

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2022 17:40
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: Community Asset Transfer (CAT) of Ralston Sports Centre to Kelburne Hockey Club: APPEAL for REVIEW of Council decision

Categories: Green category

Dear Sirs,

I write to raise my objections to the APPEAL for REVIEW of the CAT application Council decision as submitted by Kelburne Hockey Club.

The below were my initial concerns having attended various meetings on the proposals.

Now having read their APPEAL for REVIEW reponse, none of my concerns appear to have been addressed appropriately.

On page 9 of their APPEAL for REVIEW doc, it notes that a contractor has quoted £32,000 + vat to improve the grass pitch drainage. Can Kelburne cover these costs and have they got an adequate contingency? Without having the contractor's report it is difficult to comment on the suitability of these works. But what happens if this does n't work, does the company guarantee the works or do costs just escalate when it fails? Does there come a point when Kelburne simply stop trying to fix the drainage and no-one can use the pitch?

There is nothing in Kelburne's APPEAL for REVIEW doc that addresses the Traffic Impact concerns of the residents.

.....
I am a Chartered Structural Engineer & Certifier of Design, living in Ralston for 18 years. I attended the Ralston Community Council meeting in May 2022 and the Kelburne meeting in June 2022 regarding the above proposals. I also took part in Kelburne's online meeting in 2021. But with particular reference to Kelburne's meeting of 6th June 2022, I was quite disappointed at the level of the proposed engineering CAT detail that was presented by the club.

It would appear that Kelburne have only carried out some initial site surveys mainly a topographical survey and a conditional survey of the building.

A topographical survey maps the existing land, boundaries and details all the features including levels. Engineers and Architects use this as a base type drawing to assist development proposals however, no reference was made to this survey during the meeting other than to note it had been carried out.

The results of the conditional survey of the building were discussed and it seems the building is only in need of some minor repairs. Kelburne also noted they had instructed an environmental survey to be carried out but this is solely to reduce future utility bills.

Therefore, it is very worrying that the two big issues for redevelopment of the site: **Grass Pitch Drainage and Traffic Impact on the surrounding roads have yet to be addressed in the CAT application**, despite concerns being raised by many residents during the Kelburne online meeting in 2021.

With regards to **grass pitch drainage**, Kelburne appear to have conducted an initial jetting of the drainage system and are now in the process of instructing a drainage survey. However, at time of the meeting it seemed they had little knowledge of the current drainage design and the problems the pitch has experienced over the years. They appeared to be hoping that a drainage contractor may be able to shed some light on these issues and help them find a solution.

To compound this issue, Renfrewshire Council have only provided Kelburne with 3 of the original Planning drawings from the 2008 refurbishment works. From previous experience, Planning drawings are likely to provide little detail with respect to the existing grass pitch drainage design. The drawings that are required are those of approved Building Warrant status.

The normal drainage design process for a redevelopment is to review archive design drawings, understand the existing drainage concept, carry out a full survey, work out where and why any problems exist and then re-design the drainage system to suit. At this point, it would appear that none of this has been carried out as it could not be presented to the residents. I am not sure if CAT applications need to obtain this level of detail at this stage in the process but without understanding these issues and following it up with initial engineering scheme design, it would be very difficult to accurately assess and cost any required drainage improvements to allow this pitch to be redeveloped.

This could potentially leave a large hole in Kelburne's business plan if costs are more than anticipated which may then prevent redevelopment of the grass pitch for football use as per Kelburne's current proposals.

During the meeting, Kelburne also confirmed that no '**Traffic Impact Assessment**' had been carried out as part of the CAT application for the redevelopment of the centre and the possible impact it may have on the surrounding streets. No detailed or professional assessment of existing flow, proposed increased traffic flow or the implications of entering, exiting and parking have been considered. This is in despite of the current car park being full at weekends from football activities and over spilling into the surrounding streets. Residents believed that this would only be made worse by the proposed number of hockey games / training for their 19 teams as well as accommodating away hockey teams and Kelburne's proposed football use of the grass pitch.

Kelburne noted that the 'old' vehicle access point on Auchmannoch Avenue would not be reopened but offered no reasoning as to how they came to this conclusion or if they may need to change their decision should it be the recommendation of a future traffic impact assessment. Reopening of this access would have a considerable material effect on the residents and traffic movements of this street. Therefore, if this is a future option it should be fully investigated at this stage when residents and the local authority can review and comment on its possible implications.

The only Kelburne traffic improvement proposal that was tabled at the meeting was to increase car parking by adding 10 more spaces near the grass pitch and to form this in Grasscrete (which will required drainage integration with the main system). They had no data to present to the residents that proved that simply adding 10 more car spaces would solve all the existing problems of accessing or parking within the site.

There was reference to removing the brickwork piers to the front of the Pavilion to provide 2 lanes for traffic but Kelburne did not know if these piers had listed building protection. Even if this proposal was acceptable to Historic Scotland, there has been no traffic modelling to prove that the existing single lane 90 degree 'blind' bend into the main car park at the centre could work with 2 lanes of traffic. Considerable alterations,

perhaps a relocation, of the existing pedestrian centre access path and ramp would be required if modelling proved this could be an option.

Again, without fully understanding these issues and following it up with initial engineering scheme design based on traffic modelling it is very difficult to accurately assess and cost any required traffic / car parking improvements. This could potentially leave another hole in Kelburne's business plan if costs are more than they anticipated which may then prevent Kelburne achieving their CAT proposals.

With reference to the 'Asset Transfer under the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015' Guidance for Relevant Authorities, Section 7.0: Helping community bodies to identify suitable assets, notes the following:

Section 7.30: Ultimately it is the responsibility of the community transfer body to ensure it has all the necessary and relevant information to develop its proposals. There is no requirement for the relevant authority to obtain information or commission reports to provide to the community body, which it does not already have. However, as a way of supporting them, the relevant authority may agree to share the cost of producing or commissioning new information, and provide assistance by providing information to surveyors, facilitating access to the site, and so on. Funding for project development work such as surveys may be available where the community body proposes to buy the property. It is less likely to be available for proposals for lease.

With reference to this CAT application, Kelburne confirmed that Renfrewshire Council had awarded them £10,000 to conduct the surveys they required to support their application. Therefore, at Kelburne's June meeting (long after the application had been lodged and when the deadline for objections was less than one month away) it was very disappointing that Kelburne had not fully utilised this fund to obtain the necessary surveys which would have allowed them to present and include scheme design proposals and accurate costs for the grass pitch redevelopment and traffic improvements for the centre.

As part of the CAT decision making process, the relevant authority has to consider if the applicant has the 'Ability to Deliver' their proposals i.e. if the planned activities can lead to the suggested outcomes. Without the due diligence of conducting all required surveys and presenting the residents with engineered scheme design, the local authority may question if Kelburne have the 'Ability to Deliver' this project successfully and make it sustainable.

Unfortunately, none of the required survey information for the two big issues for redevelopment of the site was available to the residents. Therefore, it is very difficult for them to make an informed decision as to how these CAT proposals will affect their community and impact their everyday movements.

Kind Regards

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2022 20:10
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: Re: Kel burne hockey club

Categories: Green category

Apologies I must have done something in correctly ,I merely wanted to state my objection to the take over of the Ralston community centre by Kelburn hockey club.
I presumed, incorrectly that all I needed to do was include my name address and postcode.
Hopefully this is sufficient to register my vote?

Regards constance Buchanan

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: MBX-Cat Review <catreview@renfrewshire.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:39:53 AM
To: [REDACTED] MBX-Cat Review <catreview@renfrewshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Kel burne hockey club

Good Morning [REDACTED]

I can confirm receipt of you're email. However I would note that it doesn't contain any representation, just your name and address.

If you would like to submit further comments then they can be sent to this email address and will be included in the information pack issued to the panel. I would also note that previous comments will already be included.

If you would like to discuss further then my phone number is provided below.

Regards,

Euan Gray
Election Office Supervisor
Renfrewshire Council

07483410945
euan.gray@renfrewshire.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 October 2022 13:47
To: MBX-Cat Review <catreview@renfrewshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Kel burne hockey club

Name [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Renfrewshire Council Website -<http://www.renfrewshire.gov.uk>

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

Renfrewshire Council may, in accordance with the Telecommunications(Lawful Business Practice) (Interception of Communications) Regulations 2000, intercept e-mail messages for the purpose of monitoring or keeping a record of communications on the Council's system. If a message contains inappropriate dialogue it will automatically be intercepted by the Council's Internal Audit section who will decide whether or not the e-mail should be onwardly transmitted to the intended recipient(s).

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 October 2022 23:26
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: Ralston CAT transfer review

I [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] wish to add the following representation to my previous submission.

As a member of KH&CSC I must voice my support for the proposed CAT for Ralston community sports centre. Having played and coached hockey for over 30 years across the UK I must say the facilities that are available for hockey in Renfrewshire are extremely lacking and totally unacceptable. This is unbelievable considering the success Kelburne Hockey Club have had over the last 20+years. It seems that the priority for this council and its decision makers is to ignore minority sports. Thus, making their position untenable as a Councillor if they were to support this CAT, making their decision appear self-serving and narrow minded.

Ralston CSC is an asset of One Ren and has never been gifted to the people of Ralston, despite the general feeling of the local community. At the end of the day this centre is a business asset which is clearly not high up on the One Ren priority list due to the lack of recent time and money invested.

KH&CSC are committed to maintaining and improving the facilities at Ralston by returning the community life to the centre. Currently only open from 5pm-9pm weekdays this does not reflect the possibilities that could and should be offered to the local community. These possibilities could include a coffee shop, fitness classes, gym, and free access for local schools, this list only suggests a few of them.

As a coach at the club it's my opinion we are being held back by the lack of suitable pitches in Renfrewshire. I am also a parent of players at the club so I know first hand how the youth sections are affected by lack of local facilities.

We currently have a large number of youth players who are or have represented Scotland National squads at all levels U16, U18, U21, Seniors, and Great Britain in both the Male and Female squads. Without international level pitches in Renfrewshire we risk these youth players either quitting the sport or moving to clubs with their own pitch and clubhouse. This exodus has hit the club hard in recent [seasons](#). Our Senior Mens and Ladies teams require international level surfaces to train and play on multiple times a week, we currently have to travel from Renfrewshire to Glasgow City (Glasgow National Hockey Centre) which can prove difficult for local youth players, to access quality coaching and competitive hockey due to travel. These extended journeys not only prove difficult but reduces the ability of KH&CSC members to become Carbon Neutral.

Having reviewed the initial response from the CAP and the information supplied from the FOI request, it would appear the decision was based on emotions rather than looking at the facts and making the right decision. Seemingly bowing to the mob with very little actual discussion taking place. This shows a clear and obvious dereliction of duty maybe just to keep votes rather than looking at it from a business angle, which would ensure the longevity of Ralston CSC whilst also serving the community.

Yours

[REDACTED]

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 October 2022 09:31
To: MBX-Cat Review
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Community Asset Transfer

Dear Councillors,

I am disappointed to learn that Kelburne Hockey Club has appealed against the decision to deny the CAT of the Ralston Community Sports Centre to them. They must now be aware of the extent of the community's opposition to the transfer, and the strength of feeling of these objections.

Since the initial discussions, there have been major economic changes across the country, with substantial increases in the cost of fuel, domestic heating and general household bills. This makes the need for community facilities in the immediate vicinity of the neighborhood essential.

Access to facilities that don't require bus journeys is important, and provision of activities in a warm community centre can allow people to turn off home heating.

I ask you to take these points into consideration against KHC's appeal, and to keep the sports centre in the care of the local authority.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2022 13:30
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: OBJECTION TO KELBURNE HOCKEY APPEAL

[REDACTED]

I strongly object to Kelburne Hockey Club's appeal in respect of them taking over Ralston Community Hub on Penilee Road.

This will be so detrimental not just for the young football club who use it but for all local residents who use it regularly for gym/keep fit/social reasons.

As this hub is located in Ralston, and, these council tax rates are high in this area, our views on retaining this asset within council remit for our own use should be upheld.

[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

RALSTON COMMUNITY COUNCIL

**Ralston Community Sports Centre CAT Representation
following an appeal by Kelburne Hockey and Community Sports Club
against the refusal of their CAT Application.**

The Community Council made a CAT representation in relation to the original CAT application by Kelburne Hockey and Community Sports Club (KHCS). The concerns raised in our first CAT representation are not alleviated by KHCS's review request and its responses to the previous representations.

- 1. KHCS continue to maintain that they can provide all-action, all-embracing facilities at the venue which we contend are unrealistic. We do not dispute that KHCS can run a successful hockey club but, believe the other wide range of proposals are no more than aspirational simply to improve the chances of successful applications to the Council and prospective funding sources.**
- 2. The original plans were not supported by adequate secured funding. KHCS has not improved on this. The requested grant/loan of £300k from the Council is seen by KHCS as getting the project 'over the line', as occurred in another CAT application. 'Over the line' would suggest that substantial funding is already secured and a grant/loan by the Council will complete the required funding. On the contrary, only 12.5% of the funding required is secured (£75,000 in pledges and funds already raised by KHCS), and a further unsecured £526,500 is needed.**
- 3. The KHCS plans are heavily dependent on grants from various sources. Presumably, funding sources would wish to grant funds to projects supported by the local community and may be less inclined to give funding to projects like this which face very strong local opposition – if KHCS admits community opposition in their applications, that is. In addition, such opposition could have an adverse effect on the viability of non-hockey activities which KHCS are keen to talk up in favour of their CAT application.**
- 4. KHCS complain that Renfrewshire Council has not had proper regard for various benefits arising from their proposals e.g. regeneration, public health, social wellbeing etc. If the funding to implement KHCS's ambitious plans is not available, it follows that these benefits will simply not arise.**
- 5. Staffing levels indicated in the KHCS proposals to operate the site on a seven-day basis (9 am to 9.30 pm on weekdays, to 6.30 pm at weekends) seem very inadequate. There appears to be unquantified dependence on CPD/Training personnel to fill the gaps and periods when only CPD/Training personnel would be in attendance. This is not a credible staffing plan for the ambitious level of activity KHCS envisage.**
- 6. The Community Council believe that in the interests of fairness to all hockey clubs in the area, improvement of the facility at Linwood should be fully explored – this is already part of Renfrewshire Council's planned commitment to hockey and funding is available for this. The KHCS application is opportunistic insofar as the**

target is a facility which has been severely affected by Covid but is still a functioning public amenity. It should not be handed over to a private club when an alternative identified facility at Linwood should be pursued.

- 7. A principal part of Ralston Community Council's remit is to make Renfrewshire Council aware of the opinions and needs of the community we represent. We are very clear that our local community are very strongly opposed to this CAT application. The Community Council and the local community are as one in seeing the best way forward for Ralston Community Sports Centre to have a post-Covid recovery in public hands accomplished by One-Ren in partnership with the Community Council raising the profile of the Centre in the community and beyond.**

[REDACTED]
Ralston Community Council

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 October 2022 16:29
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: CAT Review Representation

Representation Re CAT appeal by Kelburne Hockey & Sports Club.

One of the reasons given for rejecting this CAT application was the lack of firm financial commitments to meet the costs of the project. Having read the Kelburne appeal documents, I cannot see how this situation has changed. Only a relatively small part of the costs will be put up by Kelburne themselves, the rest relies on the expectation of unconfirmed grants from various sources.

The other reason for rejection of Kelburne's application was concern for community cohesion in the light of overwhelming opposition locally to their proposals. This has not changed, irrespective of the spin put forward by Kelburne complaining about the way opposition emerged. The Community Council has a duty to ascertain the views and wishes of the community they serve, and that's what they did by holding meetings to determine this and advising residents how to make their views known. The strength of local feeling about this CAT, if successful, would impact negatively on Kelburne's image and affect participation in activities which Kelburne are putting forward as a key enhancement of their proposals.

It is very difficult to envisage how Kelburne will be able to fulfil the wide range of activities outlined in their presentation, particularly in the light of the very strong local opposition. It appears to be an attempt to secure a pavilion and an artificial playing pitch, with a lot of bells and whistles added on to sweeten their overall proposals. There are considerable problems in bringing the grassed area up to usable standard. It is all very well to say that grass is the SFA preference for football, but professional football clubs have the money and ground staff to ensure their grass is playable all year round - that is unlikely to happen here.

I believe Renfrewshire Council were correct in rejecting Kelburne's CAT proposal. The finance not secured and it is strongly opposed by the local community.

[REDACTED]
Paisley PA1 3JW

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 October 2022 23:47
To: MBX-Cat Review
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: RALSTON COMMUNITY SPORTS CENTRE CAT - KHC appeal OBJECTION

To CAT review Board

I understand Kelburne Hockey Club has appealed the decision against them taking the Ralston Community. I write to object once again to the idea that Renfrewshire Council would give away such a valuable community asset to a private club. For all the reasons I listed in my earlier email in June (below) - and for the many I probably undoubtedly have missed. Please do find Kelburne a home by all means but not by a wholehearted 'give away' of such a valuable asset - the ONLY green space left and ONLY football pitch in Ralston.

Apart from the primary and vital arguments of a football pitch full of players tonight, the same as it is used many nights & weekends each week, to which I will join them as a spectator on Sunday watching the young girls teams who now thrive similarly to the boys/youth & mens football, as I dropped off young family to the school Halloween disco tonight I was reminded yet again additionally what a vital health & safety access area this is to the school which gives some relief to the small School Road so often choc-a-block, lying at the bottom of a steep blind hill from Penilee/Hillington Estate/and M8 access - so steep from the blind summit that at the only Penilee Road crossing point, just recently put there at the exact same point at the bottom of said hill and the corner of School Road, has had to have a full anti-skid road surface laid for several meters - its purpose to try to minimise the risk of speeding drivers hitting pedestrians crossing (!), whilst at the same time removing the school crossing attendants who had been there at least 60 years. To have a private club would mean locked gates on the front pillars further down on Penilee Road and only opened and closed at their choosing - so EVERY DAY impacting on the health and safety risks of the Ralston primary & nursery children, not just the sports access for the community and school PE & sports. A school built over 80 years ago with one access when car numbers were tiny.

Additionally at least two of the shops on Penilee Road, recently revived, and one a Renfrewshire Award winner, are directly assisted in business customers by those & their families attending the sports field.

I thank councillors who courtesy responded to my earlier objection email, whatever political persuasion. Councillor Nicolson, oh dear, unfortunately your reply as the convener of a powerful decision making public body board, offers a behaviour which reflects in a telling way. It is true that I'm only from a resident family of 55 years, attending Ralston Primary and Paisley Grammar, when it had rugby fields, tennis courts, and my own sport - hockey pitches, then watching my family attend the same schools. Having only attended two packed-hall public meetings - we would have loved for your attendance and hearing your insights of the Renfrewshire Council position in relation to legislation, instead we could only hear the witness testimony of community residents as they expressed to the Community Council panel to take note and put forward for the community. Nonetheless at the first meeting though we had the SNP MP attending no less, 2 MSPs, and our Councillors of all parties - could they all have been wrong too when they all spoke? I also scoured the Renfrewshire Council website for relevant information, and finally where information could not be found, I then phoned the impartial Council Officers for additional facts which they willingly supplied.

The overriding point is - to take this historic, well loved, well used sports, football facility and give it away from the community to a private club for private use and DESTROY the football pitch would be nothing short of utterly scandalous.

Please include my objection.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Representation on The CAT Applicant Appeal to Renfrewshire Council refusal decision.

It is difficult to see the basis of this appeal as there appears to have been no change in the reasons given for refusal - lack of confirmed funding to carry out the CAT Applicant's plans and the potential for a reduction in community cohesion if the CAT was awarded given the level of objections received to the CAT from local residents and current users of Ralston Community Sports Centre. In fact having spoken with some local residents this appeal has made some people even more against the CAT Applicant's proposal. Even the other 2 Renfrewshire hockey clubs are not in favour of the CAT Applicant's plan.

More generally it is difficult to see why this CAT application is being considered in the first place. Matters that any reasonable person would expect to be in place or resolved at this stage of the CAT process are not in yet in place.

FINANCES

Hardly any of the required money is actually in place even for phase one. If Renfrewshire Council awarded any more funding to the CAT Applicant be it a grant or loan there will be a significant number of Ralston Community Charge payers very unhappy further decreasing community cohesion.

DISBENEFITS TO CURRENT USERS OF RALSTON COMMUNITY SPORTS CENTRE

Current users of the astro pitch, many of primary age, would be displaced with no relevant alternative available to them if the CAT was awarded. Up to 1000 players use the pitch on average per week. The CAT Applicant questions this figure. The figure was provided by staff at the Ralston Community Sports Centre. Ralston Skills and the Paisley and District League use the pitch on Saturday and Sunday mornings and attendance can be between 400 to 500 for these 6 hours alone. The pitch is well used on weekday evenings too. The CAT Applicant claims there is pitch capacity in Renfrewshire. This is simply incorrect. There may be capacity at, for example, 10am on Monday mornings but current users need alternatives during weekday evenings and weekends. Youth football clubs including Gleniffer Thistle, St Peters and Evro have confirmed that pitch availability at these times in Renfrewshire is next to zero. The CAT Applicant claims two new pitches at Johnstone and Gryfe will increase capacity but this is misleading. These pitches are existing ones that are being upgraded. This CAT, if approved, would solve a problem for the CAT Applicant but create a new problem for current pitch users.

The CAT Applicant continues to say the grass area beside the current astro-turf pitch at Ralston Community Sports Centre is an alternative for current astro turf pitch users. This is wrong. There are significant drainage problems which would need to be addressed. Given this would require further funding it would probably be years before the CAT Applicant addressed this given it can't raise the funds it needs for phase one. Even when upgraded the grass area would not be floodlight so the training in darker nights that takes place at the moment would not be possible. Also grass can't take the same usage as astro so capacity would be reduced especially when it has rained. The grass would never be a like for like replacement. The fact that current pitch users would be displaced if the CAT Applicant was successful would make it harder for the CAT Applicant to access grant funding from other sources as would the high level of local opposition to the CAT Applicant.

RALSTON SKILLS

Ralston Skills would never work with The CAT Applicant as we do not trust it. So if The CAT Applicant is awarded Ralston Community Sports Centre Ralston Skills will close. This decision was taken a number of months ago by the current coaches at Ralston Skills.

Ralston Skills has used the area now known as the Ralston Community Sports Centre for at least 25 years. We used the grass when the Pavilion was boarded up and used the astro turf pitch when the Pavilion was updated and the astro pitch created some 12 years ago. When we used the grass we were the only organised group that did so. Even with just us using the grass it would become sodden after heavy rain.

So why do we not trust The CAT Applicant? Before The CAT Applicant informed Ralston Skills about its CAT we had no view of The CAT Applicant. It approached us in Spring 2021 to tell us it would rip up the astro turf pitch, replace it with a hockey pitch and run the Pavilion. It has never moved from this position to this day even when presented with alternatives, for example, to retain the astro turf pitch and build a new hockey pitch beside it. The CAT Applicant hasn't held any meaningful consultation. It has had one idea for the facility. All that has happened is The CAT Applicant has told local people what it wanted to do.

If The CAT Applicant had taken time to get to know the area around Ralston Community Sports Centre it would have quickly found out that Ralston Skills was a longstanding user of Ralston Community Sports Centre, a grass roots community sports group that had a significant footprint in the area and enjoyed significant local goodwill. With this knowledge a The CAT Applicant could have decided to get Ralston Skills onside quickly. But The CAT Applicant didn't take this approach. Instead it offered Ralston Skills the grass area beside its hockey pitch. Ralston Skills rejected this offer because it was not in the interest of the children attending Skills due to drainage problems. The CAT Applicant then said we should split Skills and run it on a Friday night combined with a Saturday morning on the new hockey pitch. This offer was refused because coaches didn't want to do Friday evenings and some of our kids would be tired on Friday nights as they are primary ages. The next offer was a Sunday which was refused as Skills has run on a Saturday for a quarter of a century. Finally after some time The CAT Applicant offered us a Saturday morning slot on the hockey pitch. This offer followed by offer made us believe The CAT Applicant didn't really want us in on a Saturday or it would have offered that immediately. Also we asked The CAT Applicant for a copy of its draft charity constitution and its financial plan for Ralston Community Sports Centre. Both requests were refused with no reason given. It also became apparent that The CAT Applicant had mis-represented facts about the hockey pitch at Onyx. At the public meeting in June 2021 The CAT Applicant told a local resident who asked if the majority of local residents objected to its plan would it withdraw. The answer was no. This means The CAT Applicant doesn't care about the views of local residents, a point re-enforced by this appeal given the level of objection to the first CAT. Putting all of these together has led us to conclude that we should not trust the The CAT Applicant. Ralston Skills has a wonderful local reputation. If we worked with The CAT Applicant that reputation would be in tatters.

FACTS ABOUT RALSTON COMMUNITY SPORTS CENTRE

The CAT Applicant provide figures for 2105 which claim to prove that Ralston Community Sports Centre is a drain on resources compared with other One Ren/RL facilities . The figures given are from 2015.

Through a Freedom of Information request we received the following figures from One Ren. In 2018 there was a deficit of £106,000 for Ralston Community Sports Centre with 85,000 user visits. This gives a subsidy figure of £1.24. In 2019 the deficit was £74,000 with 70,000 user visits giving a

subsidy of £1.06. Both figures are considerably below the £2.84 subsidy provided by The CAT Applicant for 2015.

Ralston Community Sports Centre compares with other facilities as below

Facility	2018 Deficit	2019 Deficit
Erskine Community Sports Centre	£300,000	£184,000
Ferguslie Sports Centre	£265,000	£235,000
Johnston Community Sports Hub	£281,000	£330,000
On-x	£352,000	£384,000
Ralston Community Sports Centre	£106,000	£74,000

These figures are proof that the CAT Applicant's attempt to portray the Ralston Community Sports Centre as a financial drain compared with other facilities is wrong.

The CAT Applicant claim the pre covid average classes run in the Pavilion were 19 per week. It then says it will increase this to 30 classes a week.

The truth is that there were around 35 classes a week run pre-covid.

RENFREWSHIRE SCHOOLS

The CAT Applicant claim there will be benefits to all primary and secondary schools by using the facility. Given The CAT Applicant has been working on the proposal for at least 2 years can it provide the CAT Review panel with the schools who have provided written confirmation that their pupils will, in school time or as part of an official school after school activity, make use of the Ralston Community Sports Centre?

POTENTIAL FUNDERS OF THE CAT APPLICANT

The CAT Applicant list two funders National Lottery and the Robertson Trust as likely contributors to it.

The CAT Applicant says it will apply to Grants for All run by the National Lottery for £15,000 per year over three years. The correct name of this funding programme is Awards for All and the maximum award is £10,000 not £15,000. Given the high level of objection it is highly unlikely the National Lottery (National Lottery Community Fund) would support the CAT Applicant. Here is text taken directly from the National Lottery Community Fund Scotland website

Applications should do at least one of the following:

- bring people together and build strong relationships in and across communities
- improve the places and spaces that matter to communities
- help more people to reach their potential, by supporting them at the earliest possible stage.

The Robertson Trust has three key strategic priorities – reducing trauma, poverty and financial hardship. It is difficult to see how any The CAT Applicant application to this fund would be successful given these priorities. Here is text taken directly from the Robertson Trust website which show how difficult it would be for the CAT Applicant to access funding.

We are most interested in funding organisations that can demonstrate how their work focuses on:

Poverty and trauma: by showing that they recognise the challenges people in their community are facing in their lives related to poverty and trauma, as well as how their organisation's work will respond to this and support them.

This is one of the most important considerations to us as a funder and will influence the level of funding that we are able to offer. In addition, we are interested in organisations that can demonstrate how their work focuses on:

Community: by showing how they engage their community in the organisation, for example on the Board or through volunteering; and that they listen to their community and respond to their needs.

Collaboration: by showing that they are aware of other groups and services in their area and are linked in with them.

Relationships: by showing that their work clearly has a relational focus and that this is reflected in their policies and governance, for example how they involve members or participants and that they apply a rights-based approach in their work (i.e. that they treat people with fairness, dignity and respect).

THE CAT APPLICANT CHARITY CONSTITUTION

It is difficult to clearly understand which community the asset is being transferred to. The new charity constitution states it has been established a community defined as the hockey club, local residents and user groups. But it is only adult hockey club members who have voting rights. The two other identified beneficiaries may join the charity as associate members but have no voting rights. Although there is provision to co-opt up to five trustees to add skills not present in current trustees the Charity Board of Trustees has an in built majority of hockey clubs members, i.e. 10 members. The co-opted members could be local residents but equally could not be. So could the CAT Applicant explain the rational of excluding two of the charity's beneficiaries from having voting rights and define exactly what community they wish the asset to be transferred to? Could it also confirm the postcodes of the current Board of Trustees of the charity please? There will be some potential grant funders who will see the current constitution as a problem that would discourage them from awarding grants to the CAT Applicant.

CAT APPLICANT HANDING SERVICES TO OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The CAT Applicant would hand the running of the gym and dance studio to a private firm. It has had discussions with at least two people asking them to run its proposed Barista Café on a for profit basis. It claims an "anchor" body could run the grass section at the facility but has yet to find one. Is this really what the Community Empowerment Act was passed to achieve?

ST PETERS

This is an extract from the CAT Applicant's appeal document

As a comparison, St-Peters FC are applauded for their organisational work by the Community Council and others, yet they operate an identical SCIO process to Kelburne as they wish to have their own pitch for Scottish football league entry reasons. We see no difference between St.Peters and our Club in the spirit in which we nurture young sports people through their formative years, yet St.Peters is

being portrayed as a good organisation when our identical organisation is derided by others to suit their own agenda

Nobody in Ralston, the Community Council, Ralston Skills or current users have ever mentioned St Peters. St Peters have not applied for a CAT in Ralston so their business is none of our business. The CAT Applicant is really talking nonsense here.

ALTERNATIVE TO BENEFIT ALL HOCKEY IN RENFREWSHIRE

This exists at the On-X in Linwood where the CAT Applicant could work with

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Local resident and Chair of Ralston Skills

Euan Gray

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 October 2022 00:07
To: MBX-Cat Review
Subject: Ralston Community Sports Centre -KHC CAT Objection

CAT Review Committee Services,

I am a local resident

[REDACTED]

Further to Kelburne Hockey Clubs appeal to the decision of there CAT Refusal.

As I resident I have looked at KHC responses to the 'uncertainty of funding' and 'impact of the community opposition to the CAT request'

I object as KHC have still not proved the funding, as Renfrewshire Council has not agreed £300k of funding for this and have not planned to.

Grant Funders in principal -

Sports Scotland still has it on there website that they do not fund any application that the Community is against. For KHC To say they have an agreement if the CAT is successful therefore it is still not an agreement and £100k is 20% of the money needed for its business plan.

Due to KHC appeal I am now able to see the business plan with KHC figures projected.

Therefore if after the 3-5 year grants from other providers have been used it does not show how they are going to make an income to support the Centre.

The business plan does not stand up to scrutiny initially and still doesn't.

I object to the facility lease being 50 years when predominately the Council leases are normally 30years.

This CAT has raised many objections from local community and still does but the Ralston Community Council had arranged meetings with OneRen to have meetings for 'a vision' for the Centre but have been stopped due to the Appeal. The Community want the Centre to be a success for both the community and OneRen.

I object to this appeal from Kelburne Hockey Club since they have not justified the financial figures in there business plan as I've pointed out above.

I object to the CAT as it still does not take into account the Community objections, the narrative of the subsidy come from Figures given from 2014-15 not applicable now.

There was a feasibility study paid for by a grant that was given by Renfrewshire Council which has never been produced for this facility- not all paperwork being put forward.

As a resident I object to this CAT and think that a partnership between users and OneRen would be a better use of the facility and the Community is engaging already with the community council.

I object to the facility being changed to a Hockey pitch that does not bring it up to International Standard as all internationals played at the moment are still on water based pitches. The hockey pitch upgrade would only be a slightly better standard from what is at the Onx just now!

A potential waste of money and no benefit to International players at this time. KHC would not be bringing international games to Renfrewshire in the near future.

Other Hockey clubs in the same league with Kelburne Hockey Club play on water based pitches and a few have upgraded there pitch but they are still water based pitches.

Ralston Community Sports Centre should stay as is and upgrade the Onx pitch to a water based pitch for all 3 hockey teams in Renfrewshire to play on, that would bring in the potential for international games in Renfrewshire.

Many Thanks

Kind Regards



Sent from my iPhone