

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in support of this application. To have a strong capable group as residents to utilise and protect the iconic building is a sensible and practical solution to resolve the problems of both the organisation and Angus Council.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Carnoustie

Hi there,

I would like to give my wholehearted support to the 'Mens Sheds' application to use the Panmure Centre.

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Carnoustie

Dear sirs,

it is with reluctance that I write on behalf of [REDACTED] to object to the application by Carnoustie and Monifieth Men's Shed for a Community Asset Transfer of the Panmure Centre. I say with reluctance because as an organisation, we very much support the concept of Mens Sheds, and the benefits which they bring to their members. However, on this occasion, there is a wider community interest at stake here which this request threatens, and this proposal could limit the much wider community benefit which the Panmure Centre has the potential to deliver.

Angus Council called several public meetings to gauge interest in the Panmure Centre, and a large number of organisations expressed an interest in being able to access and use rooms/facilities there if the building was improved in condition and lay-out. At the most recent of these meeting earlier this year, Carnoustie Community Development Trust agreed to take on the role of organising a feasibility study to examine the potential uses of the building across a wide cross section of the community, which I may say would include the Men's Shed, and there was some tentative discussion around the possibility of the Council funding a study to not just identify possible uses, but also a business plan to ensure it had a long term viable future. All parties present, including a Mens Shed representative, appeared to be happy with that course of action. Coronavirus and the subsequent lock-down effectively prevented progress on the project and the feasibility study, but we had anticipated that it would be picked up and progressed as restrictions eased.

While the submission by the Men's Shed acknowledges that other groups might want to use the building, it is clear that they want to monopolise the ground floor, and we believe their estimate of costs requiring to be spent on the building over time is well short of what would be required to create a modern, high quality community facility catering for the needs and aspirations of all quarters of the Carnoustie community.

It is clear from the wording of the current application that it is focussed, not on the wider potential community benefit, but on the narrower interests of the Men's Shed. Their application states - " The proposed use of the land/building is to provide recreational facilities and advance the social needs, health and wellbeing of men of all ages and backgrounds living in Carnoustie and Monifieth and surrounding areas by creating, developing and maintaining a facility, namely a Men's Shed. "

We would respectfully suggest that if they have an immediate and urgent need to find an alternative home, they seek a short term lease of part of the Panmure Centre until the Group which has been meeting to consider options for its future has an opportunity to reconvene and get the feasibility study undertaken. Once that is completed, [REDACTED] would be in a position to seek funding based on the identified needs of the wider Carnoustie Community, including the Men's Shed, and if and when funding is identified, a CAT request on behalf of the community would be submitted. Alternatively, if acceptable, a CAT request could be submitted seeking a transfer SUBJECT to funding being obtained.

This application is premature and if granted, will severely limit the potential of the building to deliver on the needs of the whole Carnoustie community. I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this objection.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

We welcome the two brief statements of support for our Community Asset Transfer request for the Panmure Centre, and thank the writers for taking the trouble to register their views.

The third, longer statement contains a number of mistaken assumptions and erroneous conclusions that require to be corrected.

1. The expression of general support for the 'concept of Men's Sheds' identifies this with 'the benefits they bring to their members' but sets this against 'a wider community interest'. It is a fundamental principle of Men's Sheds that no such divide as this prevails in the work we do where the activities in which the members participate at the same time serve the needs of other groups and organisations. For example, in recent times many Sheds have gone into intensive production of masks and another notable example is a Shed which has been making prosthetic limbs. In our own case reference to Section 4, page 8 of our application illustrates the nature of the projects we have undertaken, and on page 13 a list of these is provided.

2. As the writer observes there has been a series of meetings about the future of the Panmure Centre, the first being on 12 August 2019 and the most recent on 25 February 2020. The Men's Shed has had at least one representative present at all of these meetings and indeed at one of them only our Secretary and Councillor Boyd turned up. This was a matter of some concern that interest in preserving the Panmure Centre for community use was at such a low ebb that it seemed possible it might end up being sold off. The regular attendance of the Carnoustie and Monifieth Men's Shed at these meetings has been as much out of concern for that latter possibility as about its being a possible future home for ourselves. As people are probably aware, the Shed began life in the Panmure Centre, and we have a considerable affection for the place; we would hate to see it disappear and want to see it become a vibrant community hub, regardless of whether or not we are based therein.

3. The meeting of 25 February, referred to above, was a disputatious affair in which indeed there was discussion, but of a somewhat fiery nature, around the feasibility study funded by Participatory Budgetting, and the role of The Carnoustie Development Trust in bring together some kind of consortium ultimately to prepare a Community Asset Transfer request. We had concerns as to the length of time that might be involved in doing this, having had recent experience of losing a suitable property as a result of the Council putting it up for sale. Therefore when the Shed Trustees met on 16 March, they decide strategically to proceed with a CAT request which would at least for the moment secure the place against summary disposal. Having recent experience of compiling CAT applications, we felt we were best placed to get the request in with little delay. So it proved, and our request was validated on 27 April.

4. We have emphasised in our application and elsewhere, that this action was not taken with a view to entering into competition with other local organisations. We proceeded with full awareness of the CDT intentions noted above, and considered that in the fulness of time the varying interests involved would resolve themselves into a coherent and purposeful project. In practical terms, if more than one Community Asset Transfer requests is received, the social community value of each will be weighed against the others and against economic value. It is to be hoped that the outcome of this would be to the maximum benefit of all those interested in using the Panmure Centre.

5. There is a serious misapprehension in this statement as to the nature of a Community Asset Transfer request. Such can only be submitted by a Community Transfer Body. As such the Carnoustie and Monifieth Men's Shed was in a position to proceed only its own behalf, as an individual, properly constituted group; we could not at this time extend our application to incorporate other organisations, apart from making reference to our willingness to work co-operatively with them. Our application was therefore necessarily Shed-focused, in terms of how we might deploy the space in the building if we were to be given primary use of it. To interpret this as 'wanting to monopolise the ground floor' is to go beyond any reasonable interpretation of our motives and to ascribe a finality and exclusiveness to some of the possibilities detailed in our proposals. Similar considerations apply to money, and the funds required to upgrade it, which has to be to a large

degree dependent on the outcome of the feasibility study, and/or any other survey work that might be carried out.

6. Finally the respectful suggestion that we seek a short-term lease. The problem is that we already **have** a short-term lease and are looking for a permanent home. It makes no sense to move lock, stock and barrel from one temporary base to another. The Council has been urging us to keep searching for an alternative to the place we have been occupying for the last three years, and it is not possible for us to pass by any opportunity of suitable accommodation; this fourth Community Asset Application request (none finally resolved as yet) is some indication of the diligence of our search.

7. Our application is criticised for being premature, whereas in fact it is exceedingly timely; we feel we have been responsibly proactive in opening up possibilities for this facility to be retained as a community controlled asset.

We hope that these paragraphs will serve to resolve some of the misunderstandings in the statement of objection, and that the commitment of the Carnoustie and Monifieth Men's Shed to creative community development will not be in further doubt.

Secretary