

Email 1

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 05 March 2012 15:13

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Ministerial Correspondence: Rhydymwyn MP for [REDACTED]



**20120305 MC**  
**Rhydymwyn Ha...**

Dear All

You will recall that the local MP expressed interest in the meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> before it had taken place. I have drafted the attached response, which is slightly longer than I would have normally committed to, but I think it provides a clear summary of the meeting and the immediate actions arising. Bearing in mind this summary speaks for the collective, I thought it would be helpful to have your contribution and agreement to the response proposed.

Given this is Ministerial correspondence I need to get a response back to Private Office by 4.00 p.m. tomorrow. (sorry we have very tight turnarounds on this stuff), it would be helpful to have contributions and hopefully agreement on the content by 2.00 p.m. tomorrow.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

Draft Response

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear

Rhydymwyn Valley Site

You wrote on 14<sup>th</sup> February asking for an update on the proposed meeting between government officials regarding the Valley site planned for 27<sup>th</sup> February 2012.

Defra officials met representatives from Welsh Government (Environmental Policy), Countryside Council for Wales, CADW and Flintshire Council (Development, Planning and Conservation) on 27<sup>th</sup> February.

The purpose of the meeting, initiated by Defra, was to discuss and hopefully agree at a strategic level how the works contained within the Historic Buildings Report might be implemented within the statutory and regulatory framework covering both building and environmental conservation. It has been recognised that the works of building conservation may be constrained by wildlife, ecology and landscape protection measures applicable to the site and the species which have established themselves on the site over the past 10 years. The meeting did not discuss specific buildings or the survey report and recommendations.

The discussion was informative and very constructive. It became clear that whilst there were potential constraints due to the impact of protected species, the move to preserve the buildings could potentially support essential wildlife conservation by protecting the habit established amongst the

existing structures. It was also noted that a key feature of the site was the unique environment created by managed public access, and that was in itself beneficial to the nature conservation and preserving the historic archaeology.

The meeting reach broad agreement to explore the following principal actions:

1. A joint plan would be agreed which sought to meet the essential works necessary to preserve the building in strict compliance with current legislation having regard the full legislative framework impacting on the site.
2. The representative bodies would identify the legislative framework across building and natural environment applicable to the site to provide a full picture of the regulatory landscape.
3. A summary of building maintenance measures and recommendations would be considered by the representative bodies that would then identify the regulation which would require or constrain the implementation of works.
4. To consider a plan which extends beyond the immediate conservation pressures, to include landscape management issues within the schedule landscape of the site and not exclusively linked to retained buildings.

It was also agreed in principle that is so far as it was possible within the legislative framework these immediate actions would provide a “quick wins” action plan for maintenance.

The meeting also considered whether it would be possible to incorporate the opportunity to enhance the community benefit through further exploitation of the site. It was agreed that in the first instance addressing the immediate statutory requirements took precedence over future enhancement of community access, as this presented an additional set of challenges to balancing the interests of building preservation and nature conservation.

The representatives also recognised that there was a collective responsibility to create a framework to support building conservation in the context of the clear value of the site as a protected habitat.

It was also agreed that the implementation of specific work activities would need detailed collective input and collaboration in the development of work schedules, method statements, supervision and timing of works. These measures would be developed at an operational level as work was cleared to proceed under the overarching plan.

The group agreed that they would pursue the agreed actions and meet again in approximately two months to review progress, whilst working closely on day to day issues. An example of this day to day work was collective agreement to contribute to a revision of the Bat protocol for the site, which provides guidance on how buildings will be managed, maintained and accessed without adversely impacting on the protected bat species resident in a number of the buildings.

I am encouraged that there is a commitment amongst the public bodies to address these issues in a collaborative and professional manner having proper regard for the conservation issues arising. What has become clear is that there is huge potential for conflict between building conservation and nature conservation policy; therefore it is essential that the partners work jointly to agree strategic objectives to achieve the optimum outcome.

Yours

email 2

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 March 2012 15:26

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Few: Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site-Update

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your e-mail.

To be clear Defra would be happy to allow additional storage on site, subject to compliance with all the relevant legislation. In the case in point, I had previously expressed concern as to how you might get a shipping container into any of the buildings. In the circumstances what appear clear is that a pragmatic solution is needed which avoids direct conflict with the legislative framework.

I am grateful that my alternative proposal is unlikely to breach the relevant legislation, but I think we would consult with CCW prior to any alternative location being agreed.

The container has been requested to store presentation, historic and display materials held by RVHS used on the site. If we can accommodate this request I would like to do so as similar smaller demands for storage have been made by others, and it eases storage pressures on the limited space within the Visitors Centre.

Your pragmatic support to how we manage future requests in respect of the site is helpful. Whilst in an ideal world a complete halt would be desirable, my fear is it will take us time to develop the plan and in the meantime stakeholders will want to develop their interests. What you have proposed is very similar to line taken by my staff in recent months to avoid suggestion of obstruction.

Regards

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 March 2012 11:33

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Few: Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site-Update

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for this.

We are pleased to note that DEFRA, as landowner, is considering not to allow the placement of a container in one of the buildings utilized by bats, and that an alternative option could be considered.

CCW advice in respect of this site is specifically related to ensuring compliance with nature conservation legislation. Your suggestion, based on the content of your email, is not likely to cause a breach of this legislation.

Do we know the purpose of why a container is required? Is it in connection with the use of the site by Theatre Cymru. We previously been informed by third parties about a three day event in building 45. In terms of compliance, this activity is considered very likely to cause a breach of species protection legislation.

The recent case(s) highlights the need for an integrated site management plan. This will need to consider

- (i) Relevant legislation;
- (ii) Maintenance requirements for historical and ecological features
- (iii) Access, interpretation, etc

We suggested a moratorium on new events so that an objective assessment of appropriate future proposals for the site can be made.

However, there is no reason why new projects cannot be approved if it can be demonstrated that they are (a) compliant with all applicable legislation, (B) are not detrimental to the maintenance of historical or ecological features; and (iii) will not cause prejudice too or bias the outcomes of (iii).

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Swyddog Rhywogaethau a Bioamrywiaeth Rhanbarthol/ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru/Countryside Council for Wales

[REDACTED]

Safle Wê/Web site: <http://www.ccw.gov.uk>

>>> "[REDACTED]

05/03/2012 10:32 >>>

Dear All,

Given the concern over the potential impact on the bat population and my own reservations as to how you physically insert a shipping container into the buildings, whether it be Building 45 or 59, I think we need a more pragmatic option. I am tempted to offer siting at the site close to the main gatehouse on the basis that this would not be in breach of planning policy and would be viewed as permitted development. I think we would look to find a location contiguous to an existing made path or roadway and if possible partially screened.

If this would be supported by the collective, then this is the compromise offer to RVHS in the interim.

As to a complete moratorium on proposals until the "compliance plan" is agreed, whilst this is desirable I suspect it will be hard to prevent proposals coming forward, especially if there is any suggestion that the plan may constrain stakeholders access to site or their activities. I think I will add this point to the draft response to the MP which I hope to circulate for comment/contribution later this week.

Regards

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 March 2012 12:51

To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Fwd: Fw: Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site-  
Update

Dear All

Please see the below.

It would seem to us that consideration should now be given to a moratorium on new plans or projects, until completion of an integrated heritage site management plan for the site.

The integrated plan would cover the historical and ecological interests, together with relevant legislation/legal constraints.

To help, the audit of relevant legislation applicable to the above site includes/could include:

- (1) Listed Building legislation
- (2) Scheduled Ancient Monument legislation
- (3) Habitats Directive including implications for
  - (i) SACs (River Dee and Bala Lake SAC, and possibly Alyn Valley Woods SAC
  - (ii) Annex IV European Protected Species (All species of bat, otter, great crested newt)
  - (iii) Implications of previous derogation (ie designation of buildings 45, etc as long term dedicated bat roosts
- (4) Linked to 3 the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) including clear reference to Reg 9 (1) as this requires all public bodies to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive;
- (5) Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 in respect of reptiles, EPS, nesting birds
- (6) Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Section 40 and 42) , including reference to reptiles, common toad
- (7) Water Framework Directive: EAW input required
- (8) Contaminated land legislation: ([REDACTED] can you advise? I suspect relevant statutory bodies could include EAW and possibly FCC Environmental Health)
- (9) Other: Health and Safety legislation; ?Quarries and Mines Act legislation (in respect of the tunnels)

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Safle WêWeb site: <http://www.ccw.gov.uk>

[REDACTED] 02/03/2012 11:55 >>>  
Hi [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] is considering use of building 59 instead of 49 for the container. I've emailed [REDACTED] for info on bat use - his response is below.

I've informed [REDACTED] that licence may also be required here as well, you may be contacted.

I'm sure you're aware but this is pre-app advice it is confidential so we cannot discuss the plan with NEWWildlife

[REDACTED] response:

In the main there are signs of bats in just about every building on site, apart from the gatehouse.

Just off the top of my head, the bats found in the buildings is as followed, however, this is not exhaustive and is obviously subject to change!

B12 (Gatehouse): No evidence

B40/41: Long-eared bats

B45: Pipistrelles, Lesser horseshoes, Long-eared bats

B50: Long-eared or pipistrelle bat roost high up in crack between walls and roof

B58: Lesser horseshoes, Long-eared bats

B59: Long-eared or pipistrelle bat roost high up in crack between walls and roof, possible lesser feeding perches

B97: Lesser horseshoe, Daubenton's, Whiskered/Brandt's, Natterer's, Pipistrelle spp, Long-eared bats

Most of the buildings in the Danger Area are made of brick with cavity walls. There are a lot of cracks in most of the buildings that probably have some bat usage, though without the use of an endoscope I can't quantify this. However, a lot of the larger cracks, when I checked the other year, had bat droppings in them. Several of the buildings are used by lesser horseshoe bats as either day perches or feeding perches.

Does that help?

Can I ask what the reason behind the question is? We have not heard of anything being planned for any of the buildings on site so we are wondering what the reason behind the enquiry is.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded by [REDACTED]  
Slater/EnvironmentAndRegeneration/Flintshire/GB  
on 02/03/2012 11:48 -----

[REDACTED]

01/03/2012 19:10

To

[REDACTED]

cc

[REDACTED]

Fax to

Subject

Re: Fwd: Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site

[REDACTED]

Thank you for the help.

There is no intention to modify the buildings named and the container will not be fixed. DEFRA require us to be able to move it at any time they wish. We have moved on a little in that we now see that there are access problems with P6 (Building 45) for this size container and subsequently we would wish to locate the container in P4 which has no access problems.

We did document the proposed arrangement for siting the unit in P4. I have attached this again.

I understand there no issues with bats in P4. We are aware that we will have to address the derogation issue in P6 (Building 45) in the short term as that building is of international historical importance. We have a strong possibility of major funding for its development and we will probably import an expert to manage our way through any potential issues. I am sure we will be able to come to a mutually advantageous solution.

One final question, would the future location of containers on the site outside the buildings need Planning Permission.

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I have discussed this with [REDACTED] and we have come to the view that placing the container will only require listed building consent if it is to be fixed to the ground or if other work is needed which will alter any part of the structure including the floor. If it is just going to sit on the ground then it will not require LBC.

It may be necessary to obtain a license from the Welsh Government in view of the presence of the bat roost.

Best regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
28/02/2012 09:24

To

[REDACTED]

cc

Subject

Fwd: Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site

[REDACTED]

Can you help with this?

Regards

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:

Location of a Container on the Rhydymwyn Valley Site

Date:

Tue, 28 Feb 2012 09:12:43 +0000

From:

[REDACTED]

To:

[REDACTED]

Mr [REDACTED]

I have looked over your enquiry to place a storage container within one of the listed buildings at the above site. Planning permission would not be required as it is within a building and I do not think this would be a change of use. Listed Building consent will be required because of the potential affect on the listed building. [REDACTED] in our conservation department should be able to give you some advice on any affects on the listed building.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



*Email 3*

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 06 March 2012 09:50

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Ministerial Correspondence: Rhydymwyn MP for [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As regards [REDACTED] final point, can I reiterate that we regularly issue European Protected Species licences for operations on listed buildings. Conflict between the two concerns can be minimised by adopting an integrated, structured approach of the type we discussed last week.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 06 March 2012 08:29

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Ministerial Correspondence: Rhydymwyn MP for [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your speedy response.

I take it from your response that you are content with the agreed action points, and happy that I have reflected all the actions agreed last Monday. I note your concern that the letter is too pessimistic. It is writing in a cautious manner so as to avoid creating expectation which we subsequently may be unable to deliver. I would prefer to increase the positive spin once we know more and can report agreed works. The devil here is undoubtedly in the detail of the works.

You also mention shorting the letter to add clarity. I would prefer to report the totality of the agreed actions now, but I would welcome suggestions on the aspects that might be omitted to reduce the length.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 March 2012 17:01

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

103

[illegible]

Email 4

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 March 2012 10:09  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Declined: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

[REDACTED]

I have made [REDACTED] aware. If you could send a delegate that would be helpful failing that we can perhaps arranged a 1:1 read out over the phone. Anything you want to feed into the discussion would be helpful. Please send to [REDACTED] direct.

Thanks for keeping the management proposal alive. Is there any merit offering to meet your people to reinforce how serious we are? The existing management arrangements are looking increasingly fragile due to the behaviour of certain individuals and their influence over site operations. A national organisation would be much better placed I suspect, but I acknowledge the site isn't without its problems.

Thanks very much for your continuing support.

Regards

[REDACTED]

-----Original Appointment-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 March 2012 09:35  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Declined: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan  
**When:** 09 May 2012 11:00-13:00 (GMT) Greenwich Mean Time : Dublin, Edinburgh, Lisbon, London.  
**Where:** 3rd Floor, Natural England, Bridgewater House, Whitworth Street, Manchester M1 6LT.

Dear [REDACTED],

I have a prior meeting engagement with the MOD in Pembrokeshire that I cannot break on 9 May so I will not be able to attend the meeting. I checked colleagues' availability, but no one else is available to attend. Profuse apologies. I escalated your management proposal to Cadw's Directorate Team and am periodically poking to keep the issue in their minds. I will report back when they have made a decision.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

Email 5

-----Original Appointment-----

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 15 March 2012 13:43

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Declined: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

**When:** 09 May 2012 11:00-13:00 (GMT) Greenwich Mean Time : Dublin, Edinburgh, Lisbon, London.

**Where:** 3rd Floor, Natural England, Bridgewater House, Whitworth Street, Manchester M1 6LT.

[REDACTED]

9th of May isn't any good for [REDACTED] or myself. We would of course be happy to provide comments as appropriate for the meeting

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Rhodfa Padarn, Llanbadarn Fawr, Aberystwyth, Ceredigion, SY23 3UR**

[REDACTED]

Email 5

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 March 2012 16:53  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Rhydymwyn Task Matrix -- enquiry

Dear [REDACTED]

I'm well thanks, I trust you are too.

The definition of the various items is as follows;

B – Backlog maintenance (e.g. structural issue which requires repair)  
IMP – Improvement (e.g. slight modification to guttering to prevent future blocking)  
STC – Short Term Cyclical (e.g. gutter clearance)  
LTC – Long Term Cyclical. (e.g. re-decoration)

I've been meaning to give you a call anyway, so I'll do this later on next week when you're back in the office.

Do contact me if you need any further clarification in the mean time.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**PURCELL MILLER TRITTON LLP**  
**architects, designers and historic buildings consultants**  
Peniel Chapel Vestry, Cae Forys Road, Tal-y-Cafn

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 March 2012 12:38  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Rhydymwyn Task Matrix -- enquiry  
**Importance:** High

[REDACTED]

I trust you are fine.

Defra has the intention to implement some of the recommendations of the reports undertaken by yourself and in trying to develop the matrix I came across the "category task column" with some letters that we are not sure what they mean. These are B, IMP, LTC, STC for which I would appreciate if you please clarify.

I am cc my colleague [REDACTED] because I will not be in the office in the next days to pass the information.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

*email 6*

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 26 March 2012 08:07  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: FYI

Thanks [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] had previously expressed interest.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 24 March 2012 09:11  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FYI

[REDACTED]

The following minute from the last FORV meeting may be of interest

"Since the meeting we have been made aware by CC W of a meeting which took place in Newtown on 27<sup>th</sup> February between DEFRA, WG Nature Conservation, Flintshire CC Planning, Cadw and CCW following on the PMT Report. [REDACTED] has since advised [REDACTED] of this meeting and he has replied saying he has asked for a Report from the meeting."

Regards

[REDACTED]

Email 7

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 April 2012 10:37  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Fwd: Re: Follow up on FOI request on Bats at Rhydymwyn

[REDACTED]

Thank you for copying me into this note.

I welcome the willingness to engage with my staff in York to try to work through issues and I shall endeavour in return to be as open and constructive as possible, acknowledging however there will undoubtedly be issues upon which we will not agree or be able reach a compromise on.

Hopefully you will understand the need for consultation with Welsh Government colleagues to ensure that Defra as an owner (not a policy maker) is aligned to Welsh policy and works with those bodies charged with overseeing the legislation in Wales. Defra has to respect the position of Welsh Government in such matters. We now have a dialogue with all the appropriate bodies and look forward to making sensible progress with regard to wildlife and historic buildings.

The position on Bats wasn't discussed in detail at Newtown, but it was noted that preservation of the buildings would support the bat habitat and as such there was scope of a win/win outcome if the methodology for preservation was appropriately balanced. I have replied separately on the bat protocol but think it is worth confirming that I recognise the need to improve the data capture on the bat population using an independent source to increase our understanding and better inform how we manage access to key buildings in response. I am sure that colleagues at CCW and Welsh Government would support this move.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 April 2012 00:53  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Re: Follow up on FOI request on Bats at Rhydymwyn

[REDACTED]

I have replied to this and copied it to DEFRA because it is a relevant place to comment. I have not had the opportunity today to speak to you and there have been developments including a most encouraging message from DEFRA in York which was very open concerning the site and future developments. As part of this I wish us to not issue FOI requests but try to obtain the information from York. I know the message attached relates to a previous FOI but would you leave me to be the interface with DEFRA York, although I do agree but it is legitimate to ask for information on other sites in the UK where the public are totally excluded from such a massive building because of bat activity. For further information we had no place in the meeting you mention.

The meeting in Newtown was called by DEFRA and brought together the statutory bodies with a view to agreeing a joint plan for the site, including implementing the recommendations of the PMT Report within the protective legislation which applies to the site. DEFRA needed agreement with CADW and the Welsh Government concerning the nature of the work necessary and how it would be implemented. Their own analysis of the recommendations pointed to potential conflicts between building preservation and nature conservation. DEFRA felt the right way forward was to interface with colleagues in Wales and allow those with the responsibility for the legislation to direct how DEFRA tackles implementation.





Email 8

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 April 2012 16:13  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** 'J' [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Rhydymwyn - Legislation Framework

Further to the meeting in Newtown, please find attached the list of works from the Purcell's report, with columns added to identify the relevant legislation relating to Ecology & Conservation.

The definitions under the column "Category of Task" are:

B – Backlog maintenance (e.g. structural issue which requires repair)  
IMP – Improvement (e.g. slight modification to guttering to prevent future blocking)  
STC – Short Term Cyclical (e.g. gutter clearance)  
LTC – Long Term Cyclical. (e.g. re-decoration)

We are seeking to arrange a date for the next meeting in mid May & would be grateful to receive the completed schedule by 14 May.

Regards

[REDACTED]

email 9

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 17 January 2012 09:58

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

[REDACTED]

There is undoubted merit in your proposal to meet on site, especially to resolve first hand practical issues posed by the conservation and ecology issues. Newtown was suggested as accessible to colleagues travelling from Cardiff and also as a neutral location for the first meeting.

I am open minded and would invite attendees to confirm whether they prefer a site meeting or somewhere off site. If attendee could express their preference that would be helpful.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 17 January 2012 09:36

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

[REDACTED]

Many thanks for the invite. This seems a very positive and practical way forward. I have spoken to both conservation and ecology colleagues who would also wish to attend and whilst I can see the merit of a central location to meet, it would also make some sense to meet at the site in the visitor centre. This would enable a discussion as well as a visual inspection which for issues like vegetation clearance around buildings for example, may assist in agreeing things there and then.

Regards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Environment Directorate

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 17 January 2012 08:22

**To:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

**Jon**

Thank you for your response.

I have received positive feedback from all of our WG colleagues, just waiting on colleagues from Flintshire so that we can bring people together.

It would helpful if Newtown is the optimum location if colleagues could volunteer a venue to host this meeting. I suspect we will need a few hours and that we start around 10.30 ish. Defra will issue a formal invitation once we have confirmed attendance and venue.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 January 2012 14:53  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Dear Mr [REDACTED]

I am writing to confirm that I am content to represent Cadw on the proposed consultative group. I lead on twentieth century military sites related work within Cadw and was involved with the original historic environment designations at Rhydymwyn.

I look forward to receiving further details in due course.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Historic Environment Branch / Cangen Amgylchedd Hanesyddol  
Cadw, Plas Carew, 5/7 Cefn Coed, Parc Nantgarw, Cardiff / Caerdydd CF15 7QQ

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 January 2012 08:24  
**To:** Wo [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your positive response.

I agree that an agreed position is the only way forward having regard to all the practical and policy issues we need to address.

If you think a site visit would be useful for you and your colleagues prior to this meeting, please speak to [REDACTED] in my team who can arrange access with our local staff.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 16 January 2012 09:49

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Thanks [REDACTED], we would welcome a meeting of the public sector & statutory bodies concerned to ensure a coordinated approach. Both [REDACTED] (our [REDACTED], cc'd above) and myself would like to attend. The CCW offices in Newtown would seem to be a usefully neutral location, but we would be happy to consider others, and would welcome a site visit at some stage.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government  
Rhodfa Padarn, Llanbadarn Fawr, Aberystwyth, Ceredigion, SY23 3UR

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 January 2012 11:12

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Thanks [REDACTED]

I'll wait for all responses and then write to everyone again to get this meeting set up.

Regards

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 January 2012 11:07

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Hi [REDACTED]

We will be pleased to attend your proposed meeting at the WG Offices in Newtown

Thank you very much

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 January 2012 10:54

To: [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

I am contacting you with a view to arranging a meeting to discuss and hopefully agree a building conservation and ecology implementation plan to facilitate maintenance to the scheduled and listed buildings on the Valley Works site. I believe you will all be aware of the conservation report prepared for Defra which sets out a programme of conservation works, but implementation will hang on whether this can be completed without prejudice to protected species and the ecology benefits developed since 2002.

There is huge local interest in the site, so it seems vital that the regulatory bodies discuss their views about feasibility and implementation of works, and reach a consensus to ensure that Defra, as owner, can proceed with agreed works using approved method statements under the supervision and support of colleagues from the Local Authority and Government bodies.

Subject to finding a suitable venue, I would like to invite you to join a consultative group and participate in an initial meeting to discuss how Defra should proceed. It has been suggested that Welsh Government offices in Newtown might serve as a convenient venue.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Email 10

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 27 January 2012 15:13

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

The consensus seems to be to hold the meeting at a location away from any potential lobbying is most appropriate.

The CCW Offices at Newtown seem to be a good midpoint & a 10.30 start is suggested.

Some suggested dates are Wednesday 22 February, Wednesday 29 Feb or Wednesday 7 March.

This meeting will be to agree a high level strategic approach to the implementation of the Building Conservation & Ecology Plan.

All parties will be welcome to undertake a site inspection at another time.

I'd be grateful if you could confirm your available dates.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Defra Estates  
Foss House, Kings Pool  
1-2 Peasholme Green  
YORK. YO1 7PX.  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 January 2012 11:55

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: B

[REDACTED]; [Jerry.Spencer@flintshire.gov.uk](mailto:Jerry.Spencer@flintshire.gov.uk); Fielding, Leasa (DESD - NAMU - NCB)

Subject: RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology ImplementationPlan

We'd like to see the site at some point, but feel it would be better to have a first meeting well away from the site to avoid any risk of attracting lobbying from interest groups.

[REDACTED]

>Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government  
> Rhodfa Padarn, Llanbadarn Fawr, Aberystwyth, Ceredigion, SY23 3UR  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 January 2012 11:27

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Dear All

I am happy to meet on site or at Newtown

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru/Countryside Council for Wales Glan y Nant Uned 19/Unit 19 Parc Busnes  
Yr Wyddgrug/ Mold Business Park Ffordd Wrecsam/Wrexham Road Yr Wyddgrug/Mold Sir Y  
Fflint/Flintshire  
CH7 1XP

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 January 2012 11:05

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

Dear All,

It is some time since I visited Rhydymwyn and I would find it helpful to view the site again prior to entering discussions concerning conservation issues.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 January 2012 10:55

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Rhydymwyn: Building Conservation & Ecology Implementation Plan

All

Further to [REDACTED] note below, we would be grateful to receive a view.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Defra Estates

Email 10

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 March 2012 08:34  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn Valley Site: Potential Management Transfer to CADW

[REDACTED]

I do appreciate that this is a potentially challenging proposal, but I am willing to invest the time to provide as much information as necessary if WG/CADW think there is potential benefit from such an arrangement.

Thanks for Monday, very helpful.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 March 2012 14:16  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn Valley Site: Potential Management Transfer to CADW

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I am writing to confirm that I have passed on your proposal to my head of branch in the first instance. I imagine that this will require Welsh Government Director-General consideration and/or approval at the very least. I will keep you advised of progress and may well come back to you for further information in due course.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Historic Environment Branch / Cangen Amgylchedd Hanesyddol  
Cadw, Plas Carew, 5/7 Cefn Coed, Parc Nantgarw, Cardiff / Caerdydd CF15 7QQ

[REDACTED]

**Follow Cadw / Dilynwch Cadw:**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 February 2012 12:07  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn Valley Site: Potential Management Transfer to CADW

[REDACTED]

I suspect this is a note for [REDACTED] but I do feel the obvious barrier to the introduction of a successful compliance regime that secures local support is the perception that Defra are standing over management strategy, enforcement of the legislative framework and influencing the outcome. If



we can remove this perception, and I think a management role for CADW, if they are willing, would help achieve this the site can move forward and perhaps re-engage with the stakeholders. Without over egging the devolved administration point, I do think the perceived lack of Welsh influence is making things harder than perhaps they might be.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 February 2012 11:28  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Rhydymwyn Valley Site: Potential Management Transfer to CADW

[REDACTED]

Could I suggest we need to take a measured approach to this suggestion? Might it be better if a joint heritage and nature (&H&S) legislation compliance regime of the kind we discussed were developed and 'bedded in' before considering this matter further?

[REDACTED]  
Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 February 2012 09:01  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Rhydymwyn Valley Site: Potential Management Transfer to CADW  
[REDACTED]

I raised the question of Welsh management of the Rhydymwyn site at the meeting on Monday. The site is clearly of some historic merit and a proportion of the operational management problems Defra experiences is that we are not seen as being directly connected with Wales and the Welsh people. Given the particular mix of merits of this site and the need for continued, managed access I see a potential opportunity to increase the identity of the site within Wales and given the experience for CADW in managing historic sites and buildings there is perhaps an opportunity to explore a transfer of operational site management and preservation to CADW.

I would see the ownership of the site being retained by Defra but the operational management transferring to CADW, potentially supported by WG and CCW. The degree of management transfer would need to be agreed as Defra will need to retain some control and access to tunnels complex and associated buildings to fulfil obligations to the OPCW (Organisation for the Proliferation of Chemical Weapons) which is mainly make no chemical weapons and provide international inspector access on 24 hours notice. This proposal would allow CDAW (and CCW) set the conservation and ecology agenda for the land and buildings and develop an appropriate level of supervised public access.

I would be willing to recommend to my Minister that Defra full funds CADW to undertake this task until at least 2018. The level of funding linked to current operating costs and the split of management duties determined between the parties. I say 2018 because international inspection is likely to end which opens up wider funding avenues beyond this date.

I see this as a potential long term opportunity to bring informed management to the site, and may present the right leadership to take the site forward in a manner which would be welcomed by local people.

I would be grateful if you could sound out this idea with your Directors to see whether there is scope for further dialogue.

Regards

[REDACTED]

***Defra Estates,  
Room 401,  
Foss House,  
Kings Pool,  
Peasholme Green,  
YORK,  
YO1 7PX***

[REDACTED]