

Conservation, Planning & Heritage Management

Teleconference Meeting Notes - 7/6/16

Attending - Mike Collins (Chair; Historic England), Chris Hardman (Carlisle City Council), Sara Rushton (Northumberland County Council), Mark Brennand (Cumbria County Council), Ian Ayris (Newcastle City Council), and Richard Hingley (Durham University). John Scott - WHS Management Plan Coordinator (in attendance)

Apologies – John Hodgson (Lake District National Park Authority)

Circulation - All above, and also Chris Jones (Northumberland National Park Authority) and Daniel Puttick (Northumberland County Council)

1. Membership

MC ran through the membership of the group to check the membership and the history leading up to this level of representation. The meeting agreed that the makeup of the group was a good spread of experience and geography. IA introduced himself and outlined that he has stepped in to David Heslops shoes (as David is taking retirement) for Newcastle related strategic issues. Agreement had been reached that with reference to the wider world of Planning, CH would act as a conduit for the North West and Daniel Puttick for the North East

2. Mission statement.

MC described the thinking on the purpose of a mission statement, The WHS has a web based management system and all is different, so given we are much more open to the public it's good to describe what the group is about. RH it's good to have web presence and the research group. SR, MB and CH said that it was ok and we can keep evolving the style of the statement. MC asked for final comments by the end the week (**action All**).

Current wording is: *This Delivery Group's remit is to seek to promote best practice in the management of the Hadrian's Wall WHS by:*

- *Providing a forum to share experience and lessons learned from both conservation and development-led projects*
- *Disseminating the results of management works both within the professional heritage management and planning community and with the wider Wall community*
- *Engaging with, and feeding into, the wider management of Hadrian's Wall, including in the review of the WHS Management Plan, as appropriate*

IA asked discussed the background of the group and who this group reports to. MC gave a brief rundown of the situation since the closure of the HW Trust and that the Group reports to the WHS Partnership Board which is made up of senior representatives from the stakeholder Local Authorities.

3. Annual planning meeting.

JS said that like many of the Groups from other disciplines it was good to review the validity of the actions identified and review them accordingly. With regard to the target on meeting IA thought it would be difficult to get many people together with work pressures being as they are. SR suggested that the most practical routine of meeting might be something like 3 to 5 years. MB said that it can take the entire day to attend a meeting depending on which end of the Wall people work and the

location of the meeting and that that is a big gap in the diary. CH agreed that 3-5 yrs is possible as the LAs all work at different times.

MC highlighted a common issue he'd encountered of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and issues around the understanding of this concept as the basis for decisions on what we are trying to protect. IA said that meetings/workshops to discuss OUV would be a great idea and work on an east-west basis, CH agreed. MC said that this was something that should ideally be done this year. MC said there's a meeting of the Partnership Board next week and MC will present that idea. **(action MC)**

In addition, MC proposed that our web pages should be developed into an online practical resource, which presents case studies of good practice in Planning and Conservation. It was suggested that each 'County/Park Archaeology' team supply one such case study from their work every year, and which would gradually build into a helpful signpost of modern practice in this area. CH it would be good to share good and bad practice. MC reminded the group that this could include conservation of the heritage as well as planning archaeology. If MC picks up ideas for good practice studies then he will prompt members if that helps. All agreed that this looked like a good way forward **(action All)**.

RH said that one of the issues the research group is looking at and has promoted through discussion is that of sustainability, and it might be worth looking at these in terms of planning. Member's agreed that that maybe something to discuss going forward.

4. Conservation framework

MC asked how the group felt about this issue. MC feelsthat as the WHS is focussed on the Roman frontier archaeology, a wider plan for conservation including landscape and other environmental aspects sounds like a big undertaking with current resources. RH thinks that it would be good to look at the wider aspects but agreed resource is tight for the WHS presently.

IA thought we should go to first principles and ask what the priorities are for us. SR wondered if we know what this looks like at this stage. CH what would we use this for? What's the benefit? Perhaps we should ask what's missing from our data. Do we just need guidelines on context?

MC will talk to Henry Owen John as to whether such a document exists as a model. The meeting was not sure how much of a priority it could be at the moment. MC will also talk to Chris Jones about what NNPA would like from the framework. The meeting agreed.

MC asked if everyone happy for their name being seen on the website and that the majority of conversations should be done via email rather than meeting directly. The meeting agreed.

Mike thanked everyone for their time and that he would send around notes of the meeting shortly.