

Achieving Impact with Community Benefit

A Seminar to share learning- Dumfries, 27th August 2013

Seminar Report- Part 2

About this detailed summary of the day

This second part of the report provides a summary of the presentations and discussions on the day and should be read in conjunction with Part 1- the Executive Summary.

Please note that the views recorded here are those of speakers and delegates, as they were shared on the day. They do not necessarily reflect the views of Foundation Scotland or its staff.

Each speaker's input is firstly outlined in the order it was presented. Full copies of some speeches and presentations are available from our website..

Secondly, a later section collates notes taken from the table discussions, together with key learning points highlighted in feedback. Headings have been provided where broad themes emerged, with related points grouped under these.

Welcome

The seminar was opened by **Andrew Mellor, of the Glenkens Community & Arts Trust and St. Johns Town of Dalry Community Council**. Andrew set the scene by proposing the Glenkens as a case study of community reaction to wind developments. He indicated delegates shouldn't underestimate the impact of such developments on communities and the changes which these can bring- both positive and negative.

Theme 1: The policy context

Fergus Ewing MSP, Minister for Energy and Climate Change, Scottish Government

The Minister spoke on the Scottish Government's approach to a wide range of issues related to community benefit and answered questions afterwards. He focussed on two key aspects, community ownership of renewables, and community benefit from renewables.

Key points included:

- Good to get around Scotland to hear first-hand what communities want.
- The Scottish Government regard community ownership of renewables to be a key priority- that's the ideal- but also want to maximise benefit from community benefits.
- Mentioned his own constituency and the complex issues with developers and communities. As a local MSP, he is aware of strong emotions and the need to respect these- sees his role to mediate and find a solution. Recognises that not everyone will be happy with outcome.

- Not matter what opinion you hold- for or against wind- still important to maximise community benefit.
- The Government has initiated the CARES scheme, which provides practical advice and funding for community ownership options. Negotiating can often be difficult and complex and it is not always reasonable to expect that small community organisations have the capacity to do this. Under any CARES scheme there is an obligation of at least £10,000/MW/yr community benefit. Under CARES SG has sought to lead by example to developers
- There is no fixed mandate for developers in respect of community benefit and the Scottish Government does not have the power to make community benefit payments compulsory or to set rates. The approach to date has therefore been based on the encouragement of good practice and this will continue.
- Under the recent Forestry Commission Scotland renewables scheme, Ministers have set a community benefit rate at £5,000/MW/yr and this is augmented by the intention to offer up to 45% equity shares to communities. This has helped to set a new standard for community benefit and lead to the adoption of the £5,000/MW/year rate by most major developers, including SSE.
- The Scottish Government launched a community benefit register last year. The minister encouraged all those involved in delivering or receiving community benefit to record their information on this database to encourage transparency and moves towards best practice by Developers.
- Community benefit is not uniformly paid and rates vary greatly. The Scottish Government is currently developing good practice guidance for onshore renewables, which should be published this autumn and will be followed by guidance relating to offshore renewables. These will set out a clear recommended standard for Developers.
- He mentioned that it is only guidance and you might say that it can be applied or ignored- he doesn't share this view- experience broadly has been that it tends to be followed.
- The uses of community benefit funds can be a controversial topic. However there is no doubt of the potential benefits which can be achieved through these funds. Foundation Scotland plays a key role in this. This is particularly evident in the Highlands & Islands areas where funds have been used for numerous projects including helping local people to address their energy needs or increase their employment opportunities.
- It's for local people to decide, not Scottish Government, on how funds are spent.
- Progress being made on community benefit but more to be done, need to work together.

Questions from the floor for the Minister:

Q: Has the government considered community benefit from other types of renewables including biomass?

A: Standard CARES benefits package, as prescribed under Scottish Government scheme would apply for community owned biomass schemes. However the Minister was not aware of the timber industry itself paying any community benefit.

Q – (Our community council) has not had any contact from developers regarding a massive wind development in area- we are concerned at the cumulative impact of multiple developments.

A: The Minister recognised the strong emotions associated with developments, both for and against. As he makes planning decisions on major developments, he indicated he cannot be seen to be biased either way. But he does look at each development on an individual basis and will refuse projects. SNH have legal duties to act as the impartial regulator on issues of cumulative impact. He advised people to study the cumulative impact guidance and if they are not satisfied with it, to make a clear written case to the minister, as he would consider revisions.

Q: Worried about the impacts on the tourism industry and UNESCO Biosphere world heritage site. Many developments are not shown on the SNH cumulative impact map. Also concerned by constraint payments for wind (i.e. energy not being used).

A: Happy to look at the SNH map and receive a letter detailing any omissions. Minister recognises that we need generation from a variety of different sources. He noted that constraint payments relate to all electricity generation, including nuclear and gas and are related to national grid capacity constraints rather than the type of generation.

Giles Ruck, Chief Executive, Foundation Scotland

Giles highlighted the work of Foundation Scotland, which is focused on enabling communities to benefit from community benefit funds. He emphasised that Foundation Scotland don't make decisions on how funds are used- this is purely up to the communities but can support communities in navigating that process and take on the administrative burden. Foundation Scotland can provide guidance as well as template processes, documents and models. The Foundation usually negotiates a separate fee with the developer to pay for its role, which doesn't come out of the Fund. Groups may wish to seek advice and support about how to manage and distribute community benefit. Foundation Scotland often takes on a brokering role in community discussions and decision-making. Foundation Scotland have just concluded some research about the current and potential value of community benefit funds in Scotland, which will be published shortly

Claire Addison Communications Manager for AES Wind Generation

AES operate 4 wind farms in the UK, with 2 in Scotland (1 in the Borders and 1 in D&G). They work with communities to keep them informed during the build and then subsequently work with groups to develop community benefit funds through Foundation Scotland (acting as an independent administrator). AES leave the decision-making around fund spends with local communities. At each site a community profile will be offered to establish the potential issues which the fund could be used to address. They want to work with communities but

are aware of the issues groups have had with other developers and how this can affect the trust between communities and future development projects.

Theme 2- Impact of funding- How is the money being used?

Wendy Reid, Development Trusts Association Scotland (DTAS)

Wendy wanted to share the experiences of DTAS when working with groups in receipt of community benefit funds. They found that when communities initiate discussion regarding community benefit it often highlights issues within their community and helps them realise the potential uses of a fund. Communities may develop action plans for use of the funds, consulting widely on local needs and wishes, then agreeing solutions to help direct investment. Many communities decide to develop these plans in response to developments in their area. Groups are in a much stronger position in negotiations with developers if they already have these plans in place. For this to work there needs to be appropriate community organisations to act as delivery vehicles and strong leadership driving these projects.

David Hannah, Ardgay Community Council, Sutherland and Panel Member SSE & EON community funds

David's CC is in receipt of a number of different community benefit funds and has learned a lot through negotiating with various developers. There is a considerable amount of cost and time involved in dealing with wind farms. Their funds have gone towards numerous projects in the area but the most successful has been their apprenticeship programme. There have been many good outcomes from the funding but also some bad things. There's a lack of commitment from communities (youth not getting involved) and also a concern that many groups have become dependent on the funds and stopped fundraising themselves.

Theme 3- governance of funds, how are they managed and supported?

Duncan Saunderson, Glencairn Community Council

Glencairn (Moniaive) Community Council manages their funds themselves, without any outside involvement. They have given out 59 grants (nearly £160,000) since 2007. All grant allocation meetings are opened to the public to ensure transparency. Admin costs are down to 0.03%. They have provided support for families' projects, postal service, festivals and now want to look at a big legacy project, perhaps creating a Development Trust.

Martin Brown, Chair of Kirkpatrick Juxta Community Council, Moffat Initiative and panel member SSE Clyde D&G community benefit fund

Martin outlined the importance of communities needing to work together to try and secure arrangements for delivering funds that meet with community needs and capacity and allow for longer term, strategic impact. He outlined the involvement of the Moffat Initiative and his own community council in various rounds of negotiations about wind farm funds locally. He

explained how Foundation Scotland facilitated a process of dialogue across the 12 community councils brought together through the SSE Clyde (Dumfries & Galloway) Fund. Initially the various communities had been quite far apart in terms of ambition to work together. But the agreement of a single fund, providing ring-fenced equal amounts to each community for the first six years, plus the mechanism of a Panel from across each of the areas periodically coming together to approve awards and share learning is proving useful and connecting communities with each other. Alongside this example, Martin outlined the developmental work to achieve an arrangement with the Scottish Power Harestanes Fund being shared across 32 communities. This latter arrangement will create a new legal entity through which the fund will be managed and from which its broader strategic direction will emerge.

Discussion headlines from the day

The following reflects delegates' views on the day, as recorded by note-takers on individual tables and in feedback to the whole room.

Value of listening and learning from others

- Realising how often communities get different deals from different developers. Want to learn more about what other communities and developers are doing.
- Remember that no one size fits all for communities, every community is unique
- Communities starved of info about options and sources of support
- A central database should be developed to enable CCs to share their experiences and provide examples of good applications
- More information should be available to enable communities to have community turbines
- Learning from experience and sharing is important

Community plans and community engagement:

- Like the idea of 5-year plan to get actual objectives. Makes it easier for fund panels to reject applications and avoid spreading the funds too thin for any lasting impact on community.
- Value of community plans – historically have been resistant to them, but now clear that they can help ensure funds are well spent.
- Considering developing 5-year plan to enable CC to look at bigger picture. Looking into groups raising match funds.
- Build capacity for long-term through a strategic plan; though it might involve spending the initial money on developing this there will be a better long-term effect. Consider how local plan might relate to regional plan of local authority. Concerned with community resilience.
- Local communities need to get together and produce a Local Community Plan
- Building resilience should be part of strategic plan. Raise aspirations of communities – how to involve the community more?
- When developing a community plan it is important to consider what skills and experience there already is within the community.
- Development plan? Don't know how much community will get, so how can we plan?
- Wind farm benefits useful for initiating 'wish list' in communities and creating vision

- All at the table recognised the need for a strategic plan for their communities
- Visioning/planning/profiling is key. How to find out what community wants? Leverage. Flexibility over time.
- Agreement also that communities need to have a Community Plan, find out what their communities needs are and develop plan over for example five years. Suggested that outside help is required to develop plan.

Different options for managing and investing funds

- Various models were being used:
 - Local Authority administered (South Lanarkshire)
 - Community company (CREFL)
 - Community council reporting to local authority (Dalswinton, D&G)
 - Foundation Scotland or other third party support (e.g. assessments)
- Noting the different ways of managing funds. Feel that as funds scale up there will be a need to get an outside organisation to administer funds. CC must sit down and discuss exactly what to do with money and management of funds.
- In area with several developers and attempting to manage the expectations of each, feel it could be very valuable to have an outside professional organisation assist with administration. Could end up with a multitude of CB funds, would prefer to have everything centralised.
- Communities can successfully manage funds themselves- but there's a big voluntary commitment that not everyone wants to make
- Endowments are an option as well as big project funds
- Cooperative decision making should be part of the agreement of fund management
- Revenue funding vs capital funding. How do poorest people in community benefit? How to engage them better? If funds are set up properly, community can tackle major issues. Small communities can find it burdensome to get rid of this money.
- Learn how to make money from money
- Size of fund can determine how best to manage the fund; if small, let communities manage it themselves. Professional job.
- Important to offer professional management of funds
- Need for consistency across funds- esp where there are multiple funds involving the same communities
- Need to create unique solutions to meet communities' needs
- Trustees appointed by the community council are appointed for life, stuck with them. Feels they should be elected for fixed terms instead. Separate community council/ panel membership. It can be difficult to convince people to give up their time in the early stages of a development when there are only promises of money. Community shares/part-ownership of a wind farm should not be an exclusion to other community benefit funds, they are parallel schemes. Energy 4 All model?
- CC will be receiving the first of its money in January 2014. Small level applicants will probably be handled by community council; for larger levels of funding thinks it would be best to look into an independent administrator. Trying to get a central pot of money with excess community council money for bigger projects

- Independent administrator. Due to meet with Foundation Scotland shortly to review processes. Within community council, ask for project submissions. CC reviews applications at open meetings then put proposals through to independent body. Community Council writes cheques.
- Applications over £12k go to independent body. Community Council gets £1k to distribute without referring to anyone else. Two community council members serve on decision panel with twelve other community councils. Originally different council areas got different amounts.
- Community Council didn't have capacity to deal with grants, pulled together a trust made up of other community members to guide negotiations with developer. Trust can be seen as elitist and taking over on behalf of community.
- Not always the case that a strong community council exists for developer to engage with – what then? Limitations on how much money a CC can hold, local authority councils can take excess money or disband community councils.
- Community organisation manages the funds from two windfarms. Supports the Heritage Centre/village hall/village shop, helps with running costs. Management group of 12 directors oversee the £32k.
- Clyde Community Benefit model – 12 panel members one from each CC. applications (up to £3K, £12K and over £12K sent to Foundation Scotland for scrutiny, Panel discusses each application and makes decision using a combination of the comments from Foundation Scotland and local knowledge. CCs also directly administer £1k micro grant.
- Receives grant from Dalswinton – need to produce annual report of previous' years activities and produce a plan for next year. Projects mainly come from CC. Average between £750 - £1K. Simple application process with audit each year. CC has produced a database of residents of village. Use e-mail system to contact residents.
- Oversee three wind farms – Find that D&G Council slow to pay out. Better system with Foundation Scotland. Have approx. £56K to distribute.
- The politics within community councils may be a hindrance in a model where a CC administers the funds. Comment made that may prefer volunteer time to be spent on other activities than processing grant applications.
- Carsphairn share a wind farm with Glencairn, however each administer their funds differently. Preference to adopt a similar model as Glencairn where there is open admission to allocation meetings to ensure transparency. Suggestion that having external body assess the application can avoid conflicts within a community.
- Question raised about whether it would work for communities to link up to administer funds etc. Decided that ideally this would be good option, however local rivalries and politics could make this somewhat difficult.
- Reduces admin if funds held by developer
- Communities should administer their own funds
- Community control allows them to develop projects specific to their area. Create a subcommittee to deal with community benefit. Allows other CC business to go ahead, meetings don't get bogged down.
- Ensure the funds are administered in a responsible manner – large sums must be regulated.

- 0% admin costs for funds administered directly by the CC but there is a colossal amount of volunteer time/input to achieve this
- Most recent meeting had 11 applications with 72 pages in total to read lots of time. With the change to SSE management the one thing they would like is to have the names of assessors so that the group can see longer term what the assessors are recommending or not
- Drop the use of 'criteria' instead use 'positive indicators' as want to have some more flexibility
- With conflicts of interest, they are able to stay in the room (otherwise no one would be left at times)
- Main community meetings take 3-4 hours once a month but there is usually a meeting every week
- Issues of probity in applying to neighbours and friends – 3rd party involvement would be welcome.
- Management of fund - 50 groups in the area, posters up in the community. Criteria/guidelines can be frustrating to manage. Used input from other groups to help set up the guidelines and criteria
- Pay somebody - very onerous for volunteers
- It CAN be done by volunteers but is a lot of work
- Must have regulated bodies to administer large-scale funds – too big for communities to deal with via informal panel/group scenario.
- Best practice – direct developer/community relationship.
- Local panel not supported – not in every community
- No funds to date but feels that his CC is not strong enough to take on the role of administering future funds – no experience of this.
- Info given about D&G Clyde 12 communities- have agreed a 3 year collective plan, have joined together to form joint decision-making panel, but funds ring-fenced for each community. This to be reviewed in 3 years. Supported by FS- reported as a very 'messy' fund that has been effectively brought together by FS to work well together.
- Guidelines need to encourage 'conversation' and recognise useful role of independent third party brokers like FS
- Not reasonable to expect communities to deal with this on their own, unless they wish to.
- Engagement is a process, not a single consultation.
- Once a group forms it can then lose touch with the community.
- All affected community councils invited to a meeting, asked to form a trust consisting of two members of each CC, all community benefit funds will go to that trust.
- Problems with trying to please every stakeholder. With larger projects there is a need for much better integration with all the stakeholders. There can be issues with money coming from different 'pots'
- CCs require outside assistance to help with the administering the funds
- There are dangers that the funds could cause divisions within communities. Require to have independent administrators

- Are community councils the right vehicle to take forward fund strategy: three issues a) often limited participation in / representation on CCs, b) limited capacity, c) don't have a developmental / transformative focus

Examples of how funds have been used:

- Portpatrick community buy-out of harbour. Money went directly from the developer to the seller, not via the community council.
- Kirkcolm Community Council- spending money to stabilise facilities. Village hall is owned by local authority, who only maintain it enough to keep it water-tight, so maintaining and developing the facility has been a community council priority. Funding has been unstable. Considering sponsored projects with project managers.
- Money is dissipating and being spent on one-off projects so there is little long-term benefit. Want to see more independent oversight. Communities need to take responsibility for spending the money.
- Sanquhar community benefit fund has been used to support youth groups. Only receiving small funds currently but possibly going to be in receipt of larger funds in the future so interested in finding out more about different ways to consult community and use funds effectively
- Johnstone used funds to build a multi-use games area. Managed to match fund with awards for all. Asked how community came to this decision. There was already money earmarked for this but carried continuous consultation with community. All community council meetings are open meetings but difficulty in getting the wider community to attend meetings.
- Experience of Skye- a lot of community benefit funds are being used to improve the youth unemployment situation.
- Should be guidelines on the distribution of funding, unhappiness about the current prohibitions
- Interested also in whether the Community Benefit funds can be used for the development of Social enterprise
- Focus on basic facilities that remote communities need.
- Core/revenue funding is often a policy issue.
- Non-statutory definitions. Some needs not met because of limit of statutory uses, eg transport needs – should be clarified by Scottish Government.
- Going to support local voluntary groups in town – Golf Club, 1st Responders, Civic Pride, Theatre group, Town Hall Trust, Moffat Initiative (range 3-10K). CC aware that the need to look at having a longer term vision for the funds.
- Funds used to support voluntary groups (large list!) Aware there's a need to look at the bigger picture.
- All small amounts so far so easy to administer, but in future larger amount will require the CC to have a long term strategy
- Area has received funding from coal and wind farms, distributed locally but aware that difficulties are occurring as too many groups are becoming dependant on receiving these benefits. This causes friction.
- All agreed that groups must try to be sustainable in the long term.
- Wants to avoid becoming dependent on community benefit funds.

- How to trigger conversation about needs without being triggered by money?
- Bowling club benefitted. Small grants scheme up to £250, small groups can apply. Differing scales of grants available.
- Funded local small-scale projects: school, twinning group, community pub development. More apps coming forward now. Not for revenue funding – don't want to deter local fundraising activities. Deter dependency on community benefit. Don't want to support statutory obligations.
- Subsidise local service provision.
- Glenkens potential - £3m per year. Legacy projects need to be developed. Norwegian example. Differing scale of benefitting communities can create tensions among member community councils. Small villages and larger urban centres.
- Carsphairn- money to local hall, educational grants for college attendance, support for the community-owned village shop, converted 0.5 acre of wasteland into community garden/ park, able to match funds from Leader and the Council- increases impact and local credibility
- Maximise the doubling effect of match funding
- Moniaive- only get £12k from wind fund but have drawn in £120k in match
- It's a concern that community groups stop trying to raise their own funding- dependency on CB
- Once one funder gives support (CB fund) helps to give credibility to project
- More funders gives more credibility to community or project
- Need cash flow- Leader pay retrospectively so CB good for maintaining cash flow
- Lanarkshire- got technical assistance for 1 year, helped to kick off project following community consultation. They also get coalfield funding
- Parton- no fund yet but would hope to use any in future to develop more of the Parton Heritage trail around Loch Ken
- Apprenticeships- big issue is that can't support huge numbers as there is not the work for them so inevitably leave the area anyway
- When do you decide to provide funds and pay workers – a contentious issue given so much voluntary input (i.e. voluntary drivers but admin person making bookings for people to use the service gets paid)
- Feedback/monitoring after 6 months – very hard to get from the groups. Had to put in a rule that can't apply for more funding until the assessment and monitoring is complete.
- Risks of losing funding if don't spend money; leads to psychology of overcommitting so don't lose funding.
- Where micro-grants are being offered to individuals and un-constituted groups, it can sometimes be difficult to see the public benefits.

National policy and practice around community benefit rates

- Better leadership from Scottish Government
- Better guidelines needed for CCs in their role to distribute Community Benefit money
- £5K per mega watts should be the industry minimum standard
- Need to set minimum rates for payments and make them index linked.

- Community ownership – community owns a turbine rather than receiving community benefit and gets a share of the income generated. Communities should negotiate a stake in a wind farm.
- Rates should be standardised and set in law rather than left to guidance
- Opposite view- lots of different developments and developers- difficult to standardise
- Also difficulty of different sizes of developments and no. of recipient communities- some get lots, some very little
- An estate owner in the area with wind turbines is not interested in providing anywhere near £5,000/MW
- Community benefits should be mandatory and should be a % of profits
- Some wind farmers are putting in more turbines but not paying additional community benefit.
- If providing electricity only to the farm there's a different set of rules.
- 3+ turbines are expected to make a community benefit contribution
- This should be universal. Scottish Government needs to push through legislation
- Blackcraig – no community benefit agreed with developer.
- Allow communities to make links to local energy schemes. Communities' control is strengthened. Owning 'shares' in the company.
- CARES – monies available to communities as loans to make an equity stake.
- Communities cannot rely on community benefit continuing at current level. Windfarms sold to another developer may change community benefit
- Electricity Market Reform – developers will not know how much they will be paid

Planning and community benefit- tensions for Community Councils

- Community council is the statutory consultee, but must then consult the community. If community doesn't want the wind farm, the developer then often vanishes from the discussion of community benefit even though their application for wind farm development is going forward. It is very difficult to convey to both community and developer the Catch-22 of opposing the wind farm but at the same time trying to negotiate the best community benefit deal.
- Community benefit is not a part of the planning process.
- Inifis prefers to minimise discussion of community benefit at first to separate it from planning; feels that community benefit and planning should be two separate processes.
- Community benefit can be seen as bribery to influence planning decisions.
- The table was broadly in favour of the separation of planning and community benefit. If £5k/MW became standard then it becomes non-political.
- 2-tier system also exists, in which 50+MW windfarm applications go to the Scottish Government for planning approval and the community council does not receive the same level of consultation.
- Developers should not be talking to communities until the planning process has been completed. The linking of planning to community benefit could be seen as a bribe. Scottish Government could change the rules on this.
- Feeling that there is a lack of leadership and that community benefits should be compulsory, the planning process should be kept separate and the Government needs to do more.

- Remove Community Benefits from planning
- Remove the pressure that CCs have from Windfarm companies over planning consent

Mixed views about local authority involvement and region-wide uses of funds

- Particular issues in D&G- 15 km radius set by Council is too big and CB too low
- 15km radius too blunt an instrument- takes no account of actual impact, which may vary depending on views, access routes etc
- D&G Council is using Section 75 planning agreements to force developers to make community benefit payments - question the legality of this.
- They are making it compulsory that 50% of the community benefit goes to a region-wide development fund, we are challenging this.
- Local authority can take control of community benefit money and spend it outside of the immediate community it was intended to benefit. The impacted local community should decide how to use its benefit money, not the council.
- New Harestanes development involves 27 community councils. Some communities are expressing support for the DGC policy.
- Sanquhar community is fighting the policy. Community benefit should be for the community not the council.
- Community benefit should be shared across the region.
- East Ayrshire Council – built into local development plan – community benefit must go to council.
- Tourism impact – endorse need to share community benefit across region. Impact not only in immediate locations. Impact on jobs. Major industry for Dumfries & Galloway
- In Highland, the Local Authority spend more money per capita in the bigger towns and not in the rural communities so why should the funds be made available to areas that currently get money from the local authority? There is also no 'common good fund' in rural areas (Inverness has one but it is not able to be accessed outside of Inverness).
- Not always recognised by local communities that the bigger centres are important/ or actually used by locals
- South Lanarkshire – held up as example.
- Question asked whether support can be provided to the wider area. This was not supported by others at the table. Responses included that they did not want local authorities to administer the funds and that at the moment we can spend all the funds in our own areas easily enough

Area of benefit- how is this decided?

- How the funds are split between (community) councils is troublesome too. The concept of "community" is difficult to establish, to know exactly what area should receive benefit.
- There is a need for more clarity. Also need clarity of what is meant by 'an affected area'
- Who decides geographical spread/area of benefit of the money?
- Distance criteria – point system. More points if: in sight/power lines/noise impact. The closer the turbines the more community benefit.
- The issue was raised in terms of defining community especially in areas with high numbers of part time residency

- Distribution can be disproportionate based on population. Discussions taking place with developers to ensure fair distribution. A share per person in each community.

We're volunteers!

- Big issues with community capacity to negotiate, decide and administer
- A third of the Community Council's time is taken up by wind farm discussions
- The longer involved in wind farms the easier it is to negotiate on future wind farm developments in the area as you know what it is about
- Large levels of community benefit can put communities off – too much responsibility! Development officer to support communities required
- Concerns about ageing membership of CCs in small rural communities and also lack of engagement in CCs by younger people
- People participate in a different way to how it was done in the past – don't volunteer as much or join groups as much. Perhaps looking at more of a business model in setting up structures
- Also an issue of getting varying ages involved in community organisations, younger families can be quite insular. Limited number of volunteers can be an issue.

Other issues

- Great to hear about CARES- Request for CARES info in follow up from event