

Notes of the meeting of the
CORNISH MINING WHS BID PARTNERSHIP
Held on Thursday 5th December 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, Stephen Mills)
Ainsley Cocks (CCC Historic Environment Service)
Colin Buck (CCC Historic Environment Service)
Sharron Schwartz (Exeter University)
Jan Wallwork-Wright (Trevithick Trust)
Kate McCavana (Objective One Historic Environment Officer)
Clive Barton (formerly British Geological Survey)
Kevin Williams (Baseresult Holdings Limited)
Allan Reynolds (Baseresult Holdings Limited)
Andy Wetherelt (Camborne School of Mines)
Neil Plummer (Kerrier District Council)
Mike Clayton (Kerrier District Council)
Mike Hawkey (Environment & Heritage – CCC)
Steve Crummay (Environmental Programmes – CCC)
John Fleet (CERES)
Stuart Smith (Consultant to the Trevithick Trust)
Kate Harrington (Cornwall Enterprise)
Dr Keith Russ (Cornish Mining Development Association)
Mark Kaczmarek (Cornwall County Council)
Nicholas Molyneux (English Heritage)
Mark Goodman (Tamar Valley AONB)
Roger Halliday (Duchy of Cornwall)
David Moore (Caradon DC)
David Andrew (Devon CC)
Keith Menadue (Cornish Institute of Engineers & Trevithick Trust)
William Charles Hugh Rowe (Cornish Stannary Parliament)
Colin Murley (Cornish Heritage)
Tony Rule (Carn Brea Mining Society)
Francis Angwin (Penwith DC)
John Bolitho (Gorseth Kernow)
Barry Kinsman (Federation of Old Cornwall Societies)
Barry Gamble (Freelance consultant – Mineralogy Technical Panel)
David Howard (St Aubyn Estates)
Malcolm Pinch (Restormel BC)

Ian Morrison (English Heritage)
Michael Fairhead (Perranzabuloe Parish Council)
Colin Brewer (Environment Agency)
Michael Simpson (Pendeen Community Heritage)
Wayne Kempe (Poldark Mine)
Richard Williams (Poldark Mine)
Peter Ealey (Cornwall RIGS Group)
D J Wright (St Just Mines Research Group)
Barrie Collins (Kerrier DC)
Vic Harmen (Calstock Parish Local History Group)
Ann Pattison (CCC Spatial Planning)
Colin Brewer (North Cornwall DC)
Steve Edwards (Penwith DC)
Tom Greeves (Independent Consultant, West Devon mining)
Loveday Jenkin (Camborne School of Mines)
Peter Bowden (DEFRA, RDS)
Andrew McDouall (English Nature)
Tim Brooks (Country Landowners Association)
Gretta Madigan (Devon CC)
Keith Withey (Conwall Institute of Engineers)
Keith Pascoe (Caradon DC)
Stephen Polglaze (Carn Brea Mining Society)

Apologies

Christopher Young (English Heritage)
Paul McCormack (DCMS)
Susan Denyer (ICOMOS UK)
Andrew Davey (National Trust)
Paul Richards (Cornwall Industrial Archaeology Advisory Group)
John Berry (Cornwall Enterprise)
Peter Sainsbury (Environmental Programmes, CCC)
Vernon Baldry (Trevithick Society)
Paul Richards (Cornwall Industrial Archaeology Advisory Group)
Stephen Bohane (South West RDA)
Joff Bullen (Cornish Mining Development Association)
David Hooley (English Heritage)
Francis Griffith (Devon County Council)
John C. Goodridge (Morwellham and Tamar Valley Trust)
Mark Yeoman (Objective One Programme)
Melissa Ralph (Red River Working Group, Kerrier DC)
Anna Tyacke (Royal Cornwall Museum)

Sara Chambers (Royal Cornwall Museum)

Neil Burden (Tamar Valley AONB)

Lynne Finnerty (Perranzabuloe Parish Council)

Agenda Item

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

Councillor Roberts (CCC Environment & Heritage Portfolio Holder) welcomed attendees to the fifth 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 July 2002 (see printout out of PowerPoint presentation).

- **Nomination Document (see agenda item 4 below).** Working draft circulated to Partnership Members in advance of meeting. Comments on overall scope and content requested by 10th January 2003 – detailed consultation of Partnership to take place following circulation of revised draft in New Year.
- **Management Plan (see agenda item 5 below).** Outline structure circulated to Partnership Members in advance of meeting.
- **Review of scheduling within draft Bid Areas.** Review has commenced, as an Additional Scheduling Project funding by English Heritage and carried out by CCC Historic Environment Service.
- **DCMS visit.** Lead WHS officer within DCMS (Paul McCormack) and DCMS officer within Government Office for the South West visited the WHS Bid project in November to review progress and advise on the formal procedure for consultation of and signing off of the Bid by the Secretary of State.
- **Economic Impact Assessment.** Funding secured for study (CCC, South West RDA, Objective One); Consultants appointed (Atlantic Consultants); Initial Visitor Survey carried out to help assess current mining heritage tourism contribution; Draft Economic Impact Assessment report expected by end January 2003.
- **Visitor Survey results.** Carried out during October 2002; 567 questionnaires completed at 17 key mining & other attractions; 92% awareness of Cornish Mining History; 17- 57% awareness of individual key mining attractions (visited by 6 - 20%); best known mining attractions were Cornish Mines & Engines; Poldark Mine; & Geevor; 18 - 35% awareness of tramway trails (visited by 7 - 9%).
- **Marketing and Interpretation Panel.** Established in order to develop policy and actions for inclusion in the WHS Management Plan; made up of representatives from key operations currently involved in interpreting and marketing mining heritage/the proposed WHS.

- **Consensus already reached by M & I panel:** commission WHS Marketing and Interpretation Strategy (2003); integrated marketing across the WHS (via information panels/WHS handbook/ leaflets/ web); consensus against a single WHS visitor centre; establish instead gateway sites within the different WHS areas – each to interpret: the site, the surrounding WHS area and a key aspect of the overall story; avoid duplication & displacement; establish core values and interpretation themes for the WHS; capitalise on the diversity of the site and story; standardise level of visitor facilities across WHS; staff training to ensure high quality visitor experience & repeat visits; establish common method for gathering & sharing visitor information; market WHS in conjunction with other key Cornish attractions (eg Eden); and linked to other wider initiatives (eg MINET, ERIH, Other UK & industrial WHSs).
- **Project promotion.** Presentation given to HRH the Prince of Wales at Highgrove during October – favourable reception from HRH, together with commitment from Duchy of Cornwall to continue to support the Bid and work in partnership to conserve and interpret mine sites within its holdings. Draft Bid Areas posted on website in August (with accompanying press coverage) – Partnership meeting notes and membership of various WHS Bid panels also posted; presentation given to Cornish Local Authority chief executives in September; presentations to Local Authority elected members (ongoing); project staff have give 49 presentations to date; BBC South West & Carlton TV coverage of Bid – three items since last meeting; Cornish Mining as art – exhibition proposed for Autumn 2005 to celebrate inscription.

3 **Update on boundaries and buffer zones**

Nicholas Johnson (County Archaeologist) showed maps of the 10 WHS Bid areas in order to demonstrate their present boundaries and first thoughts in terms of defining buffer zones (see printout out of PowerPoint presentation).

Field visits are currently being carried out in order verify the authenticity and practicality of the boundaries and firm up the buffer zone proposals.

4 **Nomination Document** (working draft circulated prior to meeting)

Adam Sharpe (Project Manager) talked through Section 2 (Justification for Inscription) and Section 3 (Description) of the document (see printout out of PowerPoint presentation).

It was stressed that the version of the Nomination Document currently in circulation amongst Partnership was a working draft – members have been invited to provide feedback on its overall scope and content by January 10th 2003, particularly in terms of identifying any obvious gaps. Detailed comments on content were not required on this draft.

The document will undergo further revision before being re-circulated to members in the New Year – it is at that stage that detailed comments on its content will be requested.

5 Key Management issues

Project Co-ordinator, Jeanette Ratcliffe, referred the meeting to the Management Plan structure document circulated to Partnership members prior to the meeting and talked through the headings listed under Section 2 (Key Management Issues). The policies and actions included under Section 3 (Management Objectives) will derive out of the issues.

Members have been requested to provide initial feedback (by 10th January 2003) as to whether the headings reflect all the key issues affecting the proposed WHS.

A draft version of the Management Plan will be circulated for comment to the Partnership in the New Year.

6 Partnership feedback & discussion

WHS Bid presentations to Parish Councils

Query (from Neil Plummer, Kerrier DC) as to whether it was possible for more WHS Bid presentations to be given to Parish councils and other interested bodies?

Response. Large number (54) of parishes that lie within the Bid areas makes this difficult to achieve within the Bid project's resources and timetable, but a number of public meetings are being tentatively planned for the consultation phase of the project (March/April 2003) and a presentation(s) to representatives for a group(s) of parishes (along the lines of the Parish Pathways ones of last year) could be considered as part of these.

Proposed Camborne/Redruth WHS Bid Area

Query (from Mike Clayton, Kerrier DC). Is the EIA going to study the impact that WHS status may have on development in the Kerrier area? A balance needs to be achieved in order that potential developers are not put off in the future.

Response. Meetings will be held with local authorities to address and resolve these difficult issues. Other WH Sites, such as Blaenavon, have approached the argument with the view that quality development needs to be attracted and encouraged. During the DCMS visit to the Camborne/Redruth area in November, the point was made that the Pool/Tuckingmill area in particular will require very careful explaining to the UNESCO evaluators in order for it to be considered good enough to be part of the WH Site. A lot of thought needs to be given as to whether this area stays in the proposed WH Site. This needs to be addressed over the coming months.

Comment (from Loveday Jenkin, CSM). It would be very difficult to demonstrate that the area *did not* have a major part to play in the story of Cornish mining. Regardless of the issue of £150m regeneration developments in the area, we need to insist that important historic elements are kept. To assist in this, we need to have a good idea of what exists in the area before development is allowed to take place; a list should be drawn up to this end.

Response. Work has already commenced in the area with the Cornwall Industrial Settlement Initiative and the Cornwall & Scilly Urban Survey. The only areas that are in the frame for possible exclusion from the WHS but inclusion in the buffer zone are the areas of 'crinkly sheds'. There has never any question of the historic parts of Pool and Tuckingmill being left out. It was literally only the central 'cleared' area that is in question. At the moment it's in.

Review of Scheduling

Query (from Tom Greeves, Consultant, West Devon mining) as to whether English Heritage (EH) are planning to expand the listing programme in addition to that proposed for scheduling?

Response. We are discussing this issue with EH but at the moment the resources are only in place for scheduling; something will have to go into the Management Plan in relation to this.

Marketing and Interpretation of the WHS

Comment (from Tom Greeves). Environmentally friendly, quiet, self-exploration tourism needs to be encouraged to protect the sites and the environment.

Response. Agreed.

Comment (by John Fleet, CERES). It would be useful to have a meeting in the New Year re marketing of the WHS and the MINET 2 Project (European Mining Heritage Project), to make sure that we are working together on the planning of both.

Response. Agreed.

Cornish Mining art exhibition (2005)

Query (from John Fleet, CERES) as to whether the John Harris Society been approached – he is sure that they would like to be involved in the exhibition.

Response. Yes, we will ask them.

Stannary Parliament

Comment (from Colin Murley, Cornish Heritage) re concern at the superficial treatment given to the Duchy of Cornwall within the Management Plan, specifically the constitutional position of the Heir to the Throne and the Stannaries and mining. Has the Duchy of Cornwall the power to veto anything that goes into this report?

Response. There's no pressure with regard to the Duchy of Cornwall and we don't think it is relevant to the World Heritage Site Bid to include a discussion on the constitutional position of the Duke of Cornwall and the Duchy of Cornwall. What we do need to do is to explain to people outside of Cornwall the interesting organisational element of the Stannaries with regard to taxing tin and so on, and it would certainly help to explain the cultural element of the Bid. We don't want to get involved in constitutional positions.

Query (from Colin Murley) as to why the constitutional position is being excluded because it is an integral part of the development of Cornish culture and is a very important part of whole mine structure in Cornwall. It seems unbelievable that such an important aspect of Cornwall should be excluded. It's almost as if this is a demonstration of the 'unwritten' Duchy of Cornwall constitution at work.

Response. We will refer to the importance of the Duchy of Cornwall in relation to the Stannaries, but we don't want to put any discussion of the constitution in because there is then a danger that the Government will then pull the document. We want to get World Heritage Site status and we don't want it to fall on the basis of a constitutional argument. We want it to succeed on its historical merits.

Query (from Colin Murley) as to whether the Government have said that they would turn the Bid down?

Response. No they have not.

IT links with Cornish Mining related sites and databases

Comment (by John Bolitho, Gorseth Kernow) re the need to mention in the Management Plan the opportunity using the internet to link the WHS with collections of information on Cornish mining available outside Cornwall, for example that held by the Cornish Association of Victoria in Australia.

Response. We will be dealing with this in two ways. We will partly be looking at international sources of information when we are looking at relevant archives (Cornwall Record Office are carrying out an audit of these). There will also be links via the web site to all relevant sites around the world. The Cornish Mining web site will then act as a portal linking to all the relevant sites in the UK and across the world; this is due to come later in the Bid process.

Management of farmland within the WHS

Comment (from David Howard, St Aubyn Estate) re the importance of reflecting the farming element in the Management Plan. Farmers need to know that what you want from them will be rewarded in order that they can continue to make a living within the WHS. Just using Countryside Stewardship is not necessarily the answer, because to go into Stewardship you have to commit a whole farm which they may not want to do. Maybe they want to use their mine waste [dumps] for one purpose or another.

Response. We will be taking into account the problems of farming and a working landscape in relation to the WHS Bid.

Comment & query (from Tim Brooks, CLA) - The Government's intention is for agri-environment schemes to go for a whole farm approach, so though there have been opportunities for these schemes in the past; they won't be there in the future. There has been a lot of discussion today about designations: listing and scheduling; buffer zones and AONBs etc. These are, from a land management point of view, very negative; they don't enable, they inhibit. There needs to be greater economic incentives for farmers, land managers and rural businesses to keep and retain these features but currently the funding isn't available. Will resources become available as a result of the World Heritage Site Bid?

Response. Such designations do not merely act as constraints; but are also mechanisms for levering funding into the rural and urban historic environment. For example, in the past five years they have brought in £2.6 million worth of heritage grant into Cornish towns (which has levered in approximately £10m of other money). With the enhanced status of AONBs and other rural designations the anticipation is that there will be increased grant aid for regeneration through managed use of the historic environment. In our opinion this is the direction in which agri-environmental schemes are now going, and we will be going with the flow in that respect. These issues need to be addressed Management Plan, which you will have an opportunity to comment on.

Comment (from Mike Hawkey, CCC). The Cornwall AONB Partnership that has just been formed will have a key interest in the World Heritage Site because of the overlapping areas, and it is important that people realise that AONBs can be a positive driver for change and not simply a negative constraint. Restrictions on land use are but one tiny part of AONBs.

Comment (from Steve Polglaze, CBMS). Going back to the issue of Countryside Stewardship grants, I live on a miners' smallholding and I was told that nothing under

40 acres was eligible. As most miners' smallholdings are under that size, someone needs to talk to DEFRA about that.

Response. It's not just the smallholdings within the WHS Bid areas, DEFRA are in discussion with us in relation to providing grants for any farmland within the WHS.

Comment (from Peter Bowden ,DEFRA). The Countryside Stewardship scheme is open to a wide range of landowners, not just farmers. It is decided on a points system that is used to assess the extent of the environmental benefits that will be gained via the scheme. There are no limits in terms of the number of acres or whatever, so an important site with only half an acre could possibly have a Stewardship grant. DEFRA see the scheme as being complimentary to the World Heritage Site Bid and are currently looking at the large area around Camborne and Redruth.

Ongoing management of local authority owned WHS buildings

Comment (from Mike Hawkey, CCC). Following on from the major building consolidation programmes that have been undertaken by local authorities in recent years, long term strategies have to be put in place to maintain the considerable wealth of historic buildings that they now have responsibility for. They will need to show how the sites under their control will be managed to deal with the increased numbers of visitors expected after inscription.

Wider management of the natural quality of the WHS

Comment (from Loveday Jenkin, CSM) re the apparent gap in the Management Plan in respect of the wider land management issue; not the management of the sites themselves but the broader landscape. This would bring in the farming, the management of the ecological landscapes and the AONB management plans. A broader vision of how the landscape will be managed in the buffer zones and outside is required to give an idea of issues which may impinge on the WH sites themselves. Rather than having a sub-section covering 'Ecological Sites', we need to address the landscapes outside of AONBs, SSSIs etc. This would cover issues such as field usage, hedgerows, heathlands etc. and work towards a holistic view of landscapes *and* ecologies.

South Crofty documents

Comment (from Mark Kaczmarek, CCC) re the lack of consultation with the WHS Bid Project and Partnership over the documents thrown out from the South Crofty site in September (at a time when Cornish Mining WHS Bid was quite advanced). No one in this room was contacted about these documents and six months after being inspected by the CRO they were skipped. We need to take steps to ensure that this doesn't happen in the future.

Response. This incident is going to result in a review of the acquisitions and disposal policies of the County Council and we ought to be thinking about that as a whole, for all the Partnership members. It is certainly going to boost the idea that we need to make every effort to keep as many artefacts and records as possible.

Comment (from Mike Hawkey, CCC). The CRO undertook the review of the collection at South Crofty entirely within the acquisitions policy of the County Council. This policy may need to be reviewed and we have already agreed to that but there may be resource implications which also need to be addressed. With reference to the items that went into the skip, the County Council knew nothing about those whatsoever.

Comment (from Stuart Smith, consultant to the Trevithick Trust) re the fact that CCC owns the complete collection of the Geevor archive at Geevor, and that the County Archivist has been over there several times and has agreed that the collection is best kept where it is.

Conifers at United Downs

Query (from Mark Kaczmarek, CCC) re whether the removal of conifers on CCC owned land around the edge of the former mine site at United Downs, which are hiding the mining landscape from view, can be addressed in the Management Plan.

Response. There is nothing of archaeological value at that part of the site apart from the engine pool, as all the other structures had been removed. We will be making comments on the re-use of mining sites in the countryside and this may include the types of native trees that should be planted.

Endorsement of Bid

Motion (proposed by Neil Plummer, KDC). I feel that the Partnership should endorse all the work undertaken by Nick Johnson and his team, the thousands of hours that have gone into this. I strongly urge the Partnership members to reply by the 10th January in time for the next meeting on the 31st January. We should also endorse the unique core values that are contained in this draft document and that this is the recognition of Cornish heritage and Cornish cultural distinctiveness. That really shines through Chairman and I would move that.

The motion was seconded and passed by the Partnership.

Clarification (from Jeanette Ratcliffe, Project Co-ordinator). That detailed comments Nomination Document are not required at this stage, but rather confirmation that Partnership are happy with the broad scope of this document (and the structure of Management Plan). Members will receive a revised version of the Nomination Document for detailed comment in the New Year.

7 Any other business

No other business raised

8 Date & venue of next meeting

Friday 31st January 2003, 10.00 – 13.00, in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Truro