



**Report of the Convener of the Community Asset Scrutiny Inquiry Panel
17 June 2024**

**Community Asset Transfer Scrutiny Inquiry
Roundtable Meeting with Stakeholders**

Purpose:	To look at views and experiences of Stakeholders with regard to Community Asset Transfer in Swansea
Content:	Details about the meeting and who has agreed to attend
Councillors are being asked to:	Consider the discussion as part of the Panels inquiry into Community Asset Transfer.
Lead Councillor:	Councillor Stuart Rice, Convener of the Community Assets Scrutiny Inquiry Panel
Lead Officer & Report Author:	Michelle Roberts, Scrutiny Officer E-mail: michelle.roberts@swansea.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1 A cross section of stakeholders who have been through the Community Asset Transfer progress were contacted. The following agreed to attend the meeting or provide a written submission:

- **Coed Gwillim** (Mr Rooke)
- **Mumbles Skate Park** (Mr P Beynon)
- **Penlan AFC** (Mr A Elliott)
- **Swansea Council for Voluntary Service** (Mr Winspear)
- **Swansea Tennis Centre** (Mr L Jones and Ms C Richards) – transferred under wellbeing powers rather than CAT but useful example.
- **Underhill Park** (Mr M Podbielski unable to attend has sent a written submission, see Appendix A)
- **Llanrhidian Higher Community Council** (for written submission see Appendix A)

1.2 They have been asked to consider:

- a. What went well?
- b. What was most challenging?
- c. What risks and barriers did you face? How did you overcome or mitigate them?

- d. What guidance, advice and support were you given? Including in relation to funding and applying for grants?
- e. What have been the main community benefits to the transfer you have found since?
- f. Have there been any particular disadvantages or challenges found since the transfer?
- g. What consultation did you (or was) carried out with regard to the transfer?
- h. Do you think the asset transfer process could be improved, if so, how?

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 There are no specific legal implications raised in this report.

4. Legal Implications

- 3.1 There are no specific legal implications raised by this report.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Written submissions received

Background papers: None