

**Notes of the meeting of the
CORNWALL AND WEST DEVON MINING LANDSCAPE WHS BID
PARTNERSHIP**

Held on Friday 2nd April 2004 10.00 – 13.00, New County Hall, Truro

Present: **Please note: The attendance lists were accidentally removed from the meeting before the WHS team were able to note who had attended.**

Cllr. Helen Richards (Portfolio Holder - Environment and Heritage, CCC & Partnership Chairperson)

Nicholas Johnson (Historic Environment Manager, Historic Environment Service, CCC)

WHS Bid Team (Deborah Boden, Barry Gamble, Simon Thorpe, Bryn Tapper, Ainsley Cocks)

Lesley Garlick – Devon County Council (for David Andrew)

(NB. The
attendee list is
incomplete)

Cllr. Colin Brewer – North Cornwall District Council

Cllr. Neil Plummer – Kerrier District Council

Frances Griffith – Devon County Council

Stephen Gill – West Devon Borough Council

R. Pike – West Devon Borough Council

Philip Hosken – CMB Associates

John Goodridge - Morwelham and Tamar Valley Trust

Joff Bullen – Cornish Mining Development Association

Stephen Bohane - South West RDA

Colin Buck - Cornwall County Council

Colin Murley – Cornish Heritage

Nicholas Molyneux - English Heritage

Dr Chris Young - English Heritage

Cllr. Howard Roberts - Cornwall County Council

David Hooley – English Heritage

Alasdair Neill – Plymouth Caving Group

Bill Lakin - St Just Mines Research Group/Pendeen Community Heritage

B F Angwin – St Just T C

D J Wright – St Just Mines Research Group

D J Stone – Baseresult Holdings Ltd

N Johnson – Russell Society

C R Jewson – Poldark Mine

P Roberts – Plymouth Mineral and Mining

John Fleet – CERES

L Prideaux – CERES

Clive Barton – formerly British Geological Society

Barry Kinsmen – Federation of Old Cornwall Societies

Keith Menadue – Cornish Institute of Engineers and Industrial Trust

Sara Chambers – Royal Cornwall Museum
Tony Sandercock – Kerrier District Council
Malcolm Pinch – Restormel Borough Council
Anne Boosey – Restormel Borough Council
Gretta Madigan – Devon County Council
Alyson Cooper – Carrick District Council
Keith Withey – Cornish Institute of Engineers
Tony Rule – Carn Brea Mining Society
Stephen Polglase – Carn Brea Mining Society
Andy Wetherelt – Camborne School of Mines
Peter Ealey – Cornwall RIGS Group

Apologies

Gus Grand - The Eden Project
David Andrew – Devon County Council
Dr Sharron Schwartz – University of Exeter
Bob Le Marchant – Morwellham and Tamar Valley Trust
Roger Halliday – Duchy of Cornwall
Cllr. Mrs Pascoe – Caradon District Council
Paul Richards
John Berry - Cornwall Enterprise
Prof. Phillip Payton – Institute of Cornish Studies
Peter Stethridge – Chief Executive – CCC
Adam Sharpe – Cornwall County Council
Tom Greeves
Georgina McLaren – Cornwall Enterprise
Paul Walton – Cornwall AONB
Vernon Baldry – The Trevithick Trust
Sarah Manning – Countryside Agency
Dr Kevin Brown – English Heritage
Cllr. Tonkin – Penwith District Council
Andrew Davy – The National Trust
Fred Winslade – Carrick District Council
Steve Edwards – Penwith District Council
Katie Hooper – Penwith District Council
Ann Pattison – Cornwall County Council
Karl Roberts – Carrick District Council
Stuart Smith – Trevithick Trust

Agenda Item

1 **Welcome** by Councillor Helen Richards (Partnership Chairperson)

Cllr Richards welcomed attendees to the meeting, and introduced the Bid team and outlined the focus and format of the meeting.

2 **Apologies** (see above)

3 **Notes of the previous meeting (24.10.03) and matters arising**

Corrections:

- Cllr. Helen Richards' name to be added to the notes as an attendee at the last meeting
- It was agreed that Baseresult Ltd be consulted as to their future plans for the South Crofty site
- The Mary Tavy Bid Area would not have been excluded from the Bid on historical grounds by West Devon Borough Council or Devon County Council

Colin Murley asked that the role of the Stannary Parliament, the Duchy of Cornwall and the Charter of 1337 should be given more weight within the Bid Documents.

Response: The role of the Stannary Parliament is mentioned within the Nomination Document which will be presented to the Partnership for consultation in May. The constitutional role of the Duchy of Cornwall is not necessary for the Bid but that of the Stannaries is important.

These amendments to the previous notes were agreed

Matters arising -Nicholas Johnson (Historic Environment Manager)

- Cornish language experts have been approached as to the most appropriate form of Cornish to use for the Bilingual name for the Bid and three alternatives have been received. The Cornwall County Council Arts Officer, Jennifer Lowe, is to be consulted. The Cornish Language Board and the Institute of Cornish Studies are being considered and the chosen version will be added to the Bid Documents as soon as it is available
- An additional UNESCO selection criterion is to be included within the Nomination Document. This has been done
- The web site is in the process of being updated and is due to be completed shortly. Interactive internet mapping has been included to display the Bid areas and their boundaries, in addition to other information such as nationally designated sites (Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments etc.). Mapping from the Cornwall Industrial Settlements Initiative and the Cornwall and Scilly Urban Survey has also been added in addition to the industrial sites which should be priorities for consolidation. (See <http://www.cornish-mining.org.uk>)
- Revised Bid Areas:
 - Tregonning Mining District - Goldsithney and the Tregurtha Downs engine houses have been added since the last meeting; the southern area

has been removed after further consideration.

- St Agnes – The mining openwork to the east of St Georges Road has been removed in addition to the area of beach to the north.
- The Luxulyan Valley – Austin’s Engine House is to be included due to its historical significance and it is linked to the rest of that Bid area via one of the two former tramway incline planes.
- Following on from the last meeting, advice has been sought regarding the issue of South Crofty and its inclusion/exclusion in relation to the Central Mining Bid area. Dr Chris Young (English Heritage) has been consulted and his view was that it should not be included as it does not meet the criteria of the rest of the World Heritage Site.

Cllr Plummer and other members raised a number of issues regarding South Crofty:

- South Crofty should be included within the Bid, and why has it been excluded?

Response: The majority of the South Crofty site is outside the date range of the Bid and the modern buildings are considered to be not suitable for protection. If the site was specifically in the Bid Area then World Heritage Site status would inevitably mean the need to retain all the mine buildings and structures on site. Our national advisors regard this as impractical. In addition, the proposed new access road for the Pool Area would cut through the site. Again this would involve an unnecessary complication to our Bid and our national advisors advise that our Bid will be weakened if we proceed. This is because in general terms new roads in World Heritage Sites are very controversial (for example the upgrading of the A303 and Stonehenge) and the need to retain the recent mine buildings on site would be an enormous burden on the owners. The regeneration of the area would be complicated by the site’s inclusion and the Camborne, Pool, Redruth Urban Regeneration Company agrees with this. On balance the Bid Team and its national advisors recommend that South Crofty is excluded but that the head gear and the early mine buildings should be retained (this can be achieved without the site being within the World Heritage Site). The Officer Working Group on 11 March 2004 supported the view that it should be excluded.

- Why the boundary had not been drawn up with the Chief Planning Officer of Kerrier District Council in negotiations with Baseresult?

Response: Page 8 of the notes from the last [Partnership] meeting contains the agreed statement of action in relation to South Crofty:

“The Partnership accepts the recommendation of the Area Panels regarding the WHS Bid boundaries, and that the area around South Crofty will be reviewed with District, County and other authorities.”

Simon Thorpe and Deborah Boden of the Bid team met with David Sillifant, Assistant Chief Executive of Kerrier District Council in December and with other authorities (Mineral Planning Authority) consistent with the endorsement given at the Partnership meeting in October. They agreed that the site should be excluded. The headgear could be regarded as an important part of the setting of the World Heritage Site and local planning measures could be employed to protect the setting, and ensure its preservation.

Stephen Gill of West Devon Borough Council commented that in west Devon the planning authority was in part responsible for drawing the Bid boundary around the Mary Tavy mining area which was subsequently dropped after it was considered by

English Heritage and other bodies. It is accepted that the local planning departments should be involved initially, but that advice and comment regarding broader criteria and concerns will have a role. West Devon Borough Council has accepted the advice of national bodies and the decision made to exclude and it he urged that other areas should also take the broader view in the general interest of achieving a successful Bid.

- If South Crofty is included what effect will this have on the Bid timetable?

Response: If it is agreed by the Partnership that South Crofty is included then further advice will have to be sought from English Heritage and ICOMOS UK as to how to proceed when national recommendations differ so markedly from that of local wishes. It will inevitably lead to delays. The team is uncertain whether this would be critical to the Bid.

- What are the implications for future mining?

Response: There is no presumption against mining taking place in the future, if the mine were to be within or without the World Heritage Site

- Can the evidence put to the other bodies involved in this decision be made available to the Partnership?

Response: the information can be sent to the Area Panel after the WHS Team have met Kerrier if this is thought to be helpful.

The motion:

Proposed by Cllr. Neil Plummer (Kerrier District Council) and seconded by Colin Murley (Cornish Heritage)

The [WHS] boundary to include South Crofty will be drawn up by the Chief Planning Officer of Kerrier District Council with Baseresult in consultation with the WHS Office.

The vote: The motion was lost 16 votes to 9.

Cllr Plummer noted however that at the last Camborne–Redruth Area Panel (21.10.2003) it was agreed that the headgear would be included. The WHS team disagreed that this was the case and advised that the notes of that meeting record the following decision:

It was therefore resolved that this issue should be reviewed again. It was agreed that the World Heritage Site Bid team would seek further advice from English Heritage and others in order to resolve this.

It was agreed that the Bid team will meet (before the next Partnership meeting) with Cllr.Plummer, John Pender of Kerrier District Council, and others as appropriate, to discuss South Crofty and the World Heritage Site. Baseresult asked to be consulted.

Statutory Protection of Mine Sites

The ongoing work of the English Heritage Monuments Protection Programme was presented to the Partnership by a series of projected maps.

- Over the last year the English Heritage Monument Protection Programme has been considering further mine sites within the proposed Bid areas to be given statutory protection. Mine sites outside the proposed Bid areas will also be considered for protection in due course.

4 **Project overview and timetable - Deborah Boden (World Heritage Site Bid Project Co-ordinator)**

- A number of key issues have been raised by English Heritage and ICOMOS UK regarding the Bid process and the Bid team have ensured that the local authorities and other relevant bodies have been kept in close consultation as the issues have been addressed. A further Officer Working Group meeting is planned for the 20th April to give consideration to the Nomination and Management documents before the Nomination Document is recommended to the Partnership at the next meeting (28.05.04). It is hoped that at that meeting the Nomination Document will be approved for release to the public for consultation. A further Partnership meeting is proposed for the 26th July to consider the public comments received on the Nomination Document and to approve it for circulation to the local authorities for official approval and signing
- The Management Plan is due to be circulated for public consultation until the end of August when public comments will again be considered and any changes made. The revised document will be presented to the Partnership for agreement at a meeting planned for the 8th October and then circulated to the local authorities for formal endorsement before being submitted to the DCMS by the end of December

5 **Nomination Document - Barry Gamble (Consultant)**

Cllr. Helen Richards (Partnership Chairperson). Much useful guidance has been given by English Heritage, Icomos UK and the Officer Working Group in the preparation of the Nomination Document.

Many individuals have also been consulted during the drafting and the Partnership extends its thanks to Joff Bullen, John Goodridge, Allen Buckley, Phillip Payton, Francis Griffiths, Malcolm Pinch and Nick Molyneux for all their help. Stuart Smith also gave valuable advice on the WHS assessment process.

Barry Gamble deserves special thanks from the Partnership in drafting sections one to three of the Nomination Document and for overseeing the design and production.

Barry Gamble presented a selection of pages from sections of the Nomination Document and highlighted issues concerned with its preparation.

- Thanks were extended to the National Trust, the Royal Cornwall Museum, the Cornwall Centre, the County Records Office and to Joff Bullen for supplying many of the images used in the document
- The editorial subgroup has undertaken a considerable amount of work in order to deliver the document in draft form
- An extra UNESCO criteria was highlighted which is to be used in addition to those which are already in place. The existing criteria being:

Criteria (a) (ii) 'exhibit an important interchange of human values over a span of time, or within a cultural area of the world on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town planning or landscape design'

Criteria (a) (iv) 'be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble in the landscape which

illustrates a significant stage in human history’.

Additional criteria:

Criteria (a) (iii) ‘bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or a civilisation which is living or has disappeared’

- Section 3a covers the ten Bid areas and the reasons for their inclusion are given using data and images
- Section 3b - The history and development of the Nominated site is covered in three sections, pre-history to 1500; 1500 to 1700; and 1700 to 1914
- All Partnership members are to receive a copy of the draft Nomination Document before the next meeting (28.05.04)

6 Management Plan – Simon Thorpe (WHS Planning Advice)

The Management document sets out the vision, aims, issues and proposed strategic policies that have been identified by the Bid team in consultation with the Officer Working Group. The Bid team seek an agreement in principle from the Partnership for the vision, aims and strategic policies contained within the Management Plan.

- The vision and aims have previously been considered by the Officer Working Group and have been amended as a result of their comments
- The vision: ***‘We believe that by protecting, conserving and enhancing the outstanding universal value of the Cornwall and west Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site, it will reinforce cultural distinctiveness and become a significant driver for economic regeneration and social inclusion’***

Members noted that one of the aims should be to address the possible problems associated with the expected increase in the number of visitors to the World Heritage Site. Examples of best practice of visitor management should be made available to assist those areas which presently do not receive large visitor numbers. Also, the words ‘the social welfare/wellbeing of communities’ should be added to the vision statement to address broader concerns beyond those of economic regeneration.

Response: There are policies within the document that refer to ‘sustainable visitor access’ and the Bid team are aware of those issues. It is believed that the words ‘social inclusion’ and ‘economic regeneration’ should adequately address the concerns of local communities.

Mr Murley asked that if one of the aims [of the Partnership] is to promote the use of the World Heritage Site within the National Curriculum how will we include the study of Celtic peoples in historical and modern contexts. Is this issue going to be addressed as part of the Bid management aims, to avoid the charge of discrimination?

Response: The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) provide study units that are suggested schemes of work for use by teachers but do not necessarily reflect local variations. In relation to the study of “Invaders and Settlers”, for example, this does not adequately reflect the history of Cornish communities. The Cornwall Education Authority has been developing a strategy called ‘A sense of place’, which will enable study units relevant to the World Heritage Site - tin mining and Richard Trevithick - to be added to the Cornish curriculum as an alternative to the national schemes of work. The Bid team fully acknowledge the concern and have begun

discussions regarding possible additional World Heritage Site study units for development in the future.

The issue of the Celts is relevant to Cornwall, but should perhaps be considered in a national context. It was noted that in relation to the Mineral Tramways Project, both Will Coleman and the Education Authority were consulted regarding the Sense of Place initiative, and part of the education strategy for the project was to provide funding for the development of the tin mining study unit.

Management Plan section 5.1 - Strategic policies for the management of the World Heritage Site 2004-2009

Policies have been developed for the Management Plan directly from the issues raised and are represented within the Plan in a tabular form of 'issues', 'policies' and 'actions'. Partners made comments on the following:

- Policy 1b – 'The Partnership will monitor the state of the World Heritage Site' - add 'and manage'.
- Policy 3 – 'The risks to the WHS and its management should be regularly assessed and actions taken to control these risks'- substitute 'ameliorate' for 'control'
- Policy 5d – 'There is a presumption against the removal of secondary mine waste within the WHS' - will the presumption be reflected in the local mineral plan? Has work been done by the Bid team towards the preservation of access to underground sites? In relation to mine waste, who will be responsible for granting or denying permission to remove mineral waste from mine spoil tips?

Response: The Bid team are in discussion with the relevant authorities and it is hoped that RIGS [Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites] regulations will be strengthened in the future. Regarding underground access it is a difficult issue for the Bid team but the presumption would be towards the preservation of existing underground access where possible. The Partnership was reminded that the proposed World Heritage Site extends down to the adit level of mines and it is hoped that mining and caving clubs will work with the Bid team towards the aim of preserving underground assets.

Regarding mine waste there is a presumption against removing mine waste within the Management Plan but the removal of mine waste is a permitted development in some cases. Removing permitted development rights may lead to compensation claims which has resource implications that would need to be addressed. Lobbying at Government level is required to remove such permitted development rights without the need for compensation, but a balance needs to be struck between the removal of some tips and the retention of other, more important, spoil heaps.

- Policy 6 – 'Developments outside the WHS which may affect its outstanding universal value will be resisted'- add 'adversely'
- Policy 7a – 'Sustainable heritage-led regeneration should be promoted' - substitute 'appropriate' for 'sustainable' in Policy 7a
- Policy 7d – 'Proposals for the resumption of mining will be supported where they do not adversely affect the outstanding universal value of the WHS' - The county structure plan and the mineral consultation areas already protect the future of mining. Policy 7d needs to be reconsidered with reference to the county structure and mineral consultation plans

Response: The Bid team are already working with the mineral planners on this issue but a statement needs to be made in the document that mining will be supported where it does not affect the outstanding universal value.

- Policy 7e – ‘Landscape, nature conservation and agri-environment management regimes should have regard for the authenticity and values of the WHS’ - Could the term ‘authenticity’ be defined?

Response: The term relates to any development that is out of character with that of the World Heritage Site.

- Policy 8c – ‘Traditional materials and skills should be encouraged in the maintenance of the authentic historic fabric within the WHS’
- Policy 8d – ‘Where the historic fabric within the WHS has been lost or compromised through non-authentic materials, inappropriate details and poor workmanship, historic character and detail will be reintroduced wherever and whenever possible’ - With regard to conservation and authenticity, some thought should be given to exactly what is meant by those terms. Are structures to be re-built in their original form or stabilised as ruins? This issue requires careful consideration

Response: ‘wherever and whenever possible’. We need to assess each case individually and be aware of the ongoing conservation debate.

Policy 9 – ‘Archives, collections and artefacts concerning the WHS should be curated, catalogued and conserved and made accessible to all’ - The term ‘British’ should be used instead of ‘national’ in relation to the curatorial standards covered in section 9.

Response: Work needs to be undertaken by the Bid team and Paul Brough [Cornwall Records Office Manager] to determine which of the many standards used in Britain is most appropriate for the WHS. The wording of Issue 9 will be reconsidered in light of those concerns.

- Policy 10a – ‘The WHS should be interpreted and presented as a distinctive, evolving, living landscape, encouraging visitors to explore and learn about the physical, social and cultural aspects of the Cornwall and west Devon mining heritage’ - the exact meaning of Policy 10a should be carefully worded so as to assuage any fears that the public may have relating to inappropriate access to private property
- Policy 12 – ‘The economic benefits of the WHS within the regional economy should be demonstrable and promoted to support wider cases for heritage-led regeneration and cultural tourism’ - the word ‘sustainable’ be inserted before ‘heritage-led regeneration’
- Policy 14a – ‘Research into Cornish mining and its world-wide linkages should be facilitated and encouraged’ - the words ‘published and disseminated’ be added
- Policy 14b – ‘The Partnership should promote best practice in heritage management, heritage-led regeneration and sustainable remediation of Cornish mining landscapes and communities world-wide’.- Regeneration and remediation achievements within the WHS should be promoted whenever and wherever possible’

The Partnership approved Section 5.1 of the Management Plan subject to the suggested changes being made

Economic Impact Assessment - Deborah Boden (World Heritage Site Bid Project Co-ordinator)

The Economic Impact Assessment was produced last year but was not disseminated due to the new Bid team requiring time to consider the findings in the light of other research work. The EIA addresses three main aims:

- To determine the volume and economic value of heritage tourism and conservation work within Cornwall and west Devon;
- To create a socio-economic profile of each Bid area and to assess its potential for mining heritage related growth
- To predict the impact of WHS inscription on visitor numbers, visitor spend and conservation activity, the resultant employment opportunities

The view of the consultants is that inscription in itself has little impact on economic growth, which is linked more directly to how the inscription is used. An assumed promotional budget figure of £500,000 was used as a basis for the survey which was derived from the projected spending of the businesses consulted in 2003.

The report indicates that not all of the areas are equal in their capacity to absorb increased visitor numbers and this will be reflected in the marketing strategy. Sustainable visitor numbers is an important issue which has been highlighted within the Management Plan.

Stephen Bohane The areas of the Cornwall and west Devon landscape that have been chosen for the Bid appear to coincide with the areas of multiple deprivation which strengthens the regeneration aspects of the Bid. The emphasis on increased job numbers from visitors within the report, however, is not appropriate at a time of full employment. The South West Regional Development Agency and Objective One are now giving more weight to the quality of jobs that are to be created, over the simple numbers. The quality of jobs and skills is important, and links should be made to the Combined University for Cornwall and the academic syllabus, and the proposed Global Centre for Mining Regeneration at Eden.

Mr Murley noted that a reference within the EIA document refers to 'Objective One funding through a three year cultural marketing strategy'. The words 'Cornish Celtic' should be used before the word cultural to acknowledge Cornish distinctiveness, and to keep within the guidelines which led to the granting of Objective One funding.

Response: The report referred to in the assessment is to be produced by Cornwall Arts Marketing and this comment will be passed to the relevant people.

It was noted that on page one of the document a reference is made to 'consultation with a wide range of organisations' which are listed and all appear to be related to local government. Has the Bid team consulted private businesses in addition?

Response: The document lists the organisations that comprised the steering group and not those involved in the wider consultation process. Businesses such as Poldark Mine and other attractions were approached during the process.

It was commented that perhaps greater weight could be given in the Bid documentation to the improvements expected in the way that people live and work in the area as a result of the WHS. There are other ways of using the historic environment in promoting economic good than just through visitors. Also, other WHS have been focusing on ways to increase the value of tourism and not just the

number of tourists.

It was noted that within the document reference is made to a figure of £500,000. Where did that figure come from? Are there any new funds available for marketing the WHS?

Response: The figure originated from discussions with tourist operators and their expected marketing budgets all added together that could relate to the WHS over a 3 year period.. Further information will be sought from the consultants regarding this figure. The emphasis of the work of the Cornwall Tourist Board is to maximise the economic benefit to the county and to local residents, and not to just increase visitor numbers.

Last year the County Council made £88,000 available to fund the WHS Office beyond the project funds and this year a further £100,000 has been added. Some of that funding will be available for marketing purposes.

The Partnership agreed that quality of life information should be considered in future EIA related studies

8 Marketing Strategy - Deborah Boden (World Heritage Site Bid Project Co-ordinator) (see Draft Outline Marketing Strategy)

Producing a marketing strategy has been highlighted by English Heritage and ICOMOS UK as being important to the Management Plan of the WHS. With ten separate Bid areas within the proposed WHS, the strategy has to be flexible to cope with a variety of different sites and still be consistent across the whole Bid area. An overarching strategy that addressed the high level aims, principles and strategic objectives was thought to be the best way to progress this issue. The strategy could also be used at a lower level in local marketing plans.

The four key issues arising from the executive summary:

- The proposed marketing aims and principles
- Definition of target audiences
- Strategic marketing objectives 2004-2009
- Suggested WHS Partnership roles

It was noted that ‘The Cornwall and west Devon Mining product’ is an unfortunate phrase and should not be used within the report as it diminishes the value of the Cornish heritage, which is the Bid’s strongest asset.

Response: The precise branding of the WHS will be considered as the strategy is brought to completion.

The strong Cornish image is considered to be very important to the marketing of the WHS.

The Partnership endorsed section 3 of the marketing strategy

The four marketing aims proposed:

- To increasing intellectual and sustainable physical access to mining heritage
- To promote social and cultural aspects of mining heritage
- To ensure a co-ordinated approach to interpretation [to achieve consistency]

- The enhance the experience and realise the appeal of the Cornish mining heritage

The consultants found that there was a relatively low level of awareness of Cornish mining heritage which is thought to be due to the generally low level of marketing spend at present. Of the 40 organisations consulted, the average spend was £15,000 pa, but the majority spent considerably less than that figure. Raising the awareness of mining heritage is made more difficult when the marketing budget is strictly limited. The primary aim of the partnership and the WHS Bid Office should be to support the marketing strategies of operators and to co-ordinate campaigns wherever possible.

- Encouraging the sustainable development of tourism [certain areas will be more appropriate for increased visitor numbers than others and will be marketed accordingly]
- To seek increased economic benefit from visitors but not necessarily increase numbers [by re-profiling the visitors to the WHS and adjusting the visiting patterns]
- To create a marketing strategy that is flexible and usable by all
- To ensure equality of access [regardless of income or physical ability]
- To preserve authenticity and distinctiveness [the need to increase visitor numbers in some areas should be balanced against the need to retain authenticity]

It was noted that many visitors to Cornwall wish to collect mineral specimens and are not specifically interested in the industrial archaeology that is often present at the sites.

Response: This issue is to be addressed in the Management Plan and one way of doing so would be to adopt the guidelines of an organisation like the Russell Society.

It was noted that care should be taken within the marketing strategy so as not to have contradictory aims. Increasing social inclusion by widening the appeal of sites and at the same time re-profiling visitors to be higher spending may be difficult to achieve.

Response: At the same time as focusing on higher spending tourists the marketing strategy should produce community level activities that everyone can participate in.

It was noted that the profile of the WHS needs to be raised significantly by the marketing strategy. As an example, the Cornwall Tourism Forum gave little coverage to the Bid in a recent draft strategy and much more work needs to be done.

Response: For the record, the Cornwall Tourism Business Plan is out for consultation at the moment and the Cornwall Tourism Strategy is strongly supportive of the WHS. The Cornwall Tourism Forum marketing sub-group has also taken on board the issues of social inclusion and value added tourism, and has commissioned a study on that subject. The Cornwall Tourist Board part funded the WHS study but the comment will be passed on.

It was noted that many of the sites within the WHS are important for their biodiversity and altering the carrying capacity of such sites may impact on that in addition to the historical elements. The County Council Natural Environment Service and the WHS team should be liaising on this issue.

Response: agreed

It was suggested that as a general point, the Bid team should look at other existing WHS such as Hadrian's Wall and the Jurassic Coast which have similar dispersed visitor attractions and facilities. Much work has been done by those sites to address

the problems associated with the promotion of individual attractions whilst maintaining the overall standards of the WHS.

Response: The Bid team will be approaching those organisations with regard to implementing the strategic objectives of the marketing plan. The tourism company that produced this report have worked on four other WHS, one of which was Jurassic Coast.

It was noted that the Blaenavon WHS in Wales may be a more suitable comparison with that of Cornwall as it is an industrial landscape.

Response: Contact has been made between the site co-ordinator of Blaenavon and the Bid team and further liaison is due to take place.

It was suggested that the project co-ordinator should consider incorporating sustainable geological tourism into the marketing strategy.

Response: This will be considered.

The aims and principles of the marketing strategy were endorsed by the Partnership subject to the natural environment and geological issues being addressed

Definition of target audiences (section 4)

The target audiences for the marketing strategy should be firstly, the assessment body, secondly the funding agencies (Government Office South West and Objective One) and the thirdly, the people of Cornwall and Devon. Is this approach the right one?

Response: The funding bodies were not included within the scope of the marketing strategy. The list included in the document requires further work and current resources limit what can be achieved by the Partnership in the short term. Priority audiences should be the local communities, education, and heritage tourists which are already being targeted by campaigns that the WHS can participate in. A separate plan needs to be developed for the assessors. The brief for the marketing strategy was to identify the high level aims and principles that needed to be incorporated into the management plan which will be then be presented to the assessors.

- **Statement:** [Re. European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages - Strasbourg, 5.XI.1992 and related documents] A European Parliament committee of experts visiting the UK pointed out that ‘...plans to create regional authorities in England whereby the county of Cornwall would be included within a region with six other counties, could have serious affects on the situation of the Cornish language in Cornwall unless appropriate measures are taken’. Could this be noted by the Partnership as the UK Government have ratified this treaty [noted]

Strategic approach and strategic objectives

Interpretation

A network of local interpretation centres is recommended by the marketing strategy consultants as a means by which the 40 plus organisations could be brought together. The full document indicates that an interpretation framework is required which identifies the interpretation strategy for the WHS overall and from which local strategies could be developed. Intellectual gateways should also be developed where the whole story of Cornish mining heritage is covered, and the specific aspect of it that relates to that Bid area. Geevor is recommended for the west, Morwellham Quay for the east, and a third will be required for mid Cornwall which has yet to be identified.

- **Statement:** The interpretation centre for the east of the area should be Tavistock as it is the main centre of population. The nature of the historic market town and its location makes it ideally suited for this role.
- **Response:** Morwellham has an unrivalled collection of mining related remains, a quay and restored ship, and a mine which can be visited with an underground tour. The site has an award winning educational programme, has attracted 2.5 million visitors over the past thirty years and is able to convey the mining story in a dramatic way
- **Response:** That is not disputed but the visitor would have a better experience if directed to the centre [of population] first
- **Response:** Currently the gateways are planned to be existing attractions but directing visitors initially to places where they can stay and visit other sites/attractions is to be considered as part of the wider interpretation framework.
- **Response:** The principle of the intellectual gateway is that the visitor has the Cornish mining story explained to them first and is then directed to other specific sites in order to experience it. The concept of ‘orientation gateway’ is currently missing from the debate and could possibly be located at motorway service areas to inform travellers that Cornish mining exists and is worth seeing
- **Response:** Morwellham Quay and Geevor currently meet the existing criteria for gateways as used by the marketing consultants, but other ways of disseminating information should also be considered for awareness raising purposes

The strategic marketing approach and objectives were endorsed by the Partnership

(proposed by Nick Molyneux and seconded by Bill Lakin)

9 Public Consultation - Deborah Boden (World Heritage Site Bid Project Co-ordinator)

The Nomination Document and Management Plan in their draft forms are nearly ready for public consultation and it is planned to do this by depositing copies in public libraries and by posting the text on the internet via the Cornish Mining web site. Copies will also be sent to parish councils with a questionnaire to seek their views. The Cornwall County Council Peoples Panel [600 members] is also being considered as a means of distributing information concerning the Management Plan. A community workshop is a possibility for West Devon Borough Council where the Bid documents could be explained to the public. Focus groups including specialists in education and planning are also being considered to seek their views.

Statement: The dropping of buffer zones around the Bid areas is welcomed but in relation to the setting of the WHS, it would be beneficial to consult those in the areas immediately around the proposed Bid sites in any discussions.

Statement: It would be helpful if some publicity information was sent to the National Association of Mining History Organisations [NAMHO] which is a well established and respected body.

10 Any Other Business

Question: As the Cornish flag is said to have been based on the appearance of tin set against black ashes, could we have the flag on the Bid Documents?

Response: We have the bi-lingual title on the Nomination Document but the Bid team decided not to press the Cornish flag on the Devon contingent of the Bid.

11

Date of next meeting

Friday 28th May 2004 – Council Chamber, New County Hall

End of meeting