

Minutes of the World Heritage Site Bid Partnership Meeting 10th November 2000

Devon County Council	Frances Griffith Cllr. Madigan
Cornwall County Council	David Andrew Cllr. Biscoe Jeanette Ratcliffe David Pollard Adam Sharpe Brynn Perry Tapper
AONB Tamar Valley	Neil Burden Tim Selman
West Devon Borough Council Penwith District Council	Cllr. Trembath Steve Edwards
Kerrier District Council	Steve Bott Mike Clayton
Cardon District Council Carrick District Council Restormel Borough Council	Steve Foster Alyson Cooper Malcolm Pinch Cllr. Boosey
North Cornwall District Council	Charlie David Colin Bruce
Dept. of Culture, Media and Sport English Heritage SWRDA National Trust Trevithick Trust Objective 1 Office Trevithick Society Camborne School of Mines Cornish Institute of Engineers	Ian Morrison Carol Wilson Peter Mansfield Stuart Smith Vernon Baldry Professor Keith Atkinson DCS Dixon Keith Withey
Royal Cornwall Museum Cornish Mining Development Ass'n Carn Brea Mining Society Cornwall Ind. Arch. Advisory Group St. Just Mines Research Group	Anna Tyacke Charles Smith Nigel Bartlett P. Richards Geoff Treseder Paul Wiltshire
E. Cornwall Mining History Society Cornwall RIGS Group Russell Society Royal Geological Society of Cornwall Tregothnan Estate FRCA Mineral Tramways	C. Vulliamy John Macadam David Roe Bruce Grant Nick Jeans Peter Bowden Cllr. Kaczmarek

1. Introduction

Cllr. Biscoe explained that this was the first meeting of the Partnership following its inauguration and introduced Jeanette Ratcliffe, CAU, who would be managing the Project and David Andrew, Assistant Environmental Director, Devon County Council.

2. Membership and Respective Roles of the World Heritage Site Bid Partnership and the World Heritage Site Bid Steering Group

Jeanette Ratcliffe raised the topic of the size of the Steering Group, outlining its role and suggesting that 12 to 15 people would probably be an appropriate maximum. It had been originally suggested that each delegate local authority should be represented by one officer and one member, but that this might create too unwieldy a group. The parallel Steering Group for the Cornwall and Scilly Urban Survey Project had been officer based. JR asked for guidance from the Bid Partnership on the make up of the Steering group for the World Heritage Site Bid Project.

In contrast to the Steering Group, the Bid Partnership should be the public face of the project, responsible for its promotion and ensuring the proper representation of all interests during the formulation of the Bid. Its meetings would be linked to Project milestones, would comment on Project outputs. It would be kept abreast of progress and be asked for feedback. It was felt that some organisations were not yet represented in the Partnership. Suggestions were requested.

Cllr. Biscoe suggested that the Partnership should be thought of as a parliament with the Steering Group as a technical executive. David Andrew was asked if he would outline how the bid process had been managed in Dorset and East Devon.

David Andrew explained that the Dorset and East Devon Jurassic Coast Bid was with UNESCO awaiting notification from the Assessor and was likely to be inscribed in December 2001. This was less complex bid, covering the geological/fossil interest in the coastal zone from Swanage to Exmouth and had three components:

- The technical assessment leading to the bid document
- The management plan including the core site and its buffer zone
- Raising community support for the bid.

The process has taken six years to get to this point, two of which had been taken to complete the submission. David Andrew felt that if Cornwall was to complete its bid in just one year it would need a very streamlined and efficient organisation as well as comprehensive representation if it were to be successful. The management plan was certain to require not only technical skills but involvement and support from the Partnership and community and he doubted that the Partnership was sufficiently representative, particularly in relation to landowners and the tourist industry, both of whom would need to be convinced that the end result of the bid process was not going to be a further limitation on their activities. These two groups had been turned into active supporters of the process in the Dorset and East Devon bid by their involvement through the Partnership and suggested that this approach was also adopted in Cornwall.

The Dorset and East Devon bid had been structured as follows:

- A Technical Group (the equivalent of the Cornwall Steering Group) which had consisted of officers. This group reported to elected members.
- A Steering Group (the equivalent of the Cornwall Partnership) which included County Councillors, District Councillors, representatives of geological societies, the Dorset Coastal Forum, the Dorset Geological Association, the British Holiday Parks Association, the Waterside Holiday Group the National Trust, English Nature, the Dept. of Transport and the Regions, the Defence Estates, Countryside Association, Dorset Fossil Collectors, the Clinton Devon Estate and the Lulworth Estate. The end result was a good balance of conservation and commercial interests.

Steve Bott (Kerrier DC) stressed that it was important to allay the fears of the public and developers who were uncertain about the commercial and economic impact of the bid, if successful. Broader community involvement through consultation would be essential, though the period allowed for this (January to March 2002) seemed rather short and late in the bid process.

David Andrew suggested that the technical assessment would need to be undertaken very quickly and asked what was the role of the Steering group in relation to this. It was clear that the Management Plan required a broader forum for debate in order that it could address the many and varied interests in Cornish Mining. He wondered whether either the Partnership or the Steering Group could be streamlined by identifying organisations which could speak for broad ranges of groups, interests and concerns. A Partnership of no more than 20 to 25 persons would be ideal.

Cllr. Biscoe pointed out that, as had been previously stated, the Partnership would probably have to be larger than this, since the bid was county wide and much more complex than that in Dorset and East Devon. A larger number of interests needed to be adequately represented if the bid were to succeed and be supported.

Cllr. Trembath felt that the public at large were still very uncertain about what the bid consisted of and what would result were it successful. Tourism interests should be informed, perhaps through the Tourism Committees of District Councils.

Jeanette Ratcliffe indicated that promotion of the project had been written into its design. This would be by means of a broad range of media including the web, as well as walks, talks and seminars. Promotion would start in February 2001.

David Pollard warned that the funding guarantees were not yet all in place and it was difficult at this stage to talk at length about the scope of the project. Objective 1 funding was being sought to match the joint contributions of Cornwall County Council, the District Councils and other bodies. Jeanette Ratcliffe was currently working out what could be achieved with the available finances. Indications of financial support from funding bodies would be important at this stage.

Cllr. Biscoe informed the Partnership that forms requesting suggestions for membership of the area and technical panels were being circulated.

Jeanette Ratcliffe indicated that the membership and functions of these panels would become clear in early 2001 once the project was up and running. The key thematic areas which would be addressed by the technical panels were outlined in the

papers circulated to the Partnership for this meeting. She was concerned, however, that membership of the panels might imply, for some individuals, a requirement for fees. A contingency for this was being allowed for.

Bruce Grant stressed that geological geomorphological and mineralogical interests must be taken into account.

Stuart Smith suggested that it might not be possible to identify all potential members of the technical and area panels at this stage, but that this might be achieved through circulating the request to appropriate organisations within Cornwall and Devon.

Cllr. Biscoe agreed that this was a good idea, though suggested that a closing date for nominations would be necessary.

Nick Jeans asked how the areas about covered by the area panels would be defined.

Cllr. Biscoe indicated that the Steering Group would come back to the Partnership with information on this following its meeting in mid-December.

Peter Mansfield said that he understood that each of the seven bid areas would have a coordinating panel.

Jeanette Ratcliffe indicated that these initial bid areas were for guidance only, and that the whole of Cornwall and West Devon were being examined. Once this initial data-gathering process had been completed, bid areas would be defined and appropriate Area Panels set up. The Area Panels would chiefly be responsible for input to the Management Plan, whilst the Technical Panels would be asked to contribute to the Bid Document.

Neil Burden indicated that much of this data gathering and coordination had already been done within the Tamar Valley AONB area. What would be the role of the Tamar Valley AONB forum on the Steering Group or within an Area Panel?

Cllr. Biscoe recognised the important role of the Forum as having extensive cross-boundary representation and indicated that there would be synergy between the AONB Forum and the World Heritage Site Bid Partnership.

Cllr. Biscoe again stressed that the role of the Steering Group was to oversee the technical tea and to represent the Bid Partnership. It was important to further consider the makeup of the Steering Group and to decide whether it should consist of members or officers.

Cllr. Madigan felt that it was not essential that members were represented on the Steering Group, although it was vital that they were kept informed of developments by their officer representatives. Cllr. Madigan felt that both the Steering Group and the Partnership should be as small as practicable and that some members of the present Partnership might have more appropriate roles within Area or Technical Panels.

Neil Burden wondered whether the Steering Group representation should consist only of representatives of those organisations who were funding the project.

David Pollard suggested that this would not be possible, since organisations like ICOMOS UK must be involved, but could not fund the project.

David Roe suggested that the fundamental role of the Steering Group required consideration. It was important that it was inclusive and did not solely represent local authority interests.

David Andrew indicated that the equivalent to the Steering Group for the Dorset and East Devon bid had included Professor Brunston to represent academic interests.

Nick Jeans suggested that what was needed was a small group of individuals who were committed to the project, without a preponderance of local authority representation. It was vital that the Steering Group adequately represented the interests of the Partnership.

Cllr. Biscoe suggested that the local authorities would want to be adequately represented; similarly, the Government and its agencies needed to be represented since they would submit the bid. The District Councils would probably want to be on the Steering Group and given the geographical extent of the Project, there would inevitably be a large number of LA representatives, whoever else was within the Group. Given that the Steering Group was to undertake the technical management of the project, it would probably be best that it were made up of offices with appropriate expertise, rather than members.

Nick Jeans replied that there was a need to ensure adequate representation from interest groups. The Steering Group should reflect the makeup of the Partnership.

Cllr. Biscoe suggested that the LA representatives on the Steering Group should be selected to provide a range of skills and represent a range of interests, for example Economic Development, Planning, Conservation.

Frances Griffith felt that the Partnership was a forum for debate whilst the Steering Group's function was to manage the Project. It did not therefore need to be representative, simply efficient.

Nick Jeans reiterated that he felt that the Steering Group had to be representative of the Partnership.

Cllr. Biscoe thanked those who had participated in a useful debate, but felt that it was necessary to pursue this towards a conclusion. Some decisions had to be made and, if required, the composition of the Steering Group could be modified in the future.

Nick Jeans felt that the Partnership was predominantly an organisation of organisations. It already included representatives of three large landowners, but others were not represented. The CLA and the NFU should be asked to participate.

Peter Mansfield suggested that membership of the Steering Group should be more or less as originally suggested and that other organisations or individuals could be co-opted onto the Group as required to ensure adequate representation.

Bruce Grant stressed that it was important that those who were co-opted onto the Steering Group should not be those who might potentially benefit from its decisions.

Mike Clayton felt that it was important that the Partnership members were kept informed of the decisions taken by the Steering Group. Could Partnership members attend Steering Group meetings as observers?

Cllr. Biscoe indicated that minutes of Steering Group meetings would be circulated to the Partnership.

It was suggested that the Steering Group should consist of representatives of those bodies listed in the document circulated at the start of the meeting, that local authorities should be represented by officers with a broad range of skills and that a representative should be identified who could speak for mining: past, present and future.

Cllr. Trembath asked how the local authority representatives should be chosen.

Cllr Biscoe indicated that this was a matter for the local authorities to discuss outside the Partnership.

David Pollard suggested that since cross-district meetings of Conservation Officers, Planning Officers and Economic Development Officers already took place, these would provide appropriate opportunities in to make such decisions.

Mark Kaczmarek suggested that it was important that opportunities for future co-option onto the Steering Group were not ignored.

Cllr. Biscoe agreed that this might be valuable but stressed that continuity would be vital within a Steering Group working to such a tight timetable.

David Andrew underlined the point that the function of the Steering Group was to manage the process and the budget – one important reason why funding bodies had to be represented. Technical input was not relevant to the Steering Group – this was more appropriate to the Partnership and to the Technical and Area Panels. The Steering Group needed management and communication skills.

Cllr. Biscoe felt that a consensus about the make-up of the Steering Group had been reached although the identification of a representative of mining: past, present and future was still outstanding.

Cllr. Trembath suggested that there were plenty of potential representatives for mining heritage, but that what was needed was someone who could represent the interests of future mining.

Mark Kaczmarek suggested that the technologies which would be utilised by future mining operations within Cornwall would be very different from those in the past,

but would be very likely to be associated with Camborne School of Mines. Perhaps CSM could speak for the industry or the Steering Group?

Geoff Treseder felt that it was important that IMERYYS or another active mining concern be represented.

Charles Smith suggested a representative of the Cornish Mining Development Association, the Cornish Chamber of Mines or CSM should be able to represent potential mining interests in Cornwall, stressing that whatever protection for areas or sites came out of the WHS bid, this should be capable of being overturned should active mining be again proposed.

Professor Keith Atkinson indicated that CSM would be pleased to assist with the bid and would be prepared to liaise with CMDA to identify a suitable representative for the mining industry.

Cllr. Biscoe welcomed this offer and suggested its adoption.

David Roe felt that this approach would neglect the interests of mining conservation.

Cllr. Biscoe stressed that CSM and CMDA would have to find an individual who could represent not only future mining but also mining heritage.

Cllr. Biscoe recommended that the CLA and the NFU be asked to join the Partnership, also a representative of the tourist industry, asking the Partnership for advice on a suitable individual.

Peter Mansfield suggested that since both the County Council and the District Councils had an interest in and involvement with the tourist industry, there might be no need for a separate individual. The tourist industry within Cornwall was notoriously fragmented and it might be very difficult to identify someone who could speak for the whole industry.

Cllr. Trembath suggested South-West Tourism, who covered the whole of the Bid area.

David Andrew suggested that it was important to identify a Partnership member who could represent tourism interests given the considerable implications for the tourist industry should the bid succeed. A representative on the Partnership would ensure the engagement of the industry and help to manage future tourist pressures relating to the WHS.

Cllr. Biscoe suggested that the RDA Economy and Tourism Forum might be an appropriate body to approach for a nomination, in recognition of the fact that many of the important economic outputs of the project would be within the field of tourism.

Mark Kaczmarek suggested that Tehidy Minerals (Carnon Enterprises) should be invited to join the partnership, given their extensive interests in mining in the bid area.

Charles Smith suggested that there should be a representative of the Cornish Chamber of Mines and Minerals.

Cllr. Biscoe suggested that if the Chamber of Mines and Minerals could represent active mining organisations on the Partnership, it would probably be appropriate that they were invited to attend.

Neil Burden asked whether the Tamar Valley AONB Forum could be represented on the Partnership, since he was currently only an observer.

Nick Jeans suggested that the China Clay Association might appropriately be represented

Cllr. Biscoe stressed that the Partnership should be as large and representative as possible, and could be expected to evolve throughout the year.

Malcolm Pinch asked whether the china-clay industry would be included within the bid.

Jeanette Ratcliffe indicated that this would not be the case, since the bid was based on metal mining.

Ian Morrison brought to the attention of the Partnership the fact that this had formed the basis of the bid put forward by the Government to UNESCO. It could not be changed without the original bid being withdrawn and a redefined bid passed to the Government for re-submission. This would effectively mean starting again from scratch.

David Andrew asked that Devon Archaeological Society be represented on the Partnership. This was agreed.

Cllr. Biscoe additionally suggested that the Cornwall Association of Parish and Town Councils be represented and asked that any further suggestions were passed to Jeanette Ratcliffe.

3. Objective 1 Bid

David Pollard would be sending formal requests for funding to the District Councils, English Heritage and other funding bodies in the near future.

4. Any Other Business

Mark Kaczmarek raised the point that the bid process, if successful, would have far-reaching effects on the industrial landscape, and might well lead to the creation of new or upgraded trails and paths. This might not be welcomed by local people.

Cllr. Biscoe assured Mr. Kaczmarek that this would be one of the items to be examined in detail by the Technical and Area Panels.

Jeanette Ratcliffe asked that members of the Partnership check and verify their contact names and addresses.

Jeanette Ratcliffe outlined progress on the application process and its funding, and was producing the business plan at present. This was based on Priority 5 – Regional Distinctiveness, especially 5.2: Economic Benefits from the Heritage. A draft document would be passed to the project sponsors by the end of November and would be sent to GOSW for a January decision. If this was accepted, the project would begin in February.

Frances Griffith requested that Devon County Council be sent a letter requesting a funding contribution and suggested that the Steering Group Membership details were circulated to partnership members as soon as possible.

5. Time and Date of Next Meeting

Bruce Grant requested that the views of the constituent members of the Partnership should be canvassed relating to this, since a daytime session did not always suit those who were at work.

The time and date of the next Partnership meeting will be notified to members in the near future, together with the minutes of this meeting.

Adam Sharpe
Cornwall Archaeological Unit
14.11.00