

Report to Community and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 14th December 2021

Y Gat, St Clears : Appendix 1 – Options table

OPTION	PROS	CONS
<p>1. Continue as present</p>	<p>1. Supports incubation of small local businesses as tenants. 2. Retail outlet for local arts and crafts people.</p>	<p>1. The venue lacks purpose and is not a strategic asset within the Culture / arts portfolio. 2. Profile and audience are limited. 3. The venue has been subject to budgetary scrutiny over several years. Whilst the operation has been scaled back further managerial savings would be difficult to deliver through operation. 4. The community consultation (Sept 2020) supported change. Particularly the notion of a community hub with more diverse activity.</p>
<p>2. Asset transfer to St. Clears Town Council</p>	<p>1. This is the current strategy. Heads of Terms for a proposed asset transfer were issued in April 2021. 2. Supported by the action of a joint working group between Town & County Council. 3. Transfers ownership and decision making to the local community. 4. The Town Council had proposed establishing a focus group of residents to scope out future activity but have deferred this piece of work until terms are agreed. 5. Financial advantage – through reducing subsidy over the term of a transition period. Town Council could support some cost through local precept.</p>	<p>1. The Town Council remain committed to the notion of local management. 2. The Town Council have requested alternative options be put forward to extend the “transfer period” from April 2022 to April 2023 (this had already been extended from April 2021 as negotiations were started pre-pandemic). 3. Negotiations are ongoing with a final asset transfer offer (from 1/4/22) and HoT issued to SCTC for their consideration. 4. Perceived loss of control for CCC but aligns well with asset transfer policy and reflect community consultation desire to see more localised management.</p>

<p>3. CCC review and repurpose</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CCC has strategic control to determine future of asset i.e. re-purpose; sell; lease (whole or part) 2. Working with Regen colleagues, Y Gat has been identified as an option for a rural community hub. Consultants have been commissioned to explore opportunities appropriate to the building. 3. Affords the opportunity to re-define purpose and determine a development plan for the entire building – options could include reconfiguring the space, testing the market for pop-up operators; co-working spaces and / or a public sector hub. 4. Provides more certainty for existing tenants during the any transition period. 5. Retains control over decision making around timing of key decisions e.g. on staffing / opening hours. 6. Linking in with desired community outcomes identified through the Ten Towns Initiative. 7. Continue the discussions with the TC but with CCC in a leading role rather than collaboration with the TC as an equal partner. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of local ownership 2. Small scale investment in the facility may be required to make it an attractive proposition. 3. A pop-up model works best for temporary uses and through an established alternative legal / governance structure e.g. CIC which would require a flexible approach from the County Council. 4. Reduced community ownership through the initial development phases.
---	--	--