

AT A MEETING of the CULTURE AND COMMUNITIES SELECT SUB-COMMITTEE of the COUNTY COUNCIL held at The Castle, Winchester on Wednesday, 5 February 2014.

**PRESENT**

Chairman:  
p Councillor Elaine Still

Vice-Chairman:  
p Councillor Frank Pearce

**Councillors:**

p Phil Bailey	p Rob Humby
p Brian Gurden	p Fiona Mather
	p Tim Rolt

**Also in attendance:**

Councillor Keith Chapman – Executive Member for Culture, Recreation and Countryside

44. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None were received.

45. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members were mindful that, where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting, they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore, Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary Interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

46. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No announcements were made.

Items to be actioned on the Committee's work programme:

47. **DEPUTATIONS**

No deputations were received.

48. **COMMUNITY BUILDINGS CAPITAL GRANT SCHEME**

The Chairman explained that the Sub-Committee had been formed at the 10 September 2013 meeting of the Culture, Communities and Rural Affairs Select Committee. In February 2013, the then Leader of Council had allocated a further £1 million to the Community Centre Capital Grant Scheme. This Sub-Committee had been created to consider, comment and make recommendations to the Executive Member for Culture, Recreation and Countryside on the large grant applications, made under the Community Buildings Capital Grant Scheme, before his Decision Day, to be held 6 March 2014.

Fourteen Expressions of Interest had been received for a major grant from this fund and, using criteria based scoring system, six organisations had been shortlisted by the Director of Culture, Communities and Business Services. These six organisations had been invited to attend the Sub-Committee and were given an equal amount of time to speak in support of their application and answer questions from Members.

i) **EASTLEIGH YOUTH AND COMMUNITY TRUST**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Jim Vaughan and Daisy Brookman, representing the Eastleigh Youth and Community Trust.

In summary, they explained:

- Their personal, previous experience in developing major projects.
- The Groups that currently used the Trust (including disabled groups and their partnerships with local authorities).
- That they had undertaken community research, which demonstrated the need for the proposed annexe.
- That the Trust currently had over 100 volunteers.
- That the proposed annexe would face out onto, and maximise the potential of being adjacent to, the former golf course.
- That the total build cost was £638,000.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- If the Trust was unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, it was likely to delay the project by 2-3 years. The Trust had also applied elsewhere for grants, but its postcode was likely to count against it for

National Lottery Funding.

- That the Trust did not consider the proposed café shop to be in competition with others in the area, as it would be, in part, run for and by local disabled groups. The new facility would also be unusual in offering a sensory room and changing places facility.
- That, in attempting to broaden the use of the community centre to hard to reach groups, the Trust intended to engage both the young and elderly, and would place a particular emphasis on engagement with disability groups.
- That the contingency fund for the project was 12%.

## ii) **EMSWORTH COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Mike Stott, Ann Jolly, and Jean Tier from the Emsworth Community Association.

In summary, they explained:

- That over 50 activities were held at the Association, attracting approximately 1,000 people.
- The current premises were a Victorian former school and newer annexes. The proposed project included the construction of a new glass reception between the school and annexes and a re-arrangement of the internal space.
- The proposed works were intended to make the buildings more energy efficient and improve disabled access.
- The Association's research had demonstrated a demand for the proposed facilities from a number of young families and isolated elderly in the area.
- The facilities would also be targeted at pre-school children, adults with learning difficulties (particularly in relation to the improved kitchen facilities), and create a safe and warm environment for elderly local residents.
- It was anticipated that the facilities would also attract the military families based at Thorney Island.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bolton spoke in support of the application and highlighted the nearby areas of relative deprivation.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- That there was the possibility of using the Asda Community Minibus, and others, to help transport users to the new centre.
- If the Trust was unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, they would look to other sources of funding. Although Havant Borough Council had allocated only a small grant, the Association

underlined the help in kind they had received from Havant's officers.

- That there was no contingency fund for the project.

### iii) **HURSTBOURNE TARRANT DEVELOPMENT TRUST**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Andrew Russell, Susie Hoare and Alison Wilks from the Hurstbourne Tarrant Development Trust.

In summary, they explained:

- The aim of the Trust was to improve the local community's quality of life and to create an energy efficient, low maintenance development.
- The previous church hall had been sold and the current community building was a former military building, which was no longer fit for use and beyond economical repair.
- In developing the design for the new building, they had visited other community centres and consulted their own local community.
- The new building would enable the community programme to be re-instated and enable new user groups to use the building.
- The building would benefit 2,000 people.
- The total capital costs were estimated at £530,000 and, by the end of March 2014, the Trust anticipated to have £300,000 pledged for the project.
- It was hoped that construction on the new building would begin in May 2014.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- The important role played by local residents in volunteering to assist the project's development.
- That the contingency fund was set at 10%.
- That the Trust was confident in their income predictions.
- That the village was 6 miles from Andover and had a population of 825, but that it drew potential users from a wide rural area.
- That the Trust had a marketing plan to maximise use of the new building.
- If the Trust was unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, they would consider other sources of funding, but were concerned that the project would lose its current momentum.

### iv) **MICHELDEVER STATION COMMUNITY AND RECREATION CENTRE**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Felicity Botham and Belinda

Harvey.

In summary, they explained:

- The history and current problems associated with the main building and rear annexe.
- The growing demand for community facilities as the population of the village had increased by 200% over the previous 15 years.
- That there were very few other community facilities in the village.
- That the hall would be aimed at young mothers, home workers (and would provide good broadband connection), sports groups, clinics, provide space for band rehearsals, available for private hire and act as an education centre.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- That the Trust held £81,000 in developers' contributions, had applied for Lottery Funding of £200,000 and to Veolia for £100,000. Once the shell of the building had been completed, they would then be able to apply for further grants from sporting organisations to equip the new building.
- If the Trust was unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, they would consider other sources of funding.
- That given their location, the new facilities were not in competition with other community halls.

v) **WOOLTON HILL PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Mike Palmer, John Angle and Nick Harcourt from the Woolton Hill Parochial Church Council.

In summary, they explained:

- The problems associated with the current building and the proposed, phased works. Phase 1 had been completed and economies of scale dictated that phases 2 and 3 should be undertaken at the same time. The work was likely to be completed in the summer, minimising disruption to the pre-school group.
- The potential users of the hall were sewing groups, MS and autistic groups.
- The total cost of the scheme was £400,000. The Church Council had raised £210,000 (including a £100,000 grant from Veolia, a £54,000 grant from Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council, a £15,000 grant from the pre-school group and £15,000 from local fund raising).

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- If the Trust was unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, they had applied for grants from other organisations and therefore there was the possibility that they might not need the full amount they had requested from the County Council. There was currently a £100,000 shortfall for phase 2 of their project and, without sufficient funds, the refurbishment of the existing hall would not be completed.
- That they intended to market the facility to hard to reach groups, once the facility had been completed. The building would be designed to enable disabled access.
- That they had consulted local people through the village plan.
- That the church itself was unable to financially assist with the project.

vi) **GOSPORT COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION**

The Sub-Committee welcomed Paul Dodd, Jane Littlepond and Gerry Goodwin from the Gosport Community Association.

In summary, they explained:

- The problems associated with the listed building. The works proposed the installation of gas heating and the replacement of existing windows.
- That the buildings served a local population of 86,000 and the economic mix of the area.
- The Group's relationship with the local military, other community groups and the hospital.
- That current users had been consulted on the proposals.
- That the Association was moving towards a more sustainable financial position.
- The current usage from a broad range of interests.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- Gosport Borough Council's officers had assisted and advised the Association, particularly regarding the conservation issues related to the listed building.
- In response to Members' concerns regarding the probable costs of the works to the listed building, the Association explained that they had a contingency fund of £5,000.
- If the Trust were unsuccessful in receiving all or part of their request for funding, they explained that the project would take much longer to complete.
- That the income projections were conservative estimates, which ensured that the Association would be

economically sustainable.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Chapman explained that, before his Decision Day, he intended to visit all of the shortlisted applicants. However, he had already visited the Gosport Association and reported on the scale of the works the Association faced and that the feasibility study would consider the practicalities of work to the non listed buildings.

#### **vii) CONCLUSIONS**

The Sub-Committee thanked each of the applicants for their presentations and commented on the merits of each.

As it was not possible to grant the full amounts requested by each of the applicants, following discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed to recommend to the Executive Member that he allocate the grants as set out below.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the following be recommended to the Executive Member for Culture, Recreation and Countryside:

- Eastleigh Youth and Community Trust: £173,281 (90% of the grant requested)
- Emsworth Community Association: The Sub-Committee were mindful that this project appeared to be at relatively early stage of development and therefore recommended a grant of £65,000, and that the Association would be able to apply for further grants in from the Capital Grant Scheme in the 2014/15 financial year.
- Hurstbourne Tarrant Development Trust: £149,400 (90% of the grant requested).
- Micheldever Station Community and Recreation Centre £100,000 (50% of the grant requested).
- Woolton Hill Parochial Church Council. The Sub-Committee commented that the applicant was likely to attract alternative funding and therefore, subject to a condition which would require the applicant to demonstrate how the new facilities would engage with all sections of the community, recommended a grant of £80,000 (40% of the grant requested).
- Gosport Community Association: That, subject to a condition which would enable the Council to recover any grant if the listed building was sold within a certain period, the Sub-Committee recommended a grant of

£121,900 (100% of the grant requested) be given.  
Members also commented on the potential help County  
officers could provide the project.

---

Chairman, 26 May 2014