

## Stonehenge Steering Committee Meeting

8<sup>th</sup> November 2022 13:30 – 15:30

Wiltshire Museum and Zoom

### Minutes and Actions

Agreed at Stonehenge Steering Committee 16.03.23

Present:	Hugh Morrison (HM), Emma Sayer (ES), Natalie Matthee, Ron Lock (RL), Colin Shell (CS), Heather Sebire (HS), Tim Edwards (TE), Rachel Hose (RH), David Dawson (DD), Melanie Pomeroy-Kellinger (MPK) (online), Ross Simmonds (RS) (online), Nichola Tasker (NT) (online), Jo Tudor (online), Philip Miles (PM), Janet Tomlin (JT), Melanie Barge (MB)
Apologies:	Nichola Snashall, Adrian Green, Patrick Casham, Richard Osgood, David Andrews, Richard Crook,
Chair:	Hugh Morrison
Minutes:	Natalie Matthee

1.	Apologies:	Action
2.	<b>Update on Trust Transition Board Project:</b>  a. <b>Governance structure - discussion on Option 1 from Sam Rose's report and Wiltshire Council's suggested compromise.</b>	
HM	Welcomed all the attendees and thanked everyone for their effort to attend the meeting. Grateful to David Dawson for managing the technological aspect of the meeting. Please note, this meeting is being recorded and will most probably be shared to the Stonehenge and Avebury Steering Committee.	
All	Attendees introduced themselves.	
HM	We have met together as a Steering Committee to discuss Wiltshire Council's proposal of a modified version of Dr Sam Rose's option 1. Hugh had found some support for option 1 from the last steering committee meeting and felt it best to convey that to the TTB. WC felt that option 1 in the format suggested by Sam Rose wasn't going to work. The TTB couldn't find consensus, and so we had to go back to the steering group to resolve the governance review. The purpose of this meeting is to decide whether to accept the proposal from Nabil or Wiltshire Council at the last TTB meeting.	
ES	Gave a review of history regarding the project and governance arrangements. From the feedback received from both steering	

	<p>committees and members of the TTB, it was evident that option 1 was the preferred choice. Wiltshire Council, National Trust, English Heritage, and Historic England felt they couldn't support the composition of the executive board, they couldn't come to a consensus decision of a way forward. Both Hugh Morrison and Henry Oliver who chairs the Avebury Steering committee felt that the proposal put forward by WC and the other 3 organisations would not give sufficient voice to members of the local community and other interested stakeholders. Therefore, we have come back to the steering committee to discuss and listen to Wiltshire Council's proposed amendment. After there will be an email vote sent to all members of both steering committees to indicate if you agree with the amended composition. If we don't find consensus, the existing governance will continue. As the chair of the TTB, there are improvements that need to be made should we revert to the status quo as it is. The terms of reference are rather opaque, the communication needs to improve.</p>	
MPK	<p>Brief summary of Wiltshire Council's position and background of option 1 or option 2. Option 1 was preferable. Small Executive Board with a larger Advisory board. In order to make option 1 work, there are a lot of improvements that need to be made. The relationship between the Executive Board and the Advisory Board would need to be set out in detail, tight terms of reference. We looked at the proposed size of the Advisory Board options and found it to be about right. The Advisory Board had a lot of representation from the local communities, but when we looked at the proposed size of the Executive Board, we felt it may be too large to be very effective, we felt that there was some repetition of representation from a local level. Our idea was initially, we proposed a board of 6 with independent chair. We discussed with TTB, it was not well-supported, therefore we suggested a compromise board of 7 plus an independent chair. This was supported by our colleagues at other organizations. However, having a board of 7 wasn't supported by all the members of the TTB, so there was no consensus for that. Our thoughts on a board of 7, it would make it a slightly sleeker organisation, and with the addition of an independent chair, it would be a board of 8. Quicker decisions. We still feel it is valid to discuss Sam Rose's proposal of a board of 8, we haven't completely thrown that idea out as something we could not discuss. WC really supports, and always has, the idea of community involvement in the WHS, it is very valuable. We know that going forward, that community involvement is really important. By proposing board of 7 we are not trying to weaken or dilute that at all, we would just like to focus on having an executive board that is small, and able to make quick</p>	

	decisions, and to be effective. The Executive Board, no matter what size, along with the Advisory Board which will incorporate a wide range of stakeholders, would be really effective if all of the terms of reference and the relationship between the boards are clearly set out.	
RL	What is the rationale behind a board of 7 in opposition to a board of 8? Why would a board of 8 find it more difficult to make decisions rather than a board of 7? Why is that more efficient as opposed to one more in a board of 8?	
MPK	It really boils down to size of effective strategic boards. Initially we thought a board of 6 would be the optimum, and 7 was the compromise. This is purely for effective decision making.	
HM	It has to be clear that Sam Rose's proposal was a board of 8, the compromise was a board of 7. A board of 6 was never really considered.	
TE	It sounded from the way that was worded, like the organizations wanted more of a say than the local people. That's the undertone that I am feeling, with 4 local residents, 4 organisations, at the chance of it coming to loggerheads, a board of 6/7 marginalizes the local people and gives a bigger voting to the bigger organisations. Why are you trying to take away representation of the local people?	
MPK	It wasn't the intention to take away or marginalise anybody. Has to do with effective decision making. As an organisation that has statutory responsibilities its to do with levels of accountability and as Wiltshire Council, we felt that we have different responsibilities across the WHS, and that we prefer a smaller strategic board where decisions can be made quickly.	
TE	Amesbury Town Council represent over 20 000 people right on the Stonehenge boundary. Whilst WC has a large contribution to make to this site, we represent a large amount of people as well. Taking away a voting right from us and giving WC more power. Whereas, having a board of 8, everyone more fairly represented. Feels like taking away an extra person for effective decision making really means that the locals can be overridden. That's the way this comes across.	
MPK	Apologies, it wasn't intended that way at all.	
RH	Similar feelings towards WC to thinking of reducing numbers, shouldn't have reduced local input. It would have sped things up to have local representation. Perhaps better organized with less of other organisations, or to have more balance with locals and organisations.	
CS	Made comments at the Avebury meeting which I feel I need to make here too for reasons of comparability. On the reduction of 8 to 7, at the one transition board meeting I suggested an alternative way of going about, not least because selected one land owner to represent both halves of the WHS I think is	

	<p>unworkable, and that was the view at the Avebury Committee, I did suggest that another way of doing was to combine Historic England and English Heritage Trust's membership, which could be seen as a valid alternative, EHT is contracted to Historic England for managing guardianship of monuments, the contract is due to run out next year. In one sense EHT has more of an interest in this half of the WHS than Historic England, and might well, if it were to be so, to be the representative of that pair. It was put forward as an alternative. The one landowner between the two halves of the WHS is not going to work if this Executive Board were to be introduced. If this governance review is adopted, partly because the Advisory Board is not agreed, and I'm surprised that it's been put forward without serious discussion on it, it also has not been agreed what the actual members of the Executive Board would be, it's not clear that the more senior members will actually be available. I do have a concern that every time a decision had to be made the organisational members had to report back to their organization rather than as Sam Rose appears to hope in his report that they will be on the Executive Board acting and basing decisions based on conserving and enhancing the WHS. The big objectives of the World Heritage convention are listed as the 5Cs. This Governance review suggests what can be considered as a top-down institutional control in contrast to what should be existing at the moment as a bottom-up community contribution. HE has a strategy at the moment, where they are increasing diversity on its board. Sam Rose's role was to look into means of enhancing the sustainability and financial base. The governance review as proposed does not in any way show how there is going to be enhancement of the sustainability and financial support that is needed.</p>	
DD	<p>My opinion is purely a personal view, I thought Sam Rose's proposal was quite balanced, I wonder, given the current state of road scheme, if continuing with existing set up for a while until we can come to an agreement on the governance. I also would like to say that I am on a number of boards, and I agree that if you get above 10 or 11 members then that really does impact on the decision making, but I think 7 or 8 would not make a significant difference.</p>	
HM	<p>Do you have a view regarding Wiltshire Council's proposal?</p>	
DD	<p>I would go with Sam Rose's proposal.</p>	
NT	<p>I think one of the priorities for me was getting an effective decision-making body. The governance that we had before I would say were not effective, not moving forward. Part of it is that the unit is under resourced, but the other part is that we weren't effective in taking decisions. I am keen to see change and I was keen to see Sam Rose's report. It's worth mentioning,</p>	

	the Executive Board wouldn't be voting but discussions to reach consensus. Not outvoting locals would be possible. With the kind of matters that would come to this board, we will be able to cope without voting.	
HM	To Clarify, there was no voting proposed, but it hasn't been agreed.	
NT	The TTB discussed it, and in order to avoid voting standoffs we would not have voting, discussed trialling that, 1 year's trial operating with whatever the new board is, but without voting. See how it goes, likely to adopt it.	
HM	Emma proposed no voting as a way of getting the wheels moving.	
ES	I tabled a proposal of a year trial of no voting if the TTB could agree on a board of 8 + an independent board, but could not concur, wanted us to bring proposed compromise to steering committees.	
TE	Current proposal is no voting, consensus still indicates voting, but without taking a vote. Doesn't feel like it is a good explanation on how representation on the board would work. Doesn't look like it would work.	
NT	I don't fully agree, I thought we had consensus at the TTB on not having a voting board.	
HM	We all have the best interests of the WHS at heart. We felt like things were not getting done, I think it's important to preserve representation of community.	
RL	Concerned about how 1 landowner will represent two areas. The organisations say they value local representative, but this will clearly compromise that community involvement and local representation. Struggling to understand why a board of 8 is not workable. Wondered whether community representative does not have expertise that organisations may have, perhaps it is felt as though they have less to contribute.	
MPK	Apologies – Nabil will be unable to attend the meeting and sends his apologies.	
HO	I fully respect the view that there needs to be a change in governance and decision-making body. A large number of members of Avebury Steering Committee did not accept the proposal, but it might be worth going back to terms of reference of TTB. Remind ourselves that this project was not begun to slim down governance, it was to seek adequate funding and implementation of management plan. Governance element of this lottery funded project only flows from those changes in terms of setting up a CIO. Important to remember that and I agree that if we could step away from the current situation we would be keen to start driving forward and start implementation.	

MPK	Largely the Council's decision was to try to promote agile decision making which hasn't really happened over the last 4 years, but is also a little about expertise. Looking after the WHS is the responsibility of a lot of people but the local authority and conservation bodies have a lot of responsibility, slightly different to local value, just different value, not less. WC has a large element of accountability on how money is spent and are hoping to continue to fund WHS going forward. A lot of talk about a balanced board, a bit of a misnomer, WC representative is an elected member and is representative of local communities as well as the large organisation that has a large statutory responsibility. I don't think it's helpful to use the term balanced board.	
RH	For farmer representation it is not appropriate that 1 farmer represents for Avebury and Stonehenge, they each different circumstances and heritage aspects. There would have to be a representative for both sites, farming represents a large area of WHS. Not squash one representative for both sites.	
TE	WC representative being a local representative, already suggested that they will go back to organisation for vote or feedback, still indicates that they are voting based on the organisation, would not be a local vote, it's marginal at best for local representation.	
	Melanie Barge joined meeting	
JT	TTB spent many hours discussing and committed a significant amount of time, I feel keen to move forward. Feels that we have been so stuck in this, we're not doing the not right thing for the WHS. NT is supportive of a smaller, sleeker Executive Board listening to the Advisory Board, don't lose sight that there will be an Advisory Board helping with decisions, looking to deliver the actions within the management plan. We feel that a smaller number of representatives will be more efficient. We are very strongly opposed to notion of vote, the reason is that it suggests that there may be an attempt to force an organisation against their core principles, and we will be unable to honour a vote that goes against our statutory responsibilities, that is big issue for us. As a TTB we welcomed the idea of functioning without a vote for a year, but I do not recall that being linked to a limited number on the Executive Board.	
ES	NT has been very clear throughout that they would find voting impossible.	
RL	Voting not a way forward, consensus is the way forward.	
CS	No particular view	
ES	To be clear, Sam Rose only envisaged voting on specific issues, like the acceptance of the management plan. We would never be voting on something that would require stakeholders to do anything against their beliefs.	

TE	Happy with idea on no voting, going by consensus, I agree with that, it goes both ways, the local people shouldn't have something forced on them by organisations that they wouldn't agree with, which is why I feel good fair representation for local people is important.	
RH	The comments, makes it sound that the community slowing things down, I feel it is actually the organisations slowing things down, I don't think it's a problem to have an 8-person board, you will isolate the community if you don't have an 8 person board.	
HM	The original proposal of 8 is 1 parish rep from each half of WHS which is also as problematic as is 1 farmer for both sites. Avebury going to want to be that parish, as is Stonehenge.	
RS	It's been important to hear these comments and perspectives. From HE's perspective, there have been frustrations about how the current governance has been functioning. Particularly interested where we go from here. The status quo is not functioning. Ambivalent about it. 8 is perfectly acceptable as well. We really value community representation; it is very important. Advisory Board has been underplayed today. That greater representation on the Advisory Board is an important factor to consider. A number of factors at play here, everything conspired to slow things down. Emma has done a great job at bringing us together at a time when we don't have much of a coordination unit. Funding issue is key part of this, funding in future, get a sound, sustainable footing. We do have to go back to partners or our organisations as there may be other issues for other organisations. Key area is to focus on next steps, after listening and taking into consideration both steering groups discussions, to find a way forward that is workable and pragmatic to ensure the WHS has a sound footing for the future.	
CS	I agree with Ross in terms of things need to be sorted. Definite financial problem which can't be avoided. Present circumstance of things not going as well as they might doesn't fall back to governance, goes to management problem, which has been communication with the steering committees. My view, not enough communication, steering committees need to do the job they're supposed to be doing.	
TE	We need to look at regular communication, set dates, timetables, etc. Steering committee need to receive more regular information going forward. Perhaps improvements can be made going forward.	
MPK	Agree not enough communication for a whole host of reasons which is a bit more complicated, but we are very mindful of that and we can make immediate improvements to that. We have a new member of staff starting in December, we will be able to	

	get more regular communication done, trying our best to improve that.	
HM	Effectively there is no coordination unit at the moment as Anne is on sick leave and Sarah has started a new position elsewhere. Emma has had helped with coordination from Natalie.	
NT	It's my understanding this review of governance, Sam Rose originally commissioned finding out about the setup of a CIO or a trust for funding. As a side relooked at governance because of feedback regarding difficulties from some members of the steering committees. It has, unfortunately, gotten us stuck, and not doing business as usual. Think about going back to our old governance for a year or so to start getting work done, building that trust again, then bring question on governance back and decide from there.	
HM	That sounds like it could be a prudent approach.	
JT	Add I agree with Nicola. Conscious there is a significant amount of work that we're not doing. The Partnership Panel previously worked incredibly well, all focused on doing the best for the WHS. I would welcome that, it's a serious suggestion to move forward.	
PM	Been on the Committee for a long time. I think there is a lot of talk to do on structure, but I agree with the last two speakers.	
HO	Comment on another point, I have sat on the Avebury steering committee for many years before becoming chair and then joining the Partnership Panel, I struggled joining, didn't know what it was for or see terms of reference, or what my role would be. Went back to the Egeria Review, looked at table on roles and responsibilities, the thing that strikes me, I think the status quo hasn't had a chance to function properly, we need structure and a process. Rather agree, get on with it, to give the current system a chance, we need to do swift work to put in processes.	
RS	Additional thought, around the financial models and thinking about how they work. We need to think about how we can fund and adequately resource this unit. Going back to status quo might work up to a point. Pursue parts of that.	
NT	The idea is to do it for a while, get used to working together again, create trust, instead of arguing over governance. Through that time, think about what we want for the governance.	
RS	Without a Coordination unit in place, how is that possible.	
NT	Coordination unit will function again once staffing issues resolved.	
ES	Welcome Nichola's suggestion. Interestingly there was a recommendation that every 12 months or so review governance system, put improvements in place. Take to both steering committees - Pause governance review, give status quo a chance to work and also pursue the TTB's recommendation of	



	the setting up of CIO and help some of the financial sustainability issues referenced.	
CS	I would appreciate what Nichola has said, any disagreement in room. Show of support for Nichola's proposal?	
RL	Yes, I think we could go with that. A bit disconcerting that we cannot come to a decision. Be clear what doesn't work, reviewed difficulties.	
CS	With more community engagement, I would be delighted.	
HS	Good idea.	
TE	Very much in agreement with that. Good representation of everyone involved within the sites. After 1 year, put a timeline in place so that we can get feedback. Give it a definite time frame.	
RH	Yes, I think with what we've experienced with potentially not being included, all will now attend meetings.	
PM	A year's trial would be helpful, worked quite well until finances became an issue.	
2.	<b>b. Establishing an independent CIO - next steps.</b>	
ES	Recommendation from TTB which was not unanimous, majority of board was that the only way to ensure sustainability of finances was to raise money from other sources. Independent trust in the form of a CIO. Some discussions on the potential of other partners putting money into pot, paused for now. A cross-WHS working group to move forward with the setting up of CIO, it requires agreement of preferred governance. A year long trial would be sufficient for lottery fund.	
CS	Would caution against saying year long trial.	
HM	Show who is interested in assisting CIO.	
ES	Quite a quick process, can take between 8 to 10 weeks to start functioning.	
TE	Approximately how much time will be required?	
ES	Initial meeting to discuss what needs to be done. Approximately 2/3 meetings.	
TE	Tim volunteered.	
CS	If you know of anyone with expertise in setting up charities and so on, if they would be able to join the working group.	
MPK	Melanie volunteered.	
HM	Thank you. Today has been very useful, air community and organisational views, sometimes hard to comprehend the stresses and strains of both. General consensus, get on, get things done. May have found a way forward. Thank you to David Dawson for the technological support, thank you to Emma for making this all happen, thank you to Natalie for her assistance.	
3.	<b>AOB</b>	
HM	Next steps, proposed an email with binary vote, we need to agree on what the binary vote will be on.	

ES	Different discussion today than the last Avebury meeting. Did already discuss sharing with Avebury Steering Committee, I think Colin's point of rather a 2-year timeline is rather valuable to be more realistic. Henry, as Chair of Avebury Steering Committee, should we share with Avebury this recommendation to pause current governance review and stay with status quo for 2 years?	
HO	Impression I got from the meeting was that Either options would have struggled to get support, and therefore the vote at least from Avebury would probably ended up with status quo, agree to send recording and new recommendation.	
HM	Seems we may have a new way forward.	
HS	Any danger of leaving funding?	
ES	No, just review governance arrangements and make sure they are working effectively.	
TE	Proposal is that a vote will be put out on whether to put governance review on pause?	
HM	Avebury first watch recording and then both committees will get the proposal.	
ES	Some members of Stonehenge Committee also couldn't attend today so also need to see recording.	
HO	Emma is right, the tone has been different in this meeting but the end point isn't quite so far away. But Avebury committee also want to get on with collaboration. Thank you Nichola.	
MPK	It's been very useful to hear everyone's views, take away to my colleagues and the Council before I express my views on that.	
HM	Is there a timeframe on an outcome on that discussion?	
MPK	A few days.	
HM	Thank you. Hugh closed the meeting.	