

Response Rec'd	Community Council	Contact	Comments	Docs amended with comments
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Taking the last first CC are consulted for liquor licence applications, I don't recall this happening for our local pub.	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	7.4 in training handbook states minimum 6 meetings + AGM annually SB Community Council Scheme 2014 12.1 says frequency at least 3 meetings including AGM.	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Training book 7.7 AGM states includes Secretary annual report (also in Doc 3 Constitution) but not in SBCC Scheme	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Scheme does not mention abiding by Community Councillors Code of Conduct.	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	In Doc 2 elections the Agenda of the first meeting doesn't include the undertaking by CCLrs to abide by Code of Conduct, whereas it does in Doc 4 Standing orders.	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Doc 6 Equalities Statement who signs this? when and how often? Should it be included at 5.1 in Standing Orders?	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Doc 7 Privacy Notice where do we use this. I can't find it referred to elsewhere.	yes 30/01/24
15/11/23	Hobkirk	Ron Swinton	Doc 9 CC document retention where is this referred to in Training handbook or Scheme?	yes 30/01/24
16/11/23	Peebles	Anne Snoddy	I have been looking at the 24 page Training Manual. On pages 6 and 7 there are references to 'the Formal Chair' and 'the Enabling Chair'. The Enabling Chair does not appear in the earlier list of office bearers. Does that mean these two roles are the responsibility of just one person, the Chair?	yes 30/01/24
24/11/23	Duns	Jim Carnie	Doc 6 - Equalities Statement, uses terms neither myself or the Chair understand - 'protected characteristics' and 'protected groups'. As far as we are concerned every person is treated with the respect they are entitled to, if some people have special needs then these will be acted upon in full.	yes 30/01/24
30/11/23	Selkirk	Andy Murray	I assume the instruction in the attached to 'Destroy' Minutes after 5 years is to do with GDPR. However, in our case, the Minutes archive, which goes back to 2008, includes a lot of the local history which we are loath to obliterate. Might it be acceptable to keep, say, hard copies in a locked filing cabinet somewhere?	yes 30/01/24
23/12/23	Innerleithen & District	Daniel Davis Wood	In general, we think that these documents provide good guidance for the conduct of business by community council. The guidance on declarations of conflicts of interest is particularly welcome. Individual members have commented that Document 1 is especially useful for us (given our need to clarify and formalise the respective roles of IDCC and the Innerleithen Community Trust) as are Documents 7 and 8. One member also wondered whether there was another document to deal with procurement of goods and services by a community council using public money. This might have been dealt with in Document 11, but there remains a grey around this topic. A typo was noted on Document 5, item 4.1, bullet 4: "muses" should be "misuses".	yes 30/01/24
28/12/23	Leitholm, Eccles and Crailing	Bob Hope	Leitholm Eccles & Birgham letter 28.12.24.docx	yes 30/1/24 also on general enquiries
			The amount of paperwork involved in this consultation was mind numbing and felt excessive for the management of teams of volunteers prepared to give of their time to consult with and support their communities.	general enquiries

03/01/24	Crailing, Eckford and Nisbet	Dinah Faulds	10 SBC Community Council (CC) Scheme Proposed Amendments Consultation. The committee had no comments on Documents 2,5,6,7,8,9,10,11. On the 'Scottish Borders Community Council Scheme' the meeting comments were summarised as: Para 11.4 On-line meetings – It was felt that SBC should make available a system for on-line meetings so that each community council is not required to purchase its own package Schedule -1 It was agreed that 9 elected members was adequate for CENCC and that there should be no classification by village area. It was noted that a contradiction exists between para 11.4 of the Scheme, Doc 4 Standing Orders (1.1), and the Training Handbook (Doc1 para 7.4). The first states "Meetings of each Community Council shall be convened at intervals of not more than six months and at least three meetings shall be held annually, one of which shall be the AGM. The Standing Orders (1.1) Page 5 of 6 state:- "at least 3 meetings per annum, excluding the AGM" . The Handbook states at 7.4 "The frequency and timing of ordinary meetings will be determined by the CC, subject to a minimum of 6 ordinary meetings and one AGM being held each year." This needs to be standardised. The Chair questioned whether it is necessary to state in Standing Orders (1.1) the months when meetings are to take place, as this is restrictive and does not allow for changes, for practical reasons e.g. Hall unavailability. Doc 9 – Retention Policy There was some disquiet over the necessity to destroy documents e.g. Minutes after a fixed period of time. The use of historical minutes has been useful to researchers and this could not happen if no records were retained. Would SBC hold records for longer and pass on for heritage storage? What would be the consequences should CCs hold on to data for longer than the stated periods? Doc 12 is out of date. It was noted that it is due for review. The committee wished to highlight the proposed boundary change that was forwarded to Jenny Wilkinson in August 2023 for consideration by this review. (An email was received on 21 August 2023 that confirmed Ms Wilkinson would pass the request to the SBC CC review team). Also we are aware of the boundary changes proposed by Jedburgh Community Council, the formal proposal of which we are awaiting for consideration.	yes 30/1/24 also on general enquiries
06/01/24	Duns	Jim Carnie	Duns CC response.pdf	yes 16/1 CS
10/01/24	Duns	Andrew Mitchell	I note that the Scheme states that an external examiner should be appointed to look over the accounts each year but the handbook states that 2 independent examiners have to do the job. I cannot think of any other voluntary body requiring 2 examinations. I would suggest that the scheme requirement is the one which should stand.	yes 16/1 CS
09/01/24	Hawick	Margaret Hogg	I refer to your email of 2 November last enclosing the reviewed Scheme for CCs, along with other documentation. Due to other workloads of HCC taking priority, we have only managed to date to look at the Scheme itself, and I enclose our few comments on that, for your consideration. We will endeavour to review all of the other documentation, as soon as is practicable, and provide our comments to you on each in due course. This will however likely not all happen prior to the deadline date of 12th January 2024. Our apology if some of the queries are perhaps answered in that other documentation. I hope this is acceptable to you and I'll be in touch again hopefully in the not too distant future. Hawick CC response 09.01.24.docx	
10/01/24	Reston & Auchencrow	Logan Inglis	Reston & Auchencrow response 10.01.24.docx	yes 16/1 CS

11/01/24	Selkirk	Andy Murray	Please find below the response from Selkirk Community Council re: the suggestion of extending our boundaries, and our response to the SBC proposed updates to local Community Councils' Constitutions. The below changes were approved by the Community Council, in the presence of our 3 elected SBC Councillors, who can confirm. 1. We propose to extend our boundary as per the attached map ('3 Brethren closeup..')? It includes another fence bounding the Three Brethren cairns, and makes it easier to repair the fences, because one more of them would be ours. 2. We chose not to make any changes to membership numbers. (Notwithstanding that, of the 68 Borders Community Councils, only 10 list a full complement of members. A further 20 don't list members at all.) FYI, other comparable towns to us, who could have 12 members, but haven't reached that number, include: Jedburgh, Innerleithen, Melrose, Tweedbank, Coldstream, Lauder, Earlston and Newcastleton. 3. Constitutional changes. Please see a version of the SBC proposals, with our Selkirk change suggestions in red.	Selkirk CC contacted and asked if they want to call NM 15/1
			3 Brethren closeup plus extra 2 fences.jpg	
			Scottish Borders Community Council Scheme 2014 - proposed amendments V1.3 - Oct 23 AM.docx	
			SelkirkandDistrict.pdf	
11/01/24	Walkerburn & District	Lesley Thornton	Walkerburn & District reponse 11.01.24.docx	no amendments
12/01/24	Walkerburn & District	Lesley Thornton	Walkerburn & District reponse 12.01.24.docx	no amendments
11/01/24	Peebles	Anne Snoddy	I attach the responses from Peebles Community Council to the consultation regarding SBC's review of Community Councils. Our four office bearers - Peter Maudsley, Graham Mackie, Fiona Richardson and me, Anne Snoddy - divided the sections between us and are referred to in the documents by our initials which are in red. Our responses are in blue. It was a considerable amount of work at a busy time of year and I hope you find our input useful.	
			Peebles CC 11.01.24 (1).docx	<u>yes 16/1 CS</u>

12/01/24		Graham Mackie	<p>I refer to your e-mail of 2 November. I have been treasurer of Peebles Community Council for 9 years. Prior to my retirement in 2013 I worked in financial services and was a fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales. Therefore I feel I can speak with some authority on financial matters. I have made a number of comments on your draft documents to our secretary who will have passed them on to you together with comments from other members. However, there are a couple of matters which concern me greatly that I wish to focus on. Firstly, point 14.5 of the Training Handbook states that all expenditure must be approved in advance by the Community Council. This is totally impractical, it would mean that before I bought a paperclip or a postage stamp I would have to seek approval from all members of the CC. I have not come across such a restriction applying to any other form of association. It would lead to unnecessary delays and waste a lot of time at CC meetings. The purpose of any group appointing a treasurer is to delegate decisions regarding money, rather than decisions being made by the whole group. There are of course safeguards in that cheque payments require a second signature and the treasurer has to make regular financial reports to the CC. Of course large items of expenditure should be discussed at least by the office bearers and in some cases the whole group but to require all items to be considered by the whole CC would impose a wasteful and unnecessary administrative burden. The second item of concern relates to honoraria and is in point 7 of the Financial Management Best Practice Guidance. It states that payments of honoraria may not be made to elected members of the CC. Since before I became treasurer Peebles CC has paid modest honoraria to our secretary and minute secretary. This is in recognition of the long hours that they put into carrying out their roles. To follow this rule would require these individuals to either resign their membership or cease being paid. A possible consequence of this is that we could end up without a secretary and/or minute secretary which would make it almost impossible for the CC to function. It is very difficult finding people to take on offices in the CC and we were without a minute secretary for a number of months. The rule would allow us to pay non-members but the amount we could afford would go nowhere near paying a commercial rate for a non-member to carry out the work. Could we expect the same level of dedication from someone who was only taking on the role of secretary or minute secretary for the remuneration? I think not. The comment that it would be inappropriate for these kind of payments to be made from the SBC annual grant makes no sense at all. The amounts involved are relatively small. Surely exactly the same argument could be made in relation to the much larger payments made to SBC councillors? Would they be willing to continue in office if they were unpaid? I appreciate the amount of work that must have gone into producing the draft documents and I understand that the authors are doing their best to stop public money being squandered. However it is necessary to apply a sense of proportion. I would be very willing to discuss these issues with the members of the working group if it would be of any assistance.</p>	added to general enquiries document
12/01/24	Earlston	Sheila Gibb	Earlston CC 12.01.24.msg	<u>yes 17/01/24 CS</u>

12/01/24	Upper Teviotdale & Borthwick Water	Walter Douglas	<p>We have had a look at the SBC CC Scheme and the proposed amendments. Generally we welcome these proposals especially the addition of point 16. on Complaints Procedure and point 19. on Breaches of Code of Conduct. We do however have a query on point 2.3 covering what CCs have a statutory right to be consulted on. It is stated that "CCs should contact Scottish Forestry on forestry applications". We are unsure as to what this statement means. Does it mean that we have no right to be consulted on forestry matters? Surely we have a right to be at least notified of any forestry applications in our area and it is not up to CCs to find out about any proposals. We think that it is included in forestry best practice that communities should be consulted on forestry proposals and we do at present get notifications from various forestry developers. Finally, although we believe it was raised during the review of the CC scheme, we are disappointed that the problem of the ever increasing workload and bureaucracy being faced by CCs has not been addressed. We are sure that you have been told that it is increasingly difficult to recruit CCLrs never mind office bearers especially secretaries. If the functions of CCs are to be at least adequately carried out then we are afraid that the workload is becoming beyond what can be reasonably expected of local volunteers.</p>	added to general enquiries document
13/01/24	Kelso	Gordon Horsburgh	Kelso CC 13.01.24.docx	<u>yes 17/01/24 CS</u>