



## Stonehenge WHS Steering Committee Meeting

### Minutes Agreed 04.07.23

**Thursday 16 March 2023, 2pm – 4.17pm**

De La Wyle meeting room, Bourne Hill, Salisbury and online via Teams

**Present:** Hugh Morrison **HM** (Chair), Claire Selman **CLS** (Minutes/WHS Coordination Unit), Heather Sebire **HS** (English Heritage), Cllr David Challis **DC** (on behalf of Cllr Ron Lock, Shrewton Parish Council), Richard Crook **RC** (NFU), Rachel Hosier **RH** (WHS Farmers), Colin Shell **CS** (ASAHRG) Melanie Pomeroy-Kellinger **MPK** (Wiltshire Council), Jan Tomlin **JT** (National Trust), Mel Barge **MB** (Historic England), Scott Ashman **SA** (English Heritage), Cllr Tim Edwards **TE** (Amesbury Town Council), Jo Tudor **JT** (Durrington Town Council), Phil Foxwood **PF** (DCMS)

**Attending by invitation:** Emma Sayer **ES** (Chair, Partnership Panel)

**Apologies:** Nick Snashall (National Trust), Stephanie Payne (Natural England), Roland Smith (Wiltshire Council), Adrian Green (Salisbury Museum), Cllr Andrew Shuttleworth (Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council), David Andrews (Visit Wiltshire), Patrick Cashman (RSPB), Cllr Ian Silk (Durrington Town Council), Richard Osgood (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

**Abbreviations:** Steering Committee **SC**, Partnership Panel **PP**, World Heritage Site **WHS**, Coordination Unit **CU**, Charitable Incorporated Organisation **CIO**, Sam Rose Report **SRR**, English Heritage **EH**, National Trust **NT**, Historic England **HE**, Wiltshire Council **WC**, Trust Transition Board **TTB** Avebury & Stonehenge Archaeological & Historical Research Group **ASAHRG**, National Heritage Lottery Fund **NHLF**, Parish Council **PC**

Action	Lead	Status
Circulate agreed minutes of 08.11.22 and, for completeness, summary of meeting from 16.09.21. List organisations with attendees for future minutes.	CLS	complete
Circulate invitation for partners to take part in World Heritage Day social media activity. JT to put CLS in touch with Avebury marketing lead.	CLS	complete
Following same discussion at Avebury SC, CLS circulate periodic report for comment & meet with Chairs to agree report before initial submission to DCMS.	CLS	complete
Review and update SC contacts as part of review of processes, including addition of Parish/Town Council Clerks/Chairs	CLS	complete
Identify Deputy for Chair at next Steering Committee meeting	HM	complete
Circulate proposal for comment and invitation to facilitated discussion to all SC & PP members	CLS	complete

Who	Minutes
	2.02pm: Recording started
	<b>Item 1.0 Apologies</b>
	Apologies given and all members introduced themselves
	HS joined the meeting
	<b>Item 2.0 Agree minutes from last meeting, review actions and matters arising</b>
HM	Do we agree the previous minutes? (no objections, all agreed) <b>Action: CLS circulate</b>
DC	Suggestion to include who names represent to minutes to assist those who are new to the group (agreement from members) <b>Action: CLS add to future minutes</b>
HM	No minutes from committee meeting 16.09.21, only record is RH notes for WHS Farmers. Propose these are adopted as the minutes from the meeting? (no objections, all agreed) <b>Action: CLS circulate</b>
	PF joined the meeting
	<b>Item 4.0 WHS Coordination Unit Update</b>
CLS	Items 3 & 4 switched, so as to begin with the Coordination Unit update.
MPK	Staffing of Coordination Unit update: following a period of leave, Anne's post of Partnership Manager will become vacant on 10 April. No immediate plans to replace, taking time to consider options to use funding from vacant post for admin/business/consultancy support for key projects such as Management Plan. Will present options in the next few weeks. Invite members to add messages to circulated virtual leaving card for Anne.
CLS	Joined as Partnership Officer in December, update based on circulated information including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Keen to visit partners on site, do extend invitations.</li> <li>- Three stage website review, will work with partners to update.</li> <li>- Megalith last issue winter 2020, looking to either resume or review concept</li> <li>- Communications review: in house review of internal and external communications to ensure method and contents of CU activity is efficient and effective for audiences.</li> <li>- Stall at Archaeology in Wiltshire Conference with support from ASHRG 26 March.</li> <li>- World Heritage Day 18 April: social media invitation for partners to jointly share post to show range of partners and increase awareness, bigger event next year with longer lead in time <b>Action: CLS share details of social media post</b></li> </ul>
JT	Will share contact of full-time MarComms Officer based at Avebury with CLS, to offer support.
	<b>Item 3.0 UNESCO Periodic Report Approach &amp; Progress</b>
CLS	Circulated presentation that introduces Periodic Report. Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Global survey led by UNESCO, completed by WHS, and submitted to UNESCO through the State Party/DCMS for overall sign off. Data collated and presented as regions (Europe &amp; North America) to show overarching trends by region over time.</li> <li>- In its third cycle, reflecting activity since 2013. Over 200 questions, some not relevant to our WHS, most questions multiple choice with approx. 3 sentences for written responses so limited opportunity to go into detail.</li> <li>- Information sources: combination of desk-based assessment (Management Plan, State of Conservation Reports, 2013 Periodic Report, reports published by WHS), consultation with partners in their areas of work and responses to online survey.</li> <li>- On 6 April I will circulate pdf of this first draft of report to SCs, with opportunity to comment by emailing myself and Chair HM by 17 April.</li> <li>- Propose I meet with Chairs to discuss comments, before submitting initial draft to DCMS</li> </ul>
HM	To clarify, does this require approval from committee?
CLS	Propose SC comment through Chairs, who then meet with me to feedback comments received before submission. Balancing opportunity to comment while making it achievable in the time.
CS	Believes report was agreed by SC last time. SC are the responsible bodies, State of Conservation approved by committees. CU is secretariat, but it has to be an action from responsible bodies.

CLS	Mindful of timescale, would you be happy to offer this as delegated responsibility for Chairs?
DC	Could ask for comments as exception, no response by a certain date equates to approval.
PH	(CLS asked for comment from DCMS) Steering groups should be aware of the exercise and further engagement is determined by each site.
MPK	For Avebury WHS I drafted questionnaire, shared to SC for information and went to partners for certain details. There wasn't a formal signing off procedure from SC.
ES	For State of Conservation, due to tight timescale, we went to Chairs to sign off.
CS	The Avebury committee would have to make a similar agreement of process.
	<b>Action: Following same discussion at Avebury SC, CLS circulate periodic report for comment and meet with Chairs to agree report before initial submission to DCMS.</b>
	<b>Item 5.0 Report from Stonehenge &amp; Avebury WHS Partnership Panel</b>
HM	Partnership Panel meeting on 20.02.23 was challenging however there were many positives to be drawn. Cllr Holder set out WC position, which many of us had sympathy for, particularly financial position. PP welcomed the SC's decision to look to establish a CIO and considered that it may be able to host the CU. Panel members agreed to explore within their organisations whether they could support this. Partners were keen to move forward, and came to agreement to a facilitated workshop open to all SC and PP to explore how to do this together
CS	As a member of PP, lots that needs to be resolved to move forwards.
TE	Checking all on same page, previous meeting agreed to move forward with current structure, form CIO that would look to fund CU in future, rather than SRR model at this moment in time.
JT	NT not in a position to confirm that as a charity it can sit as a Trustee or directly finance a CIO, this is being considered by our legal team.
MPK	Not total agreement with TE's summary, WC still thinks there is merit in some aspects of SRR but sees setting up a Trust as an alternate way forward and would consider both.
CS	Unfortunate if NT isn't able to participate, contributing not necessarily financially but supporting as a good idea. This can go forward without NT. At the last SC we agreed that a CIO should be set up, as did Avebury, and there's a working group. CIO must be looking to take over CU rather than contribute funding to CU, and if so a different governance review will be needed.
ES	Background to CIO: SRR included a CIO to raise funds for enhancements to WHS and projects from Management Plan. No detail for other responsibility, mentioned in passing may be opportunity to host staff. PP: one route forward is CIO hosts CU, which partners are discussing with organisations. NHLF project did include as part of approved purposes, that if you set up a Trust then governance might change.
JT	Support of MPK point, NT saw much merit in SRR and significant time went into it. For NT, SRR still a consideration on the table.
	<b>Item 6.0 Proposed changes to Terms of Reference, responsibilities, processes</b>
HM	Important to make sure structure is fit for purpose with clarity of roles. Leads from ES comments for Chairs to sign off reports at short notice eg State of Conservation and Periodic Report. With CLS help would include looking at committee membership, making sure we have the right people, organisations and contacts as this is out of date (TE & RC agreed)
CS	Town & Parish Clerks should be cc'd to be kept up to date, continuity between elections and as a means of archiving locally. <b>Action: CLS add Clerks to circulation list</b>
HM	Need for nominated deputies for members and Chairs.
RC	In the past individuals have been responsible for finding a deputy.
DC	Like I am today. Whether you want to have a nominated deputy or for it to be ad hoc. Support suggestion of including Clerks for central source of information.
MPK	Used to be several from different WC disciplines, SC may wish to resume this. Wholescale review needed of membership for both SCs. Support idea of a Deputy Chair, leads to better succession planning after Chair's term, and review of roles and processes. Funding from NHLF / vacant post to support this.
ES	NHLF bid must be spent against approved processes, which would include improvements to our way of working. Return to TE point, parties within SC aren't on the same page for where we are

	currently in terms of a pause and there is a risk of being unclear, I would encourage a fuller discussion.
<b>HM</b>	We need to find a way forward that avoids conflict. WC & NT don't want to disregard SRR, I agree it has value to everyone, but can we agree to put it to one side to move forward with CIO rather than focus on changing governance for which the way ahead is unclear and could prevent from moving forward together.
<b>TE</b>	Agree with this. Based on notes from previous SC, structure of governance isn't relevant we can continue with CIO and ensure CU is in a good place and then come to a decision on future governance. Key thing is we move forward.
<b>HM</b>	MPK: the SC accept WC doesn't want to disregard SRR, but putting in to one side would relieve the pressure. I believe we agreed that at previous meeting.
<b>MPK</b>	I don't think everyone agreed that, I said I couldn't agree on behalf of WC and would give a written response whether WC agreed to pause the SRR which was Cllr Holder's letter. Some around the table expressed a view, but whole meeting didn't agree. What we have said and what moved forward at PP was there are two options, a new option of setting up a CIO to host CU. I agree with all who have said there are things we can agree on, and can get on and do such as improving mechanisms of how different groups work, terms of reference, deputy chairs.
<b>HM</b>	Thank you, and I accept your point that at the end of the meeting you were going back to consult and the letter was the outcome of that. There wasn't unanimous agreement, difficult to see any other option than to work on what we agree on and put aside that which we don't for the moment so we can make progress together.
<b>MPK</b>	Yes, but mindful in Cllr Holder's letter there's a deadline for us needing to see significant progress before we can commit money next year. Things can't be put on hold, particularly progress on funding (HM agreed)
<b>JT</b>	Agree with MPK, conscious of deadline, sounds like we've a lot of time but we don't. Need to be careful not to keep changing the question, or we'll be unsure of what we're considering. For NT, there's much merit in SRR, we were making progress toward looking at that seriously. Conscious that I've agreed to look at the potential of funding in the next budget round, which means I need to be putting forward a serious bid in August/September, NT works a month ahead of the world. There isn't much time for waiting. When we were talking about pausing, wasn't that in Oct/Nov last year, if we pause too long NT and others will miss the window to put that forward.
<b>HM</b>	JT: What do you need to put that forward?
<b>JT</b>	A very clear roadmap of where we are going, how the structure is going to look. The first time I heard the idea the independent charity would host CU was at the last PP, will have to seek NT legal advice on that new proposal. These things take time. An idea of timescale for when I would be able to ask, what I would be asking for funding for and clear evidence that is a workable structure. Clarity of what we're now proposing in order to write a paper. It's not a given that I can get that funding, and I think I'm hearing all organisations are tight for funding.
<b>CS</b>	My view, what MPK just said for WC is why there needs to be a CIO to take over CU as soon as possible. Two partners of SC have expressed different views, which are two against the majority at the last SC, and the SC expect this to move forward.
<b>DC</b>	Was there a decision taken to pause SRR? My understanding that everyone was broadly in favour, apart from the number on the board 8 or 7 and who would represent the Parishes. Not sure who was against in principal Option 1?
<b>CS</b>	It is my understanding it was rejected, and would have to come back to SC to decide to reconsider it. There is the Avebury SC view that has to be taken into account, where it was more forcefully stated that the governance review should be rejected and CIO proceeded with. Disappointed there's a minority view in the SC that we reverse this.
<b>TE</b>	Agree with CS, we agreed a way to move forward positively with setting up CIO at the end of meeting. More negative today, not a majority and only a few are speaking, but disappointing to keep preventing progression. Discussion last time was 7 or 8 members on panel, Avebury had a similar view. We could move forward quickly if we agreed to have 8 members.

<b>RH</b>	We agreed at last meeting to move forward with CIO and start a group to work towards this. This was a solid thing we agreed, the rest was in flux as WC didn't have anyone at meeting to agree. We need to move CIO forward as that shows progress needed by WC and NT.
<b>MPK</b>	We haven't heard a view from EH or HE today.
<b>SA</b>	I will discuss with Nichola Tasker (EH) and pass that back.
<b>HS MB</b>	Historic England colleagues higher above are working on this and we haven't been briefed.
<b>HM</b>	My understanding for the facilitation group was to facilitate how we create the CIO, not a discussion about current governance structure (ES agreed).
<b>RC</b>	If you make a decision, it needs to move forward, or you won't receive funding.
<b>RH</b>	Move forward with looking at CIO, if people can't come back with decisions, then that looks like we're stalling. Let's get it underway.
<b>HM</b>	Clarify there aren't objections to pursuing CIO, more there's objection to not pursuing SRR?
<b>DC</b>	Previous meeting's minutes mention vote, did that take place?
<b>HM</b>	No, it was decided not to. Consensus is the way forward. Everyone accept we move forward with CIO as proposed? Park SSR for however little time we have so we can focus on CIO?
<b>MPK</b>	They're not mutually exclusive. All agree to pursuing CIO, don't have to park SRR as CIO was part of its recommendations. Pursuing CIO is in some way pursuing SRR. WC would support exploring CIO, but the letter sets out that WC doesn't agree with parking SRR.
<b>HM</b>	We're trying to do the things we can, not the things we can't, as a way forward. (MPK agreed) We're not refusing to do the other things, but don't have resources to do both at the same time, a lot of us working voluntarily.
<b>JT</b>	Propose we use the word pause rather than park, finality with the word park. Pause used by Nichola Tasker (EH) in Autumn. Still seeking advice from NT legal team in what way NT could provide support or funding for CIO, can't provide an answer for that yet.
<b>HM</b>	Anyone object to the word pause?
<b>CS</b>	Yes, reversing what was previously decided.
<b>TE</b>	To clarify, a lot are happy to move forward with SRR. SRR proposed 8, gave fair representation, change to 7 not supported. Happy to move with SRR as per report. No reason to pause, if we said today for fair 8 member board (JT agreed) Don't understand reducing to 7, all time and energy on report why are we pausing it? Then we would have governance that NT and WC wants, we can move forward today. The SRR is fair for all of us.
<b>HM</b>	Not all members on both SCs take that view. Our response to PP was that we would struggle to find support for Option 1 as proposed in SRR with passing of time and proposal for Option 1A
<b>ES</b>	Avebury SC Parish councillors raised even if balanced board they were concerned no mechanism exists to choose which PC would represent. Stronger objection to SRR as shown in minutes.
<b>TE</b>	Shame to slow ourselves down for want of creating a mechanism. Could look to other examples and return to SCs to agree who those representatives were as long as fair representation.
<b>JT</b>	Echo that. Were that decision to be made, it would help my presentation on releasing funding, not guaranteed, but would be based on a report commissioned where everyone has input. Agree with TE we're Stonehenge committee, should be a discussion in the room. We're at risk of throwing away time put into SRR. Would help my presentation to release funding to support CU, which is what we're all trying to achieve.
<b>DC</b>	Advisory Board plays an important role. Chair of Advisory Board should attend Executive Board as observer to ensure views fairly represented and answer questions. Question of how not if to implement SRR. If a satisfactory way could be found, agreement of numbers and role of boards, that could address Avebury's concerns (JT agreed)
<b>MPK</b>	Agree with JT and TE issues raised aren't unsurmountable, variations could be found that work for everyone. Could be two Advisory Boards for the sites, and different ways to represent landowners and Parishes on Executive Board. WC are frustrated at rejection of SRR as we saw so much in it that could be good for everyone. Would just need to make variations to it that would overcome issues.

<b>ES</b>	Most CIOs are constituted with a board to Trustees, then can choose to have designated committees beneath it. Idea of facilitated discussion for all members to explore how that might function. Could use SRR as basis for workshop, looking at the different roles, responsibilities and decision making apparatus of WHS partnership. Proposal for CIO working group and SC Chairs work with CLS to flesh out questions, circulated to SC & PP for comment ( <b>Action: CLS circulate</b> )
<b>Item 7.0 Management Plan</b>	
<b>CLS</b>	Management Plan Review Group to meet in May, report back for next SC in July. Funding from vacant post proposed to support review. Actions from Management Plan: CU updated actions spreadsheet with partners April 22 and Management Plan Review Group went through in detail.
<b>Item 8.0 Members Updates</b>	
	Members Updates circulated in advance and in person at meeting, shared in supplementary doc
	4pm: PF left the meeting
<b>Item 9.0 AOB</b>	
<b>CLS</b>	Phillip Miles, of CLA, is retiring and we extend our thanks to him on this steering committee.
<b>HM</b>	Personally, and on behalf of the committee I would like to thank Anne for all her hard work and commitment for the WHS and wish her all the very best in her future endeavours.
<b>CS</b>	For MPK regarding the Chris Blandford Associates Setting Study, will this be going forward?
<b>MPK</b>	Yes, I have a meeting next week to look at timescale and funding in place to complete that.
<b>MPK</b>	I'd like to record my thanks to Anne and to Claire, who has carried out a large amount of work in the four months she's been with us.
<b>RC</b>	Can I check regarding which Parishes get free access to Stonehenge?
<b>SA</b>	That's something I can confirm.
	4.13pm: JT and MPK left the meeting
<b>Item 10.0 Confirmation of what to feedback to Partnership Panel</b>	
<b>HM</b>	Will revisit this via email.
<b>Item 11.0 Future Meeting Dates</b>	
<b>CLS</b>	Next meeting: Tuesday 4 July, 11am – 1pm at Bourne Hill, Salisbury. I have shared the calendar of meetings for 2023-24, please do suggest further meeting venues.

Meeting ended: 4.17pm