

Grant Aid for Building Conservation

‘Quanta’ Research Appendix 1



December 2010

**Prepared by Carrig Conservation International Ltd in association with
Louise Harrington & Integral Finance Technology Ltd.**

**Upon instruction from the Heritage Council, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government and Department of
Finance**

Contents

1.	Analysis of Grant Administrators Responses to Questionnaires	2
	Access/Equality of Opportunity	2
	Administration & Efficiency	4
	Value	9
	Quality Control/Conservation Standards	13
2.	Analysis of Questionnaires for Applicants of the Schemes	17
	Access/Equality of Opportunity for Applicants	17
	Administration & Efficiency as Perceived by Applicants	18
	Values as Perceived by Applicants	20
	Conservation Issues for Applicants	23
3.	Questionnaire for Grant Scheme Administrators	25
4.	Questionnaire for Grant Scheme Applicants	26
5.	Grant Scheme Case Study Analysis Sheet	30
6.	Case Study Data	31
7.	Overall Analysis of all Grant-Aid in the State	36
8.	Analysis of the Sample Case Studies of All the Schemes	37

1. Analysis of Grant Administrators Responses to Questionnaires

Table 1 Access/Equality of Opportunity

1.1	Measures taken to publicise the scheme	<p>Three of the ten respondents used press advertisements to announce a grant scheme, one contributed articles to local papers; five of the schemes were advertised on the internet, but nearly all had the information on the scheme and application available online.</p> <p>Six of the ten respondents used a network of local authority conservation and heritage officers to publicise the scheme. The Heritage Council use their e-zine which is available by subscription and their Heritage Outlook magazine to provide information on the schemes. Teagasc was used as a point of dissemination on the REPS4 Traditional Farm Building grant scheme (REPS4 TFB). The DoEHLG thatching grant (Thatch) is not advertised annually but there is a general knowledge of it amongst thatched house owners and 'word of mouth' does much to spread the word on the scheme.</p> <p>The Large-Scale-Properties not in State care grant scheme (LSPNSC) is not advertised. It seeks rather to fund special projects which have been brought to public attention at local and national level where a significant burden of a large heritage asset is placed on a private individual(s) or group.</p>
1.2	The role of telephone enquiries	<p>Telephone enquiries are important in assisting potential applicants in each of the schemes, especially for nationally schemes that are ran from a single location (except the LSPNSC) which is not a direct application scheme).</p> <p>Due to the demographic of the thatching grant which is largely people over 65 years of age, the telephone is the way most people access information on it. In the Significant Places of Public Worship scheme (SPPW), contact made in this way is used to clarify the appropriateness or otherwise of applying, given the requirement for professional method statements and the implied costs.</p>
3	Time spent on the telephone as most common form of enquiry	<p>Dealing with telephone enquiries takes a considerable amount of time on five of the seven schemes. One respondent advised that they deal with as many as 50-60 calls a day in the period after the advertisement of the scheme. The local authority protected structures scheme (LAPS) respondents advised that this is the most common and most effective way of communicating with applicants. In many instances this marks the start of a fruitful process that eventually leads to the conservation funded work. Two respondents advised that a straight-forward enquiry could take five to ten minutes while</p>

		more complicated enquiries could take ten to twenty minutes.
1.4	The role of site meetings	<p>Site meetings in relation to national schemes (six of the seven) are rare due to the resources that would be required, therefore, their role is very limited.</p> <p>One local authority officer did not have time for site visits only for the purpose of grant scheme enquiries whereas this was more feasible within a city centre local authority.</p>
1.5	The role of meetings in person	<p>Again, due to the areas covered few meetings in person are carried out in relation to national schemes. In the Civic Structures grant scheme (CSGS), meetings are only provided if specifically requested. Another administrator responded that meetings in person are provided but not during the period of the advertisement of the scheme. In local authority areas, it is more feasible to have face-to-face meetings or to 'call in' and see someone, two respondents advised that this happens in their authority.</p>
1.6	Impact of relationships built up over time, assisting the applicant towards achieving a shared objective	<p>Four of the ten respondents on the seven schemes felt that the relationship developed with grant applicants through the process of telephone contact, advice, correspondence and meeting on-site, is a hugely important part of the value of the scheme. This process involves the initial 'cold contact' with the grant-aiding body and the technical administrator where advice is given as to how work might be prioritised, what other funding might be available, who might be able to carry out the work and if phasing is a good idea. It is an educational process for applicants and often their agents where a rapport develops. For two respondents, it helped people overcome a fear of 'officialdom' or wariness towards public authority. Another respondent felt that it was important for an owner to feel that they were being listened to in the process.</p> <p>On the larger LSPNSC and SPPW schemes, it is often an agent who will represent the owner or guardian of a property who may be less involved than they would be in a smaller project. One respondent thought that the circular provided on the scheme was effective in terms of assisting people.</p>
1.7	Means of providing printed information and forms	<p>Information on five of the seven schemes is posted immediately so that applicants should have it within a day or two of their initial enquiry. The LSPNSC scheme does not have an application form <i>per se</i>, and the SPPW is available online.</p>

Table 2 Administration & Efficiency

2.1	Typical calendar	<p>Three of the seven schemes work to a schedule that commences at the start of the year with a deadline for the completion of works at the end of October or November of the same year.</p> <p>The Building At Risk scheme (BAR), LSPNSC and REPS4 TFB schemes operate within a longer timeframe of 21, 12, and 16 months respectively. The thatch scheme commences early in the year and applicants receive notification of the outcome within one month, there is no time limit for the carrying out of works and payment is made within one to two months of receipt of claims. Applicants of the CSGS are advised by the end of March as to the outcome of the scheme. The LAPS scheme depends upon departmental notification of funding amounts for the issuing of provisional grant which can delay the process by many months.</p>
2.2	Usefulness of current timeframes	<p>Five respondents thought that the current deadlines are useful in terms of setting targets to complete work and for budgetary reasons.</p> <p>One respondent thought that while deadlines are good an 18 month life-span for the LAPS scheme would be better than the current ten month period, while another decried the current timeframe and felt that it was exacerbated as the regulations and requirements for payment augment, further diminishing the time available to carry out work. Where an administrator was required to await a budgetary allocation from another agency, this could be extremely frustrating as it could run quite late, leaving only one to two months for the completion of work, taking builders' holidays into account and so forth.</p> <p>One administrator indicated that the timing of conservation works was understood and for this reason notification as to the outcome of applications was issued as early as possible. In relation to the Thatching scheme, it was pointed out that the carrying out of work was often delayed due to the efforts of the applicant in sourcing matching funding and tying that into the work programme. The lack of thatchers was highlighted as a major factor in determining the ability of owners to meet other deadlines, for this reason, it was thought that if a time limit were introduced it should be no less than a full year and, preferably, 18 months.</p>
2.3	Role of phasing/multi-annual funding	<p>None of the schemes provides for official phasing of grant-aided work.</p> <p>The REPS4 TFB scheme permits only one application. One administrator considered that phasing in</p>

		<p>the larger scale grant-aided projects such as LSPNSC and SPPW is desirable given the size of structures and the complexity of issues, but perhaps not as good for small-scale projects.</p> <p>In general, while there is no official phasing of any of the schemes, <i>de facto</i> phasing is actively encouraged through communication so as to allow for a spreading of the financial burden and to approach different problems on modestly-sized buildings. For this reason one local authority administrator suggested that a five year budget for the authority would be preferable, to allow for a more coherent and consistent approach to the work during the life of a project. This would also allow for visibly 'continuing investment' in a structured way' to assist owners. It was felt that the opposite of structured ongoing investment over a long period can result in crisis and a building reaching a critical stage, affecting the conservation outcome and the quality of the work where people cannot plan for work.</p>
2.4	Use of prioritisation, e.g., Scheme of Priorities for local authorities or other	<p>Two of the schemes use prioritisation to assess application.</p> <p>The CSGS sets out the criteria by which awards are made in the information provided to applicants. Every LAPS scheme has a 'Scheme of Priorities' by which applications are assessed. A points system based upon this scheme is also used in some instances.</p>
2.5	Handling of incomplete applications	<p>None of the administrators return incomplete applications to applicants.</p> <p>In the CSGS and the REPS4 TFB schemes, a checklist is used to initially assess applications. Where further information is required to assess the application it is requested. In the thatch scheme, if a minor detail is missing, the applicant is contacted by telephone. The situation does not arise for the LSPNSC and in the SPPW, both the volume of applications and the standards expected for such large scale projects mean that in the absence of adequate information incomplete applications cannot be processed.</p> <p>Three of the four local authority respondents indicated that applications are not returned but rather that every effort is made to assist the owner. One respondent felt that applications were rarely complete. This means a certain amount of 'spoon-feeding' as one respondent put it, however, it was considered part of the process of up-skilling and educating owners, agents and contractors about the means of conserving old buildings. One local authority does return incomplete applications to be completed.</p>

2.6	Reporting, recommendation and decision-making mechanism	<p>Seven of the ten administrators interviewed are responsible for the assessment of grants.</p> <p>In the other cases, an independent panel of experts assesses applications by use of a points system. In another the application is assessed initially from the office (for eligibility) and subsequently by a separate technical officer on site who makes a recommendation. In one of the local authorities the initial technical assessment is outsourced.</p> <p>Within the Heritage Council, the recommendations of the appropriate officer are taken to committee level for review and further recommendation and finally approved by full council for three of the four schemes; in the case of the LSPNSC, the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government makes the final decision on the technical recommendation.</p> <p>In three local authorities, the technical recommendation is taken to the Director of Service for approval (including one via an SEP line-manager), and further, by manager's order for administrative payment purposes, in one instance. In the fourth, the technical officer makes the final decision in accordance with the Scheme of Priorities.</p>
2.7	Number and effect of site inspections	<p>In three of the seven schemes three inspections are carried out, these are for the larger Heritage Council schemes. Two inspections are made in most other instances, before the works commence and after they have been completed. One respondent said that the number could vary according to the complexity of the conservation problem or if a contractor needed direction on specific detailing.</p>
2.8	Inclusion of voluntary effort in the consideration of applications/costs	<p>Voluntary effort is considered in the reckoning of costs for most of the schemes, bar the larger Heritage Council LSPNSC and SPPW.</p> <p>In the past, the BAR did not include voluntary effort but the future version of this scheme will. The REPS4 TFB provides an hourly labour rate and timesheet for farmers to be signed off by the project agent. In the thatch scheme, many owners have traditionally carried out their own repairs and this is always reckoned according to a fixed amount. The CSGS does take voluntary effort into account, involving many community and civic projects as it does. All of the local authorities take voluntary work into account which might be in the form of project management costs, or self-performed works by a contractor such as a cabinet-maker, for example.</p>

2.9	Proportion of matched-funding & liaison with other funding agencies	<p>All of the agencies direct applicants to seek other sources of funding and in many instances actively encourage them.</p> <p>In the case of the CSGS, applicants receive 80% of the cost from the scheme and almost 40% of projects receive funding from other state sources. In the case of REPS4 TFB, applicants receive up to 75% of the cost from the scheme, 25% of the cost must be non-state funding (owners may also apply under the Local authority scheme if the building is a protected structure). Thatched house owners may avail of funding from three schemes (LAPS, Thatch and BAR), in each case applicants are required to indicate if they have already applied for other funding. The three agencies may liaise on the total amount to be given in any one instance and adjust amounts accordingly. It was generally agreed that communication between agencies in this regard is very important and should be maintained and improved if necessary.</p> <p>In the larger projects, applicants may seek other funding but it tends to be small compared to the overall cost.</p>
2.10	Out-sourcing of technical assessments and costs	<p>In the LAPS scheme one authority which does not have a conservation officer, outsources the technical assessment of the grants for the initial assessment and inspection at a cost of €10,000, the final assessment is made by a planning officer. In another authority the initial assessment was outsourced in the absence of the conservation officer who was on leave.</p> <p>In another scheme, a technical administrator did avail of the services of a consultant for a second opinion on a project on a once-off basis.</p>
2.11	Standard of financial reporting for the scheme and audits	<p>In all of the schemes a combination of receipts and as appropriate, architects' certs and signed timesheets, have to be submitted for payment. With the timescale involved in the LAPS scheme, it can sometimes be difficult to obtain a receipt rather than an invoice which is a requirement if payment is to be issued.</p> <p>All of the Heritage Council schemes are subject to internal audit as well as the Thatching and local authority schemes. One local authority had been subject to a DoEHLG external audit and it was found that the process was quite useful. Four projects in the CSGS are chosen at random for audit annually. There have been no issues to date.</p>

2.12	Review mechanisms in place to update and alter procedures	<p>The BAR, CSGS and REPS4 TFB schemes review the information and application forms annually; as a result of this a stage one screening process was developed for the REPS4 TFB due to the volume of applications. In the case of the BAR, the Architecture Committee of the Heritage Council may review criteria, however, significant changes to the scheme would have to go to full council. The LSPNSC or the SPPW have not yet been reviewed but it was thought that this might be a good idea. The thatch scheme does not have review mechanisms in place.</p> <p>Within the local authority scheme, the Scheme of Priorities is the main means of review; this had been done in one case and it was hoped to do so in two other authorities. One local authority administrator also felt that a review of the timescale nationally would be most useful and in particular, the prompt notification of annual allocations.</p>
------	---	--

Table 3 Value

3.1	Use of the grant as preventative maintenance or the remedy of neglect	<p>In general, respondents indicated that grants were used for both preventative maintenance and the remedy of neglect. The larger grant schemes deal with more acute problems on larger buildings which because of their size have tended to be harder to maintain on an ongoing basis. It was felt that this was not the deliberate intention of owners and guardians but rather a reflection of the costs involved in such properties. By contrast, it was estimated that 80% of funding in the thatch scheme is used for preventative maintenance, again, this is probably due to the nature of the scheme and the nature of thatching. The REPS4 TFB is thought to have a 60/40% balance in favour of preventative maintenance. One local authority indicated that 100% of grants are for the remedy of neglect. In the other three local authorities grant awards were thought to be evenly balanced between both.</p>
3.2	Consideration of the grant and conservation project in the context of the wider development of a site	<p>None of the grant schemes consider development of an extended site in receipt of grant-aid as the schemes deal with conservation only.</p> <p>In the LSPNSC scheme, the Heritage Council may agree of deed of covenant with building owners or guardian to ensure their involvement in future decisions affecting the heritage building. The Council would also try to exert a positive influence in development decisions affecting projects in receipt of SPPW funding. Because the REPS4 TFB scheme deals with farm outbuildings, works are considered to be exempted agricultural development, therefore, this issue does not arise (unless the building is part of a protected structure).</p> <p>In the case of local authorities, it was felt by one respondent that the role of the conservation officer in both the planning process and the conservation grant scheme ensured that this was not possible. Another local authority respondent indicated that the grant could be seen as a goodwill gesture which was not means-tested and that in awarding it to a developer, it was a way of highlighting that conservation and development are not mutually exclusive. Another respondent indicated that due to the complexities of development, it could happen and in the one instance where it did occur, the authority threatened to withdraw the funding.</p> <p>This issue does not affect the thatching scheme, however, there is a clause in the scheme that thatched houses rented as holiday homes are ineligible for funding.</p>

3.3	Contribution of the grant to maintaining a socially useful building	<p>All of the respondents agreed that grant-aid contributed to keeping a building socially useful.</p> <p>One respondent noted that an occupied building is more likely to survive, but noted that in some cases, where building ownership and/or the circumstances of the owner or guardian were such that no further works could be undertaken, the grant process when providing aid for emergency work could contribute to a moth-balling effect on the building.</p> <p>The REPS4 TFB also aims to maintaining the traditional rural countryside. The thatching grant allowed people to stay in their homes. Two of the local authority respondents mentioned the potential multiplier- or 'ripple-effect' of a grant in an area, whereby the improvement in one property could lead others in an area to work on their own buildings with or without grant funding. This gave an additional amenity value to the grant.</p>
3.4	Contribution of the grant to raising a greater awareness of the architectural heritage	<p>All of the respondents agreed that the schemes make a big contribution to raising awareness of the architectural heritage.</p> <p>One respondent said that this was a means of 'celebrating the Value of conservation work', on a large scale on big projects and at a micro level on smaller Private projects. The CSGS is significant in this regard as community participation is actively encouraged in the scheme. It was also noted that the REPS4 TFB scheme also raises awareness of environmental and landscape issues. Another respondent felt that the schemes help to maintain a link with Ireland's history and heritage and supports a sense of pride in people.</p> <p>The local authority grant scheme was thought to make a contribution on a number of levels. The scheme was considered to provide an opportunity to educate people including owners, professional agents, contractors, communities and colleagues with the local authority management as to the value of the better management of old buildings. One local authority focuses the allocation of grant awards in prominent urban location for the maximum impact in terms of education and raising awareness. Another respondent on the LAPS scheme suggested that it didn't affect enough people in the wider community and that signage would help to address this issue, this was echoed by another respondent.</p>

3.5	Contribution of the scheme towards recognizing the custodianship of structures by their owners	<p>Each of the local authority respondents felt that the grant served as a goodwill gesture and as a recognition of the duty of owners in maintaining the built heritage. In this regard, it was described as a 'small carrot' for an owner in recognition of their efforts and the costs involved as they are expected to 'maintain the heritage for future generations'.</p> <p>In the REPS4 TFB scheme one case involved a farm that had been in one family for over eight generations which was considered an impressive example of custodianship.</p>
3.6	Success of the scheme in terms of its overall objectives	<p>Eight of the ten respondents felt that each of the schemes were achieving their overall object objectives.</p> <p>The administrator for the CSGS thought it would be better if there were a larger variety of structures in the scheme. The administrator of SPPW felt that the scheme along with the LSPNSC was leading the way in terms of best practice in conservation. The REPS4 TFB administrator thought that the scheme was improving year on year. It was felt that the thatch scheme assists people to stay in their homes.</p> <p>Two respondents on the LAPS scheme disagreed with the statement. One said that with the reduced funding levels, the scheme 'did too little now', that the objective of the scheme was never 'saving the city' but rather, in addition to conserving buildings, to educate and train building owners and contractors. Another respondent also felt that the scheme did not meet its objectives as it rarely covered 50% of the cost of work.</p>
3.7	Other values or comments	<p>It was felt that there was more than value for money at stake when it came to considering the value of the schemes.</p> <p>In particular, most administrators felt that the process of working with the owners and guardians of properties or communities was immensely valuable in creating a resource of technical knowledge for the future; in providing an understanding as to why the architectural heritage should be protected; in providing training and up-skilling; and in creating goodwill.</p> <p>In the larger LPSNC and SPPW schemes it was noted that the professional agent on a project tends to provide more of an interface with the grant-awarding agency and administrator.</p> <p>The economic benefits of the schemes, in terms of providing work for specialist contractors and</p>

		the up-skilling of both agents and contractors, was highlighted. The spin-off effect of enhancing the built environment through conservation works was also stressed. The tourism benefits of preserving the character of our built heritage in rural and urban settings was also mentioned.
--	--	--

Table 4 Quality Control/Conservation Standards

4.1	Degree of control in relation to the specification submitted with the grant	<p>In five of the six national schemes, it is very important that the specification meets best conservation standards, furthermore, as the part of role of schemes like SPPW and LSPNSC is to lead the way in new conservation technology and practice, agreement on the specification with the scheme administrator is critical. While the amounts in the REPS4 TFB is much smaller, the specification is 'micro-controlled' and no work may proceed until it has been agreed.</p> <p>In the Thatch scheme, the specification is left up to the applicant because the scheme is a housing grant with fixed amounts.</p> <p>One local authority respondent felt that people tended not to make serious applications without the correct specification. Another local authority respondent felt that even with the correct specification and supervision work may still go wrong.</p>
4.2	Dealing with work that falls below the required conservation standard and penalties for applicants	<p>Only one respondent in the seven schemes had a set procedure in relation to poor works and this involved revising the amount of grant downwards according to the use of the wrong or cheaper materials, and after clear communication on the issue. This situation does not arise in the CSGS because a conservation architect must certify the completed work.</p> <p>It was felt that in the LSPNSC that this situation would rarely arise due to the nature of the scheme, but that the Heritage Council reserve the right not to pay. In the thatch scheme remedial action is specified as required.</p> <p>In the local authorities, one respondent suggested that the earlier one becomes aware of problems in a project, the easier it is to resolve the situation. Another respondent added that people rarely deliberately commission the wrong kind of work or specification and that it was not 'in the spirit of the scheme' to withdraw funding. It was noted in another authority while this is rare, it is difficult to address and a procedure should be put in place to address it.</p>
4.3	Impact of the intervention of a technical administrator	<p>In the three schemes BAR, LAPS, REPS4 TFB, it was considered that the intervention of a technical administrator was critical to the outcome of a project. In the Civic Structures scheme, it was noted that interventions are not made into individual cases, that a senior conservation architect is always available to the administrator meaning that this was not an</p>

		<p>issue.</p> <p>The respondent for the Thatch scheme felt that this was only true up to a point. For the larger schemes such as SPPW and LSPNSC, it was considered that the intervention of the technical administrator was less critical due to the nature of the scheme and the role of agents.</p> <p>Where small grant amounts were involved such as in the LAPS and REPS4 TFB, case studies highlighted the fact that the intervention of the administrator often resulted in the reduction of costs, the prioritising of the most urgent works, agreeing a more efficient work programme and the engagement of appropriately experienced contractors and personnel.</p>
4.4	Role of specialist agents such as conservation architects and engineers	<p>It was felt that the role of specialist agents in the larger schemes, such as BAR, LSPNSC, SPPW and Civic Structures was critical. In the thatch scheme it was considered that this issue did not arise.</p> <p>In one local authority, a respondent felt that it was not always necessary to have the services of an agent if the project was dealing with one aspect of conservation and an experienced contractor was dealing with it and, therefore, expenditure on agents' fees might be unnecessary.</p> <p>Other respondents in the LAPS and REPS 4 TFB thought that an agent could be critical to the successful outcome of a project, in terms of standards, cost and future works, but that often an educational process was also involved for the agent.</p>
4.5	Role of specialist contractors	<p>Eight of the ten respondents thought that the role of specialist contractors is very important.</p> <p>In the thatch scheme, the contractor is critical, in almost every respect. In the LSPNSC and SPPW, the standards set and new methods developed in such projects are important for specialist contractors.</p> <p>It was considered that contractors are important up to a point in the REPS4 TFB and the LAPS schemes, in the sense that not every job requires a specialist contractor – an ordinary builder (or in the case of REPS4 TFB, a farmer) can do a lot of necessary work, leaving joinery, lime-plastering, etc, to specialists.</p>

4.6	Contribution of a the schemes to fostering specialist skills	<p>Each of the ten respondents thought that the schemes make a significant contribution to the fostering of specialist skills or 'safe-guarding traditional crafts.</p> <p>In the REPS4 TFB, farmers may participate in lime-plastering courses, while blacksmiths also contribute to aspects of the scheme as required.</p> <p>A FAS training course in thatch was established to continue the training of thatchers which is one of the very specialized skills associated with a number of the schemes.</p>
4.7	Contribution of schemes to training and education	<p>It was agreed by all respondents that the different schemes contribute to training and education – education of building owners, professional agents and contractors.</p> <p>One respondent considered that the LAPS scheme also contributed to educating the economic and social administrators within a local authority as to the potential of the built heritage, showing that building conservation was something feasible and positive</p> <p>One respondent felt that the grant process helped people to 'read a building', to understand conservation methods and but also about other aspects of heritage such as bats, landscape and birds.</p> <p>At a more advanced level, the larger schemes could serve to tackle more complex structural and materials problems, thus developing new techniques and applying them to landmark buildings as models for future projects.</p>
4.8	Other comments	<p>It was noted that the CSGS contributes to the viability of structures which might otherwise be at risk of deterioration and that their conservation made a positive visual impact in the environment.</p> <p>The administrator of the REPS4 TFB felt that the grant was just the start of a process, at the end of which the farmer continues to conserve their property, equipped with the benefit of the experience and a deeper knowledge of the issues and ways to resolve problems. It was also considered better if a farmer could put some of their own time into the project and that more could be done to highlight the work of all the schemes in general. This could be done by means of better illustration of 'before and after' to show the positive impact of grant aid.</p>

		<p>One local authority respondent stated that a technical administrator will have more of an impact on a project than a desk-based non-technical administrator, and that for this reason, the officer is critical to the outcome of the project. The same respondent also thought that money could be used more efficiently on small projects. Some concern was raised about the outsourcing of technical assessments to a consultant who is not answerable to anybody and whose decisions can have a big impact on the good-will engendered by schemes and conserving the built heritage generally.</p> <p>Two respondents thought that communication between agencies could be improved as a matter of good practice, particularly, where projects receive multi-agency funding and where a building is a protected structure or a monument.</p>
--	--	--

2. Analysis of Questionnaires for Applicants of the Schemes

Table 5 Access/Equality of Opportunity for Applicants

5.1	Principle source of information on the scheme	Most applicants learned of their relevant schemes equally through newspaper advertisements, the architect or contractor involved in the project, through contact with the grant-aiding body and through colleagues or other professional acquaintances.
5.2	Ease of access (1-5)	Almost all applicants found it very easy or fairly easy to get information, though a few across various schemes did find it quite difficult (see 1.4).
5.3	Type of information provided	Only 20% of applicants viewed printed materials as their main source of information, while 80% attained it through personal communication and/or the Internet.
5.4	Recommendations for improvement	<p>The few applicants which found access to information difficult cited a lack of disclosure regarding possible grant stipulations as the problem. They felt that it took great effort and "chasing" administrators to understand what works were permitted, the potential grant amount they could expect, and the preliminary material investigations which would be required. Some felt that they were not made aware of the sometimes stressful timeframe and extra costs which they would be undertaking with grant aid.</p> <p>Another commonly cited problem, even amongst those who found information accessible, was the lack of budgetary information early on as it made long-term financial planning difficult or impossible. Some applicants feel they need to have an estimate of the grant amount they may be able to expect, although one applicant was given a figure early on and due to budget changes this amount decreased significantly.</p>
5.5	Length of wait for receipt of form	At least 7 applicants downloaded the application form, while nearly all others received a form from the relevant body within a few days or a week. However, several applicants said that it took between a few weeks and a few months to receive a form. These applicants were from diverse schemes.

Table 6 Administration & Efficiency as Perceived by Applicants

6.1	Length of wait for advice of outcome	Approximately 50% received notice within six weeks with a further 30% waiting for 3-4 months. Only in a few cases were applicants notified in excess of six months after the date of application. However, two applicants to the Repair & Renewal of Thatch grant scheme indicated that many months passed without an initial inspection being carried out on the property. The thatch was meanwhile deteriorating and many calls were made to the grant administrators to arrange an inspection so that works could commence. In one case a thatcher was sent within a week of the request. In the second case, no inspector arrived and works commenced as the thatcher had to undertake a much larger project elsewhere and could not return until the winter. Over a year after the application was made a letter was sent saying that a recent inspection had been carried out while the owners were away and it was determined that as the works had been completed, the property was no longer eligible for a grant.
6.2	Fairness and clarity of assessment process	Nearly all applicants felt that they understood the assessment criteria and that the process was fair. One applicant to the Significant Places of Public Worship grant scheme felt that the assessment criteria were easy to understand but that the scheme favors larger churches with bigger congregations and thus more funding. A few applicants to other schemes felt it unfair that they were not told at the outset that they would have to go to great lengths to conserve original materials. One felt it "extraordinary" that English-style thatching was not acceptable, while another felt it unfair that he had to incur the cost of importing appropriate slate. He found the grant process extremely stressful and would not go through it again.
6.3	Length of wait for receipt of payment	Nearly all applicants received payment within 2 months of the completion of works.
6.4	Relief of the financial burden of maintaining the building effected by the awarding of a grant	Nearly all applicants felt that the grant relieved some of the financial burden of the conservation works. Those that did not were normally those that felt the specifications and conditions attached to the grant caused the total expenses to exceed that which they would have otherwise incurred.

6.5	Source of matching funding	About 50% of applicants matched the grant funding with their own savings. Another 17% of applicants resorted to fundraising and 14% received donations, leaving a small fraction of applicants who received further grants from other bodies or attained loans. One applicant mortgaged his house in order to match funding.
6.6	Impression that conditions pertaining to supervision, material specification, added to the cost of the project	The divide between those who do and do not feel that grant conditions add to the cost of projects is roughly 50/50. Those that feel conditions do not add to the cost reiterate that while they feel conservation best practices <i>are</i> more expensive than normal repair methods, they would carry out the works in the appropriate way regardless of whether a grant stipulated such action. Those applicants who replied that grant conditions do add to the cost of the project feel that the grant stipulations and conservation methodologies are unnecessary. One applicant cited opening up works as specified by the grant aiding body which revealed no further damage or remedial action to be carried out. Others feel that they could carry out the work themselves or via a contractor without the added cost of hiring a conservation architect to supervise the works. The latter demographic also expressed that the grant aid process takes a long time and thus is more expensive than if they had foregone the grant. Some may not pursue grants again due to these factors.
6.7	Extent to which expenses involved in grant were set against tax liabilities or VAT ¹	Only 7% of interviewed applicants indicated that the project expenses were set-off against VAT.
6.8	Alternative suggestions for the funding this type of work	Over 50% of applicants feel that tax relief would be an extraordinary help for those providing matching funding for conservation works (although one applicant mentioned that this would not help OAP's). A further 20% indicated that VAT relief would be of significant help, even if a grant were not awarded, as sometimes the cost of VAT exceeds the amount of grant funding. In fact, one applicant expressed his amazement that one can claim VAT relief against works to farm buildings but cannot claim it against works to listed properties. A significant number cited the need for larger grant awards as at times the funding does not significantly offset the financial toll which discourages further conservation work. The general consensus is that more relief must be provided for these projects in order to ensure continued best conservation practices.

Table7 Values as Perceived by Applicants

7.1	Means by which the applicant came to be an owner/guardian of building	Approximately 33% of applicants purchased the grant-aided property. A further 27% were administrators of the property, and 22% inherited it. The remaining 18% was mostly made up of clergy who had a role of guardianship.
7.2	Extent to which funding affected the decision to proceed with work	Over 66% of applicants insisted that they could not have afforded to complete the project works without grant funding, though the size of the grant offered was a factor in their ability to find matching funding. Another 24% indicated that their property was in such condition that some remedial works would have had to be completed regardless of the grant application outcome, but that the works would have been significantly more modest without funding. The final 10% responded that they would have completed the works irrespective of grant aid, but that it was welcome support. All applicants expressed their gratitude for the funding and emphasised that these schemes <i>must</i> remain available.
7.3	Relationship of the grant amount to the overall cost	The majority of projects (61%) received between 7-50% of total project costs. Approximately 14% of applicants indicated that the grant covered less than 10% of the project costs, with the same amount of applicants reporting that their grant covered under 20%. Two properties which received Large-Scale Properties Not In State Care grants received nearly 100% of project costs for at least one phase. The majority of recipients of Repair & Renewal of Thatch grants received between 50-80% of project expenses. All of the examined local authority conservation grants awarded by one particular county council funded between 7-40% of the project costs, which was slightly below average.
7.4	Knowledge accrued as a result of participating in the scheme	Nearly 66% of applicants felt that they learned more as a result of the grant process. Knowledge was gained in the areas of conservation techniques; the importance of proper conservation methodologies; architectural history; and engineering. The 33% who felt they did not learn from the scheme were either unsuccessful in their application, were professionals in architecture/conservation, or were not very interested in the process.

7.5	Any other benefits of the scheme	<p>Applicants felt that an additional benefit of the grant scheme was that it funded proper conservation work which set a positive example for other, local historic property owners. Some also felt that the works created jobs, stimulated the local economy by sourcing local materials, initiated urban regeneration, increased the awareness of conservation principles among church congregations, and also addressed Health & Safety issues for the public.</p>
7.6	Other comments	<p>Many applicants expressed their feeling that the government has a responsibility to assist historic homeowners in caring for their buildings as the structures are part of the collective, shared heritage of Ireland. The present owners, they feel, are merely stewards and as they are required by law to maintain the buildings, they feel some further assistance from the State should be awarded.</p> <p>Others felt that the administrative timeline of the grant schemes is ineffectual in that by the time a decision has been made on the application, there is little time to attain a contractor and to complete the works to a high standard before the grant aid deadline. If they are unable to take up funding, applicants fear they will be denied a grant in the following year. Also, for many it seems that the necessity of procuring the project expenses up front is antithetical as the applicant made the application precisely because he did not have the financial resources. Additionally, some applicants delay works past the time of good weather, and possibly allowing further structural deterioration, in order to minimise the window of time between the payment of the agent/contractor and the date of grant receipt.</p> <p>Several applicants, including a conservation architect, indicated that it is difficult to apply to several different bodies for funding. The general thought is that grants should be centralised in order to increase accessibility of information, to make it clearer the grants for which applicants are eligible, and to make the application process more straightforward.</p> <p>The applicants of Church of Ireland properties indicated that, as a minority ecclesiastical population, it is quite difficult to raise funds to administer the church as well as sensitively conserve the building, and it was suggested that a special fund be set aside for these purposes. It was also suggested that partial funding intended for large ecclesiastical projects could be split and shared with smaller church conservation projects.</p> <p>Thatching is a particular concern for applicants who find that they are heavily burdened with the responsibility of maintaining a traditional Irish craft. They enjoy thatch and feel an immense amount of pride in their vernacular buildings, but feel that the grants which they are given do</p>

	<p>not adequately offset the cost of its repair. Thatching prices, they report, are increasing exponentially and the number of thatchers is decreasing. Administrators report over 70% of those living in thatched dwellings are OAP's and thus finances are a significant concern. It is felt that more funding must be given for thatching repairs or else the craft will disappear.</p> <p>Another concern for some applicants is that they find a few scheme administrators are pedantic in their adherence to procedure. For example, one applicant felt that the local Conservation Officer could have easily specified the works for his small project without stipulating the use of a conservation architect at great additional cost to the applicant. Another applicant feels that conservation is today too adverse to change. She feels that a building ought not be preserved perpetually in an earlier time but allowed to reflect its evolution. It was expressed that the present should be able to leave its mark on the building and as well serve as a responsible documentation of the building's history. She felt that the conditions attached to grants are currently too inflexible and do not allow for these measures.</p> <p>A general sentiment is that there is a lack of information about conservation grants, not only regarding the schemes and funds available to those who wish to do works, but also regarding the dates on which paperwork and certifications will be required to be in date and the stipulations and possible hidden costs associated with taking up grant funding. It was also mentioned that more information about the importance and even existence of proper conservation methodologies should be better publicised. Additionally, in the cases where a local Heritage Officer does not exist, applicants find that this has a major impact on conservation outcomes.</p> <p>The largest problem cited by many applicants is the recent decrease in grant funding. It could not here be emphasised enough the extent to which applicants stressed the need for continued grant aid funding. Without it, they claim, conservation works will cease.</p> <p>The fact that conservation creates jobs, improves the local economy and assists in urban redevelopment was an additional benefit cited by applicants.</p> <p>Overall, applicants found grant scheme administrators very easy to work with and thought the application process was a pleasure. They are exceedingly grateful for the grants which they have received because they know it would not have otherwise been possible to care for their properties. Most applicants insist that conservation grants are also an efficient incentive for executing sensitive repairs and that the improved outcome makes the added cost worthwhile.</p>
--	--

Table 8 Conservation Issues for Applicants

8.1	Understanding of the problem with the building	Almost all of the applicants felt that they knew what was wrong with their building. The level of knowledge ranged from having had a conservation report previously completed which explained the relevant issues, to seeing that stone was falling off the façade and knowing that this required redress, regardless of whether the cause of the damage was apparent.
8.2	Use of an agent to diagnose the problem	Almost all of the applicants utilised an agent or specialised contractor to diagnose the cause of the problem and to specify and oversee the works (in the case of Repair & Renewal of Thatch grants, the thatcher acted as the specialised contractor). The 14% who did not engage an agent either were architects, engineers, or builders themselves, or had grown up in said property and felt they understood how to remedy the problem.
8.3	Means and ease of sourcing good advice	Roughly 66% of applicants found it very easy to find an agent, with a further 16% finding it relatively easy though with some research involved. Most applicants found their agent through relatives or friends who had previously completed similar works, through the local authority's approved list of agents, through the RIAI website, or through their own research and/or advertisements. A final 16% found it very difficult to find a local agent who was interested in/available to complete their project, including two applicants to the Repair & Renewal of Thatch scheme. A few applicants had difficulty in securing builders to give quotes for the works and among them the estimates varied widely such that it was difficult to know who to trust. A final few had to look to other areas of Ireland or, in one instance, to the United Kingdom for expertise.
8.4	Extent of voluntary work & how it was assessed	Only 16% of applicants indicated that some of the works to their properties were completed with voluntary or self-performed labour. One REPS 4 TFB applicant indicated that most of the project work was self-performed but that the grant aid mainly covered material costs. Another indicated that his thatcher employed two young men as part of a training programme. It is unclear whether this labour was awarded remuneration by the grant. Another applicant's son

		assisted the builders with various tasks but it does not appear that his labour was compensated. In general, it appears that only formalised contracts and labour are recognised as covered project expenses under the grant schemes.
8.5	Extent of phased approaches to carrying out programmes of work	Over 35% of projects took a phased approach to the completion of works. This was due to applicants' financial circumstances, the breadth and scope of the works to be completed, and the availability of grant funding. At times agents advised applicants to phase the works for either logistical reasons or to benefit from the various grant schemes in order to address financial issues.
6	Desirability of funding on a multi-annual basis	Only 19% of projects were given multi-annual funding. One conservation architect insisted that multi-annual funding <i>must</i> be available, especially for large projects, to ensure their completion. He emphasised that often works are of such breadth and cost that they would not otherwise be possible. Applicants also insist that multi-annual funding is vital for small churches with limited congregations. One applicant indicated that the grant aiding body understood the necessity of phasing her roof repair project and that the body worked with her over two years to complete the project.
7	Understanding in relation to the securing of multi-annual funding	Overall, applicants did not indicate whether they were guaranteed multi-annual funding nor whether they submitted new applications in consecutive years for various works.

3. Questionnaire for Grant Scheme Administrators Questionnaire No.:

Scheme:

Administrator Name:

Position:

Contact:

Agency:

Total Annual Grant Amount:

Years Operating:

1. What is the range of grants normally administered by you in a year? Successful, unsuccessful?

Access/Equality of Opportunity

2. How do you publicise the scheme?
3. Do you have many written or telephone enquiries, and do you also have meetings with members of the public in relation to the scheme?
4. Do you know how the public accesses the scheme?
5. Do you feel you have adequate time to explain the scheme to an individual? Do you think this makes a difference?
6. How quickly are requests for information and forms dealt with?
7. Do you think that the scheme is easily accessible? Do you think it could be more efficient and more readily accessible? How?

Timeframe for support

8. What is the typical calendar for the advertising, processing, awarding, inspecting and paying of grants?
9. Do you find a fixed calendar for the commencement and return of claims a hindrance or a help?
10. Does the agency undertake multi-annual funding for projects? How is this communicated to the recipient? Is this guaranteed? Should it be guaranteed?

Application Evaluation

11. Would you characterise the projects awarded funding by this scheme as preventative maintenance or the remedy of neglect, or both? Could you give a percentage?
12. In the case of Local Authority Conservation Grants, do you have a 'Scheme of Priorities'? Do you think that this provides a clear and rational basis for decision-making for the scheme?
13. Are incomplete applications returned, i.e., do applicants adhere to the application and conditions of the grant scheme by submitting all of the information required?
14. How is the application assessed? Adjudicators, steering committees, Council meetings ...
15. How many inspections of the project are made?
16. How is the final adjudication made?
17. Is voluntary effort or self-performed work taken into account?

Quality Controls

18. What degree of controls do you use in relation to the specification of work to be grant-aided? Is this a major aspect in your decision to refuse an application?
19. Where the standard, or type of work undertaken in a project, are unsatisfactory, is funding refused? If so, at what stage can this happen? Do you have a procedure in place, if this does occur, to deal with this scenario? If so, does it include a facility for resolving a poor standard of work?
20. If a project is part of an overall development proposal, is the overall development (in terms of appropriateness and potential financial benefits accruing) assessed or just the work to the structure of special interest?

Administration, requirements and conditions

21. Do you think that the administration of the scheme in its current form affects the conservation outcome in terms of quality and standards?
22. Do you think that it could be said that the funding ensures that a structure remains socially useful? Or would you say this is only the case where public buildings are involved?
23. Do stipulations regarding public procurement procedures have an impact upon outcomes?

- 24. What would you say is the proportion of matching funding from other state sources in your scheme? Do you actively encourage applicants to pursue matching funding? Do you liaise with other funding agencies to discuss individual cases?
- 25. Do you outsource the technical assessment of grant applications? What is the approximate cost of this?
- 26. What is the standard of financial reporting for the scheme? Do you find applicants adhere to this? Is this subject to audit?

Other and impact

- 27. Would you have any alternative suggestions for funding this type of work? i.e., tax relief.
- 28. Do you have a mechanism for the review of procedures in place?
- 29. Do you think that the scheme is achieving its overall objectives?
- 30. Do you think that the scheme contributes to a greater awareness of our architectural heritage?
- 31. Do you think that the scheme contributes to the fostering of specialist skills?
- 32. Do you think that the scheme contributes to sustainable development?
- 33. Any other comments?

Interviewer:

Date:

4. Questionnaire for Grant Scheme Applicants**Questionnaire No.:****Name:****Contact:****Property Address:****Scheme Title:****Agency:****Grant Amount:****Type of Work:**

How did you come to be the owner/guardian of this building (family, job, purchase, personal interest)?

Access/Equality of Opportunity

1. Where did you find out about the scheme? Agency/Internet/Press/Radio/Television/Library
2. Did you find it easy to get information? Did you find printed/Digital (internet)/personal communication useful? Scale 1 – 5?
3. Could the accessibility of information on schemes be more useful? How?
4. How long did it take from your initial enquiry to receipt of the grant application form?
5. How long did it take from the submission of your grant application to advice of the outcome?
6. Did you feel that the process was fair – did you fully understand the assessment criteria? Did you have access to this information?
7. How long did it take from the time you submitted the claim for the grant to the receipt of payment?

Conservation

8. Did you know what was wrong with the building?
9. Did you engage the services of an agent (engineer or architect) to diagnose the cause of the problem? If not, why not?
10. Were you able to find a professional advisor? How did you find them? Was this easy?

11. Was your decision to proceed with conservation works entirely dependent upon receiving grant funding? Would you have gone ahead otherwise? Did the amount offered affect your decision to go ahead with the project?
12. How did the grant amount relate to the overall cost of the project?
13. Did you find that the conditions of the grant (material specification, use of professional advice and specialist contractors) added to the cost of the project work?
14. Did you feel that the grant relieved some of the financial burden of the project on you?
15. How did you match the source of funding? (loan, other grant, other public funding)
16. Did you carry out the work on a phased basis? Of your own choosing (financial reasons), or because of the necessities of the grants available? Did you find planning on a multi-annual basis a help or a hindrance? Did you have an indication that the funding could be secured in this way?
17. Were any of the works self-performed or carried out on a voluntary basis?
18. Was any of the money set off against VAT?
19. Would you have any alternative suggestions for funding this type of work? i.e., tax relief.
20. Did you learn more about your property as a result of the process? Were there any other benefits?
21. Any other comments?

Interviewer:

Date:

5. Grant Scheme Case Study Analysis Sheet

Quanta research no.:

Scheme title:

Grant ref./no.:

Year:

Applicant:

Applicant tel. no.:

Address:

Structure:

Address:

Agent:

Agent Tel. No.:

Type of works:

Total estimate at application stage:

Grant amount requested:

Technical assessment/observations:

Provisional grant amount & date:

Final cost & date submitted:

Final payment & date awarded:

Analysis comment:

6. Case Study Data

No.	Ref.	Scheme	Grant Amount	Type of Structure	Type of Applicant	Type of Works	phased	Other grant
1	1.1	Buildings at Risk	20,000	Castle	Private individual	structural repair	No	No
2	1.2	Buildings at Risk	14,000	Cottage	Community group	roof and windows	No	No
3	1.3	Buildings at Risk	35,000	House	Private individual	roof and bat survey	Yes	No
4	1.4	Buildings at Risk	8,750	Cottage	Private individual	roof repairs	No	No
5	2.1	Civic Structures	30000	Cathedral	Church (Col)	Stone repair	Yes	Yes
6	2.2	Civic Structures	15,310	Church	Parish group	Stone repair	Yes	Yes
7	2.3	Civic Structures	10,000	Mausoleum	local authority	cast-iron repairs	No	Yes
8	2.4	Civic Structures	34,000	Fountain	local authority	cast-iron repairs	No	No
9	2.5	Civic Structures	34,000	Stables	local authority	brick conservation	no	no
10	3.1	Large Scale Properties not in State Care	100,000	House	Group	roof and stone repairs	No	Yes
11	3.2	Large Scale Properties not in State Care	194,657	House	Private individual	glazing and cast iron repair	No	No
12	3.3	Large Scale Properties not in State Care	800,000	House	Private individual	roof repairs	Yes	No

13	3.4	Large Scale Properties not in State Care	100,000	Library	Community group	survey, windows and stone repairs	No	No
14	3.5	Large Scale Properties not in State Care	200,000	House	Community group	general conservation works	No	No
15	4.10	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	11,790	Fowl house and cow shed	Private individual	walls and roof	No	No
16	4.2	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	3,700	Outbuilding	Farmer	new roof	No	No
17	4.3	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	24,014	Agricultural stores	Private individual	re-pointing, door and frames	No	No
18	4.4	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	11,790	Outbuilding	Private individual	walls and roof	No	No
19	4.5	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	20,057 .25	Calf house	Farmer	roof and scaffolding	No	No
20	5.1	Significant Places of Public Worship	200,000	Church	Church (RC)	RWG, roof	Yes	No
21	5.2	Significant Places of Public Worship	9,000	Church	Church (RC)	façade repairs	Yes	Yes
22	5.3	Significant Places of Public Worship	75,000	Cathedral	Church (RC)	general conservation works	Yes	No
23	5.4	Significant Places of Public Worship	12,100	Church	Church (RC)	general conservation works	No	Yes
24	5.5	Significant Places of Public Worship	60,000	Church	Church (RC)	stone repairs	Yes	Yes

25	5.6	Significant Places of Public Worship	70,000	Cathedral	Church (RC)	roof repairs	No	Yes
26	6.1	Thatched Roof	3,859	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
27	6.2	Thatched Roof	3,810	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
28	6.3	Thatched Roof	6,350	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
29	6.4	Thatched Roof		Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
30	6.5	Thatched Roof	3,810	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
31	7.E.1	Local Authority Protected Structures	10,000	Church	Church	roof renewal	No	No
32	7.E.2	Local Authority Protected Structures	10,000	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
33	7.E.3	Local Authority Protected Structures	7,000	Agricultural buildings	Private individual	walls and roof	No	No
34	7.E.4	Local Authority Protected Structures	10,000	Terraced house	Private individual	rendering	No	No
35	7.F.1	Local Authority Protected Structures	4,000	Castle	Private individual	remedial and restoration works	Yes	No.
36	7.F.2	Local Authority Protected Structures	15,000	Farm house	Private individual	windows and doors	Yes	No

37	7.F.3	Local Authority Protected Structures	25,000	Castle	Private individual	stabilisation works	Yes	Yes
38	7.F.4	Local Authority Protected Structures	5,000	Church	Church	re-pointing	No	Yes
39	7.F.5	Local Authority Protected Structures	10,000	Cathedral	Diocese	stone repair	No	No
40	7.G.1	Local Authority Protected Structures	8,000	House	Private individual	window repairs	No	No
41	7.G.2	Local Authority Protected Structures	10,000	Thatched cottage	Private individual	roof renewal	No	No
42	7.G.3	Local Authority Protected Structures	4,000	Church	Church	roof repair	Yes	Yes
43	7.G.4	Local Authority Protected Structures	6,000	Country house	Private individual	hall restoration	Yes	Yes
44	7.G.5	Local Authority Protected Structures	7,500	Church	Church	railing repairs	No	No
45	7.H.1	Local Authority Protected Structures	1,500	Terraced house	Private individual	window replacement	No	No
46	7.H.2	Local Authority Protected Structures	9000	Terraced house	Private individual	window repairs and replacement	No	No
47	7.H.3	Local Authority Protected Structures	8000	Church	Church community group	Stonework repairs	No	No
48	7.H.4	Local Authority Protected	12000	Terraced house	Private	window and door	No	No

		Structures			individual	reinstatement		
49	7.H.5	Local Authority Protected Structures	2500	Suburban house	Community group	Roof repairs	Yes	No
50	7.H.6	Local Authority Protected Structures	4950	Georgian townhouse	Community Co-operative	Window reinstatement	No	No

7. Overall Analysis of all Grant-Aid in the State

Total Grants by Scheme (all numbers in €)

Scheme Number	Scheme Type	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
1	Buildings At Risk	1,804,341	1,737,123	1,091,802	1,221,061	1,200,000	7,054,327	18%	15%	7%	13%	14%	13%
2	Civic Structures	-	1,116,404	2,922,915	1,244,820	1,380,000	6,664,139	0%	9%	19%	14%	16%	12%
3	Large-scale Properties Not in State Care	1,150,875	1,750,000	1,475,000	180,000	250,000	4,805,875	11%	15%	9%	2%	3%	9%
4	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	-	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	0%	8%	6%	11%	12%	7%
5	Significant Places of Worship	-	-	1,835,000	450,000	500,000	2,785,000	0%	0%	12%	5%	6%	5%
6	Thatched Roof	569,647	667,925	807,627	653,165	480,703	3,179,067	6%	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%
7	Local Authority Protected Structures	6,688,996	5,706,000	6,593,569	4,438,000	3,750,000	27,176,565	65%	48%	42%	48%	44%	49%
Total		10,213,859	11,977,452	15,725,913	9,187,046	8,560,703	55,664,973	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Check Total (should be 0)		-	2,195,659	1,737,123	1,091,802	1,221,061	1,854,327						

Number of Grants by Scheme

Scheme Number	Scheme Type	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
1	Buildings At Risk	89	110	98	82	80	459	11%	11%	9%	9%	9%	10%
2	Civic Structures	-	66	121	41	86	314	0%	7%	11%	4%	9%	7%
3	Large-scale Properties Not in State Care	12	5	9	6	3	35	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
4	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	-	50	50	50	50	200	0%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
5	Significant Places of Worship	-	-	16	8	6	30	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
6	Thatched Roof	131	146	183	146	109	715	16%	15%	17%	16%	12%	15%
7	Local Authority Protected Structures	600	600	600	600	600	3,000	72%	61%	56%	64%	64%	63%
Total		832	977	1,077	933	934	4,753	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Check Total (should be 0)		701	710	698	682	680	2,771						

Average Grants by Scheme (all numbers in €)

Scheme Number	Scheme Type	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Average Total
1	Buildings At Risk	20,273	15,792	11,141	14,891	15,000	15,369
2	Civic Structures	-	16,915	24,156	30,361	16,047	21,223
3	Large-scale Properties Not in State Care	95,906	350,000	163,889	30,000	83,333	137,311
4	REPS 4 Traditional Farm Buildings	-	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
5	Significant Places of Worship	-	-	114,688	56,250	83,333	92,833
6	Thatched Roof	4,348	4,575	4,413	4,474	4,410	4,446
7	Local Authority Protected Structures	11,148	9,510	10,989	7,397	6,250	9,059
Total		131,677	416,792	349,276	163,373	228,373	300,241

Carrig Conservation International Ltd, in association with Louise Harrington and Integral Finance and Technology, for the Heritage Council, the Department of the Environment Heritage and Local Government, and the Department of Finance

8. Analysis of the Sample Case Studies of All the Schemes

Summary Sample Information

Scheme No	Scheme Type	Number Of Case	Total Estimate of Work	Total Grant Sought	Total Grant Allocated	Total Actual Cost	Total Grant Paid	Grant Sought as % of Work	Grant Allocated as % of Work	Grant Allocated as % of Grant Sought	Actual Cost as a % of Estimate	Actual Grant as % of Estimate	Actual Grant as % of Actual	Actual Grant % of Sought	Actual Grant % of Allocated
1	Total BAR Sample	4	553,703	57,800	77,750	91,497	77,750	10%	14%	135%	17%	14%	85%	135%	100%
2	Total CS Sample	5	507,664	95,300	123,310	597,664	123,310	19%	24%	129%	118%	24%	21%	129%	100%
3	Total LSHP Sample	5	1,437,000	-	675,000	1,245,805	664,657	0%	47%	0%	87%	46%	53%	0%	98%
4	Total Reps Sample	5	135,349	32,744	76,572	116,779	84,562	24%	57%	234%	86%	62%	72%	258%	110%
5	Total SPPW Sample	5	679,741	486,750	496,600	1,304,717	496,500	72%	73%	102%	192%	73%	38%	102%	100%
6	Total Th Roof Sample	5	67,860	7,000	17,829	86,024	17,829	10%	26%	255%	127%	26%	21%	255%	100%
7	Total LAPS Sample	20	850,395	264,567	144,950	623,602	176,450	31%	17%	55%	73%	21%	28%	67%	122%
Total Sample			4,231,712	944,161	1,612,011	4,066,088	1,641,058	22%	38%	171%	96%	39%	40%	174%	102%