



EASEBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of Parish Council Meeting
held at 6.30pm on Monday 18th August 2025
at Easebourne CE Primary School

Councillors Present: M Noble (MN) – chairman, C Sanderson (CS), D Pack (DP), D Kilty (DK), I Milne (IM), J Macdonald-Lawson (JML), E Roberts-Grimsey (ERG), A Dodwell (AD) & T Baker (TB).

In attendance: Parish Clerk - E Tremaine (ET).

1. **Visitors questions:** no question.
2. **Apologies for Absence:** G Nicholls for personal reasons.
3. **Declarations of interests in any matters on agenda:** None.
4. **Community Hub Project:**
 - a) Concerns raised by DK on the Business Case Document put together by Neil Sore
 - i. Lack of specific, relevant and material engagement with the community to gauge usage, need etc. General discussion concluded that there is more consultation to come, which needs to be started sooner rather than later. MN stated that this has been discussed within the steering group and is likely to include online surveys, a door drop, open days and reaching out to stakeholders and local organisations. There were some questions around prioritisation and whether the steering group should focus on one section at a time but the team feel that they can complete tasks in parallel.
 - ii. Lack of meaningful comparisons with local Community Hubs (Lodsworth, Fernhurst, Midhurst) to understand (1) the size and layout of their hub relative to their communities; (2) the services they provide and how they have performed - financially and socially; (3) the governance models employed; (4) the first few year's accounts. TB - local village halls are working, it is a proven model, also ties in with the park, the school etc. IM also commented that a number of meetings have taken place with local hubs that cover these points and notes need to be added to the document.
 - iii. Lack of any analysis of Easebourne's strategic options for a Hub. One option is the disused School building but have other options been considered such as building a new structure in the park. There was a discussion about the initial research that went into other locations and why this was selected as the favoured option.
 - iv. the cost relative to funding, where's the money extra coming from? Fundraising was discussed, IM and MN are confident that this would be achievable from National and Local sources, with soft contact already being made. There were also questions about charity set up and VAT.
 - v. the opportunity cost – loss of opportunities as money all spent. MN emphasised that the Council reserves will be untouched.

- b) JML – expressed that while she agrees that there is further work to be done, she supports the project in general. Reinforces the centre of the village being the park etc.
- c) ERG – agrees that further research and consultation needs to happen and is comfortable that it will however the timeframes are confusing and there needs to be some work to ensure robustness.
- d) CS & MN both commented that there have been some communication issues which will be resolved going forward. Also, that this is a living document, not the finished article.
- e) Planning – the figures in the document are estimates, however the plans that TB has drawn up can be used until full building regulation compliant plans are required, saving some cost.
- f) AD – suggested that another means of communication should be sought, perhaps a portal for document storage. Also mentioned figures around population, park users etc, would people know that the facility is there?
- g) It was generally agreed that where there are gaps in the skill set of the steering group, advice will be sought from others.
- h) MN proposed going ahead with the planning application, consultation, branding, investigating CIO set up and engaging with funders. Seconded by TB. It was resolved to continue with a £20k cap. ET re-iterated that there would be no VAT reclaim for this. All were in favour.

5. **Date of next meeting** – Wednesday 10th September

The meeting closed at 19.50.

Signed..... Date.....
Chairman