



LIFE11 ENV/IE/922

Minutes of An Cabhail Mhór Project Meeting

Project	Geopark LIFE B3 Working Group Meeting: An Cabhail Mhor Project	
Date	11/05//2015	
Location	Boardroom 2, Temple Gate Hotel, Ennis (2pm – 4pm)	

Attendance	Person	Organisation	Abbr.
Yes	Zena Hctor	Consultant (B2 Co-ordinator)	ZH
Yes	Ristead Ua Croinin	Clare County Council	RUC
Yes	Christine Grant	National Monuments Service	CGr
Yes	Gabriel Cooney (chair)	UCD	GC
Yes	Joanne Gaffrey	UCD	JG
Yes	Ken Curley	Office of Public Works	KC
Yes	Carol Gleeson	Geopark Manager	CG

1.0	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the B3 Working Group met in order to discuss the principles of the An Cabhail Mhór Project. The meeting was chaired by Prof. Gabriel Cooney. - The initial concept was revisited in order to reassert the basis of the project within the original proposal of the equipping of local conservation teams with the skills to provide remedial repair and maintenance to monuments in the area. The site was chosen because of the strength of interest amongst the local heritage group, the site itself and the adjacent facilities at the X-PO. The project concept has evolved from training a mobile conservation team to a community based training scheme. - The ethos of GeoparkLIFE is to strive for balance between conservation and tourism; the aim is to ensure the monument can be used as a community resource. - Actions taken to date were discussed and gaps in the preparatory works were identified with discussion on how to overcome current issues. The need for documentation was highlighted. 	
2.0	<p>Developing Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The purpose of An Cabhail Mór as a case study within the Geopark project is to use it as a means to develop toolkits and a process template that could be used by other community groups to undertake similar projects. - Recommendations arising from this discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The need for an available resource for community groups to access at the start of such a project which would guide them through the conservation process and provide templates within which to work. The Dept. previously 	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <p>Work in partnership with the DAHG towards developing and publishing guidelines to assist community</p>

	<p>worked in conjunction with LEADER to set up guidelines for community groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was agreed that the project should work towards a national standard and that existing standards should be collected and submitted to Joanne in UCD for review. 	<p>groups undertake local conservation projects.</p> <p>Adopt a standard. Submission of recommendations relating to best practice on conservation by 22nd May 2015</p>
3.0	<p>Where are we?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rather than talking in the abstract about processes and standards, it was suggested at the outset that we are <i>now actively engaged in the process</i> so it is time to move the project along. - The following gaps were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collate information in order to make the right decisions before work begins on the ground. ▪ A detailed condition report for the monument is required. ▪ A building conservation engineers report is necessary. <p>These are considered components for phase one and until these are completed then work cannot progress to phase two which is work on the ground.</p> <p>Current Notification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notification was submitted and confirmed received by the Dept. on 6th May so this process is at a very early stage. A request was made for feedback from NMS on the current notification submitted so that a concrete list of actions can be devised. It is important that there is progress made towards written suggestions and requirements rather than discussions which tend to be open ended. - Notification was submitted and confirmed received by the Dept. on 6th May so this process is at a very early stage. A recommendation was made however that the process should happen in reverse where it is possible to predict (i.e. without major issues) if best practice was being followed. It was suggested that there should be templates that can be followed on the application process, similar in nature to a Planning Application. - It is anticipated that the major gap highlighted will be the lack of a conservation engineers report. 	<p><u>ACTIONS:</u></p> <p>Receive a written detailed response from NMS to notification submitted.</p> <p>Identify terms of reference for the engineers report</p> <p>Complete a Building Conservation Engineers Report</p> <p>Complete a detailed condition report</p> <p>Devise an application model which will implement best practice</p>
4.0	<p>The Implementation of the Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion included the practicalities of the job and aspects about the work at hand and the personnel. Questions were asked about who would be trained, the follow-on plan for the trainees. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following ideas were shared about the plan for works: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is necessary to have a discussion with the Kilnaboy Heritage & History group to identify clearly their aims and objectives, what they want to get from a training programme, and their long term vision for the site. ▪ The training programme could be tailored towards groups such as the BCV and local interested people, FAS/local schemes ▪ Works would be prioritised based on what the monument needs. The safest place to start will be identified (it is now agreed that the conservation engineers report is needed for this) ▪ It must be assumed that most structures have a dangerous aspect. The issues below ground also need to be considered in any strategy that is developed, as although they are not an issue here they are very likely to be an issue at an alternative site. - There is a need to develop a very realistic conservation plan and practical toolkit. - It was raised about an alternative structure where training could take place in re-pointing in parallel with preparatory works at An Cabhail Mór. If training is the priority then there needs to be flexibility. This was met with the opposite view that rather than starting the process at another site it makes as much sense to continue here, identify issues and deal with them. - Attention was drawn to the role of NPWS and the possibility of needing to engage in notifiable actions if works are to proceed outside the season. A wildlife survey is due to be carried out on May 16th 2015. - The general conclusion is that there is still some confusion over the focus of the project i.e. whether it is to save the monument or to train the community with the added comment that if nothing is done then there will not be a monument to save. - Agreed to fully engaging the local community group in the process to date, highlighting that the process is about demonstrating best practice, not needless bureaucracy. - There was also a discussion surrounding comparative projects and the distinction between contractor-led projects versus community led project. 	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Final Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following immediate priorities were agreed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage with the Kilnaboy group to begin to devise a plan for the site. Establish community expectations, defining the outcomes and the envisaged end product. A written plan needs to be produced and the achievable goals and timescales need to be developed with the group. 	

	<p>Information needs to be relayed about the processes involved, particularly in the context of the GeoparkLIFE project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The items for consideration in the plan are:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Safety▪ Access▪ Conservation▪ Training▪ Engagement from the community▪ Costs and sources of funding <p>2. Standards of work need to be identified and adopted. This may involve adopting existing standards (e.g. Burra Charter http://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/) or a combination of existing ones, or it may require creating new standards for community conservation groups. New national standards would need to be developed with DAHG.</p> <p>3. Deal with NMS notification response which will be a formalised response most likely relating to concerns raised in email correspondence from NMS. Preparations can be made for example by commissioning a detailed conservation engineers report.</p>	
--	--	--