

Participation Request Notice Decision received on 11 July 2019.

There are many inaccuracies in your assessment in Paragraphs 1 & 2. We reserve our position to respond. However, having sought expert advice, we have had our initial concerns confirmed, that is that South Ayrshire Council did not follow recognised and published procedures regarding the use of public money and stakeholder involvement as there is no Cost Benefit Analysis.

Our expert in these matters, whose CV and observations are attached, states that the procedure would not stand scrutiny by Audit Scotland and, by today's acceptable standards, is flawed, making it more liable to further independent scrutiny.

While the costings attached to this project are estimated (and of no commercial sensitivity despite being redacted and awaiting Appeal), they nevertheless greatly affected the decision-taking deliberations of the Leadership Panel on 27 November 2018 and were misleading by the very nature of their presentation.

The procedure is detailed in the Government publications, namely: The Green Book: Central government Guidance on Appraisal and Evaluation and Communities and Local Government; Multi Criteria Analysis: a Manual available by downloading www.communities.gov.uk/community,opportunity,prosperity.

This proposal is a direct official reaction to the Grenfell disaster in which an unsubstantiated case against safety proposed demolition, with its very substantial cost implications and social disruption.

We wrote to you on 20 June expressing our concern that our Participation Request of 8 May had not been dealt with. You confirmed that you would look into the matter on 21 June and subsequently wrote on 24 June that "competing priorities" by your staff had caused the delay for which you apologised. It comes as no surprise that the Participation Request Decision was intimated to us on 11 July after the Council Meeting decided the fate of the flats. This deprived the tenants, through us, of receiving independent support, and could be seen as manipulative.

We provided a snapshot of tenants' views having had four who declined from a sample of sixty three. Had we known of your survey interpretation, we would have canvassed the entire community to demonstrate their majority support.

The buildings are ultra safe from fire being confirmed by your consultants as structurally sound. They are of solid concrete construction, inert insulation exterior cladding, internal sprinkler system in all flats, and one hour fire resistant doors recently installed to all flats. A qualified engineer's assessment of all the electrical appliances provided by the tenants would further render the buildings as fireproofed as is possible to achieve. Any fire caused by tenant action would be contained within the flat. It would not spread outwith the flat and would activate the sprinkler system.

We are concerned that Councillors, at the Council Meeting, expressed great concern about safety. Clearly there are absolutely no safety issues –Councillors should have been advised of this.

We would have provided you with this information within an Empowerment process which would most certainly have affected the outcome to the financial and social benefit of the community that we represent.

We note that you are obliged to post your findings on the Council website. We will post this response on our own website, which includes Facebook. However, we will delay this for two weeks to enable your Council to reflect on this Decision.

Yours sincerely

Norman McLean DA(Edin) FRIAS

Chairman

Fort Seafield & Wallacetown Community Council

July 2019