

**Notes of the meeting of the**  
**CORNISH MINING WHS BID PARTNERSHIP**  
**Held on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2003 10.00 – 12.00, County Hall, Truro**

Present: Nicholas Johnson (County Archaeologist, Historic Environment Service, Cornwall County Council)  
WHS Bid Team (Adam Sharpe, Sharron Schwartz, Ainsley Cocks, Bryn Tapper)  
Stephen Gill (West Devon Borough Council)  
Susan Denyer (ICOMOS UK)  
Christopher Young (English Heritage)  
Margaret Garton (West Devon Borough Council)  
Jeremy Clitherow (English Nature)  
Monica Kelly (Environment & Heritage – CCC)  
Kate McCavana (Objective One)  
Sarah Cawrse (NCDC)  
Loveday Jenkin (CSM)  
Howard Roberts (Portfolio Holder, E & H – CCC)  
D.J. Wright (St Just Mines Research Group)  
Colin Brewer (Environment Agency)  
Paul Richards (Cornwall Industrial Archaeology Advisory Group)  
Treve Crago (Institute of Cornish Studies)  
Dr Peter Ealey (Cornwall RIGS Group)  
Steve Edwards (PDC)  
Malcolm Pinch (Restormel Borough Council)  
Neil Burden (Tamar AONB)  
Russell Wheeler (St Aubyn Estate)  
Martin Eddy (Caradon DC)  
Kath Pascoe (Caradon DC)  
Collin Brewer (North Cornwall DC)  
Carol Wilson (South West RDA)  
Stephen Polglaze (Carn Brea Mining Society)  
Alasdair Neill (Plymouth Caving Group)  
Jill Guthrie (English Heritage)  
Oliver Cranfield (Cornwall Enterprise)  
Alyson Cooper (Carrick DC)  
Hugh Rowe (Cornish Stannary Parliament)  
Philip Hoskin (The Trevithick Society)  
David Hooley (English Heritage)  
Peter Rose (Historic Environment Service, Cornwall County Council)  
Kevin Williams (Baseresult Holdings Limited)

Bill Lakin (St. Just Mines Research Group)  
Neil Plummer (Kerrier District Council)  
Mike Clayton (Kerrier District Council)  
Mike Hawkey (Environment & Heritage – CCC)  
Steve Crummay (Environmental Programmes – CCC)  
John Fleet (CERES)  
Dr Keith Russ (Cornish Mining Development Association)  
Mark Kaczmarek (Cornwall County Council)  
Francis Griffith (Devon County Council)  
Keith Menadue (Cornish Institute of Engineers & Trevithick Trust)  
Colin Murley (Cornish Heritage)  
Francis Angwin (Penwith District Council)  
John Bolitho (Gorseth Kernow)  
Nigel Johnson (Russell Society)

#### Apologies

David Andrew (Devon CC)  
Catherine Backway (the Countryside Agency)  
Vernon Baldry (The Trevithick Society)  
Clive Barton (formerly BGS)  
John Berry (Cornwall Enterprise)  
Tim Brooks (Country Land business Association)  
Joff Bullen (Cornish Mining Development Association)  
Barrie Collins (Kerrier DC)  
Andrew Davey (The National Trust)  
Trevor Edwards (Cornwall Wildlife Trust)  
John Goodridge (Moewellham and Tamar Valley Trust)  
Vic Harman (Calstock Local History Advisory Group)  
Barry Kinsman (Federation of Old Cornwall Societies)  
Gretta Madigan (Devon CC)  
Debbie Smith (Cornwall Enterprise)  
G Tonkin (Penwith DC)  
Caroline Vulliamy (East Cornwall Mining History Society)  
Mons Velta (Carrick DC)  
Peter Sainsbury (CCC)  
David Moore (Caradon DC)  
Colin Buck (Cornwall Archaeological Unit)  
Tony Rule (CBM Soc.)  
Jam Clarke (Trevithick Trust)  
Barry Gamble (Freelance Consultant)  
Peter Bowden (Senior Adviser, DEFRA)

Dr. Tom Greaves (Independent Consultant)

Prof. K. Atkinson (CSM)

## **Agenda Item**

### **1 Welcome** by Howard Roberts (Partnership Chairperson)

Councillor Roberts (CCC Environment & Heritage Portfolio Holder) welcomed attendees to the meeting of the Partnership & outlined the focus and format of the meeting.

### **2 Project Progress Report**

#### **Current Situation, Progress on Documents and WHS Office**

Nick Johnson (NDJ): Apologies given (see list). Jeanette Ratcliffe, Project Co-ordinator is off on sick leave for at least two months. Her managers agreed that she needs this time. There are problems arising from this and reorganisation is required. However we must be positive in our re-assessment. Draft of Nomination Document went out when we last met but there is further work to do. We have always understood this. Time was running out and I became more involved in the Nomination Document. Jeanette was to do the Management Plan Document however she went off at the end of February.. We reviewed what we need to do. The burdens for her were too great, with three big projects on top of day job. Consequently she will be leaving the WHS Bid to carry on with her normal day job. The two urban surveys to be taken over by Peter Herring – these are relevant to WHS urban areas. We wish Jeanette a speedy recovery.

On 20<sup>th</sup> Feb we met Dr Chris Young (EH) and Susan Denyer (ICOMOS UK) to review at Nomination Document and Management Plan. The Nomination Document specifies the justification for the Bid, why it has universal significance. We also looked at the boundaries of the site and discussed the Management Plan which will outline how we shall look after the site. The meeting also allowed us to view the site on the ground. It was very clear by then that there was much work to do especially with the Management Plan. We need to talk to local authorities about implications for the site in the planning system and that it is managed to ensure authenticity of the site. We want to make the case for economic and regenerative use as well through heritage-led regeneration projects, and engendering the community spirit etc. We were warned that our site was very complicated as it was a cultural landscape, very different from individual sites. Our remit is far wider, as the impact of industrialisation includes other aspects like transport infrastructure, urban growth etc. We therefore cannot choose one area as it does not tell the whole story. Each area has to be part of the story but must also be able to 'stand alone'. The sum is greater than the individual parts and therefore finding the right and appropriate management solutions has been difficult. Practically we would like to take the Nomination Document and Management Plan to the eight Local Authorities yet this would have involved 16 executive meetings before September which simply is not possible. Therefore we met CCC executive (CCC Chief Executive, Environment & Heritage Portfolio Holder, E&H manager) in consultation with Chris Young and Susan Denyer and decided to postpone the bid for 1 year (a decision that has already been endorsed by the Officer Working Group [OWG]). We were going to go in 2004 however there was no certainty that our bid would have made it as the decision is going to be made this July. We now hope that 2005 is the slot for us in which case we would achieve inscription in 2006. We seek

endorsement now from the WHS Partnership. If so we now have more time to talk and discuss with the partnership and we need to replace key players. The budget will allow for publication (paper but also electronic format eg. CD-R) and the current project timetable. We need to review how to people the project. Documentation was to be carried out by Adam Sharpe, Sharron Schwartz, Steve Mills and Ainsley Cocks – their jobs have now finished. Adam will advise but essentially return to Industrial Heritage projects. Bryn Tapper will continue to have tangential role with GIS. Latest budget in CCC has allocated £88,000 to WHS office (permanently), this shall be used to find a new WHS manager to fill the post as soon as possible. This will shortly be advertised nationally, followed by interviews – we hope to have someone in post by early July. In addition there will be a documentation officer (helping with day to day administration and to contribute towards Nomination Document, Management Plan and Monument Protection Programme. In CCC Environmental Programmes, Jeremy Williams will be assigned to WHS project to identify conservation projects in WHS areas (eg. Mineral tramways, mine sites, access etc). He will document past conservation works and also current work and future work to generate an electronic record/database of conservation works. An enormous amount has already been done. In meantime I shall be managing the WHS, but work is still going on behind the scenes.

Dr Chris Young: DCMS will identify the order for WH nominations for 2005, 2005, 2006 in July because UNESCO WHS committee will be reviewing the way in which countries put nominations forward and how many a country can submit. No more than one per country annually. Annually the number evaluated is limited to 30 nominations. The review in June will be serious as they seek to redress the large number of WHs from western countries. UK has over 20 (in top ten countries globally). The UKs running order will be made at end of July once this debate has been resolved. DCMS will look for three criteria before nominating a site and will be closely advised by ICOMOS and English Heritage. Final decision is the Governments as advised by DCMS. The three criteria as outlined by UNESCO for WH sites are:

- The site has Outstanding Universal Value
- The site has Authenticity and Integrity
- The site has Adequate Legal Protection and Management Arrangements

If these are not in place the nomination will not go forward. Having said this I do not think that delaying the Cornish Mining bid by one year will affect the bid adversely at all, in many ways it will strengthen the bid as the management strategies are identified. As NDJ has already said the bid is very complex and the management requirements will reflect this. The extra year to develop these management arrangements is vital and they must be robust and agreed by all stakeholders. I think that the extra time will make the Nomination Document and Management Plan stronger. In terms of competition for 2005 UK slot I can think of no other nomination that will be as strong as the Cornish Bid for 2005. None are as far advanced as this one and none are as well resourced, in fact this is probably the most thoroughly resourced nomination ever put forward by UK. I am confident that going for the 2005 slot does not adversely affect the bid but positively enhances it.

Susan Denyer: The WHS Convention (drawn up in 1972) has changed considerably over the last 30 years. Initially sites tended to be individual and monumental eg. Tower of London etc. We are far more interested now however in sites that reflect the lives of ordinary people, social and economic history and cultural landscapes. The Cornish

bid is catching the flavour of what UNESCO are currently thinking in terms of WH sites. The Cornish bid demonstrates the links between people and the impact on the landscape yet it has to be reiterated that the management of these cultural landscapes is far more complex than for say an individual sites like the Tower of London. It's not impossible but more complicated. The extra time will be hugely beneficial to the compilation of the Management Plan as the necessary people can be drawn in. The important thing with cultural landscapes is that they are about people and should benefit people. They should also show that cultural heritage can be an important driver for sustainable development. We are talking about living heritage where people live. ICOMOS WH assessors of the site will look for universal significance but will also be looking at how that value is to be sustained, and how management processes achieve this. Cornish site is big, biggest in UK, big on even international scale. A similar sized site in Argentina involved local people and this impressed ICOMOS. The extra time will be a huge bonus.

Howard Roberts (HR): Thankyou for these words of wisdom.

NDJ: Over the last few months we have reviewed the Nomination Document. We have been advised that this must be very tight. On hold for time being but towards end of summer a new draft will appear. Barry Gamble has helped considerably with presentation advice and Sharron Schwartz has helped complete documentation. The Management Plan has not progressed an awful lot since the January meeting of the WH Partnership. In skeletal form at the moment.

Mark Kaczmarek: Before we take a vote on the suggestion for I year extension and WHS Office where is the funding for the WHS Office coming from?

NDJ: Money still in the project and £88,000 per year from CCC. This will pay for the project manager. Jeremy Williams is seconded by CCC. For the next year money is not a problem. In future years, after Inscription there will be a call on other partners for funding.

Frances Griffiths: Devon County Council are also supplying staff time and will in time entertain proposals for financial contribution.

John Bolitho: What effects of the delay will there be on areas that may have developmental pressures on them over the next year?

NDJ: Yes, this is an important point. Development will carry on but we think that the years delay will help us put in place policies and procedures that will benefit future development for the WHS. We feel that like ourselves most Local Authorities are now aware of the major development proposals that are in the pipeline and can be given due attention in reference to the WHS.

Mike Clayton: Canborne/Redruth Urban regeneration proposals. There needs to be a balance between development and WHS. Is the next 12 months going to make a difference? Does it need revisiting? What about Carnmenellis area?

NDJ: We are talking to the Urban Regeneration company for Camborne/Redruth. We've concluded (with ICOMOS and EH) that those areas proposed for re-development that have had an important mining sites but which have been levelled should be left out of the bid. That which is left out will be in buffer zones. We feel that the delay will give us more time to talk to the necessary partners about this area's requirements. Carnmenellis will come up in the next presentation. (see section 5)

Dr Chris Young: Cultural Landscapes in WHS terms should demonstrate the interaction between humanity and the environment. Rather than a monumental sites

and isolated sites. We need to look at the whole for 'Cornish Mining', the holistic interaction. Not as pretty chocolate box!

NDJ: In the urban areas of Camborne and Redruth the over-riding factor in determining the boundaries is the authentic and substantial remains of the built heritage. Planning and management policies will then based on these remains.

Colin Murley: Constitutional question of Duchy and stanneries has not been addressed despite our communication.

NDJ: The bid is based on the TECHNICAL prowess of mining not constitutional nature of the Duchy. Mention will be made to the history of Cornish Mining and the stanneries for which we would welcome your comments. Many of the issues you have raised before have been received and understood in the revised Nomination Document which has yet to be released in updated draft.

***Proposal: Unanimous (with 1 abstention) endorsement of decision to extend the Cornish Mining WHS Bid and the set up of WHS Office and creation of a new WHS Manager post to take the Bid to Inscription and to carry it beyond.***

### **Economic Impact Assessment**

NDJ: Experience from the Jurassic Coast WHS has shown that having EIA strategy before inscription is highly recommended. We shall have 4 documents at end of the bid.

- Nomination Document
- Management Plan
- Economic Impact Assessment
- Marketing & Interpretation Strategy (to be led by M&I Panel)

The EIA document went out to Atlantic Consultants (approved by OWG), under a steering group with Oliver Cranfield. There are two phases for this document. First phase is completed but yet to be approved by the steering group. In may it will be approved for first draft then it will wait whilst a visitor survey (CATER) is carried out between June and October. When results are brought back, by which time boundaries will be complete, the survey will be prepared for dissemination before Christmas.

Another initiative (linked to Objective 1 and regeneration issues) is the Value of Public product, all areas and sites, heritage facilities, records holdings, monuments etc that public have access to. Statistics that are missing include those figures that are part of associated attractions that may have indirect added value to WH bid areas. What is this economic value of these? These are going to be assessed for a report in the Autumn. So three things will affect Phase 2 of the EIA.

- WHS bid area boundaries changes and finalisation
- Full visitor survey will be completed
- Statistics assessing Public Product Value will be drafted

### **3 Marketing & Interpretation Panel**

NDJ: Jan Clarke of the Trevithick Trust is the convener of this panel however she is unable to attend today so I shall summarise the Panel's findings.

- Very much in favour of Marketing & Interpretation Strategy

- Strong recommendation that M&I ought to start now.
- Creation of a niche market ‘industrial landscape/history’ that is firmly embedded in other heritage marketing strategies. Eg. Marketing country houses and gardens, mining settlements as an intrinsic part of the industrial impact in Cornwall. Integration with other sectors that themselves note the relationship with mining. Integration with other Cornish Tourism flagships. Part of a holistic Cornish experience.
- No single dominant WHS centre. Recommend that each area should encourage interpretation at centres within them. Dispersed access to demonstrate variety and nature. WWW also to be utilised.

#### 4 **Name of the site**

NDJ: The WHS team seek endorsement for the name of the site. We propose that the official name be (already endorsed by OWG):

- Official: Cornwall and west Devon Mining Landscape
- Popular: Cornish Mining.

The Jurassic Coast is another example. Its correct title is Dorset & East Devon Coast. Could the partnership endorse this?

Colin Murley: Cornish language recognised by British Government. Propose that name of the Bid be Kernow and west Devon Mining Landscape. We also sent detailed text to WHS Team regarding Constitution but yet to receive response? Why are we dragging our feet on this? Are we ashamed?

HR: Do we have a second for this proposal?

Neil Plummer: I’ll second that.

HR: This amendment has been tabled.

Stephen Gill: Can we have advice from English Heritage and ICOMOS UK?

Chris Young: UNESCO will judge the nomination on the quality of the nomination rather than its name.

John Bolitho: Could I suggest Duchy of Cornwall World Heritage site?

HR: No second for that proposal.

Colin Murley: We have not been notified in advance of this naming decision.

Mark Kaczmarek: The minutes of OWG meeting which the WHS Partnership were sent clearly state in section AOB the proposal of the change. The information is there. We can therefore take the vote today.

?: Is there scope for the Title to be both in English and Cornish on the documents?

NDJ: We had always been intended that this would be the case.

Neil Plummer: Surely this is a compromise that everyone should be able to agree with?

HR: The Title shall include both Cornish and English translations.

NDJ: Most documents in Cornwall dealing with heritage have both in English and Cornish. Bilingual title.

***Proposal: The name of the WHS Bid shall be as proposed by NDJ and shall be translated into both Cornish and English. This was endorsed by Partnership 30 for, O against, 2 abstentions***

5

### **Update on information content, boundaries and buffer zones**

Bryn Tapper gave a brief demonstration on the nature and extent of the information collected by the WHS project during its first year. Recent work has focussed on the qualification of much of the information gathered with detailed site descriptions and recording of physical remains being prioritised. A considerable body of information has been gathered together from a wide variety of sources and organisations. The WHS team use GIS (Geographical Information Systems) and associated electronic databases to manage the data created so far. This archive represents an enhancement of the Historic Environment Records of Cornwall and Devon. A feature of the project in this aspect has been the building of good partnership working and data exchange and we envisage this continuing throughout the lifetime of the Bid process and indeed further. The information will feed directly into the ND and will help considerably in understanding the requirements of the MP.

Adam Sharpe: Our work has involved identifying information to inform the Management Plan eg. Principal ‘gateway’ and exemplar sites within Bid areas, land ownership, current cultural and natural designations and protection. Will help us to identify what management strategies are already in place and how they will fit into the WHS and vice versa in future. Help us to assess programmes and policies that will need to be developed eg. Monument Protection Programme.

Presented the interim report of the changes to WHS Bid areas boundaries and buffers. Long consultation period with Area Panels for each area. We need ABSOLUTE consensus for the boundaries. Remind you that we have to apply these criteria to the boundaries:

- Physical expressions of the statement of significance
- Authenticity (high proportion/density of remains within area)
- Remains and areas have to ‘stand alone’
- No insuperable management problems with regards to areas.
- Robust boundaries (recognisable on the ground and must be adjusted to fit)

The changes since December 2002 include following interim suggestions. They are yet to be fixed and will be suggested to the relevant Area Panels. There is no longer any place for sentimentality and bias towards areas. The areas are going to be rigorously assessed by the WHS inspectors and any that are ‘weak links’ will drag the whole Bid down. We have to adhere to the criteria and these cannot be changed but we have to understand what is the irreducible minimum for an area to be included and successful as world class. The principal suggestions are:

- Camborne/ Redruth have been separated from Gwennap along Lanner Hill. The area from Tuckingmill to Barncoose has been removed back to the railway line at foot of Carn Brea. Not only compromised building development but is an area of re-development that would provoke insuperable management problems. Pool however is maintained.
- Minor changes to St Agnes area, essentially removal of large tracts of farmland to the south of the area. Tighter to the coastal mining remains.

- Carnmenellis and Mary Tavy areas to be removed completely. We do not think they have enough substantial remains and would effectively weaken the Bid. We shall however go back to the Area Panels. Carnmenellis has slight mining remains and the area was only included for its miners smallholdings, which can also be clearly seen elsewhere. There was no unique feature about it. Mary Tavy also falls down in this way. If we were to rank the areas both these areas would fall off the bottom.
- Suggesting Buffer Zones: we anticipate that these areas will provide a buffer for the WHS areas from potentially impinging development immediately outside the areas. Their criteria are yet to be established formally.

Dr. Keith Russ: Date range is stipulated as 1750-1900 yet some sites are outside of this. Eg. Robinson in Pool. Are the dates to be changed or sites to be excluded? Would the best to preserve Cornish mining be its resumption?

Stephen Gill: We must remember that the Bid must be successful Nomination Document. Key advantage of extension to bid is success and time to consult. The Area Panels now need to look at the broader picture of the whole site and its Universal significance.

Loveday Jenkin: How do we manage those sites and areas outside of the Bid areas but which still indicate and demonstrate very important remains?

NDJ: Addressing Dr. Keith Russ firstly. Broadly the contribution to Indust. Rev. is between 1780-19000 but inevitably there will be remains that fall before and after the date range but we feel flexible as these sites are part of a continuity of the mining industry in this area and support the bid. The WHS Bid does not preclude the resumption of mining.

7

## **AOB**

Colin Murley: I would like Criteria 3 and 5 to be discussed for next agenda.

HR: Thankyou everyone for your attendance.

**The date of the next meeting will be forwarded to the WHS Partnership.**