

ASSET TRANSFER REQUEST - OVERALL ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this document is to evidence the assessment of an Asset Transfer Request (ATR) in respect of the asset identified below and in compliance with the Part 5 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015

The Assessment will be populated in accordance with the Assessment Matrix at appendix 1 hereof. The Asset Transfer Group will review and evaluate the assessments provided by the relevant Council Departments and carry out a comparison of the benefits of the proposal against the Council alternative.

CTB Information/Information about the Land and Rights Requested

Name: Isle of Gigha Heritage Trust

Address: Craft Workshop 1, Isle of Gigha, Argyll

Contact Details: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Relevant documents attached Y / N

Asset: Isle of Gigha Ferry Terminal Car Park

Plan attached: Y / N

Title Confirmed Y / N

The Council's title is Disposition by Oldcastle Trustees Company Limited in favour of The Strathclyde Regional Council dated 26 October and 12 November and recorded G.R.S Argyll 16 December all days in the year 1981.

Registers of Scotland plan assistance



<https://sharepoint.argyll-bute.gov.uk/sites/assettransfer/SitePages/Home.aspx>

UPRN: UPRN:PV03504400001

Ownership

Lease

Details of Lease: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Other Rights Y / N

Details [Click here to enter text.](#)

COMMUNITY REQUEST / CURRENT PROPOSED USE

Set out the reasons for the request and how Land / Building (s) will be used:

IGHT is requesting to take ownership of the car park at the Gigha ferry terminal to use it as their primary access to provide camping and motorhome facilities at Ardmish on the Isle of Gigha. This will include serviced pitches, car parking and an accommodation block comprising toilets, showers,



SECTION 1: BENEFITS - ASSESSMENT

1.1 Does the request demonstrate that agreeing to the request be likely to promote or improve Economic Development

Yes No to some extent (Assessed as STRONG by Economic Development)

How does the Request demonstrate this:

Economic Development have highlighted the following examples from the request in support:

Section 8.2 1b and 2b

Section 7.1 paragraph 1

e(p 93 (0p IndTI)2a



The number of foot passengers has increased again in 2018 by 9.97% on 2017 figures.

The island currently has no facilities for camping or motorhomes, and with the introduction of Caledonian MacBrayne's Road Equivalent Tariff scheme, the number of this type of visitors has increased. In 2018, motorhome and campervan figures have increased by 10.2% of 2017 figures. This has caused a significant amount of indiscriminate camping at various points across the island. For example, at Ministers Beach on Gigha, the indiscriminate camping blocks access for small boat launching for both fisherman and the Gigha Boats Activity Centre assistant.

This also causes further access problems for family's day-tripping to Gigha and hoping to visit beaches due to tents and camper vans being pitched across

1.2 Does the request demonstrate that agreeing to the request be likely to promote or improve Regeneration

Yes No to some extent (Assessed as MODERATE by Economic Development)

How does the Request demonstrate this:

Economic Development have highlighted the following examples from the request in support:

Section 7.1

Suggests that the development of the campsite will generate a beneficial impact for other businesses on Gigha. It will also mitigate against the environmental impacts of indiscriminate waste dumping on the island, which will benefit farming and B&B businesses, as well as Gigha residents. The project could lead to improved Partnership working with other businesses.

If yes, would it be to a greater extent than any alternative proposal?

Yes No Not applicable

Outline Relevant Evidence Below:

Council current / proposed use

The alternative proposal is the current use which is a ferry terminal and related infrastructure in support of the terminal (including the car park subject to this proposal) which is operated by the Council and supports the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island operated by Calmac.

The regeneration benefits to be achieved by the request would be outweighed by the proposal adversely affecting and jeopardising the ongoing sustainability of the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island; the deliverability of the future development plans for the Gigha Ferry Service and infrastructure (including a breakwater/aligning structure) in light of the anticipated hybrid ferry; the Council wide harbour order; and the proposed rationalisation of the g7 f

Paragraph 3 ; The campsite will reduce indiscriminate waste disposal as the proposed scheme will also provide island recycling and waste facilities.....

Additionally - Health benefits would include ambulance being able to have unhindered access on the single track road. Also the indiscriminate dumping would be addressed by the proposal.

If yes, would it be to a greater extent than any alternative proposal?

Yes No Not applicable

Outline Relevant Evidence Below:

Council current / proposed use

No promotion of public health in current/proposed use.

However, the alternative proposal is the current use which is a ferry terminal and related infrastructure in support of the terminal (including the car park subject to this proposal) which is operated by the Council and supports the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island operated by Calmac.

The public health benefits to be achieved by the request would be outweighed by the proposal adversely affecting and jeopardising the ongoing sustainability of the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island; the deliverability of the future development plans for the Gigha Ferry Service and infrastructure (including a breakwater/aligning structure) in light of the anticipated hybrid ferry; the Council wide harbour order; and the proposed rationalisation of the recycling collection in Gigha which it is intended will be situated at the asset.

1.4 Does the request demonstrate that agreeing to the request be likely to promote or improve Social or Environmental wellbeing

Yes No to some extent (assessed as MODERATE by SET)

How does the Request demonstrate this:

The Social Enterprise Team have highlighted the following examples from the request in support:

Section 4.2 - States that creating the campsite will minimise the environmental impact of tourism on Gigha through the restriction of motorhome access across the island roads to prevent indiscriminate parking on sensitive sites and laybys. The campsite will reduce indiscriminate waste disposal as the proposed scheme will also provide island recycling and waste facilities.

Paragraph 3 & 4 - The campsite will minimise the environmental impact of tourism on Gigha through restricting motorhome access across the island roads and will prevent indiscriminate parking on sensitive sites and laybys. The campsite will reduce indiscriminate waste disposal as the proposed scheme will also provide island recycling and waste facilities. The restriction of motorhome and campervan access across the island will encourage more walking and cycling. The architects design will follow a sustainable approach including minimal energy usage, vernacular local design and



sympathetic use of traditional materials to respect the location of the development in the landscape of Gigha.

The creation of a campsite will allow IGHT to manage vehicular traffic much more effectively on the islands only road to protect residents, farmers, fishermen and visitors. The campsite will also allow IGHT to reduce the impact indiscriminate parking, camping and waste disposal is having on the island's residents, businesses and visitors. It will create more accommodation to deal with times of peak demand.

Section 4.3 - Demonstrates an understanding of the issues involved. In terms of LDP 2015, part of the proposed development is within the Settlement Boundary, part in Countryside. In terms of the local plan, an exception case will be required to support development in the Countryside. A planning pingu-1.3 (,)9.8

Section 5.1 Indicates the level of Community involvement and support. The Trust held a community meeting 7th December 2018 with support for the acquisition of the car park.

Section 7.1 States that the development of the campsite will generate a beneficial impact on other businesses on Gigha by increasing the level of tourism and associated spend on the island. There is a small campsite adjoining the Boathouse restaurant offering limited pitches and facilities. IGHT intend to work in partnership with the Boathouse on the management and promotion of camping and motorhome opportunities on Gigha.

Additionally - This proposal is part of a clearly articulated and agreed plan for the island's development which includes economic impact as a result of this proposal by increasing income to island business and improving employment opportunities.

If yes, would it be to a greater extent than any alternative proposal?

Yes No Not applicable

Outline Relevant Evidence Below:

Council current / proposed use

The alternative proposal is the current use which is a ferry terminal and related infrastructure in support of the terminal (including the car park subject to this proposal) which is operated by the Council and supports the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island operated by Calmac.

The benefits in reducing socio economic disadvantage to be achieved by the request would be outweighed by the proposal adversely affecting and jeopardising the ongoing sustainability of the lifeline ferry services between the mainland and the island; the deliverability of the future development plans for the Gigha Ferry Service and infrastructure (including a breakwater/aligning structure) in light of the anticipated hybrid ferry; the Council wide harbour order; and the proposed rationalisation of the recycling collection in Gigha which will be situated at the asset.

1.6 Does the request demonstrate that set out the extent to which the requests ties into CPP, SOA and CP outcomes

Yes No to some extent (assessed as MODERATE by SET)

How does the Request demonstrate this:

The Social Enterprise Team advised that IGHT consider that their request tied in with the following Community Planning Partnership outcomes at Section 8.1

Outcome 1 – The economy is diverse and thriving

Outcome 2 – We have infrastructure that supports sustainable growth

Outcome 5 – People live active healthier and independent lives

Outcome 6- People live in safer and stronger communities



Having reviewed the request SET consider that the request ties in with Outcome 1, 2 and 6.



SECTION 2 - GOVERNANCE AND FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS - ASSESSMENT

GOVERNANCE

2.1

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

- 2.7 Has the CTB identified all the relevant costs of the request or facilities including initial investment, ongoing running costs and end of project costs?

Yes No Not applicable (Assessed as WEAK by Strategic Finance)

Outline Relevant Evidence Below:

Strategic Finance stated the following in support of this assessment:

There are estimates of the costs involved in the business plan submitted as an accompanying document with the request but no information that verifies what those estimates are based on.

The submission makes no reference to the payment of Non Domestic Rates. The average costs across the whole Council area for car parks is £60-65 per bay per year.

- 2.8 Has the CBT identified appropriate and realistic sources of funding?

Yes No Not applicable (Assessed as WEAK by Strategic Finance and Poor by SET)

Outline Relevant Evidence Below:

Strategic Finance



ARGYLL AND BUTE COUNCIL



subsequently held a community meeting 7th December 2018 with support received for the acquisition of the ferry car park.

However, the consultation indicated only mixed support for IGHT to run the project. It would also be fair to say answers were often a comment on the state of the car park now rather than support for the project.

Additionally the Council received a negative representation from the Gigha Community Council. It is considered that there is a difference of the opinion between IGHT and the Community Council which indicates a level of opposition in the community and that support in the community is not universal.

SECTION 4 – SUSTAINABILITY AND EQUALITY – ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outline any evidence of the sustainability of the request (assessed as WEAK by SET)

Limited initial development would suggest to group need to do further work on this aspect. Forecasts seem based on ferry traffic information with little in the way of potential customers or markets.

It is difficult to provide assurance on the sustainability of the project based on the information received.

4.2 Outline the extent to which the request encourages equal opportunities (Assessment Matrix) (assessed as POOR by SET)

The Trust has an open membership and are a democratic group. However, the group have not submitted any equal opportunities policy and makes no mention of it.

4.3 Outline the extent to which the request demonstrates robust monitoring / reporting arrangements are in place

(-)Tj/CS0 cs 8b (t)-2.9 (s)-1.3 ()JJoA04 (q)-giem TJ-0aRnTenTJ14 0 TETcs 0 0.76 scn0 Tw 10.924 0 Td()



SECTION 5 – BEST VALUE – ASSE6CSSSE(E)-7 (LU)1.8 (E)J 1178226 B

20– EANE thESAN whANihANE 7 (LU-n BD

Overall Scoring of Best Value

Area Assessed	Rating	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score
---------------	--------	-------	-----------	----------------

SECTION 6 – OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Evidence	Overview
Very Strong	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The request strongly sets out a more positive benefit for the Council and Community than the current of proposed use by the Council.2. Governance and financial arrangements are strong and sustainable.3. Related projected benefits are very robust and demonstrate value for money: suitability, effectiveness, prudence, quality, value, and the avoidance of error and other waste.4. Robust demonstration of sustainability equality and Performance Management5. Best Value characteristics are evidenced and contained throughout the overall approach

OVERALL CONCLUSION

This sets out the conclusions on the request with regard to the information provided in the request and the provisions set out in Part 5 Section 82(3) of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015.

Please note that the Act requires that the Council assesses each request transparently against a specified list of criteria and agrees to the request unless there are reasonable grounds for refusal.

However, the request is capable of being refused when such reasonable grounds exist including cases where the benefits of the asset transfer request are judged to be less than the benefits of an alternative proposal, where agreeing to the request would restrict the relevant authority's ability to carry out its functions, or where another obligation on the relevant authority prevents or restricts its ability to agree to the request.

(Matrix 6.1-6.5)

6.1. Please assess strength of the Proposal

Overall Scoring of Request				
Area Assessed	Rating	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section 1 – Benefits	MODERATE	3	16.667%	0.500
Section 2 – Governance	MODERATE	3	16.667%	0.500
Section 2 – Financial Arrangements	WEAK	2	16.667%	0.333
Section 3 – Related Project Benefits	WEAK	2	16.667%	0.333
Section 4 – Sustainability and Equality	POOR	1	16.667%	0.166
Section 5 – Best Value	WEAK	2	16.667%	0.333

Overall Rating	
Score/Weighted Score	Overall Rating
>4.5	Very Strong
>3.5 and <=4.5	Strong
>2.5 and <=3.5	Moderate
>1.5 and <=2.5	Weak
<=1.5	Poor

Total Weighted Score: 2.165

Total Weighted Rating: **WEAK**



6.2. Please identify any State Aid Issues

None Identified

6.3. What is the justification for the price at less than market value?

Valuation: £75,000

In terms of Disposal of Land by Local Authorities (S.001 T)0.6 (th)5.2 th elst t1tte(S.001 T