



Minutes of the Waterford LAG Meeting
Thursday 9th July 2020, teleconference Conference Room, Dungarvan at 11.00 a.m.

Present: Non Public Sector:		Public Sector	
1. Gabriel Foley *	PPN / Environment	1. Cllr. J. Pratt Chair*	Mayor Public Rep
2. Richard Grant	CEO – Waterford Area Partnership	2. Cllr. Lola O’Sullivan	Elected representative
3. Jimmy Taaffe	CEO – WLP CLG	3. Cllr. Adam Wyse	Elected representative
4. Heather Kiely	PPN/ Community & Voluntary	4. Julie Somers	CYPSC Coordinator
5. Maggie Flanagan	PPN / Community & Voluntary	5. Brendan Lawton	Reg. Mgr. Dept Social Protection
6. Senan Cooke	PPN / Community & Voluntary	6. Richie Walsh*	Head of LEO
7. Jenny Beresford	CEO Dungarvan & West Waterford Chamber		
8. Catherine Quinlan	I.C.M.S.A.		
Apologies:		Apologies:	
1. Gerald Hurley	CEO Waterford City Chamber	1. Derval Howley	Head of Wellbeing HSE
		2. Michael O’Brien	WWETB
		3. Michael Walsh	CE, WC&CC

Staff Present: D. Tuohy Chief Officer*, Ivan Grimes DoS, K. Moynihan SO *, J. Codd A/S.O, E. Smyth, A/A.S.O.); C.O’ Brien (part of meeting)
 (* attendance in person)

1.Total current Membership	19
2.Total attendees	14
3. Quorum % required (50% of 1 above)	Achieved – 74%
4. non-public/public ratio attendees % ratio non-public/public attendees	8 non-public : 6 public 57% non-public: 43% public

1. Confirmation of Quorum: Having reviewed the attendance record, Chief Officer D. Tuohy confirmed that a quorum was achieved. Non-public 8; Public 6; 14 members in attendance.
The Chair Mayor John Pratt opened the meeting.

2. Apologies

As per table above, apologies were noted.

3. Introduction of Brendan Lawton, DSP, to the LAG.

Brenda Lawton, Regional Manager of the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection, was introduced and welcomed to the committee. Brendan replaces Liam Daly whose resignation was announced at the meeting of 11th June 2020.

4. Conflict of Interest

- (i) Chief Officer D. Tuohy outlined the provisions of Section 5.4 of the LEADER Operating Rules (v2.0) and reminded members of their obligations therein. He reminded members to consider whether a conflict of interest could arise on receipt of the notice of meeting and agenda items. He requested members to contact him in advance of the meetings following reviewing the Agenda and associated documentation should a COI arise.

Agreed

5. Confirmation of Minutes of LAG Meeting held on March 12th 2020.

Proposed: L. O’Sullivan	Seconded by: J. Beresford
Abstentions: N/A	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

6. Matters arising: No matters arising.

7. Circulars: D. Tuohy, Chief Officer gave an overview of 2020 Circulars 09, 10, & 11.

8. Rural Development Programme.

(a) Project Approvals

Projects for consideration (Evaluation committee decision sheets, and score records as circulated on the extranet): Mr. J. Taaffe C.E.O. WLP summarised the main points and background of all projects detailed below for the members.

Decision of Evaluation Committee 16 June 2020

Project Code:	31LDRWAT112481
Project Name:	Purchase of laser cutting equipment
Promoters Name:	Inmasoll Ltd
Description:	The promoters are looking to invest in a laser cutting machine capable of cutting sheet metal to support their metal fabrication work which they currently have to sub contract. There are 3 facets to the business; CNC Machining, Plastic Fabrication and Sheet metal fabrication. Having previous been awarded funding to support the first two elements which have now made them self sufficient they now want to invest in sheet metal fabrication due to the slow lead in times in obtaining product. This will make the overall business much more competitive and create two more jobs.
Theme:	LO2 Enterprise Development
Sub-Theme:	SA 2.1 Capital Investment in existing and start-up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses.
Funding Sought by Promoter:	The cost of this project is €69,900.00 and the promoter has requested funding of €34,950.00 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.
Details of Private Funding:	Loan/Bridging Finance 34,950.00
Synopsis of Project:	Purchase of a laser cutting machine capable of cutting sheet metal
Detail of Discussion:	<p>The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Claire Connors advised that the following documentation were circulated to address the queries raised at the previous meeting: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Financial Projects • Addendum to Business Plan - Mr. Paul Clerkin advised that he did not receive the documents but was happy for Ms Connors to go through them. The rest of the Committee advised that they had received the documents in advance. - It was agreed that the promoters gave a very comprehensive reply and provided good clarification on all the queries raised. - A Committee Member noted that there was a very big increase in sales in 2023 to 2024 compared to previous years but stated that he was generally quite happy with the response given. - It was noted how impressive its customer list is and how 7 to 8 new

	<p>customers were added this year alone in the 2 to 3 months trading. This addressed the concerns raised regarding not focusing enough on new business.</p> <p>The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC as presented.</p> <p>A maximum of €34,950.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p>
Was an assessment completed?	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 6 th May 2020
<p>Are detailed costings provided for the project?</p> <p>Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?</p>	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters followed Category 2 LEADER Specific Guidelines and therefore is applying for 50% funding.
Innovative Element of project:	It was agreed that the idea is innovative, as the promoters will be able to offer their customers a fully in-house offering following this purchase. Their goal is to be 100% self-sufficient. Most of the products they produce have aspects of the 3 processes, CNC Machining, Plastic Fabrication and Metal Fabrication, in them and presently there are times when they cannot deliver the product very fast due to sub-contract delays.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that deadweight is not an issue as the promoter is considering buying its own premises in the very near future and will need funds available to do so.
Consideration of Displacement:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that displacement is not an issue as the business has been in operation over ten years and has established its own markets.
Economic justification for the project:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that this project fits under the Local Development Strategy for Enterprise type projects.
Average Score for Project:	After achieving an overall score of 83 out of 100, the Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend this project for approval to the Board of Waterford LCDC.
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €34,950.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Proposed by:	Donal Connolly
Seconded by:	John Harnedy
Agreed by:	Paul Clerkin
Recommendation to the LAG:	<p>The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC as presented.</p> <p>A maximum of €34,950.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project scored 83/100 - The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for supporting Enterprise projects. - The promoters have the skills and expertise to successfully implement the project.

Proposed: J. Beresford	Seconded by: H. Kiely
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

31LDRWAT110720: Restoration of Clonegam Church, Portlaw. Fiddown Union of Parishes

Project Code:	31LDRWAT110720
Project Name:	Restoration of Clonegam Church, Portlaw
Promoters Name:	Fiddown Union of Parishes
Description:	Preservation of Clonegam Church will ensure that the valuable relics contained within, will be protected from the elements and shared with visitors as part of Portlaw's heritage experience
Theme:	LO1 Rural Tourism
Sub-Theme:	SA 1.2 Cultural & Heritage Tourism
Funding Sought by Promoter:	The cost of this project is €47,670.00 and the promoter has requested funding of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.
Details of Private Funding:	€11,917.50 personal loan to Parish
Synopsis of Project:	Preservation of Clonegam Church

<p>Detail of Discussion:</p>	<p>This project was recommended for approval in December 2019 with the following conditions:</p> <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding the project with the following conditions: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lease must be in place prior to payment. • A fairer balance of membership must be obtained by adding a minimum of two members from the Portlaw Heritage Group or from a local Community group. <p>A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project scored 75/100 - The project fits the Co Waterford Local Development Strategy for Cultural Tourism. <p>Correspondence received from the promoters below requesting that they be allowed to revert to their original plan due to the extra costs involved.</p> <p><i>“When we started out this project it was through Fiddown Union of Parishes. Following a request from Leader we formed the Friends of Clonagam of which members are made up of the church, the heritage and Curraghmore. However, we did not at the time realise the additional financial implications for the group and the project. The following is a list of extra expenses we find ourselves now having to consider.</i></p> <p>Additional Costs</p> <p><i>The license and RCB solicitors will cost approximately € 500</i></p> <p><i>The license holds each one of us members severely and jointly liable This is not a safe or acceptable position to put members in. Therefore, we need to be a CLG Company Ltd by guarantee.</i></p> <p><i>This adds an additional set up cost €500</i></p> <p><i>Also 6 years of annual returns of €650 plus vat, approx €800 per annum €4800</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the RCB insist that the church would have to be insured for rebuild. This would be an extra financial cost of approx. 600 per annum to the group</i></p>
-------------------------------------	--

€4200

In addition to paying the insurance for the parish 300 x 7 years

€2100

Approx Solicitor fees

€500

Total additional financial costs

€12,600

These additional costs were never part of the original plan, as a union of parishes our normal cover of approx. €300 per annum would have covered us. We find ourselves in an untenable position, willing and able to renovate and save this heritage building with Leaders help, but unable to sustain a further very conservative €12,000-euro expense.

My husband and I were more than willing to bridge the loans and have no problem in waiting to collect the 25% which will have to be fundraised in the future. Our whole locality would benefit from this heritage and culturally significant project, located within the Comeragh uplands region. Our builder was ready to start on the first of May and we have the funds in place to start immediately. Rose Ryall, Heritage Officer for the County has also been in touch to see what progress has been made.

What we are asking is could we do this through our original plan as Fiddown union of Parishes, as it is financially far more viable and you are dealing with the very same group of people all of whom have ties to Clonagam, Heritage and development of the local area.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Corinne Power O'Mahony"

The Evaluation Committee considered the request discussing all aspects of the project again. The following is a summary of points raised:-

- Ms. Claire Connors advised that because of the Liability Insurance required by RCB the promoters have no option but to become a CLG. The costs involved in this are much greater than they anticipated, and they would like to revert to their original application under the Fiddown Union of Parishes.
- A Committee Member noted that the costs involved average out roughly at €2,600 pa. MS. Connors clarified that the promoters provided costs for 5 years to cover the lifespan of the LEADER programme.
- It was noted that in similar type projects, for example the Red Hall, Lismore, a separate community group was set up for them to obtain

	<p>LEADER funding. The original application was more Church of Ireland focused and funding was not recommended until it was changed to community. The new community group had to get insurance to cover the build.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jimmy Taaffe clarified that to be eligible for funding the group must show that it genuinely open to the general public giving the examples of the Visitor Centre in Glencairn which is run by nuns but that anyone from the public can book to stay there. • Ms. Connors clarified that the building will be open by appointment only because of the valuable relics housed within and that the doors will never be left fully open. The purpose of the application is to make the facility weather tight, with stage two opening for public visitors. This will be done by advance bookings through Portlaw Heritage Centre, Facebook, and the Fiddown Union of Parishes. • A Committee Member queried if it should be funded as its more preservation rather than restoration at this point. Ms. Connors confirmed that it is being funded under the Cultural element of the Rural Development Programme and that stage 2 will be about opening it up to the public. Portlaw Heritage Group will have a key and can take bookings for tours, there is also a Facebook page and Fiddown Union of Parishes can take bookings. • Mr. Jimmy Taaffe said that Ger Crotty from the Portlaw Heritage Group (PHG) was added to the Friends of Clonagram Committee (FofCC) noting that it would be good to have a second independent member nominated also. It was noted that Mr. Alan Walsh, a member of the Fiddown Union of Parishes, was also a member of the Portlaw Heritage Group. Ms Connors noted that the promoters are requesting not going with this model preferring to revert to their original application where the project application comes from the Fiddown Union of Parishes due to the costs involved with becoming a CLG. • The Evaluation Committee all agreed that the core issue is how they will demonstrate that the facility will be open to the public and that having it run by a local community group is best. • The Committee stated that they would like to support he project as they consider it very worthwhile but want to get the structure of it right as the second application will be for a far greater amount. • Ms. Connors pointed out that the second application will be at 50% and not 75% as they will be charging fees for entry to cover running costs. • Mr. Jimmy Taaffe advised that he did not think the Department would consider the project eligible under the Fiddown Union of Parishes. • The Evaluation Committee agreed that their original recommendations, review, and scoring shall remain in place.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Lease must be in place prior to payment. - A fairer balance of membership must be obtained by adding a minimum of two members from the Portlaw Heritage Group or a local Community group. <p>A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser</p>
Was an assessment completed?	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 27 th August 2019.
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters followed Category 1 National Procurement Guidelines
Innovative Element of project:	It was agreed that the project is innovative as the preservation of the Church will allow visitors to Portlaw to share the heritage experience.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that deadweight is not an issue as without funding this project will not proceed.
Consideration of Displacement:	The promoter would not be able to do this essential work without funding. These relics are unique to the Church and having tours here will complement the existing heritage offerings in Portlaw already.
Economic justification for the project:	The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Cultural Tourism and funding will preserve the valuable relics that are contained within Clonegam Church.
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 75/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser
Proposed by:	Mary O'Halloran
Seconded by:	Donal Connolly
Agreed by:	Paul Clerkin

Mr. J. Taaffe C.E.O. WLP informed the committee that approval for this project had previously been granted but an issue of concern requires further consideration. The LAG committee must be satisfied that the project promoter is a non denominational body as religious activity, on rare occasions, still takes place on the premises and the Church of Ireland are still legally responsible for title. A six year lease is in place. Caution was advised as further requests for maintenance and restoration from various Churches would follow if such a precedent was set. Head of L.E.O. R. Walsh noted that it was an important and historic building and it is vital to protect such structures. Chief Officer D. Tuohy advised that the Department could turn the project down and J. Taaffe C.E.O. WLP warned of potential discord should the project committee act independently of the Church of Ireland. J. Taaffe recommended that the matter be deferred to the next meeting in September.

Proposed: L. O'Sullivan	Seconded by: J. Beresford
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Deferred

(b) WLP Board observations available on Extranet.

Board observations are available on extranet for perusal.

(c) Project Extension Request 31LDRWAT111375 West Waterford Festival of Food II

J Taaffe advised the committee that a six month extension is required by the project promoters due to restrictions and limitations posed by Covid-19.

Proposed: S. Cooke	Seconded by: C. Quinlan
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

J Taaffe noted that despite Covid-19, in general, good progress was being made with all projects that had been allocated grants.

(d) Proposed RDP Funding re-allocations

J Taaffe advised the committee that the current Leader programme ends this December and that it would be prudent to reallocate available funds to oversubscribed strategic actions in order to maximise the potential of the Leader program and to be in a position to avail of additional funds in future allocations. A document had been circulated on the extranet for consideration. Under-utilized funds in 'Training' and 'Tourism' can be transferred to 'Capital' and so forth. The decision to reallocate funding which once rested with the Department is now a matter for the LAG to decide. Rural regeneration works need to continue to counteract stagnation. A funding package of €3m including Leader, philanthropic and village funds is proposed for the Blackwater Economic Development Zone and this will see derelict buildings transformed into office space with adjoining childminding facilities which will reduce the

necessity for work related city commutes. A reallocation of funding as per document circulated was proposed.

Proposed: A. Wyse	Seconded by: J. Beresford
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

J Somers requested a presentation on Leader themes 5.3, 6.1 and 6.2. J Taaffe will prepare the presentation and deliver at the next committee meeting.

(e) RDP Advance Administration Funding 1st July to 30th Sept 2020.

J Taaffe left the meeting for this discussion/decision.

Approval required for advance Leader administration funds of €91,616.77 requested by WLP

Proposed: J. Somers	Seconded by: G. Foley
Abstentions: J Taaffe	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

(f) RDP allocations, approvals, payments @30-6-20 – For noting

Chief Officer D. Tuohy outlined the mid-year position regarding allocations, approvals and payments and advised that the information was available on extranet.

9. Report of the Rural Coordination sub-committee:

R. Walsh gave a summary of the report of the Rural Co-ordination sub-committee and noted that there were a significant number of applications coming in.

H. Kiely acknowledged that these were fantastic opportunities with a ‘joined-up thinking’ approach and there are benefits for both disadvantaged groups and individuals. There also exists further scope for linking in more supports and services.

R. Walsh advised that a rural strategy will be put in place as part of the LECP review process.

10. Correspondence: None

11. A.O.B. None

12. Date and venue of next meeting: Thursday 10th September 2020 at 11.00 a.m.

Meeting Closed

Signed John Pratt 3-9-20
CHAIRPERSON DATE