



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT111373
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	The Getaway
Promoters Name:	Comeragh Wellness Centre TA The Getaway
Address:	Kilnafrehan East, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford
Description:	The construction of a 20 bay RV park located 10 minutes from Dungarvan and at the foothills of the Comeragh mountains, close to two established mountain walks providing a rural rustic setting using an existing shed for a communal entertainment space.
Theme:	LO1 Rural Tourism
Sub-theme:	SA1.4 Community hostels, RV Parks, Glamping/camping
Link to LDS	Support of community hostels, RV parks, glamping and camping in rural Co. Waterford

Total Project Costs	€90,777.55		
Eligible Project Costs	€90,777.55		
Funding sought by promoter:	€45,388.75		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	Not recommended		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€0		
Details of private funding:	€45,000 Credit Union Loan & €5,000 personal funds & €10,000 family loan		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Funding sought for groundworks, electrical and plumbing to construct a 20 bay RV park in Kilnefrehan East, Dungarvan		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report) Total Funding	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 0%
	Groundworks	37,500	€0
	Plumbing	23,200	€0
	Electrical	30,077.50	€0
	Total	90,777.55	€0

Was an assessment completed?: Date:	Yes, 3 rd Dec '19
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 and the lowest value tender process undertaken to select the chosen 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 location of the project is in a very rural area at the foothills of the Comeragh mountains close to two established walks
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter would not be in a position to go ahead with the project without funding as has already struggled to get to this point
Consideration of Displacement:	There is no other comparable RV park or camping facility close to the Comeragh Mountains
Economic justification for project:	The project will provide alternative accommodation for the growing number of campervan tourists close to the Comeragh mountains where no alternative accommodation is available and create one full time job
Average Score for Project:	43/100
0% level of aid & ceiling:	0
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed not to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 1. The project was not considered viable or sustainable 2. Accessibility 3. Location too remote 4. The project only scored 43% and not the required minimum of 65%

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1-2ft	1-2ft	€45,000 Credit Union Loan	€0
		€5,000 personal funds	
		€10,000 family loan	

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minibus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Local Enterprise Office	04/12/19	Brid Kirby
Faillte Ireland	17/12/19	Sarah Fitzpatrick

Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- Ms Claire Connors briefly outlined the project to the Evaluation Committee, advised that the promoters have been considering this project for quite a while and have attended several information sessions. They have submitted numerous Expression of Interest forms under different calls but for financial reasons this is the first time the project has been ready to evaluate.

They now have obtained credit union funding. The project has obtained planning permission for 20 bay RV park and funding will go towards the groundworks and electrical and plumbing costs. The old stone barn will be renovated to provide visitors with a communal meeting space.

Pre evaluation is when the first site visit is conducted, the location is quite remote with poor access and much further than the stated 10 mins from Dungarvan. It is located at the base of the mountain and was very wet when walked in November.

The promoter a Ms Hillary Britton worked in a livery equine business in the Uk before moving to Ireland. Her son a graduate will also be working in the business.

- The Evaluation Committee expressed their concerns on the location, the accessibility and the sustainability of the project.
- Ms Connor's advised that the promoter views the remote location as a plus point planning to sell it as a haven set on the edge of the Comeraghs.
- The Committee noted that the project ideally should be in a main town like the planned Quann's development or adjacent to the N25. Visitors will not want to drive their expensive campervans along the proposed roads to access the park and once there will have no facilities at hand i.e. shop or restaurant. While the promoter referenced Bridgie Terries it is not within walking distance.
- A discussion ensued on the RV Park in Dunmore East with it being noted that funding was granted as it was an addition to an existing business and located centrally within the village.
- A photo of the old stone building was circulated, and the Committee noted that it was not a particularly attractive building and not ideal for use as a shared meeting space being attached to the main dwelling.
- It was noted that the promoter does not have any hospitality experience.
- The Committee considered some of the costs totally underestimated.
- It was noted that both promoters are in receipt of social welfare with no access to additional funds for potential project overruns.
- The Committee noted that they would be worried about the sustainability of the project.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that they would not like to fund the promoter into difficulties and considered the finances too tight.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project for the following reasons: -

- The project was not considered viable or sustainable
- Accessibility
- Location too remote

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
The project was not considered viable or sustainable	
Accessibility	
Location too remote	
The project only scored 43% and not the required 65% necessary to be recommended for funding.	

Signed: Claire Connors

Dated: 17th Jan 2020

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: 13th Jan 2020

Time: 11am

Project Title: **The Getaway**

Project Reference Number: **311DRWAT111373**

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 <u>4</u> - Displacement 5/19 <u>4</u> - Job Creation 5/19 <u>4</u>		19	12
Promoters experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver? - Standards of Operation 6/25 <u>3</u> - Track Record 6/25 <u>1</u> - Structure of Business 6/25 <u>3</u> - Necessary skills base 7/25 <u>3</u>		25	10
Financial Viability	Are the project costs justifiable (reasonableness of costs) and / is funding available to co-fund the project? - Overall Costs 7/25 <u>3</u> - Co Funding 6/25 <u>3</u>		25	12

	- Financial Plan	6/25	3		
	- Deadweight	6/25	3		
Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			13	3
Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			18	6
Total				100	43

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: Paul Deere

Signature of Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 13th January 2020

Denise Walsh

From: pclerkin@cablesurf.com
Sent: Thursday 16 January 2020 10:57
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Evaluation Committee Meeting on 13th January 2020

Hi Denise

I have reviewed the draft Minutes of the Evaluation Committee Meeting on 13th January 2020 and I am in agreement with them.

Regards

Paul Clerkin

