

**Notes of the meeting of the**  
**CORNISH MINING WHS BID PARTNERSHIP**  
**Held on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2002 10.00 – 13.00, County Hall, Truro**

Present: Nicholas Johnson (County Archaeologist, Historic Environment Service, Cornwall County Council)  
WHS Bid Team (Jeanette Ratcliffe, Adam Sharpe, Sharron Schwartz, Ainsley Cocks, Stephen Mills)  
Stephen Gill (West Devon Borough Council)  
John Macadam (Cornwall Rigs Group)  
Max Evans (Goonvean Limited)  
Joff Bullen (Cornish Mining Development Association)  
David Hooley (English Heritage)  
Peter Rose (Historic Environment Service, Cornwall County Council)  
Clive Barton (formerly British Geological Survey)  
Kevin Williams (Baseresult Holdings Limited)  
Allan Reynolds (Baseresult Holdings Limited)  
Andy Wetherelt (Camborne School of Mines)  
Bill Lakin (St. Just Mines Research Group)  
Neil Plummer (Kerrier District Council)  
Mike Clayton (Kerrier District Council)  
Stephen Bott (Kerrier District Council)  
Anne Boosey (Restormel Borough Council)  
John Woodward (Mineral Tramways)  
Mike Hawkey (Environment & Heritage – CCC)  
Steve Crummay (Environmental Programmes – CCC)  
John Flint (CERES)  
Stuart Smith (Trevithick Trust)  
Georgina McLaren (Cornwall Enterprise)  
Deborah Smith (Cornwall Tourist Board/Cornwall Enterprise)  
Dr Keith Russ (Cornish Mining Development Association)  
Mark Kazmarek (Cornwall County Council)  
Nicholas Molyneux (English Heritage)  
Francis Griffith (Devon County Council)  
John C. Goodridge (Morwellham and Tamar Valley Trust)  
Stephen Russell (Tamar Valley AONB)  
Mark Goodman (Tamar Valley AONB)  
Roger Halliday (Duchy of Cornwall)  
David Edmondson (Caradon District Council)  
David Andrew (Devon County Council)  
Keith Menadue (Cornish Institute of Engineers & Trevithick Trust)

W.C.H. Rowe (Cornish Heritage)  
Colin Murley (Cornish Stannary Parliament)  
Tony Rule (Carn Brea Mining Society)  
Terry Tonkin (Cornwall County Council)  
Francis Angwin (Penwith District Council)  
John Bolitho (Gorseth Kernow)  
Barry Kinsman (Federation of Old Cornwall Societies)  
Nigel Johnson (Russell Society)  
Barry Gamble (Freelance consultant – Mineralogy Technical Panel)  
David Howard (St Aubyn Estates)  
John Dobson (South West RDA - standing in for Stephen Bohane)

Apologies

Christopher Young (English Heritage)  
Shelagh Evans (DCMS)  
Susan Denyer (ICOMOS UK)  
Ian Morrison (English Heritage)  
Andrew Davey (National Trust)  
Paul Richards (Cornwall Industrial Archaeology Advisory Group)  
John Berry (Cornwall Enterprise)  
Philip Hosken (Cornwall Means Business Associates)  
Peter Stethridge (Chief Executive, CCC)  
Peter Sainsbury (Environmental Programmes, CCC)  
Vernon Baldry (Trevithick Society)  
Tom Greaves (Independent Consultant, West Devon mining)  
Alasdair Neill (Plymouth Caving Club)  
Paul Gluyas (NFU)  
Paul Richards (Cornwall Industrial Archaeology Advisory Group)  
Colin Brewer (Environment Agency)  
Councillor Maurice Vella (Environment Portfolio Holder, Carrick DC)  
Councillor Gretta Madigan (West Devon BC)  
Alyson Cooper (Carrick DC)  
Prof Atkinson (Camborne School of Mines)  
Carol Wilson (South West RDA)

## Agenda Item

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

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

### 2 **Project Progress Report**

Project Co-ordinator, Jeanette Ratcliffe, reported on the progress made on the Bid since the last Partnership meeting in March 2002 (see printout out of PowerPoint presentation, slides 2- 22).

- Area Panels have been convened & Bid Area boundaries amended (see items 3 & 4 below).
- Feedback on the revised boundaries has been received from ICOMOS UK & English Heritage (see item 5 below).
- The different landscape components making up the Bid Areas have been mapped in the project GIS (electronic map database). The purpose of this mapping is to define the present landscape character of each Bid Area and identify the range and extent of surviving mining components. It will be used to illustrate the nomination documents and is part of the process of determining how each area (and the site as a whole is to be managed).
- For mine sites the Bid areas descriptive records have been created within the CCC SMR (Sites and Monuments Record) database. These records are part of the detailed data backing up the WHS nomination documents. 920 records have been created to date.
- Discussions have been held with English Heritage regarding the review of statutory protection (scheduled monuments and listed buildings) within the WHS Bid Areas, with a view to CCC carrying out this work on a consultancy basis from late summer/early autumn 2002.
- A meeting has been arranged with DEFRA to discuss the potential for targeting Countryside Stewardship grants at Miners Smallholdings within the WHS Bid Areas. Agri-environmental schemes will be the key mechanism for managing this component of the mining landscape.
- Comprehensive (costed and prioritised) lists have been compiled of future HLF/Objective One projects which will deliver key aspects of the WHS Management Plan.
- Meetings have been held with South West RDA, GOSW & HLF regarding the funding of these projects.
- £32 million worth of WHS-related projects have been completed or approved to date; an estimated £40 million of funding is required for currently proposed future projects.
- CCC Environmental Programmes Service are expecting approval for a £4 million WHS-related project in the St Just area within the next month or 6 weeks.

- Applications have recently been submitted for approximately £15 million worth of other WHS-related projects: Mineral Tramways £6.6 million; Minions and Caradon Hill £2.25 million; South East and East Cornwall £3 million; West Devon £3.2 million (which is really part of the same area as the previous scheme). In addition, there is a £2 million scheme being submitted in the next 2 weeks for St Agnes area.
- Approval for most of these projects is expected by October and November 2002, with implementation going on until 2008.
- WHS Economic Impact Assessment: Brief for this is currently being prepared (in conjunction with South West RDA, Cornwall Enterprise & others); the application for additional (RDA/CCC/Objective One) funding for the study is in progress; and information is being gathered from other WH sites.
- The WHS Bid team met Prince Charles at the Royal Cornwall Show & are hoping to have the opportunity give him a presentation on the Bid at Highgrove in the near future.
- A presentation to local authority chief executives is planned for September 2002, with a series of presentations to elected members to follow on from this.
- Elected members trip to Blaenavon WHS – a September/October date for this awaited from John Rodger (Director, Blaenavon Project).
- BBC South West are liaising with the Bid Team regarding a ten minute slot they are doing on the Bid for a new half hour magazine programme (Inside Out) starting in autumn 2002.
- Website – about to be updated and Bid Team need Partnership's agreement to proposed additional information to be posted on the site (see item 7 below)
- The Bid project was inspected by the relevant Objective One officers from GOSW on 12<sup>th</sup> June. It received a clean bill of health in terms of the financial and management systems being applied and the outputs (results) being generated by the project. The only potential area for improvement identified was more regular use of the press (via the Objective One press officer) to advertise progress on the Bid to a wider audience.
- Revision of Bid project timetable. Owing to the amount of time already spent and still to be spent refining the Bid Area boundaries the first drafts of the WHS Nomination Document & Management Plan are unlikely to be completed before the end of October 2002. On the advice of the Officer Working Group the consultation process has been simplified so that the documents go through two rather than three draft stages (but still include full consultation of the Partnership and public). This will shorten the consultation period by five months & allow the project completion date of September 2003 to be met.

**What next?** The project Co-ordinator outlined the key areas of work to be undertaken on the Bid between now and the next Partnership meeting (in early December 2002).

- Continued discussion with Area Panels regarding Bid Area boundaries and the management of the site.
- Drafting of the Nomination Document and Management Plan.

- Initial consultation with the Partnership on these draft documents.

**The meeting thanked Bid team members Sharron Schwartz (Documentary Researcher) & Ainsley Cocks & Steve Mills (Archaeological Mappers), whose work on the project has come to an end.**

### **3 Successful working of Area Panels**

- Nicholas Johnson (County Archaeologist) reminded members of the names and general composition of the seven Area Panels (see attached PowerPoint presentation, slides 23-24).
- He reported that each of the panels had met at least once and that the meetings had been incredibly valuable as forums for discussing how the draft Bid area boundaries should be refined.
- In every case the panels suggested extensions (sometimes very substantial) to the Bid Area, and additional outlying sites had also been identified.

### **4 Area Panel revision of Draft WHS Bid Areas**

Adam Sharpe (Project Manager) used GIS (electronic) mapping to show the following.

- The potential Bid Areas identified in the UK Government's Tentative List of future WH sites (June 1999).
- The various types of archaeological and historical data that have been mapped over the whole of Cornwall and West Devon in order to inform the initial drafting of the Bid Area boundaries.
- The initial boundaries drafted by the WHS Bid Team (March 2002).
- The changes to the boundaries for the different Bid areas suggested by the Area Panels (April-July 2002)

### **5 Reality check on revised boundaries from ICOMOS UK & English Heritage**

ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is the Official advisor to UNESCO on World Heritage Sites, and ICOMOS UK and English Heritage are the joint advisor to DCMS on UK WH sites and nominations.

Nicholas Johnson (County Archaeologist) reported on the response to the revised Bid Area boundaries from Susan Denyer (Secretary, ICOMOS-UK) & Dr Chris Young (Head of World Heritage and International Policy, English Heritage) – see attached PowerPoint presentation, slides 25-27.

- They agree with the Cultural Landscape approach of the Cornish Bid – i.e. one based not just on mine sites but on the full range of components that make up the Cornish mining landscape .
- They think, however, that we need to develop a very persuasive argument for why we are nominating more than one landscape – i.e. we need to make it clear that each of the different landscapes represent different but equally (internationally)

significant aspects of Cornish Mining; and why the boundaries of each landscape have been drawn in the way they have.

- They recommended that boundaries be smoothed – they are too ragged/indented at the moment.
- They advise that we consider incorporating visual parameters into these boundaries and/or using buffer zones to achieve smoother boundaries.
- They strongly recommend that isolated individual sites be excluded from the Bid as these will make it less cohesive and compromise its chances of success. Such sites can be identified in the WHS Management Plan as forming part of the context for the WHS and given statutory protection in recognition of their importance & association with the WHS.
- Having gone through a local consultation process (via the Area Panels) they advise that we now need to draw back and look at how the different Bid areas contribute to the Bid as a whole.
- The relevant text of the Nomination Document (Section 2: Justification for Inscription; & Section 3: Description) now needs to be written as this will involve describing the different Bid areas and stating explicitly how each contributes to the international significance of Cornish Mining, which will serve as an essential reality check in terms of the drawing of the Bid Area boundaries.

## 6 Partnership feedback & discussion

Partnership members asked questions or made statements to which Bid Team members responded. A summary of the key points made is provided below.

- **Query** regarding the use of the term ‘management prescription’ during the Bid Team presentations when WHS status is not a statutory designation in itself.
- **Response:** through the WHS Management Plan we will as a Partnership have to demonstrate to UNESCO how we going to manage the Site over the next 5-10 years. The Plan will contain management objectives and guidelines for the whole site and for the different parts of it and the different types of mining landscape components (and will cross refer to existing relevant plans, e.g. Geevor Conservation Plan, Camborne-Pool-Redruth Urban Framework Plan). We will need to demonstrate that the key organisations responsible for looking after the site have signed up to the approach set out in the WHS Management Plan.
- **Suggestion** that continued survival of extensive underground mining remains could be used to support inclusion within WHS boundary of areas where above-ground features have been removed by modern development (applies particularly in Central Mining District in the Camborne, Pool, Redruth Area).
- **Response:** the advice we have been given is that where significant remains survive amongst modern industrial or urban development that, in the interest of having a sensible boundary, we should include the modern development within the WHS and simply have different management prescriptions for that part of the site (ones that reflect its more dynamic character). Good underground preservation will help support this approach.
- **Query** as to why significant areas of land in the Tregonning and Central Mining

Districts shown on the GIS mapping as historically having being surface mining are not included in the Bid Areas.

- **Response:** mainly because they no longer survive. In the Tregonning area in particular it has been difficult to achieve a cohesive boundary owing to the nature of the mining remains – scattered across a large area, often within a landscape that has otherwise largely remained unchanged since the medieval period.
- **Question** as to why the whole of Cornwall isn't being nominated for WHS status in the light of the reference in the 'European Convention for the Protection of Archaeological Heritage' which refers to the knowledge of the history of Mankind and the collective memory – definitions which refer to the whole of Cornwall.
- **Response:** We have been advised very strongly that the Bid must focus on physical remains – we must confine ourselves to those areas of Cornwall (and West Devon) in which there are maximum physical remains of the subject of the Bid (18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> century hard-rock mining). This is why we have gone through the process of assessing the evidence across the whole of Cornwall & West Devon, in order to hone down to the most significant areas in terms of both historical landscape impact and present survival.
- **Question** as to whether we should advertise in the papers the forthcoming review of statutory protection within the draft WHS Bid Areas, in order to make sure builders don't knock them down. Do we notify the builders and contractors that these are potential WH sites?
- **Response:** the review of scheduled monuments will be carried out as part of an on-going programme of work (e.g. during the last 2 years a large number of prehistoric monuments in Carrick have been reassessed) and doesn't involve notification via the press. The case is different for Conservation Areas – e.g. as a result of the Cornwall Industrial Settlements Initiative, new or extended conservation areas in the St Just area have been approved by Penwith DC and these have been advertised in the Cornishman recently.
- **Statement:** though too difficult to resolve today, we need to clarify the distinction between WHS Areas, buffer zones & isolated sites associated with the WHS, and how we are going to protect sites with no current statutory protection while at the same time ensuring that WHS status doesn't stop regeneration.
- **Response:** This touches on the difficult question of when we use buffer zones and how we define these in relation to the boundaries that we have been looking at today. Buffer zones haven't really been considered fully through the Area Panels yet - that will be the next process. The other thing which Susan Denyer of ICOMOS UK is stressing is the use of visual parameters. It is unclear to us at the moment whether if our bid is a Cultural Landscape one it should have buffer zones, or whether we make sure that the boundary takes in the view shed that protects the context of the World Heritage Site. You can see that if your World Heritage Site is a building like the Taj Mahal, you can then define a clear buffer zone around it as you do with the curtilage around Listed buildings, but when it is a landscape, it is less clear where the boundary ends and the buffer zone starts. Maybe the boundary itself incorporates that buffer zone because it is incorporating the visual parameters that Susan Denyer has highlighted. This will be the subject of an ongoing debate between the Bid team the Partnership, the Area Panels and ICOMOS UK.

- **Question** as to whether the Management Plan will illustrate the need to manage the public's access expectations.
- **Response:** It will not in itself involve an extension of any right of access, but will instead highlight those areas where there is potential for access. This will be based primarily on existing public rights of way and permitted paths – increased access won't be encouraged over the wishes of a large landowner. It will, however, need to anticipate the greater degree of access resulting from the Countryside and Rights of Way Act – e.g. in terms of ensuring that sites likely to be affected (e.g. engine houses on Bodmin Moor) have been made safe.
- **Query** re operation of Technical Panels that have commented on texts relating to the different aspects of Cornish Mining. Have they met as panels or were members consulted individually?
- **Response:** The panels haven't met as panels, but names & postal addresses to which texts have been sent as and when they have been available. Partnership members have been supplied with a list of who is on each panel (those on Nature Conservation and the Mineralogical Panels still to be listed). The texts were sent out at an early stage in the data gathering process and some incredibly constructive comments received back. A very large number of the comments have already been incorporated into the documents, which are not finished texts but working documents that are helping to ensure that the right information is to hand to help in the writing of the Nomination Document, helping to justify the international significance of Cornish Mining. The texts and comments have been kept on file during the last few months, while the focus has been on defining the draft Area boundaries. They are coming back into play now as attention is turning to the drafting of the nomination documents.
- Those texts that are to be included in the Nomination Document will be circulated to Technical Panel members to ensure that we have all of the correct information in there. There are a couple of incidences, however, where members of the Technical Panels have disagreed with each other over facts, and this will require more circulation of documents for discussion.
- **Statement:** Strong recommendation that Technical Panels actually meet in order to discuss and resolve areas where there is disagreement. Not required for panels covering more peripheral/less contentious themes, but necessary for core themes such as mining and engineering history.
- **Response:** Bid team will complete as far as possible the process of editing draft texts, which will highlight those points still requiring discussion. Amended texts will then be re-circulated to the Technical Panels prior to them meeting to resolve the outstanding issues. This process to be completed by the time of the next Partnership meeting (December 2002).
- **Query** whether English Nature have been contacted regarding the review of natural designations pertaining to mineral and geological value within the draft Bid Areas.
- **Response:** Some information has been received from English Nature which is helping us define boundaries related to significant mineralogical and geological sites, in particular, to SSSIs and RIG sites and so on. The recently established

Natural Environment & Mineralogy Technical Panels will assist further with this.

- **Query** whether WHS Management Plan will contain statements relating to the protection & conservation of minerals given the threat from unethical dealers.
- **Response:** The Management Plan will need to cover this issue – perhaps in the same way as Dorset and East Devon WHS have dealt with the issue of fossil collection - by incorporating a code of conduct into the MP.
- **Statement:** Need to make a distinction between unscrupulous collectors and dealers and mining history societies who are interested in the excavation and preservation of mines. Mining history societies are governed by a very strict code of conduct, they should all be members of the National Association of Mines Historical Societies.
- **Query** as to whether project has been using historic British Geological Survey maps. (The BGS also hold a database around their records as well).
- **Response:** This is something that we are currently addressing with the Mineralogical Panel. One of the problems has been lack of funds to purchase the BGS digital mapping which would have been very useful, but that is being currently considered corporately by CCC. The mineralogical and geological aspect of the Bid is absolutely key to it and we want to make sure that statements of that importance are made, and backed up, and that key sites are identified and if possible, included in the Bid Areas.

### **Endorsement of Bid process by the Partnership**

Mike Hawkey (Head of Environment & Heritage, Cornwall County Council) emphasised that the WHS Bid Partnership was made up of a large number of organisations and individuals, and CCC as leader of this Partnership, considered it extremely important that it gets everything right in terms of the Bid - the processes, the consultation, the membership of the Partnership.

Now that we are coming up to a critical point in the Bid process, he felt it would be very useful to get some confirmation from those attending the meeting that they were happy with the way things had proceeded so far. If there was any dissatisfaction, this was the time to make it known. If there are any issues with the operation of the Technical Panels, the Area Panels or the consultations that it was felt needed to be expressed, then please could members do so. Likewise, if there were any additions that the meeting felt ought to be made to the Partnership membership.

At the request of Howard Roberts (Partnership Chairperson, Environment & Heritage Portfolio Holder):

**The meeting endorsed the membership of the Partnership and the way in which the Bid had progressed so far.**

7

### **Any other business**

- Lower Penegon Tramway, Camborne\_(Steve Bott, Chief Planning Officer, Kerrier DC introduced and led the discussion on this item). A tramway embankment which is part of the Dolcoath Mine complex, but not listed or part of a scheduled ancient monument, or within a conservation area, and is within a

site allocated for housing in the District Local Plan, was recently almost totally demolished by the developer in advance of the submission of a planning application. This incident has flagged up the need for 'local lists' of significant sites/features within the Bid areas currently without statutory protection, in order that they can be targeted at an early stage in the review of such protection. English Heritage are currently engaged in discussions with the Bid Team regarding the prioritising of sites during the review of scheduling and the perceived threats to various mine sites is one of the grounds for deciding which sites to bring forward - the Bid Team can pass on to English Heritage information about any known threats. Local authorities should liaise very closely with the Bid Team. Development proceeds all the time; local planning authorities are in close contact with developers, so are aware of sites coming up for planning applications or the subject of discussions for such, and are well placed to assist in the compilation of a list of vulnerable sites. **It was resolved that local authorities (in conjunction with local experts & the Bid Team) produce a list for each of their districts in time for the next Officer Working Group meeting 4<sup>th</sup> October 2002.** It was also noted, however, that no matter what designations exist, by far the best protection is engaging the sympathy and understanding of landowners, occupiers and the general public. Publicity for the World Heritage Site Bid has a major part to play in that.

- Partnership meeting notes & Draft Bid Areas on the web\_(Jeanette Ratcliffe, Project Co-ordinator). **The meeting endorsed the proposal to post Partnership meeting notes & Draft Bid Areas on the project website (cornish-mining.org.uk)** in order to make them accessible to the public, along with other detailed information about the Bid project (eg membership of Area and Technical Panels).
- Partnership to host international Cultural Landscapes seminar. ICOMOS UK have suggested that Cornish Mining WHS Bid Partnership host an international seminar to test the multi-landscaped approach of our Bid and sell the concept to an international audience, including potential evaluators and ICOMOS as a whole. The seminar (in Spring 2003?) could be arranged in conjunction with ICOMOS as a part of the process of developing understanding and acceptance for the concept of Cultural Landscapes. It would ensure that key people involved in advising the World Heritage Site Committee will have been made aware of the nature of our Bid and the justification for our approach before it is evaluated. **The meeting endorsed the idea of the Partnership hosting an international Cultural Landscapes seminar in order to promote our Bid prior to its submission.**

## 8 Date & venue of next meeting

Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2002, 10.00 – 13.00, in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Truro