is far closer to Pen -y-Clawdd than Mitchel Troy and offers better transport links to the wider community and beyond.

Concern must be expressed when the report states that the Commission received no objections to the final proposals. The Commission would have received observations if Community and Town Councils were aware of the recommendations. The Boundary Commission informed MCC that a second consultation could not take place. It can

only be assumed that's why the Boundary Commission state they are satisfied with the proposed changes which are desirable and in the interests of effective and convenient local government and are therefore recommended. It would appear from both volumes of the report, Community and Town Councils were not aware of these recommendations, due to the number of comments the Boundary Commission has made.

The Boundary Commission should also be mindful of the changes MCC are looking at in relation to the Local Development Plan (LDP). MCC have put a call for candidate sites and from the draft proposals MCC have published, the number of candidate sites could increase the housing stock by a further 300 dwellings and a population increase of more than 50%. The proposed recommendations by the Boundary Commission do not take into consideration the current LDP review MCC are implementing. If the proposals are implemented the numbers on the electoral register is going down to 1070 from 1120, but Raglan as an electoral ward could see an increase in residents, so the numbers for each elected member will increase.

Raglan Community Council Electoral Arrangements								
Wards	Existing				Proposed by Monmouthshire County Council			
	Electors	Community Councillors	Electors per Councillor	Variance	Electors	Community Councillors	Electors per Councillor	Variance
Llandenny	366	2	183	27%	220	2	110	-40%
Pen-y-Clawdd	99	1	99	-31%	-	-	-	-
Raglan	1120	8	140	-3%	1070	4	268	45%
Gwehelog	-	-	-	-	223	2	112	-40%
Kingcoed	-	-	-	-	146	1	146	-21%
	<b>1585</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>144</b>		<b>1659</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>184</b>	

716. The Commission considered the community council electoral arrangements proposed by The Council and proposed the following amendments to the Council's proposal:

Raglan Community Council Electoral Arrangements								
Wards	Existing				Proposed by LDBCW			
	Electors	Community Councillors	Electors per Councillor	Variance	Electors	Community Councillors	Electors per Councillor	Variance
Llandenny	366	2	183	27%	220	1	220	19%
Pen-y-Clawdd	99	1	99	-31%	-	-	-	-
Raglan	1120	8	140	-3%	1070	6	178	-3%
Gwehelog	-	-	-	-	223	1	223	21%
Kingcoed	-	-	-	-	146	1	146	-21%
	<b>1585</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>144</b>		<b>1659</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>184</b>	

**Reports to: - Raglan Community Council**  
**Subject: - Review of Communities and Electoral Arrangements**  
**Report: - by the Clerk**  
**Date: - February 2019**

---

This report is to provide members some background information relating to the review of Communities and Electoral Arrangements in Monmouthshire, the Local Government Boundary Commissioner Wales (LGBCW) is the responsible body for the setting of County Council ward boundaries in Monmouthshire. When undertaking this exercise, the LGBCW must, by law, ensure that a whole community, or where warded a whole community ward, lies within a County Council ward.

Under s55 (2) of the Local Government Act 1972 requires all principal authorities in Wales to keep under review the communities within its areas. s57 (4) requires all Principal Authorities in Wales to keep under review the electoral arrangements within its area. The last review undertaken by Monmouthshire County Council was completed in 1999 with the changes taking effect in 2004.

In order to maintain its duty relating to the above legislation Monmouthshire County Council commenced a review in 2012 with a view to having proposals finalised and approved in time for the next ordinary Council elections due in 2017.

Monmouthshire County Council are responsible for conducting reviews of communities and their electoral arrangements. In order to conduct the review, the Monmouthshire County Council appointed a politically balanced working group of County Councillors to oversee the procedures and have responsibility for formulating the draft and final proposals which would then be submitted to the Council for approval.

The scope of the review should have regard to the following:

- The creation, abolition or merging of communities and community wards;
- The number of councillors representing the community and, where warded, the number of councillors per ward;
- The name of the community and, where warded, the name of community wards;

Monmouthshire County Council is not bound by any fixed timetable in legislation to conduct a review of the communities and electoral arrangements. The only requirements placed on the County Council are set out in s60 of the Local Government Act 1972 to ensure effective consultation is carried out as part of the review.

The County Council approved commencement of the review and appointed members to a working group on the 26th July 2012.



A 9-week consultation was between August 12 and October 12 the working group meet to finalise Terms of Reference (ToR) and prepare the submission to the County Council in October 12. The County Council published the ToR and public notice of the commencement of the review on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 12. The consultation for initial proposals was 12 weeks from December to February 13. The County Council prepared a draft proposal for publication in February 13, and published draft proposals in June 13.

Sometime after this date the county council suspended this process, partly as it was around the 2017 elections.

**Below are the consultation questions that were posed in 2012.**

1. What other facilities can the Council utilise to ensure extensive consultation is carried out with as wide an audience as possible?
2. Is the existing level of representation across Town and Community Councils in Monmouthshire appropriate?
3. Should a consistent approach be applied to the level of representation of electors throughout Monmouthshire?
4. What methods could the Council utilise to ensure fair levels of representation throughout Monmouthshire?
5. Would a banding system of urban and rural wards be a suitable system to apply to the levels of representation and what factors should be considered when categorising the wards?
6. Should there be a minimum and / or maximum number of electors in order for a ward to be created?
7. Should there be a minimum and / or maximum number of electors in order for a council to be created?
8. In what circumstances should a council area be warded?
9. Do you agree that where possible whole streets should be contained in a single ward?
10. If Streets must be split, what is the best approach to dividing them effectively?
11. What factors should the Council consider when identifying whether a boundary is easily identifiable?
12. Are there any other statistics that the Council should consider when projecting the population estimates for this review?

Further to the Monmouthshire County Councils review, a further review has been undertaken by an Independent Review Panel (IRP) on C&TC's in Wales. That review panel has taken evidence from Community and Town Councils (C&TC's) in Wales were over 190 individuals (councillors) attended engagement events and over 600

points were received as part of further feedback and a further 801 responses were made from a General Survey, made up from 227, Public Survey, 453, Youth Survey, 104 Local Authority Survey 17.

The main points that came from the IRP was to retain C&TC's on the basis that they are very local, are democratically accountable and are able to raise resources. All areas should be supported by a Community and Town Council and should be established in all areas that haven't currently got one.

The IRP, concluded that boundaries of a Community and Town Council need to be relevant and fit for purpose in order to correctly serve the local community.

A strength of C&TC's is that they are locally based and have a natural sense of community. IRP believe it is not for IRP to draw lines on a map, or to propose an arbitrary reduction in numbers. However, some of the present boundaries of C&TC's no longer best serve their communities, for example reflecting recent housing developments.

IRP also believe that some C&TC's will be sustainable or be able to fulfil the role we envisage for them if they remain as they are. Many C&TC's will need to work together to fulfil the role envisaged in later findings. Some C&TC's may choose to merge to play that role. The IRP received evidence from the Boundary Commission. The IRP know that the extent to which Local Authorities have undertaken community reviews varies. The IRP understand that all but five of the 22 Local Authorities have carried out reviews within the last ten years. Of the outstanding five, one has not made any changes to the communities in their area since 1996.

IRP believes there should be a comprehensive review of boundaries of C&TC's without delay to ensure community areas fit the current and future needs of their community and the future role envisaged for them arising from later findings. Community areas should then be reviewed on a regular basis to make sure they continue to make sense as areas (and needs) change and develop.

IRP states that there has already been two attempts to distinguish between existing C&TC's. The Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales has determined a set of groupings of C&TC's for mandatory payment for councillors. Furthermore, in suggesting pay scales for clerks, the agreement by the Society for Local Council Clerks.

Members of the IRP believe in the context of their review, the main distinguishing factor is whether C&TC's are able or have the capacity and capability to fulfil the place for the service delivery role envisaged by IRP. IRP explained that they are not prescribing an arbitrary threshold for this, either in terms of geography, population or income, though the IRP state that all of these will impact on a council's ability to operate.

The IRP believe there should be a clear distinction between what a Community and Town Council is responsible for and what the Principal Authority is responsible for.

The IRP believes this process will provide clarity for the general public and drive change. C&TC's should, by and large, be responsible for all 'place-based' services and the Principal Local Authority should be responsible for 'people based' or statutory, regulatory or strategic services (such as education, social care and environmental health).

The IRP believe that 'place-based' should be any mainly discretionary services. Being the social, cultural, economic & environmental, and physical wellbeing of the community, which can be linked to a place. The IRP finds it difficult to determine a full list of place-based services but have given some examples, based on community need. Burial Grounds, Bus Shelters, Street Furniture and Features, Community Assets: Village halls/centres, Toilets, Culture Tourism and Heritage, Libraries, Museums, Street cleaning/street bin collection, Litter, Grass cutting, Drainage, Highways including: local footpaths and pavements. Leisure & Recreational Facilities Markets, Playing Fields & Open Spaces, Allotments, Local community & village transport including bus shelters and War Memorials.

The IRP explained that the role of a Community and Town Council councillor is changing. The IRP know many councillors think of themselves as volunteers, when they are in fact elected members with statutory responsibilities. The IRP agree with the steps taken by the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales to reinforce that councillors are elected members. The IRP also believes there should be a clearer description of what the 'ask' of a councillor is in light of the new role for councils we have set out. As elected members, councillors have to meet the standards expected of them in the Code of Conduct and adhere to the Seven Principles of Public Life.

The IRP received evidence that some councillors are willing to attend regular training, where as some are more reluctant. It is important they are familiar with what's expected of them as councillors. The IRP will be recommending that a core package of training should be mandatory for all councillors as a requirement for acceptance of office and that this mandatory training is repeated regularly (every election term) and the IRP will be calling upon Welsh Government, C&TC's and councillors themselves to ensure all councillors are fully trained and have a training plan.

**Some of the conclusions are:**

The IRP believes the case has been made to retain C&TC's on the basis that they are very local, are democratically accountable and are able to raise resources.

All areas should be supported by a C&TC and should be established in all areas that haven't currently got one.

The IRP believe there should be a comprehensive review of boundaries of C&TC's without delay. These boundaries should then be reviewed on a regular basis to make sure they continue to make sense as areas (and needs) change and develop.

The IRP believe that every council should play the same place-based delivery role that is outlined elsewhere but have the scope to play that role differently.

The IRP believe expect place-based services to become the responsibility of C&TC's. It is recognised there will be need for a transition period however it is believed this process should start as soon as possible.

The IRP believe C&TC's have a clear role to improve the well-being of people in their areas and should not be constrained from doing anything they deem required by their community.

The IRP recommend that an explicit duty to represent is explored to give formal weight to the voice of C&TC's, subject to any relevant protocols.

All C&TC's should be required to act in line with the Sustainable Development Principle i.e. the five ways of working

**Raglan Community Council**  
**Action Points from meeting dated 27 February 2019**

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Allocated to</b>	<b>Date issued</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Meeting regarding Website	Clerk	28 June 2017	Ongoing	Task & Finish group with Cllr's Butler-Donnelly, Merrett, Tilley & Clerk
2	Road cleaning	Cllr Davies	27 June	Ongoing	Clerk to contact MCC street cleansing
3	MUGA	Clerk & Chair	27 June	Ongoing	Solicitor to contact MCC Head of Legal services
4	Waste bins in the main village	Clerk	27 Feb 19	Ongoing	MCC have looked at the locations and will provide new waste bins with a contribution from the community council
5	Street cleansing on Usk Road,	Clerk	12 Dec	Ongoing	Clerk to contact MCC street cleansing
6	Community meeting	Chair & Clerk	12 Dec	Ongoing	Arrange a meeting in Oct 2019
7	Replacing the waste bin on Usk Road & High Street	Clerk	27 Feb 19	Ongoing	MCC have looked at the locations and will provide new waste bins with a contribution from the community council