

Saltaire World Heritage Site Steering Group – Meeting 3

MINUTES

Meeting held on 28th August 2013, Park Lodge, Roberts Park

Attendees

Cllr Val Slater (VS)	Bradford Council, Chair
Cllr Martin Love (ML)	Bradford Council,
Robin Copeland (RC)	Bradford Council
Craig Broadwith (CB)	English Heritage
Dr Jo Lintonbon (JL)	ICOMOS-UK
Audrey O'Connor (Ao'C)	Canal & River Trust (Heritage Adviser)
Andrew Mason (AM)	Newmason Properties (Managing Director)
Nav Chohan (NC)	ShIPLEY College (Principal)
Rob Martin (RM)	Saltaire Village Society
Sue Brearley (SM)	Incommunities (Regional Development Manager)
Deborah Wall (DH)	English Heritage (Principal Local Engagement Adviser)
Helen Thornton (HT)	Bradford Council

Apologies

David Ford (DF)	Saltaire Traders Association (Chair)
Paul Hogg (PH)	Bradford District Care Trust (Trust Sec)
Patricia Tillotson (PT)	Bradford Council
Len Morris (LM)	Saltaire United Reformed Church (Publicity Officer)
Sue Cole	English Heritage (Senior International Advisor)

Agenda

- 1. Welcome and introductions**
- 2. Apologies**
- 3. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising**
- 4. Vision Statement Update**
- 5. Stakeholder Workshop**
- 6. Review of Management Plan overview**
- 7. Support for Steering Group**
- 8. Any other business**
- 9. Date of next meeting**

1. SB was welcomed to her first meeting. DW was attending as an observer.

2. As above.

3. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

Minutes of previous meeting agreed.

Cllr S noted that date of first workshop has been changed following SOG recommendation.

Actions from last meeting complete except AM to speak to Bradford Property Forum before next meeting.

4. Vision Statement Update.

The following was circulated. This latest version included suggestions from SG following circulation of draft and input from HT after starting WHSO role.

The Vision for Saltaire World Heritage Site is to be:

“A welcoming and inclusive place with a vibrant community, which takes inspiration from its past, whilst planning for a sustainable future and striking an effective and creative balance between a place to live, invest, work, learn and visit.”

“Saltaire will be a place where World Heritage significance is fully acknowledged and understood by everyone and future generations. It will strive for the highest standards of interpretation, protection and conservation in support of deliverable economic development and tourism.”

Group agreed the draft Vision includes all the right words. Group suggested minor changes to tense. RM suggested ‘hold’ rather than ‘strive’.

Agreed: that the draft Vision (with revisions as above) had got to a stage to be shared widely for further input at the Stakeholder Workshop. HT to circulate further revised version.

5. Stakeholder Workshop

25th September, Victoria Hall. Stakeholder mailing list approx. 100 people – 75/80 orgs. Approx. 20 yes’s to date. Some have indicated theme – the objective being to group people by themes around discussion tables facilitated by Officer Group members with the relevant expertise. Themes reiterated. The objective of the workshop was to draw out and capture info from those that attend on the draft Vision, the themes and then do some early action planning. SOG to help plus facilitators. Workshop plan circulated and HT went through in detail.

Cllr S requested thoughts on overall shape from group.

AM – key note speaker – 30 mins enough. Add 15 to exercise 1? Or 30mins with 15 mins q and a?

NC – Themes. Give people opportunity to say what they are doing already?

SG members – what they are doing already.

Discussion - Alternatively up front pack to explain what we are doing already.

Include vision in pack or on tables.

Action: HT explained New Lanark had been approached re keynote (*since meeting New Lanark have indicated they can not provide a speaker.*

Blaenavon have been approached and other ideas are being pursued).

Cllr S said that SG support on the day would be useful. NC stated that if the questions around the themes were strong there may be no need to write down what we are doing now. (*since meeting the facilitators have met and a SWOT exercise on the themes is a favoured way to draw out all the issues encompassed by the questions*).

Action: Cllr S explained that SOG would act as scribes on each table. RC added that trained facilitators would lead the day, keeping to time and organising activities etc.

HT suggested that a table could critique a previous tables comments.

Cllr S suggested the comments could be displayed around the room and everyone could comment on everything if they wished.

Action: All agreed. Need to display feedback via flipcharts or screens for all to read/comment on.

NC asked if the workshop would comment on the vision? HT explained that we would like to collect peoples big ideas. Cllr S agreed that we should capture issues, priorities and hierarchies. JL agreed that the vision should be tested.

Agreed: All agreed that the themes in particular should be left 'up for grabs' in case there are significant themes to add.

NC suggested we could ask "are there any words in the vision you are uncomfortable with?" and "is there anything else you would like to see?"

AM suggested that Cllr S should read out the vision in the introduction. People should feel they can make a difference. The day should be lively and fun wherever possible.

Action: RC explained that HT and he would sit down with the facilitators and plan the day as a fully interactive session using various tried and tested exercises.

AM suggested games like acronym bingo with prizes would help to get the best out of attendees. Something 'a bit different'.

Action: All agreed this should be included.

NC asked – what if people want to take things in a completely different direction, e.g. focus on detailed issues such as car parking?

Cllr S suggested this was the role of the steering group to lead the process via participation on tables.

AM said that we should encourage open discussion.

JL suggested this should be an entirely neutral event. A fact finding mission. SWOT analysis would be a useful tool and the process would be almost as important as the outcome.

Cllr S suggested that facilitators' tools such as car parks could be employed HT queried how the Workshop should feedback. All agreed it would be appropriate to capture the event for a legacy and for a future archive. It would be helpful to understand how opinions had been formed.

Action: RC noted that digital photography could be employed to capture the events in progress as well as to record flip charts etc. AM suggested a photographer should be booked. The press should also be notified.

In addition to the Stakeholder Workshop there were to be other consultation exercises including:

- a **Neighbourhood Forum. 24th October.** All agreed this should be a mini version of the first workshop.

Cllr Love suggested this event should not be called neighbourhood forum so people were prepared for it being something different.

Agreed: The proposed title should be Saltaire WH forum or similar.

RM suggested this could be an opportunity to be very creative, such as planning for real with paint/ modelling clay etc.

Cllr S suggested there should definitely be workshop approach.

RC noted previous intention to consult on initial evidence base for Victoria Road public realm may be 'trying to fit too much in'.

Agreed: All agreed this should be consulted on separately.

- a **Young peoples event.**

HT explained the intention to go to schools etc. and that it would be useful to involve Shipley College.

NC agreed and state that Titus have network and may be able to lead consultation?

AM suggested a different pitch for different age groups would be sensible. All agreed.

Cllr S state that Nav's community should definitely be included.

6. Review of Management Plan Overview (Gantt chart)

HT/ RC presented Gantt chart and formal process for adoption by CBMDC.

Cllr S queried process from EH/ ICOMOS side.

Action: CB/ JL to confirm.

HT/ RC explained that the management arrangements would be reviewed after adoption stage to move into delivery stage.

AM/ NC suggested that some continuity with a similar level of champions should be targeted. Cllr S suggested a champions group with supporting operational/ delivery group may be appropriate.

7. Support for Steering Group

Agreed: All agreed that contact details could be shared.

Request to circulate SOG minutes and SB suggested feedback from SOG should be a standing item of the SG agenda.

Agreed: All agreed SG minutes should be made public.

All agreed that the ideas listed by HT for support for SG were good ideas.

Action: HT to circulate SOG mins to SG, add SOG agenda item to SG agenda and arrange for SG minutes to be put onto CBMDC website. HT to facilitate support for SG as detailed.

Action: HT to send mins to Salts Estates.

8. Any Other Business

- Victoria Road Public Realm (VRPR)

RC highlighted VRPR capital budget and approach.

Cllr S suggested that SG should input into project.

RM/ NC suggested that information should start with what was previously consulted on.

Action: RC to bring further information about scheme to next SG mtg.

- Cllr S./ NC suggested that names of SG could be put out with residents survey.

- RM noted issues with timing of meetings for some but it would be useful to have an alternate member for SVS to attend SG. The group were open to this idea.

9. Date of Next Meeting

HT to forward suggested dates and venues. Offers of venues from SB, AM and PH had been received.