
 <p>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</p>	 <p>City of Bath inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987</p>	<h2>City of Bath World Heritage Site Steering Group</h2>
<p>Meeting held on 22 September 2015 at the Assembly Rooms, Bath</p>		

Minutes

Attendees					
Peter Metcalfe (Chair)	PM	Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones	PAJ	Dr Kristin Doern	KD
Tom Boden	TB	Rohan Torkildsen	RT	Dr David Thackray	DT
Dr Marion Harney	MH	Stephen Bird	SB	John Wilkinson	JW
Dr Anne Bull	AB	Caroline Kay	CK	Tony Crouch	TC
Apologies					
Lisa Bartlett		Nick Tobin		Victor da Cunha	
Henry Owen-John		Ian Bell		David James	
Andrew Cooper					

No	Agenda Item	Act.
1	Welcome and introduction	
1.1	The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting and stated that the primary purpose of this meeting was to provide a review and steer on key elements of the emerging replacement WHS Management Plan 2016-2022. He apologised that the proposed July meeting had needed to be cancelled, but noted that the delay had enabled further progress on the draft document.	
2	Membership changes to the Steering Group	
2.1	<p>There have been 5 changes to membership of the Steering Group since the meeting March 2015 meeting. Following the May elections, 4 of these relate to political representatives on the Steering Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Ben Stevens, former Council cabinet member with responsibility for World Heritage, gives way to Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones. The Chairman welcomed Patrick to the group. • Cllr Bryan Chalker was also not returned. He was the Council's Heritage Champion. The Council has re-configured and renamed champions as 'member advocates', with Cllr Peter Turner (Cons., Abbey Ward) being the newly appointed Member Advocate for Heritage & Culture. Cllr Turner will be invited to join the group. • Cllr Gerry Curran represented Bath Charter Trustees. Gerry was present at the first ever WH Steering Group meeting in June 2001 and was therefore highly experienced. Bath Charter Trustees meet in early October 2015 and are expected to either appoint a new representative to the group or verify that Cllr Turner will wear twin hats as Heritage and Culture Advocate and Charter Trustees representative. • Malcolm McDowall represented Avon Local Council Association (serving the surrounding parishes) and has resigned as he has moved out of Corsham. ALCA are looking for a new representative. 	

	One further non-political change is Andrew Cooper, Bath BID Manager, who is moving to Leeds to manage their BID team. His interim replacement is Jonathan O'Shea, former chief executive of the St John's Hospital charity.	
2.2	The Chairman put on record his thanks to all the former members for their contribution to the Steering Group.	
3	Previous Minutes	
3.1	Minutes of the March 2015 meeting were accepted as a true record. Proposed by JW, seconded by RT, all in agreement.	
3.2	Minutes will be posted to the (new) website www.bathworldheritage.org.uk All members are encouraged to look at the new site.	ALL
4	Matters arising	
4.1	<p>The Chairman asked for updates on several matters on the March minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 5.3, JW had advocated integrating aspects of the Public Services Vision with the draft management plan vision. TC confirmed that it had been done, with key phrases carried across. • Training was mentioned, especially in relation to briefing new Councillors on the Development Management Committee. TC confirmed that a new programme of training was in place and he was seeking a slot for WH to be included. TC to pursue. • RT had previously commented that the management plan had the freedom to include aspects that statutory planning documents did not, and was asked to expand upon this. He said that the management plan should ensure continuity with other plans but avoid duplication, cross-referencing as necessary, then use the freedom it enjoyed to cover a wide remit. • JW confirmed that the Placemaking Plan was heading for public consultation in November 2015. 	TC
5	WHS Management Plan review	
5.1	TC introduced his progress report on the management plan revision. The April stakeholder event successfully delivered a wide range of issues which had enabled draft actions to be compiled. These were presented today along with the executive summary (including priorities), vision and aims. Comments were invited on these at the meeting, or in writing to TC by Tuesday 20 October.	ALL
5.2	TC said that the initial target of presenting a draft to Full Council for approval in Nov 2015 or Jan 2016 would not be met, and he would seek to procure assistance on compiling a consultation draft. A revised timetable would be presented to the November 17 th Steering Group.	
5.3	<p>Comments on the executive summary were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM recognised that the OUV could not be changed but asked that other periods of history were recognised, such as the mediaeval abbey. SB commented that the Abbey fell under the 'social ambitions' strand of OUV. TC gave assurances that holistic management would be fully recognised in the plan text. • DT said that consistency of headings should be followed through from aims to actions, and it would be useful to see the progression from issues to objectives and actions. TC responded that he agreed with regard to headings, and that the exercise of 'progression' had been undertaken and it was currently being assessed as to how best to present this. 	
5.4	<p>Comments on the vision were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RT - There is an issue with the word 'enhance' in relation to OUV, as we are not looking to change the OUV and enhance implies we are. TC 	

	<p>to re-word.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was general agreement that inclusion of the Core Strategy policy wording within the vision was acceptable. CK said that it should be very clear that there should be no harm to OUV and this should be a line not to be crossed. JW said that there was an opportunity to make the emphasis of wording positive instead of negative. TC to re-draft. • SB - instead of using the word 'will' it could be strengthened to 'must'. PAJ agreed this would help firm it up. TC to re-draft accordingly. • DT - it should state that people 'continue to' rather than 'will' find the site accessible/enjoyable as presumably they already do. TC to amend. • RT highlighted the word balance, as this implies compromise and that harm to the OUV will be acceptable. It should be re-worded to show that planning had been undertaken to show that sustainable growth can be accommodated without harm to the OUV. • KD considered that the vision was the wording most likely to be used in promoting our approach. The emphasis should therefore be 'we are' doing this rather than 'we will do'. • TB questioned whether an end date of 2022 could be included – as in Bath will look like this in 2022. TC to look at this. • CK – the vision ought to have implications for people. Did the current wording advocate significant difference? • JW – Cambridge have a quality charter mark obtainable through the planning process. A Bath Design Review Panel could explore something similar to promote high quality. 	
5.5	<p>Comments on the aims were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAJ – Success can be destructive and Bath has physical limitations with regard to the number of visitors it can take. If we are too enthusiastic we may compromise sustainable management. TC commented that the action seeking a Sustainable Tourism Plan was designed to address this point. There was discussion around this point with initiatives from the National Trust and the Bathscapes project to promote the wider landscape and visitor dispersal. • SB – The UNESCO key words authenticity and integrity could be reflected in the aims/vision. 	
5.6	<p>Comments on the actions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer/cross reference to other plans/strategies rather than repeat and support the initiative of others in protecting OUV. • MH. Important points need to be retained in the main document – points are overlooked in appendices. • RT – the main point should be in the document which delivers it, others should refer to that document. • CK – major developments should be individually named, maybe by bullet point under a single action. • CK – re-order the actions so that the minor administrative actions are not read first. • Building Heights (action 11). JW – would prefer reference to 'a' study rather than 'the' study. The previous work may require updating. • JW. Action 12 can refer specifically to the proposed design panel. • TB & DT. Perhaps categorise under aims and use sub-headings. • CK – a working group session to develop these would be useful. • RT – Birmingham have a heritage panel which reviews funding bids, which could be of interest to Bath. • 21 Streetlighting. Include the issue of light pollution and consistent design. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 Craft Skills. Support projects initiatives which deliver this. • 25 Bathscapes. MH and CK content that it warrants a separate heading as protection of the setting. • 26 Housing numbers. Remove the word unrealistic. PAJ – brownfield first. RT - Look at wording around ‘sub-regional growth is informed by the special characteristics of the WHS’. Include local government. • 27 River and canal management. TC to speak to JW about actions underway to ensure this refers to a specific initiative. • 35 Bath Records Office. TC to speak to SB about ‘History Centre’ project specifics relating to this. • 37 Outreach work. Broaden beyond archaeology. CK – be wary that support is not taken to mean financial support. • 38 Education. AB – potential sub-group on education needed to focus on that. Education as a sub-heading in the actions. Acknowledge existing education work. • 40 Research Group. See update below in 6.1. • 41 The description of museums should be widened to be Bath’s cultural and heritage offer. • 42 Transport Strategy re-word to replace the negative planning policy wording with positive wording. Strengthen this if possible. • 43 Transport Strategy. It was felt that it should not be grouped together under physical access with public realm and mobility issues, but these should be separated out. • TB said there was a need to included wayfinding. • 51 Pollution from vehicles. CK pointed out that electric vehicles do not have harmful emissions. 	<p>TC/ JW</p> <p>TC/ SB</p>
5.7	It was raised that it would be good practice to disseminate feedback from the April Stakeholder event to all attendees. TC to investigate this.	TC
5.8	<p>PM mentioned the reference in the UNESCO Operating Guidelines (2012) to sustainable use and considered it would be useful for all to note. Repeated here:</p> <p><i>119. Sustainable use</i></p> <p><i>World Heritage properties may support a variety of ongoing & proposed uses that are ecologically & culturally sustainable, & which may contribute to the quality of life of communities concerned. The State Party & its partners must ensure that such sustainable use or any other change does not impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. For some properties, human use would not be appropriate. Legislations, policies & strategies affecting World Heritage properties should ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value, support the wider conservation of natural & cultural heritage, & promote & encourage the active participation of the communities & stakeholders concerned with the property as necessary conditions to its sustainable protection, conservation, management & presentation.</i></p>	
6	Research Group	
6.1	MH reported that Bath University had signed off her proposal to pursue a HLF bid for the research group work. This was therefore now free to proceed, but it would have to be discussed with other partners. Some match funding was likely to be required, and an approach to the Enhancement Fund was likely. MH and TC to meet and discuss.	MH/ TC
7	General Update Items	
7.1	Time did not permit delivery of updates on the Great Spas project or the Archway Centre. These items to be added to the agenda of the November	

	meeting as appropriate.	
8	Any Other Business	
	None	
9	Date of next meeting	
	Tuesday 17 November 2015. 2pm. Kingston Room, Roman Baths	