

**Notes of the Cornish Mining World Heritage Site Bid Officer Working Group  
10.30 am 27<sup>th</sup> November 2003, The Count House, Botallack**

**Present:**

Nick Molyneux	- English Heritage (Chairman for the meeting)
Malcolm Pinch	- Restormel Borough Council
Frances Griffiths	- Devon County Council
Jeremy Williams	- Cornwall County Council
Katie Hooper	- Penwith District Council
Alyson Cooper	- Carrick District Council
Andrew Richards	- Kerrier District Council
Mike Hawkey	- Cornwall County Council
Barry Gamble	- Consultant on WHS Project Team
Sarah Cawse	- North Cornwall District Council
Deborah Boden	- Cornwall County Council
Simon Thorpe	- Cornwall County Council

**1. Apologies:**

Christopher Young	- English Heritage
Nick Johnson	- Cornwall County Council
Dave Andrews	- Devon County Council
Shelagh Evans	- DCMS
Martin Eddy	- Caradon District Council
David Moore	- Caradon District Council
Andrew Davey	- National Trust
Susan Denyer	- ICOMOS
Philip Payton	- Institute of Cornish Studies
Stephen Gill	- West Devon District Council
Nils White	- West Devon District Council
Andrew Wetherelt	- Camborne School Of Mines
Tim Selman	- Tamar Valley AONB
Mark Goodman	- Tamar Valley AONB
Carol Wilson	- South West Regional Development Agency

**2. Matters arising from notes of the last meeting and the Partnership meeting of 24 October 2003 (not dealt with on agenda).**

Economic Impact study – DB reported that the results of the visitor survey conducted April to end October 2003 will be delivered on 3<sup>rd</sup> December. Implications for the Economic Impact Assessment report can then be assessed, prior to circulation.

Key WHS projects – Jeremy Williams queried the notes of last meeting regarding whether the priority list that was discussed at the last meeting was formally approved, as the notes did not record this. The OWG members present at the last meeting agreed that it was their opinion that the list had received their approval. The Chairman put the recommendation that the list of the top ten priority WHS proposed projects prepared by English Heritage and the Objective One Historic Environment Officer at the request of HLF, GOSW and SWRDA be endorsed by the Officer Working Group. This was agreed unanimously.

It was also noted that Cornwall local authorities will meet HLF on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> November to discuss heritage project prioritisation. Current known proposals/potential projects costs are substantially in excess of likely available funding.

Project Design, timetable and budget – DB reported that the revised project design and timetable, as prepared by Nick Johnson, had been submitted to GOSW in August and approved. Objective One quarterly reports now reflect new timetable.

Dates of future meetings – DB advised that the group will need to change proposed date of the next meeting from 26 February 2004 to 11 March 2004, as a result of needing to insert time for consultants to report back on the Marketing Strategy study. She put to the group that it may wish to consider inserting another meeting in late January or early February to report back on further bid documentation development and the English Heritage Industrial Panel mentors visit planned for 7/8<sup>th</sup> Jan 2004. It was agreed that DB should seek dates convenient for Christopher Young and Susan Denyer and then contact OWG members regarding a possible further meeting.

Arising from the Partnership meeting on 24 October 2003 – DB reported on the bid areas boundary changes approved by Partnership :

- Porkellis/Carmenellis was extended to include Wheal Ann and Wheal Dream, taking in river Cober down to this point. Now renamed Wendron District.
- Mary Tavy/ Peter Tavy was removed due to limited physical survival above ground
- Camborne/Pool has had minor deletions to create a corridor for E/W distributor road. South Crofty was to be examined with a view to inclusion. Adam Sharpe has prepared a statement of significance on SC and ST will prepare a discussion paper that the project team will consider with Kerrier District Council colleagues before approaching the CPR Urban Regeneration Company.

The group noted the issues surrounding the inclusion of South Crofty, and the implications for consistency of approach across all bid areas. The project team were working to a widely agreed set of component identification and area selection criteria that should be rigorously applied. MH asked that the St Ives area be reconsidered.

DB reported that the Partnership had agreed to a change in approach for defining Marketing priorities within the Management Plan as a result of the delay in the implementation of Cornwall Arts Marketing's Heritage Marketing proposal, its geographic limitation to Cornwall and the breadth of attractions within the WHS areas. The Partnership had agreed to prepare its own Marketing Strategy, and DB had prepared a brief following consultation with Cornwall Enterprise and Jan Clarke, chairman of the Marketing and Interpretation Panel. This was presented at agenda item 3 e).

### **3. Progress since last meeting**

- a) Task Timetable – DB had previously circulated a copy of this to the Officer Working Group for information. She explained that it is derived from the revised project design, to breakdown headline tasks into more detailed list of actions required to deliver them on time. A work in progress, as the project team achieve actions and the project develops it will continue to change and evolve. It will also be used to measure progress at team meetings and stimulate debate about project development. In answer to questions about

whether there was sufficient time for consideration of the bid documentation by the District Councils, DB advised that they are being consulted as part of the process of preparation of the Management Plan, prior to the period of formal consultation due to commence after the next Partnership meeting, in April. In the case of the Management Plan, they will then have 5 months to comment, after which the revised bid documentation will be circulated for signature during September/ October. The consultation strategy to be prepared for discussion by the next OWG will address the issue of formal local authority endorsement.

- b) Conclusions from the meeting with Susan Denyer – DB had circulated notes from the meeting for information, and explained that these have been guiding the project team’s work for the last month, and were therefore covered separately on the agenda. One item to note related to bid area boundaries – in addition to the already agreed changes, the conclusion from this meeting was that the project team need to be able to describe the decision making process for all bid areas. BG is preparing a methodology report for consideration by the next project team which will review and develop the bid areas current definition.
- c) Draft sections 1 and 2 a) – d) of the Nomination Document - BG explained that he had been reworking the evidence and information gathered for previous draft nomination documents into the UNESCO required format. All previous comments had been reviewed and a wide range of views sought as part of the process. He presented the draft text previously circulated as a work in progress, aimed at striking the right balance in presentation within the UNESCO format and providing sufficient content whilst remaining succinct. BG tabled a mock-up example of section 2 a) – Jusification for Inscripton – with example images inserted. He advised that work on section 3 was already underway.

The chairman expressed the view that section 2 a) now more closely expresses the case for significance in terms of what a World Heritage Site is, and invited comment on the draft text. It was noted that;

- more clarity of expression was needed, one example given being the differentiation between a fragmentary landscape and one that was never spatially continuous.
- Given the decision to submit evidence under UNESCO Criteria (iii) (cultural tradition), the wording of this might have implications for the consideration of South Crofty
- FG be consulted regarding appropriate inclusion of West Devon references, prior to circulation to Devon County and West Devon District Councils.

The group endorsed the the approach as outlined in the drafts circulated, and expressed pleasure at the progress made. It was agreed that all detailed comments on the text should be submitted direct to BG, with a copy to DB. DB to circulate details of BG’s e-mail contact to the Group. FG requested that all papers sent out for comment be clearly marked with the deadline date.

d). draft section 1 of the Management Plan. ST explained that this was the product of a team awayday session which had considered the Vision, Mission

and Aims that would underpin management and development of the World Heritage Site. Following discussion, it was agreed that;

- The Vision should include reference to conservation, and should be clearly identified as the Vision for the World Heritage Site, which the Management Plan then delivers.
- The Mission Statement refers to the priorities to be addressed within Management Plan in pursuit of the Vision.
- The issue of equality of opportunity should be carefully expressed and relevant objectives clearly identified later in the document
- The relationship between Aims and objectives/actions to be pursued within the Management Plan should be clearly expressed

It was also noted that the Management Plan should indicate how local authorities will address management of the land and structures in their ownership. AC suggested that the EH publication Managing Assets would be a useful model.

d) Marketing Strategy brief - DB presented the Marketing Strategy consultancy brief, and explained that in order to deliver evidence based conclusions on Marketing priorities for the Management Plan the Partnership have commissioned a study to

- audit current WHS area marketing activity
- assess what results this is delivering
- compare against potential performance
- do a sampling exercise on a representative range of sites
- use this evidence to draw conclusions for what should be the WHS Offices' strategic priorities for the next 5 years, within the overall aim of developing a consistent approach.

She explained that this work was part funded by Cornwall Enterprise. Its impact on the project timetable had been previously noted, but the required results were deliverable prior to inclusion in the draft bid documentation to be submitted to the Partnership in April. DB would be organising a progress meeting and stakeholder workshop in February 2004.

e) Communication plan - DB introduced this document, which was produced after discussions between DB and Monica Kelly, Environment and Heritage Section Marketing Officer. It was necessary to give structure to PR/publicity activity by creating a framework within which it can sit, and enables DB to identify where to be proactive in pursuing opportunities. Comments on audiences, channels and communication tools that should be included were invited, to reach DB by 23 December. She explained that the next stage is to develop this into an action plan with times, responsibility and costs identified.

#### **4. Buffer Zones**

Following on from discussions with Susan Denyer about UNESCO's preference for buffer zones to be identified, ST presented a paper that explores the options in relation to the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape bid. His conclusion was that given the nature and extent of the bid areas, a formally identified buffer zone for each would not be the most effective way of protecting them from inappropriate visual impact. He outlined his preferred approach of pursuing, via adoption by planning authorities, a policy that would seek to protect the setting of the WHS. He advised that this would not require the identification of boundary

lines, but would involve the consideration of the key risk factor development proposals, as outlined in the paper, and their potential impacts – which differ considerably – individually.

FG noted that a case could be made for either option, and that the key consideration is which one is most likely to deliver the required results – influence on the planning process. AC endorsed the risk analysis approach, identifying what we seek to protect, what the risks are and how we manage these.

It was agreed that before a final decision could be made the group needed to seek the UNESCO view on Buffer Zones. DB to pursue and report back.

**5. Date and place of next meeting** – end Jan /early Feb and 11 March 2004. DB to contact Chris Young and Susan Denyer before setting final date.

## **6. AOB**

NM announced that, due to reallocation of responsibilities within the EH South West Region, from the New Year he would no longer cover Cornwall, but would retain responsibility for the WHS bid in the interests of continuity. The OWG expressed their pleasure on hearing that his membership of the group was to be maintained. DB thanked him for chairing the meeting. The meeting ended at 1pm.