

**ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE**

Date: 16th June 2015

Agenda Item: 13

Contact Officers: Craig Jordan / Maxine Turley

Telephone: 01543 308202; 308206

SUBMISSION BY ECONOMIC GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CABINET MEMBER

TOWNSCAPE HERITAGE (TH) PROGRAMME FOR FAZELEY AND BONEHILL

1. Purpose of Report:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members with a detailed explanation relating to the refusal of the Round One Application for Fazeley and Bonehill Townscape Heritage (TH) programme to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)
- 1.2 To present information relating to subsequent actions in respect of Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area.

2. Summary of Policy Development:

- 2.1 The Fazeley and Bonehill TH programme was included in the Capital Programme approved by Council on 17th February 2014 as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (Revenue and Capital) 2015-18. The project included £34,000 of match funding from the Council that was to be funded from the Historic Buildings Grant.
- 2.2 On the 4th June 2014 support was given by the Economic Growth, Environment & Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee to develop a TH Round One application to the HLF. The application would cover a section of the Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area. Funding would be made available to property owners to undertake the repair, reinstatement and conservation of buildings with architectural and historic interest. On the 15th July 2014 approval to submit the application was given by the Cabinet.
- 2.3 A completed Round One application was submitted to the HLF on the 28th August 2014.
- 2.4 Representatives from the HLF visited the application site on the 20th October 2014. They were given a tour of the Conservation Area, during which they met District and Town Council members. This was followed by a question and answer session. Other stakeholder organisations including Canal and Rivers Trust and Bromford Homes also attended the question and answer session.
- 2.5 On the 30th January 2015 the Heritage Lottery Fund informed the District Council that its Round One Townscape Heritage application for Fazeley and Bonehill had not been successful.
- 2.6 The decision letter acknowledged the heritage importance of the area and the need for the Council to address those buildings considered as being 'at risk' by English Heritage. The HLF however, had concerns relating to deliverability of the project and the level of funding requested given the scale of the buildings and their state of dereliction.

- 2.6.1 A report was presented to this committee on the 12th March 2015 where the members were presented with the aforementioned information. The Committee agreed to receive a further report in due course setting out more detailed feedback from the HLF to enable the direction of future work in Fazeley and Bonehill to be determined.
- 2.7 On the 2nd of April officers from the District Council met with Reyahn King, Head of the West Midlands Region, HLF. At that meeting the detailed feedback on the application was received.
- 2.8 The highly competitive bidding environment and the over subscription of the TH programme was reiterated. It was noted that the HLF during this TH bidding round ear-marked £14 million grant funding nationally; 30 applications were submitted with a total funding request of £39 million. There were three applications from the West Midlands region, only one of which was successful. The successful application related to Dudley Town Centre, and this application was a resubmission.
- 2.9 The highly competitive environment resulted in the Fazeley and Bonehill application being judged at HLF Regional Level as a medium priority and at HLF National Level as low priority.
- 2.10 Information on the other applications presented to the HLF National Board at the same time as the District Council's application for Fazeley and Bonehill can be found in **Appendix A**. The data clearly illustrates the wide range of applications submitted, the broad regional pull the fund has and the high profile nature of those applications which received support from the HLF Board.
- 2.11 As regards the specific Fazeley and Bonehill application, the funding request for the larger and more derelict buildings deemed to be proportionately low by the HLF. It had concerns that at the level requested, a significant positive visual impact to the townscape through the works proposed would not be achieved.
- 2.12 This point was particularly relevant in terms of the large vacant buildings in the TH area most notably Tolson's Mill and the Bonehill Mill complex. Concerns were expressed that the funding level requested would not be sufficient to fully address the issues the buildings were experiencing. There was a risk that partial restoration would not facilitate occupancy or secure the buildings' long term sustainability. **Appendix B** contains photographs of these buildings and serves to illustrate the scale of the buildings in relation to the townscape and the level of dereliction.
- 2.13 The submitted TH application proposed to cap the grant available to Tolson's Mill and the Bonehill Mill complex. This capping would have resulted in funding being focused on the restoration of roofs and guttering and ensure adequate grant remained for the other buildings identified by the application.
- 2.14 The original TH application sought £969,000 of funding from the HLF. Applications under £1,000,000 require 5% match funding. Applications over £1,000,000 require a greater match funding contribution of 10%. Therefore, an increase in the funding request would result in the need for additional match funding being sourced and secured by the District Council and its partners.
- 2.15 At the present time the range of match funding sources above those previously identified available to support a TH application within Fazeley and Bonehill is deemed to be narrow and therefore the task of securing additional match funding unviable.
- 2.16 During the feedback session the HLF also recommended that Tolsons Mill and the Bonehill Mill complex would better fit the criteria of a HLF Heritage Enterprise grant. Heritage Enterprise grants fund repair costs to single buildings to complete works which

are not commercially viable with a view to promoting economic growth and creating jobs. Commercial owners must work with a not-for-profit organisation to secure grants from £100,000 to 5 million.

- 2.17 The removal of these two large buildings complexes from any future TH application would lead to a difficulty in illustrating significant need and would have a negative impact on the applications ability to achieve the monitoring measure, '*vacant floor space brought back into use*', reducing further the viability of the overall TH application.
- 2.18 The HLF recognised the clear historic chronological link between Fazeley and Bonehill, however, they felt that the geographical link between Fazeley and Bonehill was not strong. The historic buildings identified for improvements as part of the application are concentrated within two separate clusters. The HLF felt that the visual impact of the TH project would be dispersed across a wide area leading to the improvements delivering minimal overall visual impact. It should be noted here that TH's are generally focused around market centres or along high streets or secondary historic retail areas. The geographic focus of approved TH is evidenced in the applications outlined in **Appendix A**.
- 2.19 Separating Fazeley and Bonehill into individual geographical areas would result in two small applications that would struggle to deliver significant visual impact on the townscape or generate the community impact also required by the HLF. The ability to achieve prescribed outcomes and outputs is further significantly eroded with the removal of the Tolson's Mill and Bonehill Mill complexes from any future application.
- 2.20 The skills programme in relation to the application was developed in partnership with Bromford Homes and the Canal and Rivers Trust. While this strong partnership was noted by the HLF it was deemed that the proposed skills package did not add enough value to the existing resource within the area.
- 2.21 The delivery stage of the TH application submitted provided the following 61% of match funding, from a range of sources, the largest being from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Although secured match funding is not a requirement of a Round One application, the HLF raised concerns relating to the uncertainty surrounding the LEP funding. At the time of the TH application being assessed by the HLF the LEP funding application had not been selected for funding support.
- 2.22 The TH application proposed to manage the development and delivery of the project through a combination of consultants and existing officer time. This project management arrangement was presented to the HLF to ensure that there was no increase in revenue expenditure to the District Council during the life of the project. Whilst this combination does comply with the HLF guidance it is clear following the feedback session with HLF that they regard the appointment of a dedicated project officer as a key component to the successful delivery of a TH. The HLF's experience suggests that a dedicated officer enables robust relationships with property owners to be developed and that a single contact point ensures continuity for owners/applicants. It should be noted that in some instances it could take the whole life of the TH project (five years) to develop and reach agreement with owners. HLF also feel that a dedicated officer ensures that momentum is maintained between the delivery and development stage of the project.
- 2.23 Feedback was also received in relation to the detailed proposed improvements to the buildings that were located in the TH area. In particular comments focused on the row of Mill Worker Cottages along Main Street in Fazeley. **Appendix C** contains historic and current photographs of these properties. The TH application focused on the removal of satellite disks and the delivery of structural improvements to the chimneys, roofs and guttering.

- 2.24 The HLF would have preferred to see the improvements focusing on the reinstatement of original window configuration which was most likely altered in the early 1960s. The HLF felt that amendments to the window configuration would have resulted in the maximum positive impact on the townscape.
- 2.25 Amendments to window configuration had not been included in the application for a number of reasons. It was felt by officers that reinstating the original window configuration would result most notably in a loss of light for the occupants and that the 1960's amendments were of a uniform style and did therefore not significantly detract from the streetscene. In addition it was felt by officers that it would have been difficult to secure owner support for the window configuration amendments and also that funding, if secured should be focused on improvement to increase the life span of the buildings hence the focus on roof and drainage improvements.
- 2.26 It is clear from the feedback received that the HLF do not see Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area as a potential future TH.**
- 2.27 It is however clearly evident that there remains significant conservation need in Fazeley and Bonehill. There is also strong policy support (Policy Faz1, Local Plan Strategy) for intervention to enhance the physical environment and bring derelict buildings back into re-use within Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill.
- 2.28 In addition there is a small amount of capital funding available from the Historic Buildings Grant Fund which may support a future small grant applications. The HLF, for example, administer an Our Heritage grant programme. The Our Heritage open programme is for any type of project related to national, regional or local heritage in the UK. The grants range from £10,000 up to £1000,000 applications are received at any time and a decision is received within eight weeks.
- 2.29 Whilst we have been unsuccessful and we do not recommend pursuing a re-submission there still remains a large number of listed buildings at risk in Fazeley and Bonehill. As such other funding opportunities will be brought to the attention of relevant property owners and officers will investigate the potential of securing smaller grant funding opportunities to ensure the future of listed buildings within Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area.

3. Community Benefits

- 3.1 Local Ward members and Town Council members have been informed of the detailed reasons for refusal provided by the TH.
- 3.2 Local Ward members and Town Council members have been informed of the recommendations presented by this report.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 That the Committee:
- i) notes the contents of the report.
 - ii) recommends that no further applications are made to the HLF for a TH in Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area.

- iii) recommends that officers approach the land owners of Tolson's Mill and the Bonehill Mill complexes to bring to their attention the wider funding opportunities available to them through the Heritage Lottery Fund.
- iv) recommends that officers provide advice and guidance to those owners if applications to the HLF are taken forward.
- v) recommends that officers investigate further the potential for small historic grant schemes to secure the sustainability of listed buildings within Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation area and that any future applications to those funding sources could be supported by the Historic Buildings Grant Fund.

5. Financial Implications

5.2 The Historic Building Grant fund exists to fulfill the general duties to preserve and enhance as outlined within Section 71 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

5.4 The Historic Building Grant fund of £34,000 will remain available.

6. A Plan for Lichfield District Implications

6.1 The HLF refusal means that currently there is not a capital supported programme to deliver the aspirations within Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (January 2011) and Policies Faz1 and Faz3 in the Local Plan Strategy for Fazeley, Mile Oak & Bonehill.

7. Sustainability and Carbon Reduction Issues

7.1 N/A.

8. Human Rights Issues

8.1 None.

9. Crime and Community Safety Issues

9.1 N/A

10. Risk Management Issues

| (b) Risk | Likelihood/ Impact | Risk Category | Countermeasure | Responsibility |
|---|--------------------|---------------|--|----------------|
| The 6 listed buildings in Fazeley Parish considered 'at risk' will continue to deteriorate. | Medium | Corporate | Seek alternative funding sources for smaller scale projects. Support owners to seek appropriate funding. | Maxine Turley |
| The number of listed buildings 'at risk' in Fazeley Parish will increase. | Medium | Corporate | Seek alternative funding sources for smaller scale projects. Support owners to seek appropriate funding. | Maxine Turley |
| That match funding | Low | Financial | Seek approval to | Maxine Turley |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-----------|---|---------------|
| is not available to support future funding applications. (The capital monies associated with the Historic Building Grant is cut as part of Fit for the Future savings). | | | use these funds to match smaller scale grant applications. | |
| Historic Building Grant is allocation to support conservation intervention in other parts of the District. | Low | Financial | Seek approval to use these funds to match smaller scale grant applications to support Faz1 and Faz 3 Policies in the Local Plan Strategy. | Maxine Turley |
| Partner and Stakeholder support for future LDC intervention cannot be secured. | Low | Strategic | Partners and Stakeholders are kept up to date on the any future project proposals. | Maxine Turley |

Background Documents:

1. Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy
2. The Fazeley and Bonehill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

Important web links

www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/localplan

www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/localplanexamination

http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4058/fazeley_and_bonehill_conservation_area_appraisal_and_management_plan

R. K. King

Report checked and approved:

Strategic/Corporate Director

Appendix A

| | Townscape Heritage Area | Applicant | Decision | Round One Request |
|----|---|--|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Upper Westgate | Wakefield Metropolitan District Council | Rejected | £1,684,800.00 |
| 2 | Cleethorpes Central Seafront | North East Lincolnshire Council | Rejected | £1,205,400.00 |
| 3 | Bridlington Quay | East Riding of Yorkshire Council | Awarded | £981,500.00 |
| 4 | Rotherham Town Centre Phase Two | Rotherham MBC | Rejected | £1,979,800.00 |
| 5 | Wisbech High Street | Fenland District Council | Awarded | £1,995,300.00 |
| 6 | CHOICE - Coalville's Heritage | North West Leicestershire District Council | Rejected | £687,600.00 |
| 7 | Boston | Boston Borough Council | Awarded | £1,069,000.00 |
| 8 | Enhancing Heritage in the Abby and Barking Town | London Borough of Barking and Dagenham | Awarded | £1,380,900.00 |
| 9 | Mitcham Cricket Green | Merton Council | Rejected | £844,000.00 |
| 10 | Northumberland Square | North Tyneside Council | Rejected | £1,023,900.00 |
| 11 | NE1 Bigg Market project - giving the historic heart back to Newcastle | Newcastle NE1 Limited | Awarded | £1,837,900.00 |
| 12 | Skelton Villages Civic Pride Community led THI | Skelton Villages Civic Pride | Awarded | £1,021,400.00 |
| 13 | Gladstone's View | Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council | Awarded | £1,549,900.00 |
| 14 | Regeneration of Liverpool's Chinatown and Ropewalks | Liverpool City Council | Rejected | £1,500,000.00 |
| 15 | Padiham | Burnley Borough Council | Rejected | £1,328,600.00 |
| 16 | Stranraer | Dumfries and Galloway Council | Rejected | £1,844,000.00 |
| 17 | Preserving the unique heritage of the Lerwick lanes Conservation Area | Living Lerwick Ltd | Rejected | £304,900.00 |
| 18 | Govan Cross | Glasgow City Council | Awarded | £1,838,600.00 |
| 19 | Millport Heritage Tourism | North Ayrshire Council | Rejected | £1,385,000.00 |
| 20 | Fraserburgh Town Centre Heritage Regeneration | Aberdeenshire Council | Awarded | £1,844,300.00 |
| 21 | Paisley Town Centre | Renfrewshire Council | Awarded | £1,995,300.00 |
| 22 | Airdrie Town Centre | North Lanarkshire Council | Rejected | £1,615,000.00 |
| 23 | Sheerness | Swale Borough Council | Rejected | £853,400.00 |
| 24 | St Austell | Cornwall Council | Rejected | £935,100.00 |
| 25 | Holyhead Townscape Transformation | Isle of Anglesey County Council | Awarded | £1,589,000.00 |
| 26 | Dolgellau | Snowdonia National Parks Authority | Awarded | £1,026,400.00 |
| 27 | Connecting Commercial Street | Newport City Council | Rejected | £1,983,900.00 |
| 28 | Fazeley and Bonehill | Lichfield District Council | Rejected | £968,900.00 |
| 29 | Transforming Ledbury | Ledbury Places Ltd | Rejected | £1,996,500.00 |
| 30 | Dudley Historic Core | Dudley MBC | Awarded | £1,222,000.00 |

Appendix B

Tolsons Mill



Tolsons Mill



Appendix B

Bonehill Mill Complex: Bonehill House



Bonehill Mill Complex: Old Bonehill Mill



Appendix B

Bonehill Mill Complex: Old Bonehill Mill



Appendix C

Mill Worker Cottages: Current



Mill Works Cottages: Historic



Appendix C

Mill Worker Cottages Current



Mill Worker Cottages 1960's

