

 <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 28 July 2016 at the Drawing Room, Roman Baths, Bath</p>		

Minutes

Attendees			
Peter Metcalfe (Chair) PM	Stephen Bird SB	Cllr Peter Turner PT	
Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones PAJ	Rohan Torkildsen RT	Tom Marshall TM	
Colin Clark CC	Cllr Robert Law RL	Ian Bell IB	
Leslie Redwood LR	Tony Crouch TC		
Apologies			
Caroline Kay	Tom Boden	Victor Da Cunha	
Lisa Bartlett	Dr Kristin Doern	Dr David Thackray	
Henry Owen-John	John Wilkinson	Dr Marion Harney	
Dr Anne Bull	Louise Prynne	Nick Tobin	

No	Agenda Item	Act.
1	Previous Minutes	
1.1	The minutes of the meeting of 7 April 2016 were accepted as an accurate record.	
2	Membership of the Steering Group	
2.1	There were a number of new members at the table and the Chairman invited introductions.	
2.2	Robert Law is an Architect and parish councillor from Englishcombe. He is the representative of the Avon Local Council's Association. (ALCA)	
2.3	Tom Marshall is the Chair of the Architecture and Planning Committee at Bath Preservation Trust, standing in for Caroline Kay.	
2.4	Colin Clark represents the Federation of Bath Resident's Association, standing in for Nick Tobin.	
2.5	Les Redwood is the Head of Business Development and Partnerships at Bath Tourism Plus.	
2.6	The Chairman announced that David Thackray (ICOMOS President) was standing down from the Group, having found difficulty in fitting meeting attendance alongside other duties. Peter Metcalfe recorded his thanks, on behalf of the Group, for David's contribution and welcomed a message from the ICOMOS Secretary saying that a new representative would be sought.	
3	Matters arising	
3.1	The Chairman asked if there were any matters arising (none), and drew attention to a commendable consultation response statement from the Corps of Mayor's Honorary Guides which outlined how they have incorporated the WHS into their interpretation. He said this set an excellent example.	
4	WHS Management Plan Review Report	
4.1	TC introduced his report on consultation on the plan. He outlined the	

	measures taken and reported that a total of 98 responses had been received, which in comparison to similar strategies and previous plans is high. Most pleasing was the high number of individuals (73) who had responded. These figures, plus the previous engagement through the April 2015 Stakeholder Event, satisfies the UNESCO request for plans to be produced through 'participatory means'.	
4.2	58 of the 98 comments received mentioned Park and Ride, and the most frequently referred to subject was transport. In this respect, the Group were asked if they were content with the wording of Action 5. Current wording: <i>Action 5. Monitor & engage with the delivery of the Transport Strategy (2014) objectives in so far as they relate to the WHS & seek to ensure that they have no unacceptable impact on the OUV of the WHS & its setting.</i>	
4.3	CC said that residents were very concerned about traffic levels and resulting pollution and damage to health and building fabric. The WHS should be managed to the highest international standards. FOBRA felt that the current action sounded a defensive note and did not throw wholehearted support behind the Transport Strategy. It was suggested that the wording began 'Give support to and engage with the delivery of the Transport Strategy...	
4.4	TC urged caution on the word 'support'. For example, the current landscape assessments on the principal potential park and ride sites within the WHS or the setting all showed visual harm, and there would be many other examples throughout the delivery of the Transport Strategy where harm and benefit had to be balanced. Adding support may be seen as giving blanket approval to potentially harmful actions and it may be prudent for the Group to fully engage with the strategy but not be seen to fully commit support to everything that might result from it.	
4.5	There was general support from the meeting for the removal of the words 'in so far as they relate to the WHS', as these were seen to dilute the Group's support for the Transport Strategy.	
4.6	CC also suggested that the action might be given a more positive emphasis by focusing on benefit from the Transport Strategy rather than 'unacceptable impact'.	
4.7	TC was asked to propose a re-drafted Action 5 for circulation to members. The proposal is as follows: <i>Action 5. Engage with and monitor the delivery of the Transport Strategy (2014) objectives & seek to ensure that they deliver maximum benefit & no unacceptable impact to the OUV of the WHS & its setting.</i> The revision leads with engage, which is a positive action as opposed to monitor which is more passive. It omits the 'in so far as' wording in order to give more unqualified support to the strategy and includes reference to benefit to again accentuate the positive. It does not use the word support for reasons outlined in 4.4, but otherwise moves closer to the suggestions from FoBRA. As discussed at April steering group, 'unacceptable impact' is consistent with wording in the Placemaking Plan.	
4.8	The question of whether the city should take precedence over the setting was briefly discussed, but no change was suggested to the current Objective 11 which seeks to ensure the natural and built elements of the site are afforded equal importance.	
4.5	The suggestion for an action concerning coach parking was accepted. The suggested action (to the section on visitor management) is as follows: <i>(New) Action 43. Engage with proposals to address coach parking within the</i>	

	<i>WHS, and seek to ensure that sustainable solutions are delivered which maximise the benefit and minimise any harm to the WHS.</i>	
4.6	The meeting raised no objection to the addition of wording to section 2.7 which will point out that although the condition of the built environment is good, the landscape setting would benefit from greater management (hence the HLF 'Bathscape' bid). This wording will take heed of the advice from Strategic Management Team (27 July) that care should be taken that this is not written in such a way that it is seen as relating to potential Park and Ride sites.	
4.7	The suggestion to add additional wording relating to opening up and maintaining historic views under action 31 was accepted.	
4.8	The suggestion by the Council's Sustainability Team to add additional wording relating to energy efficiency under action 28 (relating to street lighting) was accepted.	
4.9	There was agreement on the deletion of the example of community engagement which pointed to the number of respondents to the consultation on an Eastern Park and Ride. It was considered that there was significant sensitivity around this subject plus it may not provide the best example.	
4.10	Action 39 refers to seeking to make the historic environment more accessible for those with limited mobility. Historic England had suggested that this might be widened to include those with disabilities. The meeting raised no objection to this, but had concerns over the wording used. SB pointed out that the language on this shifted and evolved and what one group or individual accepted could cause offence to others. Advice was sought from the Council's Equalities and Diversity Officer (Louise Murphy), who was unfortunately out of office for the week. However, language used on the award winning accessibility guide introduced by the Roman Baths is consistent with the suggestion to use the terms both 'limited mobility and disabled'. It is therefore proposed that the action should read as below, and this will be checked with Louise next week: <i>Action 39. Continue to identify and implement opportunities to make the historic environment more accessible for those with limited mobility and disabilities.</i>	
4.11	Historic England questioned whether specific reference to an A36/46 link road was wise given that this was not mentioned in the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan. The meeting accepted the advice of Council Highways (Peter Dawson) that the reference be retained but re-worded to refer to 'improvements to the national trunk road network'.	
4.12	Historic England questioned the meaning of the term 'Exceptional Environmental Scheme' under action 6. Whilst an explanation of term was outlined to the meeting, it was agreed that this was unnecessarily long-winded to include in the plan and it was better to delete it.	
4.13	Historic England suggested that with regard to street works and the Bath Pattern Book, it would be better if the monitoring mechanism was to record any works which did not accord with the guidance, rather than those which did. This was agreed. The Chairman pointed out that the Pattern Book was now adopted and published.	
4.14	Bath Tourism Plus outlined the importance of marketing of the WHS and suggested this should be a priority of the plan. LR gave an explanation of the need and importance of this. The meeting agreed that this matter was important, but that it was a matter of ongoing management and did not need to be specifically listed as a priority item.	
4.15	The Group agreed with the suggestion from Bath Tourism Plus that reference	

	to a visitor tax should be renamed as 'visitor contribution. This would allow a scheme involving a contribution to be progressed without incurring problems over tax law. LR confirmed that preliminary discussions on the matter had already been held.	
4.16	The Group supported the inclusion of a reference to enforcement in chapter 4 which describes how the site is managed.	
4.17	The Group supported changes to the wording of action 23 which currently refers to the impact of flooding on the OUV. In line with a suggestion from the Henrietta Park Resident's Association reference will instead be made to impact on "people, historic buildings and archaeology". CC confirmed that this is an important subject for that Association who hopefully will welcome this change.	
4.18	A query had been received as to whether the Plan, in mentioning the potential project to replace the Radial Gate at Pulteney Weir, should also make mention of the 'Aqua Eye' proposal. The Group agreed that it was necessary to limit the number of projects mentioned, and including this project would open the Plan to many more suggested inclusions which would be difficult to accommodate. It was agreed therefore not to include reference to this project.	
5	Other issues concerning the Plan not included in the report	
5.1	RT raised the fact that the WHS Management Plan looked in many actions toward the Placemaking Plan. The September Examination in Public (EiP) would undoubtedly lead to changes in the Placemaking Plan and that raised the risk of inconsistent wording between the two plans. The matter was discussed, but give that the Inspector may not report until early 2017 there was little option but to proceed with the current WHS Management Plan timetable but noting that there was nothing to prevent sections being updated if necessary. A statement on this may be necessary if questions are asked at Full Council or the EiP	
5.2	TM raised the Bath Preservation Trust comment on the danger of cumulative harm. it was agreed that this could be included in the text in chapter 5 so as not to suggest that just because the number of buildings at risk were low, that all was perfect. A new action on this however was disruptive at this stage.	
5.3	TM also raised support for the local list project. It was agreed that this was desirable, and TC will liaise with Historic Team leader Paula Freeland to see if this can be added to action 29 concerning conservation area appraisals.	
5.4	PT said there was concern about retaining the special charm of Bath, which prompted some discussion on modern and traditional architecture. The special charm would be a key theme to pick up in any visitor contribution scheme (see 4.15)	
5.5	It was agreed that TC would produce minutes of the meeting, including proposed changes to the plan, and circulate them on 30 July. Comments would be invited during the week of 1 August and beyond this the revised draft would be prepared for informal cabinet consideration on 15 August and Full Council endorsement on 15 September. PM secured the agreement of the Group that they were content to proceed on this basis.	
6	Project Updates	
6.1	Research Group. Marion Harney sent a written update asking that it be reported that on RT's advice she has submitted a Funding Application/ Project Proposal to Historic England's Heritage Protection Commissions Programme for the Creation of a web-based resource hub for the City of Bath World Heritage Site. The timescale for a decision was not known. MH also reported that with regard to the Bathscape project she had met with the HLF Assessors this week in a positive and constructive exchange. The HLF had described the submission as 'strong'. They asked for some additional information and clarification on a couple of points which has been compiled	

	and will be sent imminently.	
6.2	Archway Project & World Heritage Centre. SB gave an update. The HLF stage submission had been made in full and on time. Both the planning and listed building consent applications have been submitted and registered. Fundraising continues.	
6.3	<p>Great Spas of Europe. TC gave an update. At the April Steering Group it was reported that work was underway to reduce the 16 members of the project group, in line with UNESCO and ICOMOS advice. A comparative analysis was completed and ranked 7 of the 16 spas worthy of progression. Bath was ranked joint first (alongside Karlovy Vary). These rankings were contested by some of the spa towns. The Czech Republic Government called a meeting of all state party representatives and reached agreement on a group of 11. This was announced at a subsequent meeting of the mayors in Prague in May. This process worked well, in that the disappointed mayors were told at the meeting that if they had any questions about their failure to make the submission group, these should be addressed to their relevant governments who had agreed the decision. In fact, the rejected parties took the decision well and wished the remaining towns every success.</p> <p>The project group now comprises of Bath, Baden-Baden (Germany), Bad Ems (Germany), Bad Kissingen (Germany), Baden bei Wien (Austria), Františkovy Lázně (CZ), Karlovy Vary (CZ), Mariánské Lázně (CZ), Montecatini Terme (I), Spa (Belgium), Vichy (France)</p> <p>The disappointed candidates are Luhacovice (CZ), Wiesbaden (Germany), Bad Homburg (Germany), Bad Ischl (Austria), Bad Pyrmont (Germany)</p> <p>Work will now concentrate on putting together the bid, which will need a draft management plan and governance arrangements to be proposed. This work will draw heavily on existing arrangements.</p> <p>In terms of the Brexit vote, the official message from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport is that this will not impact upon the project, which should proceed as normal.</p>	
6.4	Visit of Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Partnership. TC reported that on 5 July the partnership of Stonehenge and Avebury Steering Groups had visited Bath. SB, PM and TC talked to them about the work of Bath WHS Steering Group and showed them around the Archway project. The Chair of the partnership had subsequently been very complimentary about the work in progress and the 'enthusiasm and imagination' of our Council.	
7	Any Other Business. None	
8	Date of next meeting. Thursday 22 November 2016	