



**Trust Transition Board Meeting & Partnership Panel  
(Extraordinary Meeting)  
Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022  
Online Meeting  
3 PM – 5 PM**

**Minutes**

*Agreed at Partnership Panel Meeting 20.02.23*

Present:

- |                                 |                 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Emma Sayer - ES                 | Chair           |
| Nabil Najjar - NN               |                 |
| Nicola Tasker - NT              |                 |
| Ross Simmonds - RS              |                 |
| Janet Tomlin - JT               |                 |
| Henry Oliver - HO               |                 |
| Colin Shell - CS                |                 |
| Melanie Pomeroy-Kellinger - MPK |                 |
| Hugh Morrison - HM              |                 |
| Phil Foxwood – PF               | (DCMS observer) |
| Natalie Matthee - NM            | Note taker      |

<b>1. Introductions and apologies</b> No Apologies	
<b>2. Minutes of the previous meetings and matters arising</b> Minutes of the last meeting were discussed and agreed upon.	
<b>3. Introduction:</b> ES. This meeting is quite an important one in order to discuss and reflect upon both Steering Committee meetings. The aim is to hopefully be able to take a formal recommendation forward to these committees now after this meeting. All those who attended the Steering Committee meetings were thanked, and both chairs were commended on excellent chairing. Greatest points taken from meetings: It was clear that there is a real desire for greater involvement from Parishes and community.	

<p><b>4. Discussion on WHS CU - recommendations from Rose report.</b> The co-ordination unit had been through a tricky time for a while. ES thanked MPK and NM for their efforts to keep communication on track.</p> <p>Strategic discussion. RS to start.</p>	
<p>RS: Outlined that it is important to remember that Sam Rose’s report was originally prepared to strengthen the co-ordination unit, leadership and to aid finances. It also included a report on the governance structure. The unit needs to be financially sustainable, and we need to be mindful in order to ensure that we are getting the best value for money.</p> <p>The focus needs to be on the coordination unit’s future, how do we progress.</p>	
<p>NT agreed, we need to collectively decide what we want the unit to do. First define what we want the unit to do, the focus on the organisational structure second.</p>	
<p>CS: The aspirations for the unit need to be discussed, and include meetings and interactions with individuals who have involvement in the WHS, as well as the promotion of the WHS.</p>	
<p>ES: Noted that the Lemon drizzle and Egeria report was helpful.</p>	
<p>MPK: Responding to comments on the history of the WHS Unit, MPK explained that senior role and job description didn’t change when the Council went Unitary in 2009, it went from a temporary role to a permanent role, which was a big benefit.</p>	
<p>HM: Noted that the coordination unit is front and centre of the WHS, reestablishment is important.</p>	
<p>JT: In agreement with NT.</p>	
<p>RS: A useful place to start would be to finalise what we want the coordination unit to do, we need to be pragmatic and mindful of what the Unit will set out to achieve. Focus on what we want the coordination unit to look like in future, base roles accordingly.</p>	
<p>MPK: In process of developing an induction plan for Claire Selman. Please note, the work description that was attached with Emma’s email was unfortunately an old document, the updated version can be forwarded to members should they wish to see it. A realistic induction plan and work programme needs to be developed. Important to note that not everyone shares the perception that the unit had lost independence, nothing has changed in roles or independence of unit.</p>	
<p>HM: Important that the unit plays a central part. Lack of trust is also an issue.</p>	
<p>CS: In agreement with HM and RS. Work programme – PP has a priority setting this.</p>	
<p>ES: Set profile of unit, how are we going to take this forward? Volunteers? NT, RS, MPK and Council.</p>	
<p>RS: Mindful to start with work that Emma suggested.</p>	
<p><b>5. Feedback from Steering Committee meetings &amp; discussion on next steps:</b></p> <p>HM: Useful meeting, important to include local council and communities in governance. NT suggestion to pause and go back to original governance was well-received by several partners.</p> <p>NT: Really struck by the parlous lack of trust. Her suggestion was in response to this lack of trust.</p> <p>HO: Majority of people showed clear rejection of option 1. Strong feelings regarding involvement of parishes and local communities. Status quo was favoured. Wiltshire Council sought to consider its position.</p>	

ES: Found both meetings to be overall quite positive.	
NT: suggestion was in response to lack of trust, idea was to start working together again, start getting work done and building trust again. Important to define a time period for review of governance once we know what we want the unit to do.	
HM: Suggested not putting an end date or trial period in.	
RS: Suggested putting a review period in place, not one that will necessarily take us back to Sam Rose's suggestions.	
JT: Personal view is that it's important to start working together again. Feedback from the NTrust: There is support for pausing up to a year, but they feel that 2 years may be too long.	
MPK: In-person meetings are important. Regarding Sam Rose's report, there are elements that we could take on board that could help to improve effectiveness, for example, setting out and sending out a 1-year programme for important dates and meetings, which will be well in advance, and improve communication. There are ways to improve current structure.	
CS: Noted that 2 years review period may be more pragmatic, as what needs to be done will take time. Steering committees need to be reengaged. At the end of the day, steering committees remain the decision makers.	
HO: Noted that it wouldn't be realistic to expect everything to be running smoothly within 18 months.	
ES: This committee needs to decide on frequency of meetings, suggested 3 times per year. Will circulate what has been developed so far.	
NT: Noted that there are practical things and other items that need to be achieved in addition to the trust aspect.	
HO: From experience, 6 a year is too many for the Unit to manage.	
NN: In Avebury Steering committee there seemed to be a very pessimistic feeling around Sam Rose's report options. Noted that he cannot commit a definite answer for the recommendation to return to status quo without first consulting with colleagues.	
HM: Noted that it was important to spend our energy on getting our current structure to work.	
NN: Requested information on what wasn't working with the previous governance, do we know what we need to do differently? Suggested perhaps using performance indicators to show us if we are moving in the right direction.	
HO: Noted that the governance review was only there to deal with the setting up of the CIO. There was no particular deficiency.	
NN: Suggested tightening up governance structure to ensure it works.	
MPK: The governance review was initially done in order to start the process of setting up an independent trust. It was also about financial resilience.	
RS: Fully support developing trust. The terms of reference of the governance structure needs to be tightened up, suggested not throwing out Sam Rose's report in entirety, there are helpful points.	
CS: Suggested looking at minutes of earlier meetings to help identify areas where we can move forward or improve upon.	
ES: Confirmed that the update that will be sent to steering committees will include: strengthened terms of reference, perhaps useful to explore a code of conduct, TTB	

have agreed on recommitting to previous governance structure, which is to be reviewed after a period of time.	
<b>6. CIO. Subgroup:</b> Update on CIO's subgroup: ES: People who have volunteered: MPK, Stephen Stacey, Tim Edwards, RS also has a representative from HE that will assist.	
ES and MPK will have a separate discussion on Claire Selman's involvement in this in order to ensure a balanced workload.	
<b>7. UNESCO Periodic Reporting:</b> MPK: Currently exploring different ways to do this as Anne is still on sick leave. There is still enough time for Claire to make a start on this, with help from Emma and other partners. Claire to engage with the steering committees to gather the information early in the new year.	
RS: Mindful of capacity of 1 person, consider scaling of time and effort with this task.	
PF: Provided clarity on this report, would be an administrative role, filling out of report. Actual information will come from stakeholders. Personally, do not think it is too much for one person to handle alone. Highlighted that there are various deadlines for various sections, however July next year is the final deadline.	
<b>8. Update on Management Plan Review Actions. ES:</b> This document that Sarah Askham sent me before she left was circulated in August. She had not received any updates since the meeting in April. As a matter of priority, there is an action for all partners to update these spreadsheets by the end of January 2023.	
CS: Requested information as to who the members of the review management plan group are, present state should be circulated to us please.	
MPK: will circulate updated job description for Claire Selman to members. Next management plan will be more focused, realistic and achievable.	
JT: Suggested rather not circulating as it is outdated and not helpful. Rather review and update before circulating.	
CS: It will be part of the Steering Committee meetings once reviewed.	
<b>9. Update on WHS CU Project Officer recruitment - to include discussion on work plan.</b> MPK: Claire Selman, 18-month contract funded by HE. She does have heritage background and experience. Requested help from partners for induction for her. The role description has been updated which reflects new structure. Role is currently lined managed by County Archaeologist but supervised by WHS Manager.	
RS: Noted that he has reservations about a junior member of staff joining and requested for the workplan to please be shared.	
MPK: Definitely intend to share workplan, which will be developed by Claire once she is inducted and will be drafted with input and support from ES and the PP	
<b>10. AOB:</b> Setting Study, CS asked for an update.	
MPK: Thanked CS for raising this, Anne was working on this, Wiltshire Council is funding this. Currently ongoing, project will be picked up early next year. MPK shared further details, this is shared at the bottom of the minutes.	
PF: World Heritage Committee – seems like the problems have been resolved, double World Heritage Committee meeting next summer. Details will follow. Event taking place at British Embassy in Paris in Feb to explain A303 scheme better.	

ES: Thanked PF for joining our meeting.	
CS: Wished all members a happy festive season.	
<b>12. Date of next meeting</b>	
ES: Will work with MPK and Claire on dates for further meetings and circulate them.	

A brief update on progress with the Setting Study SPD project from MPK

- Chris Blandford Associates (CBA) was appointed to undertake the project for Wiltshire Council and a Project Board was set up to guide the project
- The project plan has a number of key stages these include:
  - i. Draft report that is consulted internally within WC
  - ii. A workshop for input by WHS partners
  - iii. Formal public consultation before being adopted as SPD in Autumn 22/early 23
  - iv. Consideration of comments received and amendments
  - v. Cabinet approval
  - vi. Full council adoption
- CBA has produced a draft methodology statement and the Project Board were consulted on this.
- CBA went on to produce an initial draft report which has been circulated internally within WC and comments have been received. This was circulated in May 22.
- In June we held an internal meeting on the draft, which included Spatial planners. The purpose was to discuss the draft and next steps (the document need to alignment with the revised timetable of the local plan review and its policies which will be ready early 23).
- The lack of staff in the WHS Unit since the late summer has prevented any further progress, and UNESCO has issued new guidance on HIAs which may affect the draft SPD
- This will be picked up early next year when the Unit has enough staff to move it forward and an assessment of the new HIA requirements has been done
- The next step will be sharing the draft report with the Project Board and the wider WHS partnership (early in 23). As the report is in an early draft and has not had internal sign off it is not possible to share it yet.
- We would hope to be able to move to public consultation Summer 2023, with the subsequent SPD being adopted in the Autumn