

Scheme for the Establishment of Community Councils – consultation 2020 – stage 1

Part 1 – Comments from the public

Ref.	Boundary comments	Composition comments: maximum:	Composition comments: minimum	Council comments
Alloa CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	<i>The current area was proposed by the former Alloa Centre Community Council and agreed following public consultation. Since then, the current Alloa CC has kept its boundaries, their effect on participation and the geographic areas from which members are drawn under review. They confirm they are not recommending a change at this time.</i>
Alloa 1		10	6	
Alloa 2	Alloa seems to large, Split Alloa South & east? Alloa Community Council is not effective and does not reflect the needs of the community. Meetings are not effective or well attended. Community groups do a better job of consultation.	This should depend on the size of the area, no less than 5 and should also be an odd number	Min 5 max depending on size of area	<i>Current minimum numbers are calculated to ensure that the quorum as much as the minimum operating number will be a number which residents consider appropriate to the area.</i>
Alloa 3	No, I think area 9 would benefit by dividing the area into two. Either side of the main road through Alloa, the current boundary for area 9 is to large and is not one coherent community	Representatives should be proportionate to the number of residents. For example Alloa is the most populated area and yet has only 2 more members than	with the exception of Alloa, I think the current figures are the minimum. It may be worth discussion to have minimum and maximum numbers?	<i>Public responses are clear that too low a number making decisions at meetings is not acceptable and except for exceptional circumstances</i>

	As mentioned, Alloa is not one coherent community. There are a number of communities with differing needs and expectations that are lost in the current arrangement.	the rest (Muckhart being the exception)		<i>there is not generally a case for lowering minimum membership numbers.</i>
Alva CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	Change proposed to reduce minimum number to 6	<i>Alva CC has not normally struggled to maintain membership number but circumstances this year have been exceptional. As we can put in place provision to cover exceptional circumstances we do not feel there is a need to lower minimum membership numbers at this time.</i>
Alva 1	Looks good as it is No change	I think Alva's current limit of 14 councillors is about right.	8 is the minimum I think it needs to have to be able to function properly. Less than that means that they would not properly reflect the views of all the community.	<i>We note the comments on how numbers affect meeting efficiency, whether too many or too few.</i>
Alva 2		12. 14 is too many for the size of Alva. It would stop cronies from being brought on board too	10. Sometimes a smaller group can think better than a larger on	<i>We feel that the existing provisions for minimum and maximum membership numbers found the balance between the benefits of high numbers of decision makers and the efficiency of low.</i>
Alva 3		7	5	
Clackmannan CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	

Clackmannan 1		I think the number of members should ideally reflect the population in said areas. E.g. Tullbody CC has a population of around 10,000 people but Clackmannan CC has a population of around 3,500 but both need to have 14 members It would also maybe make sense to make the number of members an uneven number so should there ever need for CC's a vote on a matter that there is not a deadlock	I think the members required should reflect the population of the area. e.g. 0 - 5,000 = 11 Members 6,000 - 10,000 = 13 members and 10,000 upwards = 15 members	<i>As community council areas can vary in population, we feel that numbers based purely on such a formula might not be practical.</i> <i>The choice of membership maximum and minimum numbers must be workable even when there are unforeseeable absences and vacancies.</i>
Clackmannan 2	I feel our area is logical I do not think a change desirable	Good number	12 - studies have shown this is an optimal committee size for decision making. Assuming all members may not be able to attend then 14 is about correct	
Dollar CC	No opposition to the change to Commonedge Hill as proposed by Muckhart CC which affects their shared boundary.	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	<i>We respect the agreement made by both community councils on behalf of their respective communities</i>
Menstrie CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	

Menstrie 1		10 To gain a fair mix of individuals and groups represented young and old	5 So one family can't easily run an area's council. Also to stop hung voting during resolutions	
Menstrie 2		The current number of members in Menstrie Community Council (14) is fine.	I think our community council should have no less than 10 members. I chose 10 as that number should be representative of the residents in Menstrie	<i>There is a wide range of views on maximum and minimum numbers for Menstrie, which has historically operated successfully with current minimum membership numbers.</i>
Menstrie 3		15 seems reasonable under the current local government arrangements - but I don't believe these arrangements to be the best. Also, this entirely depends on how engaged/active/skilled members are and whether they are adequately diverse	12 - with the same reservations [as per max]	<i>As above, there is not generally a case for lowering minimum membership numbers.</i>
Menstrie 4			10 to allow for sufficient governance	
Muckhart CC	Changes proposed (see below)	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	<i>As Dollar above. We have no objections to the proposed, mutually agreed boundary change.</i>
Muckhart 1		Around 10 to 12. This sort of number allows for members to	8. Any less than this an	<i>(As above - previous comments</i>

		be away on work or holiday and still have adequate numbers attending meetings. Also it helps spread the workload across the members who are volunteers.	meetings may have few members turn up, and the workload per member would increase.	<i>relating to practical application of max/min numbers.)</i>
Muckhart 2	It is odd that the Japanese Garden seems to be split between Dollar and Muckhart CCs. It should be solely in Muckhart CC as should the Castleton and Lawhill areas. They look to Muckhart for social events and people living in that area tend to say that they live in Muckhart rather than Dollar. I also think that it is very important that Muckhart continues to have its own Community Council. As Muckhart lies at the far end of Clackmannanshire, it is often forgotten and our rural needs are quite different to those of Dollar.	Happy with present number	Minimum of 10 people	<i>We have taken advice from Muckhart CC and there do not appear to be grounds at this time for this change to the boundary.</i> <i>We note the resident support for a community council for the Muckhart area specifically. There are no proposals to merge Muckhart CC area with any other.</i>
Muckhart 3	Muckhart Community Council would like to request a minor adjustment to the local CC boundary, to transfer an area of historic, common land - called Commonedge - from the Dollar CC area back into the Muckhart CC area (I will forward the relevant maps directly to Lesley Baillie). Muckhart CC has been in contact with Dollar CC which has agreed to this request. Historically, this area of land, which is located on the ridge of the Ochil Hills,	12 members. Muckhart CC supports the current number of elected members allocated to our area which we feel allows both Muckhart and its surrounding area to be fairly represented, in addition to allowing us to spread CC tasks and responsibilities equally and fairly amongst members. MCC currently has members elected	6 members. In support of the current SoE, Muckhart CC believes that this would be the minimum number of members that would allow the CC to continue to function whilst continuing to fairly represent our community	<i>Views on minimum numbers range from 6 to 10.</i> <i>We are not aware of any difficulties this area has in maintaining membership numbers or in its numbers raising questions of representation.</i>

	above Muckhart, is where the tenants of the Muckhart Parish traditionally grazed their animals in the summer and where villagers cut their peat.	from the Upper Yetts, Mosspark, Blairhill and New Broadmeadows (Golf Course Road) areas, in addition to members who are resident in the Pool, thereby, fairly representing residents across all areas of Muckhart.		
S & F CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	
Sauchie & Fishcross 1		Happy with current number of 14	10 or 5 for Quorum - prefer to have as many people as possible on final decisions.	<i>We note that views are in line with current max/ min numbers.</i>
TC & D CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside 1		8	8	
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside 2		Tillicoultry have the same number as Dollar and as Menstrie who have a lot smaller populations	More than smaller communities to represent population	<i>The views of the public recognise the need for representation and practicalities. We have no reason to believe this cc has experienced difficulties with either and note the general support for the existing arrangements.</i>
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside 3		9 is probably enough people. I would say it has to be an odd number to enable a quorum when voting of issues otherwise I would imagine the Chair has the casting vote.	7 should be enough as a minimum so long as they represent a cross section of members of the community	
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside	Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton and Devonside is shown as No.7 but not in the KEY	Despite it being more difficult to keep Councillors active 12 to 14 members is okay. This since	A minimum of 14 i.e. as is!	

4	NO CHANGE REQUIRED!	they are needed to make sure the whole community is represented properly and fully.		
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside 5	tillicoultry	16	as it covering 3 villages	
Tillicoultry Coalsnaughton & Devonside 6		I think the numbers currently are suitable	Minimum of 5. The split in the county means the areas covered aren't huge. I think its still feasible to have a minimum of 5	
TC&G CC	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	No changes proposed	<i>This area had very strong membership in the past but as members recently moved out of the area the cc has struggled to maintain numbers. It represents a relatively large population and we are not proposing lowering membership numbers.</i>

Part 2 – Dialogue with community councils

Joint Community Council Forum – dialogue on the key contents of the Scheme March 2021

Key points from March	Council comment	Proposal
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Scheme 	<p>Every review of the Scheme is an opportunity to think differently about all aspects of governance.</p> <p>The main reason for the review of the Scheme was to incorporate provision for flexibility in the event of an emergency (such as a pandemic), to avoid having to go to Council to put measures in place to allow ccs to continue to operate, and to remove where possible any provisions which require recourse to Council where there could be cc control.</p>	<p>Draft revised Scheme includes new provisions.</p>
<p>Commitment to the cllr role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Getting people to convert ‘interest’ ‘effort’ and ‘willingness’ into commitment to the cc seems to be the problem we hope the Scheme will solve. Effect of trend towards community ownership of buildings 	<p>We have yet to find a perfect way within the governance framework to attract people to their cc. The scope to recruit volunteers and make co-options is the best we can do without radical change.</p> <p>The distinctive cc function and governance are the best we can come up with to prove that whatever else a ccs does, it exists to fulfil a very clear function which other community groups generally do not.</p> <p>We accept that as policy trends come and go, people will decide if they want a cc and it is up to people to make their choice to which group/s to dedicate their effort.</p>	<p>We have no proposals at this stage. Stage 2 invites comment and suggestions from the public.</p>
<p>Co-options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-opted members should count for minimum numbers Co-option ratio should be more generous 	<p>The co-option provisions are as loose as the Council can make them without recruitment becoming a prerogative of existing cllrs.</p> <p>The public do not seem concerned about co-options and the public do sympathise with ccs about limitations on recruitment.</p> <p>Co-options provisions have not normally been found to be a barrier until circumstances are exceptional.</p>	<p>A greater degree of flexibility in exceptional circumstances / inability of Council to arrange regular or interim elections might address these suggestions</p> <p>The motive for these suggestions is linked with minimum numbers. See below.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-options as a recruitment tool 	<p>Co-options are a flexible but legitimate way of replacing members who leave within a term of office. The provision for co-options is vital for maintaining membership numbers and breadth of representation.</p>	<p>Retain co-options in principle.</p> <p>We do not feel that loosening co-option provisions is a solution for community councils.</p>
<p>Minimum numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower minimum numbers would make recruitment at elections easier 	<p>The public seem to sympathise with ccs when they lose members and cannot replace them quickly. However, there were several comments indicating the public do not like the idea that too few people represent the community, so lowering minimum numbers might not be a popular move.</p>	<p>Lowering minimum operating membership numbers has a knock-on effect on the quorum and co-option ratios. We do not recommend lowering the quorum.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be lowerable. Do they have to be set in the scheme? Could they be based on the membership at any given time? 	<p>Provisions which allow minimum numbers to adapt to changes in levels of interest of people who want to be community councillors will help community councils to manage their membership numbers but in practice could either compromise democratic standards or not be a quick process.</p>	<p>Except perhaps for exceptional circumstances, we think communities and community councils alike would prefer for clarity and transparency to have set membership numbers.</p> <p>The flexibility in case of emergency will go some way to addressing the problem this suggestion addresses.</p>
<p>Elections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal elections should be retained Current election method should be retained 4 yearly cycle versus yearly elections 	<p>Formal elections instil credibility and confirm to residents that community councils can't choose their own members. They imply commitment and continuity, and the four-yearly cycle allows ccs to focus on business rather than filling membership every year.</p> <p>The Council is not in a position to run yearly elections at the moment or in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Retain current election frequency and method.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Election by Half' 	<p>Election by half every two years helps retain experience and continuity. It asks residents to fill a smaller number of spaces but it gives the impression of a shorter term of office and people choose to leave after 2 years instead of 4.</p>	<p>Retain 4 yearly regular elections and interim elections as required.</p>

	<p>The Council could not currently consider running cc elections every two years. The current economic climate and elections landscape appear prohibitive.</p> <p>The Council is open to suggestions on other election formats but if they are to be run by the Council's elections team the Council will only run elections in the format set out in the existing Scheme and will continue not to make exceptions to standards and deadlines.</p> <p>Cc may still choose at the next stage of consultation to ask for regular elections with 'elections by half' if they wish to arrange elections themselves or through a third party.</p>	
--	--	--