



LIFE11 ENV/IE/922

Notes from An Cabhail Mór Site Visit (B3)

Project	Geopark LIFE B3 Site Visit	
Date	12/01/2015	
Location	An Cabhail Mór, Kilnaboy	

Attendance	Person	Organisation	Abbr.
Yes	Risteard Ua Croinin	Clare County Council	RUC
Yes	Joanne Gaffrey	UCD	JG
Yes	Christine Grant	National Monuments Service	CHG
Yes	Ken Curley	Office of Public Works	KC
Yes	Richard Morrison	Burrenbeo Trust	RM
Yes	Eamon Doyle	Geopark Geologist	ED
Yes	Carol Gleeson	Manager	CG
Yes	Clodagh Lynch	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
Yes	Tom Keating	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
	Mary Keating	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
Yes	Michael Lynch	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
Yes	Frank O'Grady	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
Yes	Michael Malone	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
	Mary Malone	Killinaboy History & Heritage Group	
1.0	Assembly - Everybody gathered at the Killinaboy XPO where the group was led to site by RUC		
2.0	Site Visit: Introduction & Background - RUC gave a brief introduction to the site and the building, including an outline of the history of the site, the features of the building and the previous work of the local community		
	The Training Proposal - The priority for the site is a focus on training which will aid the consolidation of the walls which are in a bad state of disrepair - It would include Conservation Volunteers, members of local FAS schemes (or equivalent) and those that have shown an interest and commitment to the site - It is suggested that those trained become future leaders - The program will include aspects of training in research on historical backgrounds and building technologies with a focus on mortared buildings (not including dry stone walling) - Initial work at the site needs to be done as a matter of urgency; cut ivy and remove heavy branches from top of the walls to ease the weight on the walls - Conservation work should be done/can be done on a phase by		ACTION: Immediate action (i.e. before end Feb) needed on ivy and heavy branches on the walls

	<p>phase basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is envisaged that the programme would raise awareness from a heritage point of view - There is no long term plan for the site as yet but suggestions were made to utilise the space, perhaps for markets or expos, archery etc. It has potential from a tourism perspective and there is a general agreement that it ties in well with B3 conservation management and community engagement 	
	<p>A Local Perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the Kilnaboy Historical Group/ local farmers speak of their experience and perspective of the site. Within one generation there has been a rapid and somewhat unusual degradation of the building of a substantial nature. The local people are very proud of the site and do not want to lose it - This community is very pro-active (recent publication on Graveyard) and keen to work on the site 	
	<p>Why this site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is a simple building - The walls are not too high so accessibility (and H&S) should not be an issue - There are facilities on site at the XPO - Local landowners already agree in principle 	<p>ACTION: Landowner agreement needs to be formalised</p>
3.0	<p>Post Site Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CHG began the discussion by introducing issues that may arise as part of this work and emphasises the desire to have all issues pre-empted and resolutions in place so that the project can run smoothly - CHG & CG emphasise the need for compliance with EU criteria, the establishment of indicators and a certain level of bureaucracy that is necessary as part of the LIFE project - CHG Suggests that initial stages of work could be carried out at the site but that the hands on training for conservation should happen simultaneously at another suitably identified location. One concern raised was if people were trained off-site then they would not part-take in conservation at An Cabhail Mór itself so the project would not benefit from the programme. This could be easily addressed by making work on-site an integral part of the training programme - One of the biggest issues to be addressed is training & certification. What is a realistic level of training to be achieved? Will it be certified or not? When trained, what is permissible for the trainee to work on in the future? These question need to be thought out - Problems need to be pre-empted before they arise as this is an EU funded project and there is an expectation that 'best practice' will be employed, legislation will be adhered to and processes will be developed that can be transferrable. Despite the frustration of those involved surrounding bureaucracy, it is accepted that a certain level 	<p>ACTION Find an alternative structure of lesser significance that could be used for training</p>

	<p>needs to exist to meet criteria for the LIFE funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is eventually proposed among the group that off-site training is best practice with other aspects of the training/programme (e.g. recording/surveying) happening in tandem on site. This would ensure a more consistent standard and pace of work on site - The initial recording needs to be completed by a suitable qualified person and this initial recording becomes part of the condition report for the monument, with more detailed recording being completed as the various phases of work are being done - KC introduced two documents to RUC about what level of recording is recommended/necessary and also references the DoEHLG publication on the 'Conservation and repair of masonry ruins' (2010) and the DOENI document on the 'Conservation of Scheduled Masonry Monuments' - CG highlights the desire of the project to document activities where possible – video footage of conservation (e.g. Ivy trimming) in action would be welcomed - Projects partners will follow up some of the practicalities in the afternoon and establish what the next steps are 	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Follow-on meeting at Ennistymon Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First item to be addressed in relation to the project is landowner agreement. In order to do this a timescale needs to be established. The timescale may, for example, affect landowners/farmers Single Farm Payment so all aspects of timing and programme of work need to be established (relevant contact with Dept. Agri to check out any implications of fencing off part of the land) - Can one training episode take place under the LIFE supervision with remaining conservation work undertaken independently? This could also help to demonstrate the 'afterlife' of the project? CG says not really as it is important for the community to see the project started and finished. RUC specifies a working season of March-October which is determined by the mortars condition requirements; an initial proposal was a 3 month season. - CHG still raises concerns about training on monuments and an even greater complex issue surrounding certification (or not) of those being trained. - RUC emphasises the primary concern is consolidation of a degrading monument and the tendency to over complicate matters but under the LIFE heading there needs to be clear indicators and best practice must be employed - KC suggests a background review of those wishing to undertake training and their current level of skills to determine suitable candidates - RUC clarifies that the fundamental issue here is the lack of funding for conservation work to be carried out and that this can be addressed through schemes such as paid training courses. 	<p>ACTION CHG will arrange a meeting in Dublin soon with Pauline Gleeson, Nessa Roche and Freddy O'Dwyer to try and get answers and/or guidance for a series of project questions devised by CG and RUC</p>

	<p>Example given of the Portumna Workhouse Conservation and Redevelopment Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An issue persists surrounding training on a monument, accreditation of trainees and the scope of the work. It is decided that a meeting with a very clear agenda take place in the coming weeks. This will allow NMS to address specific questions (drawn up by CG and RUC) should take place immediately to facilitate progression of this proposal. NMS as project partners should be approached with key questions to be addressed to find answers or alternatives as appropriate. Key personnel to be included are Pauline Gleeson, Nessa Roche and Freddy O'Dwyer, as well as the present members of the B3 working group. The experience of these invitees should assist this proposal and it could be seen as a 'pre-planning' consultation of sorts. - A final concern of CHG is how this specific project relates to tourism as there is no long-term tourism plan for the site but CG is confident that it does fall within the remit of the LIFE project as a community initiative and conservation issue, and the site is also on a proposed Geopark Heritage Trail. - Discussions are suspending pending a meeting with NMS - CG and RUC extend their meeting beyond this group to devise a list of questions to be addressed at the forthcoming meeting. 	
5.0	<p>Meeting with CG, KC, RUC and NMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time and Date to be confirmed 	
	<p>Photos attached on next page</p>	



Site visit to An Cabhail Mór, 12/05/2015



The interior western side of the building



The northern exterior wall showing ivy growth



South East Corner - Exterior