REPRESENTATION BY AN INTERESTED PARTY ON AN APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, section 86
Asset Transfer Request (Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2016, regulation 4(4)

Details	
Application for review by	Rainbow Muslim Women's Group SCIO (SC047758), lodged 9 September 2026
Property	Thornhill Community Centre, Thornhill Road, Falkirk FK2 7AE
Representation by	Falkirk Thornhill Community Hall SCIO (SC047801)
Address	Thornhill Community Hall, Thornhill Road, Falkirk FK2 7AE (principal office registered with OSCR)
Contact email	[redacted]
Sent to	Strategic Property Review Team, Falkirk Council, StrategicPropertyReview@falkirk.gov.uk
Date	30 September 2026

1. Introduction and what FTCH asks

1.1 Falkirk Thornhill Community Hall SCIO ("FTCH") makes this representation in response to the Council's notice of 17 September 2026 of the application for review lodged by the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group SCIO (the "RMWG") on 9 September 2026. On 10 September 2026 the Council confirmed in writing that it would notify FTCH of the RMWG's review as an interested party. FTCH is also the sub-licensee and an occupier of the Centre, and its Chair, and other board members made representations on the RMWG's asset transfer request in March 2026.

1.2 FTCH has lodged its own application for review of its competing request for the same property, with its Statement of Case dated 28 September 2026. The Council holds it. This representation does not repeat it. It answers the RMWG's review and refers to the sections of FTCH's Statement of Case where the evidence is set out.

1.3 FTCH asks the Community Empowerment Review Committee (the "Committee") to:

(a) find that there are reasonable grounds for refusing the RMWG's request as made;

(b) consider the two reviews together, since each request is the alternative proposal against which the other must be compared under section 82 of the Act, and agree FTCH's request, which provides for the RMWG's continued use of the Centre; or, if the Committee considers that neither request should be agreed as made, determine the matter on the basis of the equal governance model FTCH has proposed; and

(c) hold a hearing session and visit the Centre before determining either review.

1.4 FTCH values the RMWG's work with the women it serves and makes no criticism of it. FTCH's request has provided for the RMWG from the start, and it still does. This representation concerns one question: which request will best secure this building for everyone who uses it.

2. The test the Committee must apply

2.1 The RMWG's review asks the Committee to "uphold" the officers' recommendation, and frames the question as "what evidence emerged following the Council's assessment process that justifies departing from the recommendation" (Review Submission, sections 1, 10 and 19). That is not the statutory test.

2.2 No decision was ever made on either request. The Executive considered both on 18 June and 13 August 2026 and decided neither. An officers' recommendation is advice, not a decision, and there is nothing to uphold. Section 86(8) of the Act applies section 82(3) to (5) to the review: the Committee must itself weigh the benefits of the RMWG's request against those of the alternative proposal, FTCH's request, on the evidence now before it, and must agree a request unless there are reasonable grounds for refusing it. The Scottish Government's guidance states that on review the request is to be considered in the same way as in the original process (paragraph 18.23 of the guidance for community transfer bodies). The RMWG itself accepts that the section 82 comparison "applies during the review process" (Review Submission, section 15).

2.3 The officers rated both requests Strong, at 68 and 62 out of 80. Every reason given for the six-point difference is expressed as a "panel view", and the Head of Investment, Assets and Climate confirmed in writing on 12 August 2026 that "it was felt" one application was more community focused. A score resting on a feeling, and recorded before almost a year of operating evidence existed, is part of the history of this process. It is not the foundation of this review (Statement of Case, sections 3 and 6).

3. What the RMWG's review says, and what the record shows

3.1 The table below sets out each proposition on which the RMWG's review relies, including the earlier representations reproduced in its evidence bundle, the documented position, and where FTCH's evidence is.

What the RMWG says	What the record shows	FTCH Statement of Case
"Collaborative working was not refused"; it was tested "over a prolonged period"; "no jointly governed proposal emerged" (Review Submission, sections 1 and 8 to 10)	The RMWG told FTCH in May 2025, and more than once later that year, that it did not want to collaborate with anyone because its own plans were too far advanced. It then declined every proposal to share. On six occasions FTCH made, renewed or accepted a proposal to share the Centre: an anchor let offered on 3 September 2025; up to a third of the Centre offered on 17 September 2025; a renewed offer on 29 September 2025; a permanent anchor let written into FTCH's request, validated on 2 March 2026; a legally enforceable equal governance model put to the independent mediator on 8 July 2026; and the Executive's own three-month extension to explore joint governance, which FTCH accepted in writing on 16 August 2026. The RMWG declined every one; in September 2025 it agreed face to face to take the anchor let, then rejected it and took the licence after meeting officers without FTCH. At the Council-facilitated meeting of 26 November 2025 its representatives said that FTCH's groups should pay the RMWG directly, that there was no point in FTCH being at the Centre, and that the Centre was theirs. Its own review bundle contains its letter stating that it "does not agree to any extension". The mediator reported that no agreement was reached. That is not the same as no proposal being made.	Section 5

What the RMWG says	What the record shows	FTCH Statement of Case
Shared occupation since October 2025 "tested" collaborative working "in practice" (sections 1 and 8)	The arrangement was a licence to the RMWG and a sub-licence to FTCH, with the RMWG in control. It did not test joint governance. It tested how the RMWG treats the building's other users: locks changed without notice, leaving FTCH without keys for around three days; the heating control withheld through the winter, with 16.5°C recorded by the Council's contractor on 1 December 2025 during a session for elderly users, followed by a Hive control that only the RMWG operates; FTCH's broadband removed and then recharged to FTCH; a statutory mental health service refused one hour within FTCH's own time for six weeks on the basis of a let that did not exist; and a faith group's one-off booking within FTCH's protected hours refused on 21 September 2026 by reference to a separate dispute about money.	Sections 7 and 10
The RMWG sought "clarity through governance proposals, communication protocols, operational rules and dispute-resolution arrangements" (section 8; bundle E1 and E2)	The Operational Rules were issued unilaterally on 2 March 2026 and rejected by FTCH. They form no part of the sub-licence. The Head of Investment, Assets and Climate has confirmed in writing that the Council "did not contribute or have any input" in their development. The RMWG breaches its own Rules: Rule 4.6 allows 30 days for payment, but it demanded 7; Rule 5.4 says each party pays for its own broadband, but it recharged FTCH for its own; and it has never used the Rule 9.1 dispute process, choosing instead to threaten debt recovery. The Rules describe FTCH's financial questions as "vexatious conduct".	Section 8
"Council officers were required to intervene and provide clarification" (section 8; bundle E3)	The Council's clarification was that it has no contractual relationship with FTCH and that any breach of the sub-licence is for the RMWG to resolve. The Council's email of 25 May 2026 addressed a single cleaning item, which FTCH accepted. On 25 September 2026 the Principal Surveyor confirmed that the Hive installation "**should not be included** in the 31% recharge".	Sections 7 and 8
£4,107.08 invoiced and £3,889.19 outstanding (bundle E4)	The RMWG's totals do not agree with each other (£4,107.01 and £3,889.12 in its email of 15 September 2026) or with its own line amounts, which total £4,106.85. FTCH has paid Invoice 001 (£217.89) and, on 18 September 2026, £2,385.38, being every charge that was properly substantiated and not in dispute. The remaining £1,503.58 is disputed across 33 itemised lines, each with a stated reason and the document that would resolve it, including charges made twice, charges with no supporting document, and the Hive installation. The RMWG has **not** answered one of them, and it has never acknowledged the £2,385.38 payment. It then told the public that FTCH had paid only "one invoice of just over £200", omitting the £2,385.38, deleted FTCH's reply, and has not corrected its post.	Section 8
The RMWG is "an established community organisation" with more than twenty years of delivery (sections 7, 11 and 12)	FTCH does not dispute the RMWG's record, which is across the Falkirk area and the wider Forth Valley. It is not evidence about this building. The RMWG's public survey asked about "this group taking on its own premises", and its request records a preference for a central location, "particularly in Falkirk". Its own equality assessment records, against every protected characteristic, that data on the Centre's existing users "was not available" to it. The Council's report describes the proposal as a base for the RMWG's "own charitable operations, from which	Section 4

What the RMWG says	What the record shows	FTCH Statement of Case
	to deliver their classes and activities to their core audience, women from an ethnic minority background" (paragraph 4.24).	
Governance, capacity and deliverability were "recognised by the Council's own assessment process" (section 12)	The officers assessed a proposal on paper. The Committee now has almost a year of the RMWG managing this building with other groups depending on it. Six of the twelve established groups in FTCH's protected timetable have ceased to use the Centre, and actual occupation of that timetable has fallen from 31 per cent to around 19 per cent.	Sections 7 and 10
Enablement Funding of up to £101,738 is waiting, and "continuing uncertainty" harms the community (sections 13 and 14)	The uncertainty followed the RMWG's refusal of the Executive's extension, which FTCH accepted, and which the RMWG announced in the Falkirk Herald on 17 August 2026 before the process had run its course. The community is tired, but of a year of problems at the Centre under the RMWG's control, not of waiting: six of twelve established groups have gone, and FTCH's petition gathered 631 signatures in less than three weeks. The Enablement Fund is available to whichever community transfer body takes the Centre. The RMWG's request allocates £51,990 to altering the pavilion to create a base for its own core work (Council report, paragraphs 4.25 and 5.46). FTCH's request, of £110,040, is for the works the Council's own 2023 condition survey identified as most urgent: full electrical rewiring, addressing a Category 1.1 immediate safety risk, and flat roof works.	Section 9
"No viable alternative proposal emerged"; there are "no reasonable grounds" to refuse (sections 15 and 16)	A viable alternative proposal exists: FTCH's own request, validated on 2 March 2026, rated Strong by the same officers, and now before the Committee on review. It serves every group at the Centre and includes the RMWG.	Sections 2 and 4
Written procedure is sufficient (section 17)	The two reviews conflict directly on questions of fact. The RMWG itself says it would welcome a hearing or site visit if the Committee considers one would assist. FTCH asks for both.	Section 13
FTCH "declined multiple invitations to meet" and adopted a "combative approach" (RMWG representation of 26 March 2026, in its bundle)	FTCH has never refused to meet. It asked for an agenda in advance, told the RMWG on 10 November 2025 that it had already confirmed to the Council that it would attend a Council-facilitated meeting, and attended that meeting on 26 November 2025. FTCH's correspondence reported specific matters under the sub-licence (keys, heating, CCTV, an unsafe floor before an exercise class, invoices) and was copied to the Council, as the Council required. Every one of those matters was raised on behalf of FTCH's groups; FTCH has no programme of its own. The RMWG has treated the groups' concerns as FTCH complaining, calling them "hostility" and, in its Rules, "vexatious conduct". Other meeting required reschedule due to holiday periods only.	Section 5
FTCH "withheld basic operational knowledge despite previously managing the facility" (RMWG representation of 26 March 2026)	FTCH's Secretary carried out the handover herself. On 1 October 2025 she took the RMWG's representatives round the whole building, showed them every compliance folder, including the management folder, risk assessments, asbestos records and contractor signing book, showed them where every key was held, and explained the weekly checks. She went through the folders with the RMWG on **two separate occasions.** She can give that evidence in person at a hearing.	Section 7 (hearing)

What the RMWG says	What the record shows	FTCH Statement of Case
Former trustees who ran the Centre "for ten years" until "early 2025" support the RMWG; FTCH's current committee "lacks long-term operational experience" (RMWG response to representations)	FTCH, as an organisation, has managed the Centre for around a decade; the RMWG's own public statement acknowledges that FTCH's previous committee ran it for almost ten years. The current Board took office from February 2025, and FTCH has never claimed otherwise. Among the former trustees relied on is a former trustee who was a signatory of an FTCH account that had not been transferred to the current Board, and which has been the subject of a formal legal process led by FTCH's solicitors, with OSCR kept informed throughout. The Committee should weigh that support accordingly. Its trustees are professional people who together bring more than 75 years of professional experience across everything a community charity board needs: governance, finance and funding, HR, social value and responsible business, community wealth building, nursing, health and wellbeing, care, addiction and recovery, and disability, and they are drawn from the groups that use the Centre.	Sections 4 and 9
FTCH's "divisive public campaigning" and "false and divisive narratives" (RMWG response to representations and representation of 26 March 2026)	FTCH told the Council in writing on 29 August 2026, before launching them, that it intended to approach the Falkirk Herald and to run a petition. The petition asks for the Centre to be kept for the whole community, "including the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group". The RMWG does not identify a single statement by FTCH that is false or divisive. In October 2025 it wrote, of the online comments it relied on, "we do not suggest these comments originate from FTCH".	Sections 4 and 11
FTCH's forecasts are "unsupported by historic performance" (RMWG representation of 26 March 2026)	On average, FTCH's invoices for regular group lets on its 31 per cent of the timetable come to £1,337 a month, before any private hire. The RMWG's own running-cost schedule puts the running costs of the whole building at about £14,500 a year. FTCH's income from under a third of the hall already exceeds that. FTCH holds approximately £60,000 in reserves, without the inclusion of grant funding.	Section 9
216 of 231 representations supported the RMWG (RMWG response to representations)	FTCH does not doubt that the RMWG has many supporters across Falkirk. The question under paragraphs 10.21 and 10.23 of the guidance is the views of this Centre's users and the local community. The RMWG has not said where its supporters live or whether they use the Centre. On its own account, 15 representations opposed its request. FTCH's petition, which ran from 8 to 27 September 2026, gathered 631 signatures in less than three weeks, at least 325 of them from the Falkirk Council area and many of those are connected to the centre, and was closed only so that it could be included in FTCH's review, while people were still signing; twenty of the 23 comments left are from the Falkirk area, and eight of the people who commented describe using the Centre, one of them for 49 years.	Section 4

3.2 The RMWG's refusals also went against what the Council itself asked for at every stage. The Council's report records that, where requests compete, the guidance seeks that groups work collaboratively (paragraph 3.5). After the meeting of 26 November 2025 the case officer wrote that "the groups should be able to work together to agree a set of written operational rules". On 18 June 2026 the Executive deferred its decision so that collaboration could be tested through mediation, and on 13 August 2026 it voted to extend the process specifically to explore joint governance. The RMWG's review says collaboration was tried and failed. It

does not say why. It failed because the RMWG refused every offer, from FTCH and from the Executive. The Committee is entitled to ask why an applicant felt able to refuse, at every stage, the collaboration the Council kept asking for, and section 5 below identifies the records that bear on that question.

4. Reasonable grounds for refusing the RMWG's request

4.1 The Act requires a request to be agreed unless there are reasonable grounds for refusing it. FTCH submits that the following grounds exist, individually and together.

(a) **Impact on other community groups.** The guidance requires the Committee to consider the potential impact on other community groups (paragraph 10.20) and the views of local residents who are not part of a community of interest (paragraph 10.23). Before the licence the Centre served 16 groups and around 346 regular weekly users, disproportionately disabled, older, living with mental ill health or brain injury, in recovery, or from minority ethnic and faith communities. Under the RMWG's control, six of the twelve established protected groups have gone. Two of those that remain have told FTCH they will leave if the RMWG's request is agreed, and a third has raised concerns about its future at the Centre.

(b) **No enforceable protection for existing users.** The RMWG's assurance that all lets will be honoured and none displaced (Council report, paragraph 4.22) is not a condition of transfer, and no group can enforce it. At its public meeting on 27 March 2026 its only answer was that lets would be honoured unless a group did not pay; FTCH has been told, verbally only, that the protection would last twelve months. Its own proposal moves current lets to the pavilion whenever its activities require the kitchen (paragraph 5.22), and its Operational Rules can be changed by the RMWG alone. Its Review Submission says nothing about how the Centre's existing groups would be protected. The Council's equality assessment rates the impact of the RMWG's request as low only because of that assurance. When the licence and sub-licence end on transfer, the protections in the sub-licence end with them.

(c) **Deliverability.** The pavilions to which groups would be moved are currently used for storage and are not fit for purpose. The RMWG's own Enablement Fund request is to alter the pavilion to create a base for its core work. The pavilions have no kitchen, yet the groups that would be moved are the ones that rely on the kitchen at every session, many of them older, disabled or vulnerable users. The same proposal says the RMWG will run its own core activities from the pavilion, so it cannot also be the place existing groups are sent. No accommodation exists today for the groups the RMWG proposes to move, and the Committee has no specification, timetable or funding certainty for it. In practice the proposal means that the RMWG's needs come first and the existing groups take what is left.

(d) **The greater benefit of the alternative proposal.** FTCH's request serves every group at the Centre, keeps the RMWG at the Centre on a defined anchor let that it could enforce as a contract, brings back groups that have left, and brings in new groups that have said they will come only under FTCH or an equal governance model. A transfer to FTCH displaces no one; the RMWG keeps its other venues. A transfer to the RMWG ends FTCH's service at its only venue and leaves established groups with no equivalent alternative.

(e) **Equal opportunities and good relations.** The Council must decide in a manner which encourages equal opportunities (guidance, paragraph 10.10). The RMWG has

repeatedly alleged racism against FTCH: in correspondence copied to the Council's Chief Executive, at the Council-facilitated meeting of 26 November 2025, and other occasions it relies on. It has never supplied any evidence, although FTCH has asked for it every time, and it has never withdrawn or answered a single allegation; its review is silent on them. It has also made false statements about FTCH in public during this process: that FTCH had paid only one invoice, that FTCH removed the Centre's cameras, and, in February and March 2026, that it had been running the Centre for 18 months; and when FTCH replied publicly, the RMWG deleted FTCH's reply. On 21 September 2026 it refused a faith group's one-off event within FTCH's protected hours by reference to its invoice dispute with FTCH, a dispute to which that group has no connection, and told FTCH to stop describing the group as faith based because the RMWG is "an equalities rooted organisation and do[es] not discriminate". FTCH's trustees are volunteers and professional people; statements of this kind, made publicly by a body that does not know them, damage their professional reputations as well as the charity's. FTCH holds screenshots of each of the RMWG's posts referred to in this representation and will provide them to the Committee on request. Unsubstantiated allegations of that kind against a volunteer charity, made during a competitive process, bear directly on which applicant can manage a shared building fairly for everyone.

5. Matters the Committee should resolve before relying on the recommendation

5.1 Section 12 of FTCH's Statement of Case sets out matters of process and impartiality on which the Council holds records that FTCH does not: how the licence came to be granted to the RMWG in September 2025, a week after the Council wrote that doing so would look like pre-determining the transfer; the case officer's recusal from the assessment and her continuing role as case officer for both applicants; a Council officer's assertion that FTCH is in breach while stating that it is not the Council's role to review the evidence; the Council's part, if any, in the RMWG's Operational Rules; and the letter of support written for the RMWG by the Council's own [redacted] team and relied on twice in the Council's report. FTCH relies on that section and does not repeat it here.

5.2 The RMWG's review asks the Committee to rest its decision on the recommendation. FTCH asks the Committee to obtain those records under regulation 8 before it does so.

6. The RMWG's conduct towards the wider community

6.1 The guidance asks the Committee to consider the views of local residents who are not part of a community of interest, and the impact on other community groups (paragraphs 10.20 and 10.23). Several matters, some of them arising since FTCH lodged its own review, show how the RMWG treats the wider community while it holds only a licence.

6.2 On 30 September 2026 a member of the community posted publicly that the RMWG had put restrictions on the area between the Centre and the Harriers hall, so that the public can no longer smoke or vape, or walk or sit, anywhere in that area, although it has been used by the public without restriction for many years. On occasions earlier this year the RMWG cordoned off the Centre's car park during its own events so that others could not park, and it has been reported to FTCH that "no dogs allowed" signs have been put up by the RMWG in Victoria Park, a public park. The RMWG holds a licence of the Centre; it does not own the car park, the surrounding land or the park, and it has already recharged FTCH for a pothole repair kit for land outside the licensed property (Statement of Case, section 8). FTCH asks the Committee to establish exactly what land the RMWG's licence covers and on what authority each of these restrictions was imposed. How the RMWG treats the wider public's use of the

land around the Centre while it holds only a licence is relevant to what ownership would mean.

6.3 This week, during the representation period, the RMWG published new hall prices on Facebook: £15 an hour for regular lets and £18 an hour for non-regular, ad hoc lets, with no charge for the kitchen. That differs from the £15 an hour plus £10 for the kitchen it has charged during the licence, and from its asset transfer request, which proposed a kitchen charge on top of the hire charge and on which its business plan and sustainability were assessed. FTCH asks the Committee to require the RMWG to explain whether the change applies equally to every let, including regular community groups and groups that use the kitchen, or only to those that do not; what each regular group will now pay; why the change has been made now; and how its business plan stands on the new charges. A request is assessed as it was made, and the Centre's groups are entitled to know what they would actually pay.

6.4 Earlier this year several members of the public contacted FTCH to say that they had tried to book the Centre for birthday parties and family events and received no reply, or a reply too late to be of use, some after trying more than once by email and phone; members of FTCH's protected groups reported the same. FTCH's protected groups also raised with FTCH whether events at which alcohol is served, which the Centre has always hosted responsibly, would be permitted under the RMWG. The RMWG's request contains no policy on it. Private parties and events have always been part of this Centre's community use and its income, and FTCH asks the Committee to require the RMWG to state its position.

6.5 At the RMWG's public meeting on 27 March 2026, its representatives filmed those attending without their consent. When FTCH's Chair asked for the footage of attendees to be deleted, they went into the kitchen and shut themselves in rather than discuss it. At the same meeting one of the RMWG's representatives referred to FTCH's Chair, in front of the whole hall, as "Alice in Wonderland". What was done with the footage has never been explained.

7. Procedure and publication

7.1 FTCH asks for a hearing session under regulation 7(3)(b) and the Hearing Session Rules, and a site visit that includes the pavilions. FTCH consents to any record of the July 2026 joint mediation session being made available to the Committee, subject to the mediator's confidentiality requirements, and asks the Committee to invite the RMWG to give the same consent.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The RMWG's review rests on three propositions: that the officers' recommendation is the starting point; that collaboration was tried and failed; and that nothing since has changed the position. None of them holds. The Committee must make the comparison itself. Collaboration was offered by FTCH at every stage and declined by the RMWG at every stage, including when the offer came from the Executive. And almost a year of the RMWG's control of the Centre has shown what its assurance to the existing groups is worth in practice.

8.2 FTCH asks the Committee to find that there are reasonable grounds for refusing the RMWG's request as made, and to agree FTCH's request, which keeps Thornhill Community Centre for the whole community, including the RMWG.

For and on behalf of the Board of Trustees

Falkirk Thornhill Community Hall SCIO (SC047801), 30 September 2026

Strategic Property Review Team
Falkirk Council, Falkirk Stadium, Stadium Way, Falkirk FK2 9EE
By email: StrategicPropertyReview@falkirk.gov.uk

From: [redacted]
Date: 30 September 2026

Thornhill Community Centre: personal representation on the application for review by the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group SCIO

Dear Strategic Property Review Team,

1. I make this representation in my personal capacity on the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group's ("the RMWG's") asset transfer request in March 2026, and I ask the Committee to consider it again alongside this letter.

2. I am the Secretary of Falkirk Thornhill Community Hall SCIO ("FTCH") and have been closely involved in the running of the Centre and in FTCH's dealings with the RMWG and the Council throughout this process. FTCH has made its own representation, which I support and do not repeat. I am writing because the RMWG, in its review and in the earlier representations it has put in its evidence bundle, makes claims about FTCH's conduct that concern things I did and saw personally. They are not true, and the Committee should hear from the person involved.

The handover of the Centre

3. The RMWG's representation of 26 March 2026, which it relies on in its review, says that FTCH "withheld basic operational knowledge despite previously managing the facility". I carried out the handover of the Centre to the RMWG myself.

4. On 1 October 2025 I took the RMWG's representatives on a full walk-round of the building, in the presence of Council representatives. I showed them every compliance folder: the management folder, the risk assessments, the asbestos records, the contractor signing book and the other compliance records, as well as the weekly checks required to be in place. I referred them to the community centre management folder retained in the cupboard. I showed them where the keys for every area of the building were kept, and I explained which checks had to be done every week. I went through the folders with the RMWG on two separate occasions as I noted they hadn’t been completing this paperwork. When I was asked how long I could stay to help, I explained how long I could stay at that point, said I knew it was a lot to take in, and asked whether they were comfortable managing. They told me they could manage.

5. Nothing was withheld. Every record needed to run the building safely was handed over and explained, and I offered my help.

The RMWG has never wanted to collaborate

6. The RMWG's review tells the Committee that "collaborative working was not refused". That is not my experience. In 2025, before the licence, the RMWG told FTCH that it did not want to collaborate with anyone because its own plans were too far advanced. In September 2025 FTCH offered it a long-term anchor let of around a third of the Centre, with plans our architect had redesigned around its needs. The RMWG rejected the whole idea of sharing and took the licence of the whole Centre instead.

7. **The meeting of 26 November 2025.** I attended the meeting the Council arranged at the RMWG's request. I heard the RMWG's representatives say that FTCH's groups should pay

the RMWG directly, that there was no point in FTCH being at the Centre, and that the Centre was theirs. Allegations of racism were made against FTCH, and we were not given a fair opportunity to answer them.

8. Since then FTCH has put forward an equal governance model and accepted the Executive's own three-month extension to explore joint governance. The RMWG refused the extension and announced its refusal in the Falkirk Herald. The Council itself asked for collaboration at every stage. Collaboration did not fail because it was tried; it failed because the RMWG refused it every time.

What I have seen at the Centre

9. **An emergency call-out.** In late 2025, I had to attend the Centre for a contractor during an emergency while the RMWG was in the building. The RMWG's representatives did not introduce themselves to the group using the hall at the time, and when they left, they left the building open. I was left to lock up the building, and was late home for my own childcare arrangements. Under the licence was the RMWG's responsibility, not mine to support the contractor visit and ensure the building was secure.

10. **The water leak.** In February 2026 I was with FTCH's Chair when she found water dripping from the light fitting in the disabled toilet, with water pooling on the floor and a wet floor sign beside it. We recorded it on video and FTCH reported it to the RMWG and the Council that day. I work as a nurse. Water coming through an electrical fitting, in the only accessible toilet in a building used by disabled and elderly people, is a serious risk to life, and it had been known about for months.

11. **The private meeting of 9 March 2026.** FTCH held a closed information session for its own groups' representatives. Two people from Westfield Park Community Centre attended uninvited and said that the RMWG had asked them to come. There was also an undercover journalist present. This individual gave a false name and reason for being there. When I questioned him for his reasons for attending a closed private meeting, he became anxious. Later we confirmed he was a journalist and he was secretly recording the meeting. It was confirmed there was no reason for him to being there. I escorted him from the premises at that point for recording the meeting. All the groups were uncomfortable with him being there. The RMWG had never approached our groups itself, and it did not tell FTCH it was sending anyone.

The RMWG's public meeting of 27 March 2026

12. I attended the RMWG's public meeting at the Centre. I repeatedly asked the RMWG directly why it needs this particular hall, when it operates across the Falkirk area from other venues and its own request describes the building as a base for its own operations. The RMWG only response was that they “needed a base” in a more “central location” to provide their services for their community. That question matters, because the RMWG's case rests on needing this building, and it has never explained why this building rather than any other, or why it cannot share it with FTCH and the groups already here.

13. At the same meeting the RMWG was asked whether it could displace a let at any time. Its only answer was that lets would be honoured unless a group did not pay. One of the RMWG's representatives leading the meeting referred to FTCH's Chair, in front of the whole hall, as '[redacted] in Wonderland". RMWG representatives at the back of the hall filmed those attending without asking for consent, and when we asked them to delete the footage they went into the kitchen and shut themselves in rather than discuss it. That is not how a charity

asking to be trusted with a community centre should treat the community that came to ask it questions.

FTCH speaks for the groups

14. The RMWG says FTCH "declined multiple invitations to meet" and was "combative". As Secretary I was closely involved in FTCH's correspondence. Every email reported a specific matter under the sub-licence, and every one was raised on behalf of FTCH's groups: the heating at elderly and vulnerable users' sessions, a protected group's concern about CCTV audio recording, an unsafe floor before an exercise class, an hour for a mental health service, a booking for a faith group, and invoices that trustees are required to check before spending charitable money. The Council was copied in because it asked to be. FTCH never refused to meet. We asked for an agenda in advance; on 10 November 2025 we told the RMWG that we had already confirmed to the Council that we would attend a Council-facilitated meeting; and we attended it on 26 November 2025. Any other meeting had to be rescheduled only because of holiday periods.

15. Yet the RMWG has treated the groups' concerns as FTCH complaining for the sake of it, calling them "hostility" and, in its Operational Rules, "vexatious conduct". Most recently, on 21 September 2026, it refused a one-off event by an established faith group within FTCH's protected hours by linking it to its invoice dispute with FTCH, a dispute that group has no part in, and told FTCH to stop describing the group as faith based because the RMWG is "an equalities rooted organisation". A body that dismisses the existing groups, and the charity that speaks for them, while a sub-licence is in place to protect them, will not protect them once it owns the building.

    The RMWG has also stated on social media that meetings between the two groups were cancelled, and blamed FTCH. That is not true either. Very few meetings were ever actually arranged. The one meeting that was definitely arranged was cancelled by Falkirk Council itself, on 14 November 2025, not by FTCH. The RMWG notified us of the same on 10 November 2025. The RMWG's public account of who cancelled meetings is another statement that the record does not support.

The allegations of racism and the RMWG's public statements

16. I work as a nurse with people from many different communities. The RMWG does not know me. The allegations of racism made against FTCH, and so against its trustees, are false. They have never been supported by any evidence, though FTCH has asked for it every time, and they have never been withdrawn.

17. The RMWG has also made false statements about FTCH in public during this process: that FTCH had paid only one invoice, when FTCH had paid every properly evidenced, undisputed charge; that FTCH had removed the Centre's cameras, when they remain in place, disconnected as the sub-licence provides; and, earlier this year, that it had been running the Centre for 18 months. When FTCH replied publicly, the RMWG deleted the reply. FTCH holds screenshots. FTCH's trustees are volunteers and professional people. Statements like these, made publicly by a group that does not know us, damage not only the charity but our professional reputations, and in my case my standing in a profession built on trust. That goes far beyond a disagreement between two charities.

What I ask

18. The RMWG asks the Committee to accept its account of the last year on paper. Much of that account concerns things I did and saw myself, and it is wrong. I ask the Committee to hold a

hearing, and I am willing to attend and answer questions. I ask the Committee to refuse the RMWG's request as made and to agree FTCH's request, which keeps the Centre for the whole community, including the RMWG.

19. Please redact my home address and contact details if this representation is published.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]
30 September 2026

Strategic Property Review Team
Falkirk Council, Falkirk Stadium, Stadium Way, Falkirk FK2 9EE
By email: StrategicPropertyReview@falkirk.gov.uk

From: [redacted]
Date: 30 September 2026

Thornhill Community Centre: personal representation on the application for review by the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group SCIO

Dear Strategic Property Review Team,

1. I make this representation in my personal capacity under regulation 4(4) of the Asset Transfer Request (Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2016, in response to the Council's notice of 17 September 2026. I made a personal representation on the Rainbow Muslim Women's Group's ("the RMWG's") asset transfer request on 13 March 2026, and I ask the Committee to consider it again alongside this letter.

2. I am a regular user of Thornhill Community Centre and run a group there on Monday evenings. I am also Chair of Falkirk Thornhill Community Hall SCIO ("FTCH"). FTCH has made its own representation on behalf of the charity and the groups it serves. I support it and do not repeat it. This letter sets out what I have seen and heard myself, because the RMWG's review describes the last year in terms I do not recognise.

The RMWG has never wanted to collaborate

3. In May 2025, when FTCH first met the RMWG, and again on more than one occasion later that year, the RMWG told us plainly that it did not want to collaborate with anyone, because its own business plan was already well advanced and did not involve anybody else.

4. I was at the meeting at the Centre on 3 September 2025 at which FTCH showed the RMWG and Council officers our plans for the Centre, which our architect had revised around the RMWG's needs, and offered the RMWG a long-term anchor let. The RMWG said it wanted its own space, and it proposed that FTCH hold the licence while both requests were assessed. The Council agreed in writing the next day.

5. On 19 September 2025 I asked [redacted] about an email a Council officer had sent FTCH three days earlier about finding alternative accommodation for our groups from 1 October. He told me and a fellow trustee that the email should never have been sent. Within a week the licence had gone to the RMWG instead. FTCH signed its sub-licence at the Council's offices on 30 September 2025 because we were told the Centre would close if an arrangement could not be reached, and we were not prepared to let that happen to the many people who depend on it weekly.

6. In September 2025 the RMWG agreed with us face to face that it would take an anchor let of around a third of the Centre from FTCH. It then rejected that arrangement and, after meeting Council officers on 23 September 2025 without FTCH present and without telling us, took the licence of the whole Centre itself.

7. The RMWG's review now tells the Committee that "collaborative working was not refused", and that it took part in the mediation "fully, professionally and in good faith". The record, step by step, is this:

   (a) **May 2025, and more than once that year:** it told us it did not want to collaborate with anyone, because its own plans were too far advanced;

(b) **3 September 2025:** it rejected the whole concept of sharing the Centre with FTCH, including plans our architect had redesigned around its needs (given the RMWG were going to be an anchor let);

(c) They agreed to take a third of the Centre as our anchor let, then rejected it and took the licence of the whole Centre after meeting officers without us;

(d) **26 November 2025:** at a meeting it had asked the Council to arrange, it said that FTCH's groups should pay the RMWG directly, that there was no point in FTCH being at the Centre, and that the Centre was theirs;

(e) **2 March 2026:** it imposed its own Operational Rules on FTCH, without agreement, after the Council had repeatedly stated the two groups should collaborate;

(f) **July 2026:** FTCH put a legally enforceable equal governance model to the independent mediator; no agreement was reached;

(g) **13 to 17 August 2026:** the Executive voted for a three-month extension to explore joint governance. FTCH accepted it in writing. The RMWG refused it, and announced its refusal in the Falkirk Herald on 17 August 2026; and

(h) **September 2026:** it lodged a review asking to be given the whole Centre, telling the Committee that collaboration was tried and failed. It does not say why it failed. It failed for one reason: the RMWG refused every offer, from FTCH and from the Executive itself.

8. That is not my opinion. It is the record, and the documents show every step. At no point, from the first meeting in 2025 to the Executive's own offer in August 2026, has the RMWG been willing to share this Centre with anyone on equal or protected terms. It cannot now tell the Committee that it acted in good faith towards collaboration, or that collaboration failed through no fault of its own. Collaboration was offered by FTCH at every stage, and refused by the RMWG at every stage.

9. **The Council asked for collaboration at every stage.** This was not only FTCH's wish. The Council itself has repeatedly said the two groups should work together. Its report to the Executive records that, where requests compete, the guidance seeks that groups work collaboratively (paragraph 3.5). After the meeting of 26 November 2025 its case officer wrote that "the groups should be able to work together to agree a set of written operational rules". On 18 June 2026 the Executive deferred its decision so that collaboration could be tested through mediation. On 13 August 2026 it voted to extend the process specifically to explore joint governance. At every one of those stages, the RMWG went against what the Council had asked for.

10. The Committee needs to ask why. Why did an applicant that depends on the Council's recommendation feel able to refuse, again and again, the collaboration the Council itself kept asking for? FTCH's Statement of Case, section 12, sets out the questions the Committee should answer before it relies on anything that came out of this process: how the licence came to be given to the RMWG in September 2025, a week after the Council said that doing so would look like pre-determining the transfer; the role of the case officer after her recusal; the letter of support written for the RMWG by the Council's own [redacted] team and relied on in scoring; and the Council's funding of the RMWG every year since 2022. I ask the Committee to obtain the Council's records on each of those matters and to look at them before it decides.

What I have experienced at the Centre since October 2025

11. **Heating.** At my own Monday evening group the heating has repeatedly gone off between 8.30pm and 9pm and not come back on until just after 10pm, as the session is closing. On Monday 27 October 2025 it went off at about 8.30pm and some of those attending had to leave early because of the cold. My group has many vulnerable and elderly participants. We have had no way to adjust it ourselves. Through the winter the thermostat was kept in a locked box to which FTCH was given no key. It has since been replaced by a Hive control that only the RMWG operates, remotely.

12. **The water leak.** In February 2026 I found water dripping from the light fitting in the disabled toilet while I was using it, with a pool of water on the floor and a wet floor sign beside it. FTCH's Secretary was with me and we recorded it on video. FTCH reported it to the RMWG and the Council the same day. The RMWG ***had known of the defect since October 2025***, and the only measure taken was the sign. Water in an electrical fitting, in the only accessible disabled toilet in a building used by disabled people, is a risk to life. They publicly tried to turn this fact to blame on FTCH, however, prior to 1 October, the council would have been responsible.

13. **The mediation meeting of 26 November 2025.** I attended the meeting at Falkirk Stadium that the Council arranged at the RMWG's request. I heard the RMWG's representatives say that FTCH's groups should pay the RMWG directly, that there was no point in FTCH being at the Centre, and that the Centre was theirs. When we pointed out that a competitive asset transfer assessment was under way, they said they did not know what that was. Allegations of racism were made against FTCH at that meeting, and our opportunity to answer them was restricted. We warned the Council that access to the heating controls was an emergency requirement for our elderly and vulnerable users. Five days later, on 1 December 2025, one of our protected evening sessions for those users found the building without heat.

14. **The private meeting of 9 March 2026.** FTCH held a closed information session for its own groups' representatives. Two people from Westfield Park Community Centre attended uninvited and said that the RMWG had asked them to come. Why would a competing applicant send people into a private, closed meeting of FTCH's groups? I allowed them to stay so that their questions could be answered. The RMWG had never approached FTCH or our groups itself, and it never told us it was sending anyone.

15. **The RMWG's public meeting of 27 March 2026.** I attended. The RMWG was asked whether, since it could impose Operational Rules that FTCH had never agreed to, it could also displace a let at any time. Its only answer was that lets would be honoured unless a group did not pay. No answer was given about what protection groups would have after the first twelve months, nor about alcohol, men, or individuals of the LGBTQ community. One of the RMWG's representatives leading the meeting referred to me as "[redacted] in Wonderland", in front of the whole hall. It is disgraceful for a charity seeking to own a community centre to speak in derogatory terms, in public, about the chair of another charity, in front of members of the public and the groups who use the Centre. This remark was made because I asked a question on behalf of the community regarding displacement.

    At the same meeting, RMWG representatives at the back of the hall were filming those on no less than two mobile phones, of us who attended, without asking our consent. When I went over and asked them to delete the footage of us, they went into the kitchen and shut themselves in, so that I could not speak to them. I do not know what was done with that footage, who it has been shared with, or whether it has ever been deleted. The RMWG has never said. Filming members of the public at a community meeting without consent, and then

refusing to discuss it, is not how a body that wants to own a community centre should treat the community.

16. **Allegations of racism.** As Chair I received the RMWG's letter of 28 October 2025, which spoke of "hostility directed toward RMWG, which appears to extend beyond procedural disagreements", and its letter sent on 30 October 2025, which said that "as a well-established minority ethnic women's organisation, our assumption of the principal licence appears to have triggered resistance rather than cooperation". On 10 November 2025 the RMWG copied the Council's [redacted] and the [redacted] into correspondence about "how a marginalised community organisation is being treated", in reply to FTCH's report of a protected group's concerns about CCTV audio recording, an unsafe floor and the heating. In March 2026 an anonymous account called "Racists Out", with no followers, posted on FTCH's Facebook page calling us racist. I cannot prove who created it. But it appeared at the same time as the RMWG's own derogatory posts about FTCH, which the RMWG has since deleted and all of which FTCH captured by screenshot, and I do not believe the timing is a coincidence.

17. In almost a year no one has told me what I, or FTCH, are supposed to have said or done that was racist. I have asked. No evidence has ever been given. The only explanation ever offered was a post an individual made on her own private Facebook page. She is not a trustee of FTCH, and neither I nor any of our trustees are even friends with her on Facebook. FTCH cannot be held accountable for what a private individual posts on her own social media. The RMWG has never withdrawn any of these allegations, never apologised for them and never answered them. Its review does not mention them at all, and the representations it relies on carry the same theme forward, describing FTCH's campaign as "divisive". These allegations have been deeply distressing to me and to my fellow trustees, all of whom are volunteers giving their time to keep a community centre open for everyone and to run or take part in groups there. They have been used in place of answers to straightforward questions about keys, heating and invoices.

    Most recently, on 21 September 2026, when FTCH asked to move some of its own protected hours for a one-off event by an established faith group in our timetable, the RMWG refused the booking and told FTCH to stop describing the group as faith based, because the RMWG is "an equalities rooted organisation and do[es] not discriminate". Describing a church as a faith group is simply accurate. The implication that FTCH was accusing the RMWG of discrimination by saying so, or that FTCH was the one discriminating, has no basis at all. It is the same pattern again: an ordinary request on behalf of one of our groups answered with an insinuation about race and religion instead of a booking.

    The invoices are a dispute between FTCH and the RMWG. They have nothing to do with that church or its members, who have no part in it, yet it was their event that was refused because of it. It is the same pattern again: an ordinary request on behalf of one of our groups answered with a refusal linked to money, and an insinuation about race and religion, instead of a booking.

18. **The account.** In September 2026 the RMWG posted on the Centre's Facebook page that in almost a year FTCH had paid only "one invoice of just over £200". The post left out that FTCH had paid a further £2,385.38 on 18 September, days before, covering every charge that was properly substantiated and not in dispute. When FTCH posted a short reply saying there were two sides to the story and inviting anyone who wanted clarity to contact us, the RMWG deleted our comment. We have asked the RMWG to acknowledge receipt of our payment. It knows it has been paid, yet at the time of writing it has still not acknowledged it,

and it has not corrected its post. The RMWG only began supplying supporting documents after we raised the matter in our deputation to the Executive on 13 August 2026, and the 13 points we raised about the invoices on 15 and 22 May 2026 have still not been answered.

19. **The RMWG's false public statements about FTCH.** That post was not a mistake about one figure. In its public statements on Facebook in September 2026, published to the whole community in the middle of a statutory process for this building, the RMWG told people:

    (a) that FTCH had paid one invoice, when FTCH had paid every properly evidenced, undisputed charge days earlier;

    (b) that the Council "had to step in to confirm that FTCH was responsible for its 31% share", when FTCH has **never** disputed its 31 per cent share, or its willingness to pay, and the Council's email of 25 May 2026 dealt with a single cleaning charge only, which FTCH accepted; and

    (c) that FTCH had removed the Centre's cameras, when FTCH's CCTV equipment is still in place, disconnected for the licence period exactly as the sub-licence provides.

20. Earlier, in February and March 2026, during the statutory representation period, the RMWG posted that it had been running the Centre for 18 months, when it had held the licence for about five. It later deleted those posts. FTCH holds screenshots of every one, and of each RMWG post and the community member's post referred to in this letter, and will provide them to the Committee on request. At its public meeting on 27 March 2026 it told the community that FTCH had "bullied" it. None of these statements is true. Every one was made in public, during a competitive process for this building, and every one has damaged the reputation of FTCH and of its volunteer trustees in the community we serve. FTCH's trustees are professional people, with careers built over many years on their integrity and good name. Public statements of this kind, made by a group that does not know us personally and knows nothing of our work, damage not only our standing as volunteers but our professional reputations and livelihoods. That goes far beyond a disagreement between two charities, and it is not acceptable conduct from any organisation, let alone one asking to be trusted with a community's building.

    When FTCH tried to correct the record, the RMWG deleted our reply. That is not how a body that intends to serve the whole community behaves towards the charity that speaks for the Centre's existing groups.

Dismissing the groups, and the charity that speaks for them

21. Every issue FTCH has raised with the RMWG has been raised on behalf of the Centre's groups and the people in them: the cold at elderly and vulnerable groups' sessions, the unsafe floor before an exercise class (more than one occasion), a protected group's concern about CCTV audio recording, being monitored entering and leaving the building, an hour for a mental health service, a booking for a faith group, and invoices that FTCH's trustees must check before spending charitable money that comes from those groups' lets. FTCH has no programme of its own. It is a management committee, speaks for and supporting the groups, users, and local people; that is what it is for.

22. Yet each time, the RMWG has treated those concerns as FTCH complaining for the sake of it. It has called them "hostility", described them to [redacted] as the mistreatment of a "marginalised community organisation", written them into its Operational Rules as "vexatious conduct", and told the community FTCH "bullied" it. That has never been the case. If the RMWG can dismiss the Centre's existing groups, and the charity that is their

voice, while a sub-licence is in place to protect them, it shows me it does not truly care about the existing community. I cannot see why it would start once it owned the building.

23. **Birthday parties and private bookings.** Earlier this year, several members of the public contacted FTCH to say that they had tried to book the Centre for birthday parties and family events and received no reply, or a reply so late that it was no use, and members of FTCH's own protected groups told us they had not been able to book it either. Several said they tried more than once, from different email addresses and by phone. That is not one person's experience or a message lost in spam. Private parties and events have always been part of what this Centre is for, and part of its income.

24. **Alcohol at private events.** The Centre has always hosted birthday parties, celebrations and fundraisers at which alcohol is served responsibly, and they are a normal part of community life in Falkirk. Earlier this year, FTCH's own protected groups raised the issue of alcohol at events under the RMWG with us. The RMWG's request contains no policy on whether such events will be permitted, and the RMWG has never said. Families and groups planning events are entitled to know, and I ask the Committee to require the RMWG to state its position.

Treating public land as its own

25. **The area between the Centre and the Harriers hall.** On 30 September 2026 a member of the community posted publicly, "to let the community of Falkirk know", that the RMWG had put restrictions on the area between the Centre and the Harriers hall, so that people can no longer smoke or vape there, or walk or sit anywhere in that area. She wrote that the area "has been used by the public for countless years and there's never been restrictions", and that she considered it an abuse of individual rights.

26. **The car park.** The RMWG has cordoned off the Centre's car park during its own events, so that other people could not park there, on occasions earlier this year. The car park does not belong to the RMWG. It is used by the public, and every week by the Connect2 recovery bus, which parks there to support people in recovery. Connect2 are a fundamental service for its users, use the centre weekly, and also sit on our board.

27. **Victoria Park.** It has also been reported to me by several individuals that "no dogs allowed" signs were put up by the RMWG in Victoria Park during a play event they held. Victoria Park is a public park. The RMWG does not own it and cannot dictate who can and cannot use the park.

28. The RMWG holds a licence of the Centre. It does not own the Centre, the car park, the land between the Centre and the Harriers hall, or the park, and it has no right to restrict the public's use of land outside its licensed boundary. It has already recharged FTCH for a pothole repair kit for land outside the licensed property. I ask the Committee to establish exactly what land the RMWG's licence covers, and on what authority each of these restrictions was imposed. If the RMWG treats public land around the Centre as its own while it holds only a licence, the Committee should consider what it would do as owner?

Changing its prices in the middle of the review

29. This week, in the middle of the review, the RMWG posted new hall prices on Facebook: £15 an hour for regular lets and £18 an hour for non-regular, ad hoc lets, with no charge for the kitchen. Until now it has stated in its applications charges are £15 an hour plus £10 for the kitchen, which groups have told FTCH they cannot afford. Its asset transfer request proposed charging for the kitchen on top of the hire charge, and I raised that in my representation of 13

March 2026. The officers assessed its business plan and its sustainability on the charges in its request, not on the ones it has now posted.

30. I ask the Committee to require the RMWG to explain: whether the removal of the kitchen charge applies equally to every group, including the Centre's regular community groups and groups that use the kitchen, or only to groups that do not need it; what each regular group will now actually pay; why it has changed its charges now, during the review; and how its business plan still stands if the charges it was built on have changed. A request is assessed as it was made. The RMWG should not be able to change the basis of its proposal part way through the review without explanation, and the Centre's groups are entitled to know what they would pay.

The community is tired, but not of waiting

31. The RMWG's review, and its statements to the Falkirk Herald, rest on the claim that the community is tired of delay and that the RMWG should now be given the Centre. But the RMWG declined the Executive's three-month extension to explore joint governance, which FTCH accepted, and announced its refusal in the Falkirk Herald on 17 August 2026, before the process had been allowed to run its course through the proper channels. It then told the Committee that no jointly governed proposal emerged. The delay it complains of is the result of its own refusal to share the Centre.

32. The community is tired, but of something else: a year of heating failures, locked controls, refused bookings, unanswered questions, false public posts, and restrictions on land and a car park the RMWG does not own. It is no wonder to me that six of the Centre's twelve established groups have left, and that two more have said they will leave if the RMWG takes the Centre. FTCH's survey of 126 responses showed 98.4 per cent support for FTCH's plans. FTCH's petition, "Protect the Whole Community", gathered 631 signatures in less than three weeks. It was closed on 27 September only so that it could be included in FTCH's review. People were still signing, and a number of supporters told us the platform would not accept their signature. I have no doubt it would have gathered many hundreds more had it stayed open. The RMWG wants the Centre as a base for its own operations; that is what its request says. FTCH wants it kept for everyone, including the RMWG, and that is what the community has asked for.

Why this matters to the review

33. The RMWG tells the Committee that shared occupation "tested collaborative working in practice". I have lived that year at the Centre. What it tested was whether the RMWG would look after people who are not its own members. The heating, the leak, the lock change, an hour refused to a mental health service, a booking refused to a faith group, entering and interrupting protected group sessions, sending people into a private meeting of our groups, restricting land and a car park it does not own, publishing false statements about FTCH and deleting our replies, and a meeting at which we were told the Centre was theirs: none of that is collaboration.

    Moving groups out to the pavilion. The RMWG's own proposal, as the Council's report records it, is that "where RMWG activities require the kitchen, the pavilion will be offered as alternative accommodation to current lets" (paragraph 5.22). In other words, whenever the RMWG wants the kitchen, the existing groups are the ones who move. The pavilions are currently used for storage. They have no kitchen, and they are not fit for the groups that use the Centre, many of whom are older, disabled or vulnerable and rely on the kitchen for tea, coffee and basic hospitality at every session. The same proposal says the RMWG will run its

own core activities from the pavilion, and its Enablement Fund request is to alter the pavilion as a base for its own work. It cannot be both the RMWG's base and the place existing groups are sent. What this means in practice is that the RMWG's needs come first, and the groups that have used this Centre for decades take whatever is left. That is not honouring existing lets. It is displacing them, on the RMWG's terms and at the RMWG's convenience.

34. I do not believe my group, or any of the Centre's other groups, would be secure if the RMWG owned the building. That view comes from what has already happened while a sub-licence and protected lets were in place to protect us. On transfer, those protections end, and nothing enforceable has been offered in their place.

35. I ask the Committee to refuse the RMWG's request as made, and to agree FTCH's request for ownership, or a legally binding equal position, both options keep the Centre for everyone, including the RMWG.

[redacted]

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]
30 September 2026

From: [redacted]
To: StrategicPropertyReview
Subject: community hal
Date: 30 September 2026 14:39:20

External email >

First time sender >

Hi there .
i want to give a little opinion from me about the thornhill communty center that please give ownership of the hall to rainbow muslim women group so we can orgnise all kind of activities there. that will be kind for us .
thank you
Sent from my iPhone