

Agenda

Liaison Meeting with Community Councils

Date: Thursday, 20 September 2018

Time: 6.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

To: Councillors Bishton, Coedkernew, Goldcliff, Graig, Langstone, Llanvaches, Llanwern, Marshfield, Michaelstone-y-Fedw, Nash, Penhow, Redwick, Rogerstone and Wentlooge

Item		Wards Affected
1	<u>Apologies for Absence</u>	
2	<u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting: 22 March 2018</u> (Pages 3 - 6)	
3	<u>Matters Arising</u>	
4	<u>Prevent</u> A presentation from the Regional Community Cohesion Coordinator on Prevent which is the Government's aim to stop vulnerable people from being exploited and drawn into terrorism	
5	<u>Shared Community Charter</u>	
6	<u>Rural Development Programme</u> Information on rural development activity	
7	<u>Date of next meeting: 6 December 2018</u>	

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes



Liaison Meeting with Community Councils

Date: 22 March 2018

Time: 6.00 pm

Present: G Price (Head of Law & Regulation) (in the Chair), M Bleazard (Information Development Manager), A Jenkins (Democratic Services Officer)

Together with the following representatives from Community Councils:

N Tarr, R Caston & S Davies (Graig), T Ducroq (Nash), J Davies & R Southall (Bishton), G Davies (Michaelston-y-fedw), T Jeffery & H Jones (Langstone), J Foster, B Miles & J Yeo (Wentloog), J Small (Goldcliffe) and Councillor Y Forsey (Rogerstone)

Apologies: Councillors Llanwern, Penhow and Redwick

1 Apologies for Absence

As above.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting: 11 January 2018

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2018 were submitted.

Agreed:

That the minutes were recorded as a true recorded.

3 Matters Arising

Concurrent Expenditure

No progress to date on the above, it was still with the Cabinet Member who was reviewing the options. In the meantime, the contribution was fixed for the next 12 months.

Community and Town Council Boundaries

Nash Community Council referred to the lack of communication during the previous change in boundaries, resulting with them being included with Lliswerry. They felt that this was not suitable boundary agreement and used to be part of Goldcliffe and Whitsun boundaries which were rural and not densely populated. Any PACT meetings focused on the Lliswerry boundary and was not Nash which had its own rural Police issues. Residents of Nash therefore hoped that consideration should be given to their views in any future consultation.

The Chair explained the boundary commission consultation had nothing to do with the Council. The only input that the Council could give would relate to new communities, such the Glan Lyn development near Spytty or Jubilee Park in Rogerstone and extra wards were required.

The Boundary Commission were currently consulting in Torfaen, this was a rolling consultation, Newport was due for consultation in 2019 and this would be an extensive public consultation. The Chair advised that every Community Council had the right to be consulted.

Goldcliffe Community Council recalled the issue being discussed at the last Boundary Commission consultation approximately 20 years ago. The Community Council Clerk for Nash did not consult with Goldcliffe.

The Graig Community Council representative referred to the recent South Wales Argus article and green paper published by Alun Davies recently on the council mergers within the 22 Welsh local authorities. The Chair advised that there was no information from the Council as yet and could therefore not speculate. Any information relating to changes to the unitary authorities would be shared with the Community Council.

Wentlooge Community Council mentioned a Wales Audit Office survey out at the moment inviting Community Councils to give their opinion on local authorities and potential devolved responsibilities etc.

Other Community Councils had also completed the survey. The Chair suggested that feedback from the survey could be discussed at a future meeting.

Bishton Community Council asked if community councils took on more responsibilities, would that be reflected in the concurrent payment. The principal of the grant was to provide double taxation, therefore any responsibilities taken on by community councils would be remunerated by the Council. For example, if community councils approached the council on fly tipping, which they could provide a cheaper service for, the council would be eager to negotiate funding for it to be carried out at a local level. Small services such as litter picking would be reasonable unlike disposal of asbestos or matters that might involve enforcement powers. Grass cutting, litter picking, children's playground maintenance would be services that could be taken over by community councils by contacting Newport City Council.

Due to the recent snow, Goldcliff Community Council mentioned that it had its own snow plough, which would be helpful for local communities.

Finally, the Chair advised that any information that community councils would like to share with Newport City Council was welcome.

4 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Presentation

The Information Development Manager gave a presentation on the changes to the GDPR and the key differences, including development of technology, especially Internet and the explosion in social media to re-affirm the right of privacy under the Human Rights Act.

Discussion ensued regarding sending out newsletters by emails and how the new regulations would make it clearer on what a customer would expect.

The community councillors asked whether there was a need for them to appoint a data protection officer. The Chair suggested contacting One Voice Wales who might be able to advise.

The role of Data Protection Officer (DPO) although not set up as yet by the council, would be part of an existing role. The principal was that councils should be an advocate for holding data, therefore in a larger organisation a new post was not required.

The Chair advised that the role of Data Protection Officer within a community council should not be onerous but it needed to be directly linked to each community council, such as the chair for example, although they could change on an annual basis and might not be qualified.

It was suggested that the 14 community councils appoint one DPO, however the Chair advised that this wouldn't work, due to different sizes of the community councils. It would be far better to appoint someone from within the community council.

A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was sent to all community council clerks for information.

5 **Shared Community Charter**

Planning Consultation:

The representative for Bishton Community Council mentioned that the planning consultation information received was the same as the public consultation. It was felt that the Community Council was never informed of the results, or if the planning application was not heard on a specified date. There was a weekly planning list that covered all districts which was sent to community council clerks on the assumption that the list should suffice; information was therefore not sent to clerks if the application was deferred. The list was also circulated when it was determined.

The Chair was asked if the comments of the community councils attached any weight to an application. This was not the case as it was down to the planning considerations and officer recommendations. It would therefore be unlawful for any community council or other body to carry weight on any application. Only a formulated response representing members of the community and a well prepared response could carry some reasonable weight.

Whilst community councillors considered that the Planning Portal was a very good system, there was some confusion over the start of the 21 day consultation date when community councillors received letters from Planning Services regarding applications for deadline submissions. There were two dates indicated on the email and letter, this made it unclear as to when to count the consultation from. A Jenkins would contact the Development and Regeneration Manager to seek clarification and send on to clerks.

Additionally, there were some occasions when clerks received a letter via email but the link did not work. The Chair advised that this would need to be reported as soon as possible to Planning Services by the clerk.

6 **Items requested by Community Councillors:**

Road Closures:

The representative for Nash Community Council referred to the lack of consultation from event organisers in general regarding road closures. This would be an issue with farmers in rural areas with cattle. It was mandatory with regard to the welfare of animals to check stock twice a day, the marathon would hinder this

The Chair advised that Run 4 Wales would need to be contacted by the community councillors regarding any events. The Chair advised that there was nothing that the council could do. The marathon could only be refused on road safety grounds and due to general complaints by residents. As long as there was access for emergency services no other consultation was required.

Discussion ensued and right to freedom of movement and the tremendous impact road closures would have on local communities. The Welsh Government gave the organisers the right to arrange the, organisers did not need a licence.

With regard to emergency vehicles accessing roads, Councillor Forsey mentioned that runners did move out of the way to allow emergency vehicles to get access to anyone that required emergency attention.

A Wentlooge community council representative referred to the Velathon organisers that provided time slots for residents to access or egress their homes.

7 **Date of Next Meeting**

Would be held at 6pm on Thursday 21 June 2018, in Committee Room 1.