
REPORT TO:	DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM: 5
DATE OF MEETING:	29 TH JULY 2003	CATEGORY: DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE	OPEN
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	NEIL BETTERIDGE 01283 595895	DOC:
SUBJECT:	SWADLINCOTE HERITAGE ECONOMIC REGENERATION SCHEME SUB-COMMITTEE	REF:
WARD AFFECTED:	SWADLINCOTE	TERMS OF REFERENCE: DC01

1.0 Recommendation

- 1.1 That the Minutes of the Swadlincote Heritage Economic Regeneration Scheme Sub-Committee held on 31st March 2003 be received.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 To receive the Minutes of the Swadlincote Heritage Economic Regeneration Scheme Sub-Committee held on 31st March 2003, a copy of which is attached at Annexe 'A'.

3.0 Financial Implications

- 3.1 Refer to Minutes.

4.0 Background Papers

- 4.1 Minutes of Meeting.

SWADLINCOTE HERITAGE ECONOMIC REGENERATION
SCHEME SUB-COMMITTEE

31st March 2003

PRESENT:-

District Council Representatives

Labour Group

Councillor Brooks (Chair), Councillor Dunn (Vice-Chair) and
Councillor Mrs. Rose.

Conservative Group

Councillor Hood.

Sharpe's Pottery Heritage and Arts Trust

Mr. J. Oake.

Made in Swadlincote Partnership

Mr. T. Freeman.

SHS/22. **MINUTES**

The Open Minutes of the Meeting held on 22nd January 2003 were taken as read, approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

MATTER DELEGATED TO SUB-COMMITTEE

SHS/23. **GRANT APPLICATIONS**

(a) No. 1 Church Street and Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Hill Street

Further to Minute No. SHS/21 of 22nd January 2003, Members were reminded that Mr. A. W. Fenwick had been offered a grant of up to a maximum of £27,935 (being the balance of the 2002/03 fund). It was also agreed that a further grant of £43,897 be considered in due course, subject to the availability of funds.

English Heritage had now contributed a further £50,000 to the 2003/04 fund and accordingly, it was possible to make a further offer. The two figures outlined above provided a combined figure of £71,832, which was in excess of the limit allowed under European Commission rules on state aid to the private sector. The limit to any one individual was 100,000 euros, which equated to approximately £67,000. An offer could be made to Mr. Fenwick, provided it was subject to non-contravention of any European Commission rules. It was noted that the likely level of grant offer was not excessive in comparison with other HERS grants, as it covered four properties at an average of approximately £18,000 per property.

The eligible works were outlined in the previous report to the Committee. Since then, the four existing sash windows to be overhauled had been closely inspected with the joiner concerned. It had now been ascertained that these were replacements of the originals in poor condition and it had been agreed that they may be replaced. The owner had also requested that six further windows in a rear single-storey range be added to the application. The existing windows in this late 19th century range were all modern and restoration to a historic pattern was both desirable and eligible for grant aid.

The total cost of the eligible work, as reported to the last Meeting was £99,483 (£84,666 + £14,817 VAT and £10,560 architects' fees). Allowing for the first grant offer, eligible costs of £64,564 remained and this figure would be amended, subject to receipt of revised estimates. Of the total eligible costs, £25,848 covered eligible works at 50% and £73,635 related to eligible works at 80%. The additional windows would also be eligible at 80%.

The project would result in authentic architectural details being restored and disfiguring alterations reversed. This would result in a huge improvement to the appearance of the conservation area, particularly at this end of the High Street.

The Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) had now advised that the assistance constituted State aid as defined under Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty of Rome and was being granted as "de minimis" aid under the Commission Regulation EC/69/2001. European Commission rules prohibited any undertaking from receiving more than 100,000 euros "de minimis" aid over a rolling three year period. Any "de minimis" aid granted over the 100,000 euros limit may be subject to repayment with interest. Any applicant receiving any "de minimis" aid over the last three years (from any source) should inform the DTI immediately with details of the dates and amounts of aid received. Furthermore, information on this aid must be supplied to any other public authority or agency asking for information on "de minimis" aid for the next three years.

RESOLVED:-

That, subject to the advice from the Department of Trade and Industry, as outlined above, Mr. A.W. Fenwick be offered a further grant up to a maximum of £43,897 or the maximum figure permitted under European Commission rules, whichever is the less, towards eligible costs of £64,564 for repair and restoration works at No. 1 Church Street and Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Hill Street, as set out in the tender from Harvey and Clark dated 22nd August 2002, subject to the standard conditions and to the following additional conditions:-

- (i) That, prior to the commencement of works, the precise pattern of all replacement joinery, roof hips and all external ironmongery shall be approved by the Council.**
- (ii) That, prior to the commencement of works, a sample panel of pointing and samples of replacement slates and bricks shall be approved by the Council.**
- (iii) That all leadwork shall be detailed and fixed in accordance with the Lead Sheet Association's guidelines.**
- (iv) That external joinery shall be painted to an approved colour scheme before the payment of any grant.**
- (v) That gutters and downpipes shall be painted (black unless otherwise agreed) before fixing.**
- (vi) That precise details of the new signage shall be approved and the signage be installed before the payment of any grant.**

(Note: An offer of £41,025 was subsequently made).

(b) No. 71 High Street

Members were reminded that at the Meeting of the Committee held on 3rd October 2002, a grant of £18,902 had been offered to Mr. T. Freeman for restoration and repairs work to the above property. This work had now been completed and the appearance of the building had been transformed. Unfortunately, the Nationwide sign on the right hand side of the fascia had been installed at a larger size than agreed under the terms and conditions of the previous grant and it was considered to be visually dominant. Discussions were in progress with the Nationwide Building Society regarding remedial works to the sign to resolve the matter.

As the repairs progressed, a variety of additional works were undertaken, all of which were necessary and had contributed to the success of the project. These works concerned an additional cost of the agreed decorative gutter, an additional cost of cleaning following identification of a suitable method to successfully remove paint, the removal of pipework and strengthening of a rotten floor to accommodate the new shop front and the replacement of an area of modern bricks and repointing. The additional costs of these works amounted to £1,304.80 (£1,165 + £139.80 fees). The repointing in the sum of £810 was eligible at 50% and the remainder of the works were eligible at 80%.

RESOLVED:-

- (1) That Mr. T. Freeman be offered a supplementary grant of £932 towards eligible costs of £1,304.80 for additional works to the shop front, guttering and brickwork at No. 71 High Street, as set out in the final account statement from A. F. Simms and Co, subject to the usual conditions, as applicable.***
- (2) That the Nationwide Building Society be requested to replace the existing sign to a sign of smaller agreed dimensions.***

(Mr. T. Freeman declared a prejudicial interest in this application and withdrew from the Meeting during the consideration and determination thereof.)

(c) No. 55 High Street

It was reported that Mr. P. Marston had already received a grant of £3,471 towards the cost of repairs to the shop fronts and rear windows at the above property. This work had all been completed satisfactory and the joinery was now in good repair. At his own expense, the applicant had also replaced his blind and removed an ugly sign, which was to be replaced sensitively with lettering on the glass of the first floor shop front. The appearance of this attractive late 19th/early 20th century brick and slate building had been substantially improved as a result of the works.

This second application related to re-roofing both the front and the rear ranges in slate, reinstating crested ridges on the front section (if appropriate), replacing two lead valleys to the rear, re-pointing the rear and side elevations and replacing existing rainwater gutters in cast iron. The cost of the eligible works, based on the lowest of two estimates, was in the sum of £12,582 exclusive of VAT as this could be reclaimed. It was reported that a third competitive estimate had now been received and the appropriate evaluation would now be necessary in this regard.

The project would result in careful repairs, preventing deterioration to the fabric of the structure. The original roof covering would also be reused and cast iron rainwater goods restored.

RESOLVED:-

That the level of any offer of a further grant to Mr. P. Marston be delegated to the Planning Services Manager in consultation with the Chair of the Sub-Committee following an assessment of the third estimate now received.

(Note: An offer of £5,726 was subsequently made).

SHS/24. **FUTURE OF HERS SCHEME**

The Sub-Committee noted the contents of a letter received from English Heritage and a report would be submitted to the Council's Development Control Committee in due course on the future of the HERS Scheme.

L. J. BROOKS

CHAIR

The Meeting terminated at 3.35 p.m.

