

I object to the Community Asset Transfer request from Dundonald Gymnastics Club {DGC} in relation to Muirhead Activity Centre, KA10 7AZ. The justifications for my

objections are as follows.

1: Dundonald Gymnastics Club is a one activity sport, requiring specialised sprung flooring, with adequate space for fixed large equipment, wall bars and tumble areas. This effectively excludes many of the existing clubs who currently use MAC. 4.4 of the DGC submission states that “ The proposed equipment set up will mean that the centre will no longer be available for hard court sporting activities. This asset transfer request is submitted at a time when newer and better sized hardcourt provision is now online at the regenerated Marr College facility”

Are these possible new facilities adequate and available during school holidays and especially during the daytime when they would be expected to be utilised by the school?

I object to the loss of an all-round sporting facility for the community.

2: Section 4-4.2 of the Community Proposal lodged by DGC, states that the community benefits should include social wellbeing and consideration of inequalities. If local residents on low incomes need to source alternative facilities { Marr College} at much higher cost, it would put them at a disadvantage. I object to the loss of a taxpayers facility being transferred to a commercial business.

3: The Proposal only deals with the demands for gymnastics, does not consider 'others'. The proposal has not considered any other sporting group or club who are, or in the future, may want to use the facility. This is contrary to Section 4 4.2 of the proposal, where the proposer must show how the project will benefit the community, and others.

4: Considering the alleged numbers of gymnasts who will allegedly be encouraged to MAC, there is no traffic management survey included with the proposals. With only a limited number of allotted parking spaces, this could create overflow parking in nearby streets and possible traffic congestion at peak periods.

MAC has a user base from a local population of around 15000 people, which is growing rapidly. It is the most utilised of all the Council Activity Centres. It is noted that the other Activity Centres in Coyllton, Dundonald and Mossblown have equivalent populations of around 2500 people, with presumably a similarly lower user base. Ayr and Prestwick have both the Citadel and Whitletts facilities. Irvine, with 35000, has the new Portal.

I object to the loss of a sporting facility, used by groups from toddlers to older people and individuals who are not part of larger organisations.

As for the Asset transfer process, [Part 5 of the Community Empowerment Act](#) introduces a right for community bodies to make requests to all local authorities, Scottish Ministers and a range of public bodies for any land or buildings they feel they could make better use of. They can request ownership, lease or other rights as they wish.

The public authorities must transparently assess requests against a specified list of criteria, laid out in the Act, and agree the request unless there are reasonable grounds for refusal.

Dundonald Gymnastics Club has made such a request for ownership for the Muirhead Activity Centre land with a proposed price of £1

It is not known exactly what land is included in the proposal, presumably the building which was built at a considerable cost to the public. Is the car park included?, are the surrounding grassed areas?

Dundonald Gymnastics Club states that the proposed equipment set up will mean that the centre will no longer be available for hard court sporting activities. They state that there are facilities at Marr which can be used instead. SAC have not confirmed this claim.

I use the Muirhead activity centre, as do many other people. It is the most used of all the local activity centres, and demand for the centre can only rise as the 800 new homes are constructed, adding to the numerous new flats in the town.

Dundonald Gymnastics Club proposes to restrict access to members of their single sport club which is obviously not suitable for the majority, older people in particular.

How can it be a better use of the facility if local people are no longer able to use it? This is not a benefit to the community.

The application should therefore be refused on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for refusal.