



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT108648
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Renovation of thatched cottage & develop for cultural tourism
Promoters Name:	Enda Kirwan and Anne Marie Casey
Address:	Balleighteragh East, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford
Description:	The proposed project involves the full refurbishment of a protected structure circa 300 year old 4 bay single storey thatched cottage and an outbuilding immediately adjacent to the cottage. The restored cottage will provide much needed tourist accommodation in the area and a unique self catering accommodation experience. The thatched cottage is iconic of past times and gives an insight into a traditional rural lifestyle, preserving Ireland's culture and heritage.
Theme:	Rural Tourism
Sub-theme:	Culture & Heritage Product Development
Link to LDS	The project fits with the Rural Tourism local objective and Culture & Heritage Product Development Strategic Action 1.2

Total Project Costs	€135,575.50		
Eligible Project Costs	€67,787.75		
Funding sought by promoter:	€67,787.75		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€0		
Details of private funding:	In house funds		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Funding sought to restore a circa 300 year old single storey thatched cottage and outbuilding for unique tourism accommodation that focuses on the visitor experience and character of the building		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 0%
	Construction Contract	€135,575.50	€0
Total Funding		€135,575.50	€0

Was an assessment completed?: Date: <u>14th January '19</u>	Yes
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering was used to invite contractors and the lowest value tender used to select the winning contractor
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	Not applicable
Innovative Element of the project:	The uniqueness of the traditional thatched cottage and the importance of its preservation in the local Irish landscape whilst providing visitor accommodation where alternative accommodation is limited
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project will go ahead without grant aid as the promoter's are committed to the project and the preservation of this protected structure. The timeframe to complete will extend to facilitate self funding of the project.
Consideration of Displacement:	No, this project is unique in that restoring it for self catering accommodation helps the lack of such facilities in the town
Economic justification for project:	The proposed end product will also provide much needed self catering accommodation and tourist experience in the area where facilities are limited.
Average Score for Project:	0/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €0 or 0 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation agreed to recommend to the Waterford LCDC not to fund this project as presented for the following reasons:- - Deadweight - The project does not fit the criteria set out in the LAG Business Plan for the relevant measure. A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
2pt	2pt	€€67,787.75 in house funds	€0

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of the proposed project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
LEO	16th Jan '19	Brid Kirby
Failte Ireland	11th Jan '19	Sarah Fitzpatrick

Detail of Discussion; The main points raised in the discussion of this project were:- - Ms Claire Connors advised that the promoter Enda & Anne Kirwan, both engineers, purchased the building for €70,000. It is a protected structure under section 57 and does not require planning permission. The site is .5 of an acre but they also purchase a small strip to the side of the property as the boundary was right up against

the wall of the structure.

- The proposed works were put out for tender and the quotations received were very keen.
- A Committee Member queried if the accommodation once completed must comply with Failte Ireland standards to qualify for grant aid? Mr Jimmy Taaffe confirmed that it would not but for the accommodation to be approved and promoted by Failte Ireland it would need to meet their standards.
- It was advised that the layout will not comply with Failte Ireland or general environmental health standards. The sitting room /dining and kitchen area is too small for the sleeping capacity. Having the only bathroom in the main bedroom that opens out to the living area is not acceptable. To possibly make it acceptable one of the bedrooms should be converted into a bathroom and a corridor between bathroom and living room constructed without impacting on the small living space.
- Ms Connors advised that the promoters are retaining the original footprint and layout of the building. It was noted that it is more of a museum piece than an accommodation place in that case and it is not suitable as accommodation for tourists.
- As the other two bedrooms do not have access to the bathroom it is only suitable as a one bedroom.
- Ms Connors advised that the promoter's intent to add on an additional two bedrooms in phase 11 of the project noting that they would need planning permission for that. The Committee agreed that the property does not have the living space for that. It was noted that they should not go for capacity but for quality.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed the projections are not realistic and noted that the planning costs are included in the expenditure for year one.
- A Committee Member noted that Phase 11 of the project the inclusion of Camping Pods at the rear of the cottage is not really practical as the site is not big enough.
- A big concern of the Evaluation Committee is that the promoters have the funding to complete the project without Rural Development funding. While they have the right to apply for funding should public funding be allocated where it is not needed? The promoters show that they sufficient funds available to fund the project themselves and state on the application form that the project will proceed without funding.
- Another concern is that even though the project is applying under the heritage measure it could be viewed as a b&b.
- A discussion ensued and the Evaluation Committee stated the following concerns:-
 - o The layout of the property is not suitable as it has only one bathroom located in one of the bedrooms.
 - o The Projections are showing it as being highly profitable
 - o Deadweight is an issue.
 - o Is the programme about funding the restoration of buildings? Does it fit in with the Local Development Strategy?

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project as it does not fit the Local Development Strategy and deadweight is an issue.

Recommendation: A maximum of €0 or 0 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €0

0 % of Eligible Project Funding: €0

Signed: _____

Signed: _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response

Signed: _____ Claire Connors _____

Dated: _____ 26th Feb '19 _____

WLP Project Officer

Please insert photos below of reference purposes:

(for example a photo of the building to be renovated/machinery being purchased, etc)



Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Date: 11th Feb 2019

Time: 11am to 3pm

Project Title: Renovation of thatched cottage & develop for cultural tourism

Project Reference Number: 31LDRWAT108648

Assessment Criteria	Objective	Issues raised by Evaluation Committee	Weighting	Score
Compatibility with Local Development Strategy	Do the project proposals meet the criteria set out in the LAG business plan for the relevant measure?		Yes / No	
Innovation	Is the product innovative in its nature and does it displace existing enterprises? - Product / Service 9/19 _____ - Displacement 5/19 _____ - Job Creation 5/19 _____		19	0
Promoters experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver? - Standards of Operation 6/25 _____ - Track Record 6/25 _____ - Structure of Business 6/25 _____ - Necessary skills base 7/25 _____		25	0
Financial Viability	Are the project costs justifiable (reasonableness of costs) and / is funding available to co-fund the project? - Overall Costs 7/25 _____ - Co Funding 6/25 _____ - Financial Plan 6/25 _____		25	0

	- Deadweight	6/25			
Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			13	0
Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			18	0
Total				100	0

N.B. Project must receive a minimum score of 65% prior to being recommended for approval.

- Has the potential level of deadweight been assessed for this project? YES / ~~NO~~
- i.e. would the project proceed without LEADER funding? YES / ~~NO~~

Recommendations of the Evaluation Committee: Refused

Signature: [Signature]

Signature of Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 11th February 2018

Denise Walsh

From: pclerkin@cablesurf.com
Sent: Tuesday 19 February 2019 15:28
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Draft Minutes of Evaluation Committee Meeting on 11th February 2019.

Hi Denise,

I have reviewed the draft minutes of this meeting and i am fully in agreement with them.

Regards,

Paul Clerkin

