#### THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL

# Caithness and Sutherland Area Committee 16 September 2015

Agenda Item	16.
Report No	CS/34/15

# Request for Boundary Change by Lairg and Rogart Community Councils

### Report by Head of Policy and Reform

#### Summary

This report details a request by Lairg and Rogart Community Councils for an amendment to be made to the boundary between the 2 Community Councils. The report asks Members to approve the boundary amendment proposed and agreed by Rogart and Lairg Community Councils and detailed at Appendix 1.

# 1. Background

- 1.1 In August 2012 Lairg Community Council asked the Highland Council for changes to be made to their boundary to include an area in the vicinity of Dalnessie currently within the Rogart Community Council Boundary.
- 1.2 Lairg Community Council felt this would be an improvement and reflect the fact that the 2 households situated at Dalnessie look to Lairg for all their services. Rogart is 7 miles away and people from these 2 affected households drive through the village of Lairg to reach Rogart.
- 1.3 Community Councils were formed under the 1973 Local Government (Scotland) Act and provision was also contained for their continuation under the 1994 Local Government (Scotland) Act. Each Local Authority must create a Scheme for Community Councils which will provide the framework for their operation. There is provision within the legislation for making minor amendments, reviewing and revoking a Community Council Scheme. At a meeting of the Highland Council in June 2015, Members agreed to delegate all future decisions regarding boundary amendments to Area Committees.
- 1.4 This report asks Members to approve the boundary amendment proposed and agreed by Rogart and Lairg Community Councils.

#### 2. Consultation

- 2.1 Following the initial approach to the Council regarding the boundary change request, the 2 Community Councils met and considered 3 potential options for changing the boundary which were produced by Council GIS staff. The boundary amendment, as agreed between the 2 Community Councils, can be found at Appendix 1.
- 2.2 Rogart Community Council wanted to agree the request whilst minimising the impact on the area covered by their Community Council. They asked for the smallest area of land to be transferred and for it to follow the road leading to and around the two houses at Dalnessie.
- 2.3 Both of the Community Councils involved then carried out public consultations within

their communities in 2014 and with the residents affected. There was support from those affected for the proposed change. A letter of agreement from both Community Councils has been received by the Council expressing support for the proposed change.

- 2.4 Local Members have also had the opportunity to consider the proposed boundary amendment. East Sutherland Members are supportive of the amendment as proposed by the 2 Community Councils. North, West and Central Sutherland Members have differing views. 2 Members are supportive of the proposed amendment, whilst a third suggests that it would have been preferable for the lineage to have followed a more natural boundary fitting in with a more identifiable and permanent geographical feature.
- 2.5 There is not support for this alternative proposal from the 2 Community Councils who wish the smallest amount of land transferred as part of the boundary amendment.
- 2.6 Members are asked to agree the amendment to the Lairg and Rogart Community Council boundary as detailed at appendix 1 and as agreed by the 2 Community Councils.

### 3. Implications for the Council

- 3.1 <u>Legal and Risk Implications:</u> Members are asked to agree the amendment as per the provisions contained within the 1973 Local Government (Scotland) Act, within Highland's own Scheme of Establishment for Community Councils and under the Council's Scheme of Delegation.
- 3.2 <u>Financial Implications:</u> None and there are no implications for community benefit funding.
- 3.3 Equalities Implications: None
- 3.4 <u>Climate Change/Carbon Clever Implications</u>: None
- 3.5 Gaelic Implications: None
- 3.6 Rural Implications: None

#### 4. Recommendation

Members are asked to agree the proposed boundary amendment found at Appendix 1 as proposed and agreed by the 2 Community Councils and the local community.

Designation: Head of Policy and Reform

Author: Andrew Mackay, Ward Manager Date: 20 August 2015

# **Appendix 1**

