

## Responses received as part of the first public consultation exercise

<b>Governance Documents</b>		
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response/ Action Taken</b>
Election Team, ACC	<p>Scheme of Establishment</p> <p>5.4.1 The Returning Officer shall make Nomination forms widely available by publication on the Aberdeen City Council website and where possible in City Council buildings such as, libraries.</p> <p>5.4.2 Inclusion of ' If the Returning Officer deems the statement to be inappropriate or illegal, they may refuse to publish it. The Returning Officers decision on this is final'.</p> <p>5.4.6 Electronic signatures are not an acceptable way to sign nomination papers.</p> <p>5.7.1 Inclusion of ' No election will be held if a scheduled election is due to take place within six months of the proposed polling day'.</p>	<p>This is a change in wording which has been accepted and amended in the document.</p> <p>This has been accepted and amended in the document.</p> <p>This is an addition to the Scheme and has been included.</p> <p>This refers to applications submitted to establish a CC outwith election years. Agreed as it would not be effective to hold a by election as candidates would be required to complete the process again within the six month period.</p>
Member of the Public	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community councils in Aberdeen are not functioning effectively, with large numbers of vacant positions, limited levels of engagement and limited powers and income to effect change and deliver positive community outcomes.</li> <li>2. As a result, the current boundary change proposals will do nothing to support community councils to protect their communities in the face of expected cuts to council run services in the year ahead.</li> </ol>	<p>The majority of Community Councils (CCs) across Aberdeen are continuing to meet on a regular basis and undertake a variety of projects within their areas despite having some vacancies. Overall they are engaging with their communities on local issues.</p> <p>A review of Community Council boundaries was undertaken to ascertain whether the existing boundaries reflected the needs and wishes of local communities having regard to changing circumstances involving housing and industrial</p>

	<p>3. In other member countries in the UK, community councils have the ability to raise a precept on council tax bills, which has resulted in local libraries being run by a CC instead of closure by the larger council body. CCs in other parts of the UK are also able to employ a clerk with clear duties and responsibilities to run the council's affairs on behalf of the council/councillors.</p> <p>4. In Scotland/Aberdeen, CCs are not of sufficient scale to protect local communities and the lack of any powers may also put off people standing for election as they are unable to effect positive change via a Scottish CC.</p> <p>5. Aberdeen CC should therefore consult on setting a minimum population/elector size for a community council, which would be sufficient to employ a clerk and, potentially take on other local projects which can benefit local communities, should the Scottish government allow CCs to levy a precept on council tax bills at a future point in time.</p>	<p>development within the city and any resulting change in population in certain areas.</p> <p>Two of the proposals were submitted by CCs in line with the statement above. All proposals are looked at and where they are feasible they are consulted on allowing residents and the CCs an opportunity to comment and to ensure that they are presenting the best option for that community.</p> <p>This is referring to Parish Councils in England and Community Councils in Wales.</p> <p>Scotland do not operate this system. Shetland Community Councils have paid clerks but they work on a self-employed basis to the community councils. They are not employees of the community council.</p> <p>Details of CC success stories can be found on <a href="https://www.communitycouncils.scot/the-work-of-community-councils">https://www.communitycouncils.scot/the-work-of-community-councils</a></p> <p>The boundaries for CCs in Aberdeen reflect the communities that they serve therefore having an average population figure would not match the true sense of what a community is. The population figures will fluctuate across the city to match those established communities and this is common across all Scottish CCs.</p> <p>Until such time as the legislation changes for how CCs operate in Scotland, the Scheme has to reflect the current legislation in place. If and when the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>6. Setting a minimum council size will also help to address a problem of widespread vacancies and co-options and unspent CC grants.</p>	<p>Scottish Government review the legislation and the powers that CCs have, this Scheme would be amended to reflect the position.</p> <p>Vacancies will arise regardless of the population figure and CC size. We allow co-options to help CCs maintain membership numbers. We also have an option to be an Associate Member to provide additional skills for projects or general business of the CC. The majority of CCs spend their grants each year or allocate funding for a project they are undertaking but not yet started. A minimum council size would not benefit the CC in terms of spending grants.</p> <p>Unfortunately there is apathy across the City for individuals to join a CC.</p>
<p>Member of a Community Council</p>	<p>Guidance 6 2.2 - Unreasonable demands or level of contact</p> <p>"The level of contact is unacceptable when the amount of time spent talking to a member of the public on the telephone, or reviewing and responding to written or electronic communication, impacts the ability to deal with the relevant matter or on the ability of members to deal with other items of business and statutory responsibilities."</p> <p>My comment is that we are talking about unpaid volunteer Community Councillors here - so the level of contact is unacceptable if it impacts negatively on any part of their life, not just ability to deal with business or statutory responsibilities.</p>	<p>Agreed. I have amended the document to reflect this.</p>

	I am also wondering about the requirement to minute decisions taken under Guidance note 6 (4.2 and 5.3), and whether there should be a clear direction about whether these decisions that are to be minuted regarding the bad behaviour of individual residents should be made public or redacted, and if so, how?	<p>The person's name would not be included in the minute, only that the CC had discussed an unacceptable behaviour issue and the decision they had made. The CC would need to communicate with the person in question to advise on the CC decision.</p> <p>I have amended the document to make reference to the above.</p>
Member of a Community Council	<p>Scheme of Establishment</p> <p>7.2.6 I would request that consideration be given to reducing the period to six months from date of co-option for a person to become a full member.</p>	<p>This proposal would support CCs to maintain membership numbers and not have the restraints of waiting for a full year. Several CCs at present are in the position of having people waiting to come on board so this would benefit them.</p> <p>Accepted and the document has been amended.</p>
Member of a Community Council	<p>Scheme of Establishment and Constitution</p> <p>16 Could this be changed to Complaints rather than Disciplinary Matters? This would be more in line with the content at 16.1 and the Complaints Procedure.</p>	Accepted and the document has been amended.
Member of a Community Council	Is there still a handbook for Community Councils?	The handbook was replaced by a series of Information Sheets which are available to all Community Councils. They cover a range of topics to help CCs in their roles.
Rosehill and Stockethill CC	The documents are well written. We are happy with the processes and guidance as described. We also note that often once a process has been applied it becomes apparent that clarification may be required.	If any process requires clarification or amended, this can be done for guidance documents 2 to 8 following consultation with CCs and approval from the Chief Officer – Governance.
General Community Council views	The documents, although several of them, are appropriate for the needs of Community Councils. The supportive measures being included are very welcome.	



<b>Boundary Proposals</b>			
<b>Kincorth and Leggart/Nigg/Torry</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>		
Nigg CC	<p>Nigg community council are against the plans to merge into KLCC. Our belief is that our small and diverse area would have less representation within the significantly larger area with different priorities. We have a long local history behind Nigg, and losing our community council would diminish our identity. In recent years, we have lost our church, where there is a war memorial, lost our community centre and post office; we DO NOT want to lose our community council.</p> <p>Significant residential development is planned for Nigg, and many residents are concerned that ACC would diminish our voice with these changes. Some suggest that it would be 'anti-democratic' to lose our CC, and it is certainly against the wishes of most residents we speak to.</p> <p>Like many other areas, we had understandable issues during the pandemic, but we are now re-established and wish to utilise our CC to give residents, present and future, a stronger voice. Losing our CC would be interpreted as a punishment for the difficulties we faced during the pandemic. Nigg CC has always been an active community council, and it will be again.</p>		
Torry CC	Torry CC members are of the view that the boundary should remain as it is currently.		
Kincorth and Leggart CC	Most members (with one exception) have no objection to the boundary proposals which would in effect have Kincorth/Leggart and Nigg as one Community Council.		
<b>Door to door canvassing in Nigg</b>			
Looking at the boundary map and knowing your area, do you think one larger CC area would work or would you keep individual CC's?	One area	Keep as separate CC	No preference
	10 7 respondents stated they had more of a connection to the Kincorth area.	46 All respondents stated they were aligned to Nigg area.	42 The majority of these respondents were not aware of Community Councils or what they did so had no preference.
Comments received	Good plan to merge the 2 CCs into one larger area, will give a stronger voice across the area meaning we might get things done.		
	If you merge the two areas together it will give a better voice for this area (Nigg).		
	I believe to be more connected to the Kincorth area due to children attending Primary School in Kincorth.		

	I feel a stronger connection to Kincorth and I feel it is important to have a strong voice on local issues.			
	Nigg needs to keep its own CC and its own identity.			
	I would keep Nigg separate but having an option to work jointly with Kincorth and Leggart CC on common issues.			
	Nigg needs to retain its own voice however it needs to have some younger members come forward to move things forward and generate new ideas.			
	This area is Nigg and should not be merged with Kincorth. It will dilute the voice of residents not make it stronger.			
	We need to get the current CC operational to give us the voice that we have been missing over the last few years.			
	I have no view either way as I don't know what they do.			
	I have no preference but would like to see things moving forward regardless of the outcome.			
	Will Nigg CC be able to move forward due to the problems they have experienced?			
	If the boundaries change, would it affect my postcode or school catchment areas?			
<b>Door to door canvassing in Abbotswell Road (Torry boundary)</b>				
Looking at the boundary map and knowing your area, do you align with Torry (current CC) or Kincorth and Leggart or Nigg?	Kincorth and Leggart	Torry	Nigg	No preference
	20	7	0	9
Comments received	My postcode is for Kincorth area so I'm not sure why this area is under Torry CC.			
	I would say Kincorth due to the location, Torry is the other side of the road.			
	This area links better with Kincorth due to the school my child attends and also doctor surgery.			
	We are Kincorth, not sure why we would be allocated under Torry CC.			
	I always thought we would come under Kincorth and Leggart CC, I don't know anything about Nigg.			
	We should be Kincorth and Leggart, my child attends Kirkhill Primary and I am involved with the Parent Council.			
	I shop in Torry, therefore I think the boundary should stay as Torry.			
	This area is closer to Torry so I would keep it within Torry CC boundary			
	I have no preference as the decision won't affect me and my opinion does not matter anyway.			
	Not aware how this would affect me, so I have no view on it.			
What difference would it make to my area.				
I know nothing about Community Councils, I may attend one to see what they do.				

<b>Drop-in Session at Kincorth Library</b>			
Looking at the boundary map and knowing your area, do you think one larger CC area would work or would you keep individual CCs?	One area	Keep as separate CC	No preference
	6	7	4
Comments received	We share the same facilities such as schools and doctors so merging the areas together would not cause any issues.		
	Nigg CC should remain as its own CC however they need to try and promote themselves a bit better using social media or even the radio.		
	When do Kincorth and Leggart CC meet as it would be good to attend a meeting?		
	Would Community Councils consider using a mini-bus to collect people as that would help with attendance and keep membership numbers healthy?		
<b>Outcome</b>			
Boundary to the left of Wellington Road	Based on the information above, move the area to Kincorth and Leggart CC as shown in Map 1.		
Boundary Proposal to Combine Nigg CC, Kincorth and Leggart CC into one area	Based on the information above, there is a stronger opinion to keep the CCs are separate areas. Both CCs would be willing to work on joint ventures that would benefit both areas. Keep Nigg as its own CC. Also shown in Map 1.		



<b>Boundary Proposals</b>	
<b>Rosehill and Stockethill/Rosemount and Mile End/George Street</b>	
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Rosehill and Stockethill CC	<p>From the map presented:  The Plum Coloured Area - Belmont &amp; North of Ashgrove Road.  Unanimity - that this area should remain in R&amp;SCC. No reason to transfer to Rosemount &amp; Mile End. It is well represented by members of R&amp;SCC and at least one councillor from Rosemount &amp; Mile End.</p> <p>The Orange Coloured Area - Southside of Belmont Road.  Ambivalent - Why change from R&amp;SCC? It is more closely associated with R&amp;SCC than the George Street community from which they are separated by roads, railway and large retail area. A clear reason for change should be presented.</p> <p>The Yellow Coloured Area - Kittybrewster Triangle.  Ambivalent - Why change from R&amp;SCC? Whilst some feel that the area is part of Woodside, others question justification for change. The completed Berryden Corridor Project will further isolate the triangle from Woodside. A clear reason for change should be presented.</p> <p>The Planning Officer for R&amp;SCC is concerned that the large population to the north and west of Berryden &amp; Kittybrewster will have reduced involvement in the Berryden Corridor and Ashgrove Connects projects planned to redevelop several roads in the current R&amp;SCC area. Those projects are planned to make significant change to Ashgrove Road, Belmont Gardens Belmont Road, Laurelwood Avenue, Backhilton Road, Ashgrove Road West, and will impact a large number of R&amp;SCC residents to the west of Great Northern Road.</p> <p>The three proposed boundary changes would transfer responsibility for much of the Southeast corner of R&amp;SCC to three different Community Councils. The proposed changes are of areas that are on the periphery and not integral to the current areas of responsibility for those Community Councils. We believe that R&amp;SCC is best placed to represent those communities that will be most affected by these major projects.</p> <p>It is considered that unless there is a pressing need, or overwhelming demand to change the boundaries, any decision should be deferred until after the plans and programme for the Berryden Corridor and Ashgrove Connects projects are matured and defined to permit R&amp;SCC consultation.</p>

<b>Door to door canvassing in Belmont Gardens, Laurelwood Avenue, Cedar Court and Ashgrove Road</b>			
Looking at the boundary map and knowing your area, do you align with Rosehill and Stockethill (current CC) or Rosemount and Mile End	Rosehill and Stockethill	Rosemount and Mile End	No preference
	18	15	25
Comments received	My children are at school within Rosemount and Mile End area (x4)		
	School catchment area falls into the Rosemount and Mile End CC.		
	I believe I am in Rosemount and Mile End CC area		
	I have lived in Rosemount for 27 years and that has not changed		
	Due to my child being at Mile End Primary School, I believe I have a closer link to Rosemount and Mile End.		
	My child is at Mile End, if I needed anything I would contact Rosemount CC		
	I'd stay with Rosehill and Stockethill, but would change the name as doesn't properly reflect the whole area		
	If we have active members in this area – leave them at current CC (Rosehill and Stockethill)		
	Not sure if it matters, I've not had to contact one before.		
	Not sure the name properly reflects the area, you need to make sure Ashgrove is mentioned in the name.		
	Please change the name so this area is properly represented.		
<b>Outcome:</b>	<p>Based on the statement by Rosehill and Stockethill CC and the feedback from residents, Ashgrove Road to Belmont Road area to remain with Rosehill and Stockethill CC.</p> <p>Based on the comments from residents, changing the name of the CC will be considered and consultation with the current members of the CC will be presented in stage 2.</p> <p>Comments from Rosehill and Stockethill CC relating to the boundary proposal with Woodside and Hilton will carry forward to the report in April 2024.</p>		

<b>Boundary Proposals</b>	
<b>Bucksburn and Newhills/Dyce and Stoneywood</b>	
<p>The consultation for the boundary proposal consisted of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance at the Beacon Cuppa speaking to attendees</li> <li>• Attendance at Dyce Community Centre speaking to centre users</li> <li>• Attendance at both Community Councils</li> <li>• Door knocking at the Craibstone Development</li> </ul>	
Respondent:	<p><b>Bucksburn and Newhills CC</b></p> <p>We would support the proposal (option 1 on Map 4), however we have an additional proposal which would be to extend the boundary line to encompass the Craibstone round-a-bout and follow the A96 to the boundary with Aberdeenshire Council with the area to the South of A96 and to the West of the AWPR transferring to the Bucksburn and Newhills CC area. The reason for this would be to prevent Dyce and Stoneywood having a satellite area out with their natural boundary. It would also make it easier for potential members to attend the CC meetings at the Beacon, using the road networks currently within Bucksburn. This is presented in Map 4 and shown as option 2.</p>
Outcome:	<p>Due to the revised boundary proposal being submitted, this will require to be consulted on. The comments received at stage 1 from the activities mentioned above, along with the outcome of the stage 2 consultation on the new proposal will be presented in the report to Council in April 2024.</p>