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From the options considered by Council in April 2019, do you agree or disagree that "to increase the number of scrutiny committees to 5 " was the right option?


If you disagree, which of following options would you prefer?


If you do not agree with any of the previous options what alternative do you want to suggest?
I believe there should be a Community Engagement, Consultation Scrutiny Committee 4 committees not necessarily in the grouping as listed above

Moving forward, do you consider that the frequency of meetings should:

something else, please give details below: (1) $2 \%$

Q3a
with the option of special meetings if needed, already available I believe
Would be good if we could explore options for members with childcare responsibilities.
Dependent on the number of Committees
The frequency would obviously depend on the number of Committees
Moving forward, do you consider the scrutiny committee councillor membership should: (Do you consider the scrutiny committee councillor members...)


If you consider that the Scrutiny Committee membership of 16 Councillors should change, what do you consider appropriate?

Too often down to 12 or less due to habitual non-attenders
Should be a nomination process where Cllr with knowledge \& experience on a particular subject gets selected.
Again dependent on the number of Committees
It would depend on the number of Committees.
open to debate


