

Appendix 3 - Responses received as part of the first public consultation exercise

Respondent	Comments	Response/ Action Taken
Bucksburn and Newhills Community Council	<p>Many thanks for all your help and the explanations you gave at our meeting on 30th January, 2018.</p> <p>With a clearer understanding of the whole boundary issue, for both Community Councils and elected Councillors ward boundaries, having now considered the matter of what relates to each community, and how it effects each community.</p> <p>The effects of commercial/industrial development, the new exhibition centre, the proposed new housing developments on the Schools, Medical facilities, and the general infrastructure, road usage, traffic passing through along the A96 and the pollution caused etc. but also the loss of green space on this community.</p> <p>We propose that The Aberdeen City Council adopt the Original Proposal for boundary change.”</p> <p>This would make it possible for Community and Individuals to make fair representation on what happening in the area they live.</p> <p>In that respect the boundaries should be 1)The boundary between Dyce/Stoneywood Community Council and Bucksburn/Newhills Community Council should be Dyce Drive, Wellheads Drive, Market Street, Stoneywood and along the A947 to the existing boundary</p>	<p>There are two proposals being offered for the change to the Bucksburn and Newhills and Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council Boundaries.</p> <p>There is currently not consensus between the Community Councils therefore it is proposed that public engagement events be held in both Bucksburn and Dyce to seek the views directly from residents.</p> <p>The other parts of the boundary changes have received no comment from the neighbouring Community Councils as part of the formal consultation therefore the recommendation would be to adopt those changes.</p>

	<p>with Bucksburn & Newhills Community Council, as detailed on the original plan, placing the new Exhibition Centre, Waterton Road, Stoneywood Road and Prospect Terrace area in Bucksburn /Newhills area.</p> <p>2) The minor change to include the north side of the A96 leading to the Haudagain roundabout as detailed on the plan</p> <p>3) The area next to Heatherfold/Northfield including the Auchmill Golf Club all as detailed on the plan.</p> <p>4) The Brimmond Hill area as detailed on the plan, although residents at the west side (Clinterty side) do have a Kingswells postal address.</p>	
Culter Community Councillor	<p>We are delighted to see the addition of clause 3.1.6 under Role. We all know there is a tension between the general duty on Community Councils to consult with their communities, and the specific requirements of Planning law, and that this tension has given rise to challenge levelled at other Community Councils recently. This new clause will allow Community Councils to focus on promoting worthwhile feedback from communities in the short timescales available.</p>	
Local Resident in Bucksburn	<p>I refer to the proposed changes to be made to the boundaries for Community Councils and would like to propose the following changes to the plans issued for the Bucksburn and Newhills area.</p> <p>The plan as issued shows that the new Aberdeen Conference and Exhibition Centre is outwith the boundaries of Bucksburn. The</p>	<p>There are two proposals being offered for the change to the Bucksburn and Newhills and Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council Boundaries.</p> <p>There is currently not consensus between the Community Councils therefore it is proposed that public engagement events be held in both Bucksburn and Dyce to seek the views directly from residents.</p>

	<p>Council must accept that the Rowett was always considered to be part of Bucksburn, although it was nominally outside the Community Council area. Everything associated with the new Exhibition Centre will affect the residents of Bucksburn far more than the residents of Dyce. That includes noise, traffic, litter and everything else that matters. It is essential that this area is included in the Bucksburn and Newhills Community Council area.</p> <p>I would suggest therefore that from the end of Forrit Brae the boundary should travel along the A96 to Dyce Drive, along Dyce Drive to Wellheads Drive, along Wellheads Drive to Market Street, along Market Street to Stoneywood Road, down to join the A947 as shown on your map south of Waterton House.</p>	<p>The other parts of the boundary changes have received no comment from the neighbouring Community Councils as part of the formal consultation therefore the recommendation would be to adopt those changes.</p>
<p>Garthdee Community Council</p>	<p>We are emailing and confirming that following a positive and mutually agreeable meeting with CBM community council, that we have come to a quick and joint position re the boundary changes.</p> <p>We agree to the proposed changes with the boundary going straight down the middle of the station road bridge.</p> <p>I would be really grateful if you could confirm that you have received this email and note that Garthdee community council will not contest any boundary changes so long as it meets the above.</p>	<p>This was already in the proposals for the boundary changes.</p>

<p>Cults, Bielside & Milltimber Community Council</p>	<p>1. Para 3.1.6:</p> <p>This new paragraph is welcome but we would suggest a little more clarification as follows:</p> <p>"In the case of complex applications <i>affecting the whole community where the proposal might benefit from a formal consultation</i>, it may be impractical for Community Councils to perform a valid consultation, collate the feedback and lodge a meaningful representation within the timescales allowed. In this case Community Councils may lodge representations based on material considerations affecting the interests of their community provided they have also advertised the application in their community and encouraged members of the community to make their own representations. ..."</p> <p>2. Section 5.1.1 Suggest the wording be changed to "individual aged 16 and over" to make it clearer that 16 year olds can stand.</p> <p>3. Section 5.4.3 Paragraph 5.4.3 (a) needs to be amended to read "which does not contain the information prescribed in section 5.4.1." The insertion of a new section 5.4.2 makes the current wording invalid.</p> <p>4. In Standing Orders para 1.5 we think that the Chair needs to have authority to call a special meeting, so suggest:</p>	<p>1. The additional wording has been included in the Scheme.</p> <p>2. The new wording has been included in the Scheme.</p> <p>3. Agreed, this was an oversight and has been amended.</p> <p>4. Agreed, the wording has been amended in the Scheme.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>"Special meetings may be called at any time on the instructions of the Chairperson or on receipt of not less than half of the total number of Community Councillors or if requested to do so in writing by 20 residents in the Community Council area."</p> <p>5. We note a small typo at para 9.2 which should presumably read "Membership is invalidated..."</p> <p>6. In relation to the boundary with Garthdee CC at Pitfodels Station Road, we have met cordially with Garthdee CC and jointly agreed the current proposal for the full length of the road between North Deeside Road and Inchgarth Road to form the boundary between the two council areas. Also both councils agreed that the boundary should run down the centre of the road so that both would be consulted on matters affecting the road.</p>	<p>5. Agreed, this was an oversight and has been amended in the Scheme.</p> <p>6. This was already included in the boundary proposals.</p>
George Street Community Council	George Street Community Council still wants the boundary to be the railway line at Bedford bridge down to Mounthooley Way and not the proposed boundary to have the dual carriageway as the boundary.	Froghall, Powis and Sunnybank Community Council have agreed to the amended boundary and have stated that Froghall Community Centre would then be part of their boundary. They have indicated that they wish for the boundary to be amended as described in the Area descriptions and on the maps.
Old Aberdeen Community Councillor	<p><u>General comment</u></p> <p>This dossier amount to 7 documents, 76 pages of 'stuff' that any prospective community councillor should read. Many issues are</p>	The document was issued as one to make it easier for sending. Once the documents have been approved they will become separate documents and listed on the website separately. The written descriptions of the boundaries

	<p>repeated in different sections. Line spacing between every sentence makes it more bulky. Our concern is that many will not bother to read it.</p> <p><u>Scheme for the Establishment of Community Councils</u> Para. 2.1.1. This refers to reader to page 17 – the List Of Community Council Areas. Either this is an integral part of the Scheme for the Establishment of Community Councils document; in which case it should be an Appendix of that document and so referenced and without an ACC front sheet, or it is a standalone document so should be referenced as that.</p> <p>Para 3.1.6 This states: “In the case of complex planning applications, it may be impractical for Community Councils to perform a valid consultation, collate the feedback and lodge a meaningful representation within the timescales allowed”. The timescale is equally short for any planning application and we see no logical or legislative reason to differentiate between complex and the simpler applications. The phrase ‘valid consultation’ is problematic, as it is not defined. Suggest change to “In the case of any planning application, ...” . Or define ‘valid’. Or both.</p>	<p>takes up 21 pages and these have never been provided before. The Complaints Procedure takes up 18 pages and this is a new addition.</p> <p>It will be a standalone document so requires the front sheet.</p> <p>The term valid has been changed to full as valid was not considered to be the right terminology.</p> <p>Complex planning applications come with additional paperwork and often very lengthy which does not allow Community Councils to read all of it and then seek the views of the community within the timescales.</p> <p>For smaller applications it is deemed that for the majority of these, the Community Council would be able to determine whether representation was required without discussing each application with the public. For example, change of windows. Where an application relates to an extension of a house, Community Councils would be expected to seek the views of neighbouring properties.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The last sentence is also troubling; “In this case Community Councils may lodge representations based on material considerations affecting the interests of their community provided they have also advertised the application in their community and encouraged members of the community to make their own representations”. This raises issues of what is sufficient. What is deemed sufficient advertising, what is deemed sufficient encouragement? What this paragraph is doing is creating a mechanism for those who are against the community council (and community?) viewpoint to call foul due to lack of sufficient ‘advertising’ and ‘encouragement’. In reality, there can never be ‘sufficient’ as this can only be achieved by being able to demonstrate having reached the majority of the community within a timescale that would permit feedback if so wished; i.e. within one week of a planning application being posted. We often don’t even have the full application posted on the council web site in that time.</p> <p>This entire paragraph (3.1.6) should be simplified to something along the lines of; “In the case of any planning application, Community Councils should, within the timescales allowed, conduct valid consultation and lodge a meaningful representation based on the wishes and interests of the community”.</p> <p>Para 5.2.2 The University of Aberdeen is situated centrally within the Old Aberdeen CC. The Aberdeen</p>	<p>These are the words provided to me from other Community Councils heavily involved in planning applications.</p> <p>For major planning applications, as long as the Community Council have advertised it on facebook, website or other means available that will satisfy this and the community will have no come back. This is not asking for feedback but advising the community of the application and telling them where they can make representations.</p> <p>Based on the above I will not be changing the wording in the paragraph.</p> <p>There is a prescribed timetable for the elections so making forms available early will not be possible.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>University Students Association representative has commented how this date makes it difficult for prospective candidates from the University to put themselves forward for election. Assuming the student is entering second year and has already entered themselves onto the local electoral roll, the process of nomination and secondment will occur while they are within their summer recess; this creates a strong reason either to delay the CC elections until November, or to put in place a means for early nomination, prior to the recess? We note that it should be possible for students to complete nomination forms remotely, provided they have made prior plans for a seconder; perhaps this mechanism could be bolstered by putting in place a circulation/invite system for those wishing to take this opportunity?</p> <p>Para 5.6.5 The current text (para 5.6 (v)) includes the option for candidates to attend at an election count. We think it is important that this scrutiny remains available.</p> <p>Para 7.3.2 This text; “Associate members may include representation from other local organisations and may serve for a fixed period as determined by the Community Council” Is not particularly clear. We suggest: “Associate members may</p>	<p>The Scheme has been changed so only a witness will be required and not a proposer and seconder. Based on elections being held in late October, the deadline for nominations would be near the end of September. The majority of returning students will arrive in Aberdeen late August/early September so they would still have time to submit a nomination form.</p> <p>Experience has shown that there is not a high uptake of students joining Community Councils whether at the election stage or via co-option.</p> <p>At the time of nomination the candidate must be on the electoral register. Evidence has shown that the number of students who do register has reduced significantly since 2014. Although the register is published in August and then December, a person can register the day before a nomination form is submitted. The new system allows the Returning Officer to check all those on the register at the time of nomination.</p> <p>Community Council elections are usually undertaken by online voting with no physical count required. The system used calculates the totals therefore there would be opportunity to attend a physical count.</p> <p>Agreed, the text has been changed in the Scheme.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>include representation from other local organisations and may serve for a period determined by the Community Council, but will terminate no later than the next community council election”.</p> <p><u>Constitution for Community Councils</u> From the document: “3. Objectives The objectives of the Community Council shall be to: 3.1 Have in place mechanisms to encourage public involvement and feedback to secure greatest possible involvement from all sectors of the community which may include consultations, questionnaires, public meetings and effective means to publicise the determinations of the community council”.</p> <p>We consider that this is incorrectly categorised as an objective – it is something expected of the CC so should be moved under “4. Roles and Responsibilities”</p> <p>Para 12.4 The order of actions required to achieve approval of the constitution is incorrect here. Suggest: “The Constitution is to be adopted formally and signed by the Chairperson and two members of the Community Council. Within three months of the first meeting following an election, the Community Council shall review, may introduce minor amendments to reflect local circumstances if desired, but must agree and sign the Constitution and submit it to the</p>	<p>Agreed the text has been amended in the Scheme.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Community Council Liaison Officer for approval on behalf of Aberdeen City Council within three months”.</p> <p>Para. 14 “The local library within the Community Council shall receive:” as several CCs (and specifically the Old Aberdeen CC) do not have a library within their boundary, so suggest this be re-worded as: “Any local library within the Community Council should receive:”</p> <p>Para 15.5 A minimum of three signatories seems like overkill and unnecessary bureaucracy. Often it can take months to put multiple signatures into effect – this just makes that worse.</p> <p>Para 15.7 “per head of population” would be great for Old Aberdeen CC, but suspect you intend this to refer to head count on the electoral register??</p> <p>Para 17 This section would appear to be focused on a desire to alter the constitution subsequent to the review of the constitution after an election (para 12.4), so should be re-worded to that end.</p> <p>What is missing from this constitution is anything regarding what a CC can expect from the City Council. No mention of the Community Council Protocol, for instance.</p>	<p>Agreed the text has been amended in the Scheme.</p> <p>3 in a required minimum to cover illness or holidays. This is common practice and usually banks request this. This will remain as is.</p> <p>The proposal is to change the funding formula from electorate count to per head of population.</p> <p>This section has been amended in the constitution to make it clear when alterations would be carried out.</p> <p>The constitution is the governance arrangements for Community Councils not Aberdeen City Council. There are 2 other documents that state what Aberdeen City Council will do – the Planning Agreement and the Communication Protocol. I will make reference to these somewhere in the Scheme.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><u>Community Council Complaints Procedure</u> At the bottom of page 61 “There are some things we can’t deal with, these being:...” - this cannot be correct. These are issues that the Community Council can’t deal with, but there are specific process within Aberdeen Council for dealing with such issues and this section should make that distinction clear and direct the reader to the appropriate web site/ contact etc..</p>	<p>This is correct as Community Councils cannot deal with those things listed. The complaints procedure is for Community Councils only.</p> <p>The introduction clearly states that it is a complaints procedure for Community Councils and not for any other purpose. A link to the introduction page has been added to the complaints procedure.</p>
<p>Bridge of Don Community Council</p>	<p>The number of constituents represented by the Bridge of Don Community Council is likely to be one of the largest in Scotland.</p> <p>There are currently two members from Danestone who actively serve in the Bridge of Don Community Council. There is inevitably going to be substantial further growth of the Community Council coverage owing to the development of the Grandhome Estate. The members of the Community Council at the meeting broadly supported the change of boundary that would enable Danestone to form its own Community Council. It was also recognised that from the point of view of residents coming forward from Danestone with issues to review/ discuss/ action there was a perception that there was a disproportionately low occurrence of community members coming forward when compared to Bridge of Don. Subsequently there was some concern that after</p>	<p>This is true and reflected in the Scheme and the number of Community Councillors required for the area.</p> <p>During the lead up to the 2015 Community Council</p>

	<p>a boundary change the Community could fail to actually form a Community Council. It was also noted that in 2015/16 some 500 to 600 leaflets were delivered to the Danestone area that promoted the Bridge of Don Community Council, its remit, but in particular when its next meeting would be with an objective of generating more participation within the Bridge of Don Community Council by residents in the Danestone Area.</p> <p>In fact, the initiative did not result in any additional members of the Danestone Community attending the meeting. This further strengthens concerns that there could be a possibility that the Danestone Community may fail to successfully form a Community Council due to lack of participation.</p> <p>The most prominent concern arising from this possibility was that in the event the boundaries were changed and the residents did fail to form a Council that the Community of Danestone would no longer have a functioning Statutory Planning Consultee arrangement, mechanism or organisation in place.</p> <p>Taking the above in to account, the views of the Bridge of Don Community Council are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boundary changes to enable Danestone to have the opportunity to form its own Community Council are supported. 	<p>elections, leaflets were distributed throughout Danestone as well as the ones issued by Bridge of Don Community Council. At that time only a few people responded to the campaign. Some residents within Danestone and the Community Centre have stated that they would support a Danestone Community Council being established.</p> <p>1. The boundary for Danestone Community Council will be amended slightly due to other comments received.</p> <p>The original proposal was to remove an area to the west adjoining Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council however this been amended so it will be added to the Danestone boundary using the river as the boundary. Hutcheon Low will remain with Woodside and Hilton</p>
--	--	---

	<p>2. The Bridge of Don Community Council would take comfort from any mechanism that could be put in place to ensure that the residents of the newly formed area could fall back under the Bridge of Don Community Council in terms of Statutory Planning Consultee arrangement in the event that Danestone did fail to form a local Community Council.</p> <p>3. The Bridge of Don Community Council would undertake further steps to assist in promotion/ likely success of Danestone Community Council being formed. This may be via leafletting, Bridge of Don Community Council Newsletter article and/ or promoting the Bridge of Don Community Council membership from within the Danestone area to enable the possible transference of Bridge of Don Community Council members to Danestone once the formation process is undertaken, if such an action is undertaken. For the sake of clarity by “transference” it is not suggested or proposed that this should in any way circumvent the normal democratic process, only that there would be experienced Community Councillors within the Bridge of Don Community Council that could seek nomination for representation of the Danestone Community Council.</p>	<p>Community Council.</p> <p>2. Once Community Council areas have been approved, they are in place until they are next reviewed. Where a Community Council fails to be established the area cannot be represented by another within the Scheme. The process would then be to either: a) try again to get a Community Council established, which could not be done until 3 months after an election or b) apply to merge the areas together which could take some time to go through consultation and approval.</p> <p>As the neighbouring Community Council Bridge of Don Community Council could comment on planning applications however they would not carry the same weight as they would not be the statutory consultee.</p> <p>3. This would be very welcome and the CCLO would support the Community Council.</p>
ACC Election Team	Is paragraph 5.1.1 describing the eligibility for membership and voting? For voting, the requirements outlined in 5.1.1 need to be met	This section has been changed in the Scheme. Proposers and Seconders have been removed and

	<p>“on the day of poll”. The requirements for candidates, proposers, seconders are at the date of nomination, as already outlined in 5.1.2 . Maybe it would be clearer to make 5.1.1 about voting and so add “on the day of poll” and 5.1.2 about membership by adding the age requirement.</p> <p>Eligibility for voting – do you want the criteria to be inclusion in the register AND residency (as it is described now or implied) or just inclusion in the register? Standard practice would be inclusion in the register only. I would suggest removing the word “resident” from 5.1.1. Defining and verifying residency is difficult. The same comment applies to section 9.1</p> <p>5.4.1 If we continue to allow candidates the option of withholding their address from notices and the ballot paper, we need to give some thought to what appears in its place. Using methodology used in UK parliamentary elections, it would say something like “address within the xxx community council area”. Note that local government elections do not allow for withholding home address. This text has some meaning in UK parliamentary elections as the home address need not be within the contest constituency. If we allow the facility of withholding the home address in a community council election we may wish to make the text more meaningful e.g. “this candidate chose to withhold their home address”.</p> <p>I’m not sure what purpose requiring a proposer</p>	<p>changing to one witness.</p> <p>This section has been changed in the Scheme.</p> <p>The wording has been amended in the Scheme to include ‘address within the xxx community council area’.</p> <p>This has been accepted and will change to a witness.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>and seconder serves. I suggest removing this requirement and replacing with the signature of a witness.</p> <p>In section 5.4.2 it says the “the following text will appear on the ballot paper”. This should be “on a separate paper for candidate statements and provided to voters together with the ballot paper”.</p> <p>5.5.2 I suggest “Voting methods will be determined by the Returning Officer. They will be designed to ensure a properly run election and accurate count. Chosen voting methods should also increase accessibility and participation and wherever possible will include electronic methods.”</p> <p>In Section 5.6.3 (d) I suggest adding “Specify the methods of voting” and the location of the polling station “if applicable” to allow for the option of running an election without a physical polling place.</p> <p>5.6.5 Suggest “The Returning Officer will arrange for the counting of votes following the poll. In normal circumstances this will be the first working day following the date of poll.”</p>	<p>This has been accepted and the text has been amended.</p> <p>This has been accepted and the text has been amended.</p> <p>This has been accepted and the text has been amended.</p> <p>This has been accepted and the text has been amended.</p>
Member of the Public	<p>With regard to the proposed boundary changes, it is my opinion that the new AECC is included within Bucksburn and Newhills CC boundary as it is in no way associated with Dyce and any traffic problems that may arise will affect Bucksburn and not Dyce. Furthermore the boundary should include Dyce Drive to the</p>	<p>This is similar to the initial proposal as outlined as proposal 1. The part that is not included in the boundary is Stoneywood Terrace to the river don and was discussed with members of Bucksburn and Newhills Community Council.</p>

	junction of Wellheads Drive and to the junction of Market St. Then to Stoneywood Terrace and the river Don all the way to Persley Bridge.	
Member of the Public	<p>Agree with the proposal to create a new community council for Danestone as it is an area not well represented nor is it part of Bridge of Don although clearly they are linked by the facilities and resources that they share.</p> <p>However I do not agree that lower persley(hutcheon low) should form part of this. It is clearly segregated from Danestone by the River Don and can't see how it would be beneficial for residents there to be represented by Danestone Comm Council. Suggest inclusion to Woodside comm council or the comm council which covers the former Davidson Mill site currently being developed."</p>	<p>Hutcheon Low is currently within the Woodside Community Council area however it isn't seen as being part of traditional Woodside.</p> <p>The option would be to either keep it within the Woodside boundary or extend Bucksburn and Newhills boundary. The preferred option would be to keep it within the Woodside boundary.</p>
Members of the Public	<p>Although most community councils work extremely well there is the grave danger that a community council can be taken over by vested interests particularly where there is no contested election and no mechanism to challenge decisions or actions.</p> <p>This is particularly of concern when there a large population flows for example relating to the arrival of students. Students typically arrive in September and are immediately disenfranchised from there community by the fact that the last register of electors is August and the following one is December. To disregard this temporarily transient community is a fundamental flaw in democracy particularly where students form large segments of the local community.</p>	<p>Across Scotland the majority of Community Councils are established uncontested. Over previous elections Aberdeen have had contested elections in three areas.</p> <p>Community Councils can be challenged on the decisions they have made.</p> <p>At the time of nomination, the candidate must be on the electoral register. The process has changed in that the electoral registers are published at certain points in the year however the Returning Officer has access to the complete list up to the date the nomination has been received. A person could register the day before submitting an application as a Community Councillor.</p> <p>History has also shown that there is not a high uptake from students to join Community Councils or to be on the</p>

	<p>To claim that students are represented by student bodies again is false. Student bodies are not community councils and do not have the statutory consultation rights on planning and licensing.</p> <p>To claim that CC elections can 'only' be undertaken in October is also false. There have been main Government elections in October which could possibly conflict with CC elections. The ideal date for CC elections, to avoid the clash of the movement of large numbers of students, is in February.</p> <p>To claim that the 'settled community' would have no voice is also false. There is no principle in law that one person's vote is more important than another whether they form one part of a community or another. It presumes that the settled community would be swamped by the transient community but that is exactly what happens at present in reverse. Where in Community Council legislation is this principle enshrined?</p> <p>Proposals to allow other non elected members to join the CC are again flawed as only existing CC can make the invite. If existing CC are formed by flawed elections this solves nothing in terms of the flawed electoral process.</p> <p>To prevent abuse of power there should be a</p>	<p>electoral register whilst in Aberdeen studying.</p> <p>This is not in the Scheme.</p> <p>The date commonly used across Scotland for Community Council elections is October.</p> <p>Also based on the fact that students could register and apply within the deadlines prescribed this would rule this argument out.</p> <p>This is not in the Scheme.</p> <p>I have assumed the respondent is referring to Associate Members. Anyone with an interest in the work of a Community Council can attend the meetings and if they have expertise in a particular area that the Community Council could benefit from, they can become an associate member.</p> <p>Residents on the electoral register can request that the</p>
--	---	---

	<p>process whereby 20 voters can request to dissolution of a CC and request another election at anytime in the year (except October to December).</p> <p>The proposal for by elections is also flawed. Allowing an election for one position where all were previously elected uncontested merely perpetuates a flawed system. At the very least not only the vacancy but all vacant positions should be open for by election - at any time (excluding Oct- Dec).</p> <p>Fundamentally to prevent abuse of power any CC should be dissolved by a majority vote in a meeting of not less than 50 electors at a public meeting. Such meeting being called by not less than 20 electors.</p>	<p>Community Council hold a special meeting. This is covered under section 12.9 in the Constitution and 1.5 in the Standing Orders. There would need to be a valid reason for the request and a vote taken. To dissolve a community council a public meeting must take place.</p> <p>This is not what the Scheme states. The Scheme states at section 7.4.2 'Only the vacant positions will be advertised'</p> <p>This means that all vacancies on the Community Council would be advertised. The by election route is usually only undertaken where co-option has not been possible or the numbers fall below the minimum number.</p> <p>By elections are held at anytime throughout the year unless there are scheduled elections in May which may make running the by election more difficult due to time constraints on the Returning Officer.</p> <p>As previously mentioned those on the electoral register can request a special meeting where a discussion can take place and a vote taken.</p>
<p>Bucksburn and Newhills Community Councillor</p>	<p>I believe that Stoneywood should be in the Bucksburn and Newhills ward as should the new exhibition centre from along Dyce Drive down Market street and directly across Stoneywood road down to the mill and the Don. It is a clear border with everything one side being Dyce the other Bucksburn, as it stands the current boundary twists and turns, chops parts of Bankhead off and Greenburn . These areas are locally and historically in Bucksburn not Dyce. The old Rowett site and Strathcona House now the exhibition centre is well removed from the</p>	<p>This is similar to the initial proposal. The only part that has not been accepted is the additional part across Stoneywood Road (from Market Street) down to the mill. This has already been discussed with members of Bucksburn and Newhills Community Council.</p> <p>This is outlined as proposal 1 in the supporting documents.</p>

	<p>community of Dyce and has been classed as the Bucksburn area for years, the traffic and future issues affect Bucksburn not Dyce. Can I also add that the area before the Haudagain with the pizza shop and units should also be in Bucksburn and not Northfield .</p> <p>Thank you"</p>	
<p>Councillor Donnelly, the Depute Provost</p>	<p>May I take this opportunity to object to the proposals for the north of the Ferryhill area to be moved into the wider City Centre Community Council boundary.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that there is a large concentration of licensed premises in the north of Ferryhill, there is a large proportion of care in the community projects in that area as well as retail premises that are part of Ferryhills culture and successful wellbeing.</p> <p>The issues and concerns have always been of my utmost concern as well as previous Ferryhill Community Councils.</p> <p>I propose that the boundary should be amended as follows:</p> <p>From Union Street, go along Holburn Street to the junction with Justice Mill Lane, continue onto Langstane Place, down onto Windmill Brae, continue down Bridge Street onto College Street to the junction with Wellington Place, travel across the railway line to Market Street. This would take in Union Square area and the other side of Union Street.</p>	<p>This proposal has been highlighted in the report with a proposed action to target the views of the local residents.</p>