

**MINUTES of MEETING of COMMUNITY COUNCIL CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL held BY
MICROSOFT TEAMS
on MONDAY, 28 AUGUST 2023**

Present: Councillor John Armour
Councillor Jan Brown
Councillor Liz McCabe (Chair)
Norman Muir, Convener of Helensburgh Community Council
Valerie Nimmo, Convener of Campbeltown Community Council

Attending: Shirley MacLeod, Committee Manager (Adviser)
Hazel MacInnes, Committee Services Officer (Minutes)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

The Committee Manager, having welcomed everyone to the meeting, invited the Panel to nominate a Chair for the proceedings. It was unanimously agreed to appoint Councillor Liz McCabe as Chair of the Conduct Review Panel.

4. LOCHGOIL COMMUNITY COUNCIL - COMPLAINT REFERRALS

The Community Council Liaison Officer had received 3 separate complaints in relation to the con

Community Council for consideration. The Panel agreed to refer that aspect of complaint 1 back to the Community Council for consideration.

Referring to paragraph 5.4.2 of the report the Committee Manager advised that there had been a request from the Community Council that the part of complaint 3 suggesting that the theft and vandalism of the complainants' brown tourist signs was related to the Community Council Meeting held on 13 February 2023 and / or the publication of a resignation letter be ignored due to concern that this was a serious matter which could adversely affect the reputations of members of the new Community Council. The Committee Manager asked the Panel to consider the request from the Community Council that the Panel exclude this part of Complaint 3 from their consideration as there were other avenues in which this aspect of the complaint be dealt with. The Panel agreed to exclude this part of the complaint from their consideration of Complaint 3.

Having assumed the role of Chair, Councillor McCabe advised that her first task was to establish whether members of the Panel had sufficient information before them to discuss and determine the subject of the complaint. The Panel agreed that they had sufficient information before them to discuss and determine the subject of the complaint.

Having determined that they had sufficient information before them to reach a view on the grounds of the referrals, the Panel proceeded to discuss and determine whether the Community Council, on the balance of probabilities, had failed to comply with and abide by the terms of the Scheme of the Establishment of Community Councils, the constitution of Lochgoil Community Council and the Code of Conduct for Community Council Members. A summary of each complaint was provided together with a response from the Community Council for ease of reference.

Complaint 1 related to the conduct of half or more of Lochgoil Community Council and the way in which the Community Council had dealt with a planning application by Loch Long Salmon which had been considered by Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority. There were 9 parts to Complaint 1 with a summary of the complaint and the response from the Community Council detailed at Appendix 2.1 of the submitted report.

Complaint 2 related to the conduct of half or more of Lochgoil Community Council and had been submitted by a representative of Loch Lomond Salmon. The complaint referred to the way in which the Community Council had dealt with a planning application by Loch Long Salmon which had been considered by Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority. There were 3 parts to Complaint 2 with a summary of the complaint and the response from the Community Council detailed at Appendix 3.1 of the submitted report.

Complaint 3 related to the conduct of Lochgoil Community Council as a whole and covered a number of issues relating to the conduct of the Community Council. There were 7 parts to Complaint 3 with a summary of the complaint and the response from the Community Council detailed at Appendix 4.1 of the submitted report.

In relation to complaint 1, the Panel had further discussion around the identity of the complainant with specific reference to point 1.3 noting that if the complainant was a Community Councillor they could have attended the private meeting. In terms of the

Complaint 2