

## WHS Partnership Panel

**Minutes**    *Agreed 19.01.24*

**Tuesday 26 September 2023, 10.30am – 12.15pm**

**Monkton Park, Committee Room A / Teams**

**Present:** Emma Sayer **ES** (Chair), Claire Selman **CSe** (minutes/WHS Coordination Unit), Cllr Nick Holder **NH** (Wiltshire Council), Hugh Morrison **HM** (Stonehenge WHS Steering Committee Chair), Colin Shell **CS** (ASAHRG), Lynn Trigwell **LT** (Wiltshire Council), Ross Simmonds **RS** (Historic England), Stephen Stacey **SS** (Avebury WHS Steering Committee Chair) Jan Tomlin **JT** (National Trust), Nichola Tasker **NTa** (English Heritage Trust)

**Observer by invitation:** Jayne Drew **JD** (Avebury WHS Steering Committee), Phil Foxwood **PF** (DCMS), Gill Swanton **GS** (ASAHRG), Nick Simms **NS** (National Trust)

**Abbreviations:** Steering Committee **SC**, Partnership Panel **PP**, World Heritage Site **WHS**, Coordination Unit **CU**, English Heritage Trust **EHT**, National Trust **NT**, Historic England **HE**, Wiltshire Council **WC**, Trust Transition Board **TTB**, Avebury & Stonehenge Archaeological & Historical Research Group **ASAHRG**, Working Group **WG**, National Lottery Heritage Fund **NLHF** Development Consent Order **DCO**

<b>Meeting Summary</b>	Members received updates on a number of projects and events including a report from World Heritage Committee and process to input into State of Conservation report, and the Setting Study. Members from TTB invited alongside CIO Working Group to support preparation of governance proposal to inform consultation at November Steering Committee meetings, taking into consideration consultation of survey and workshop.			
<b>Decisions</b>	Recommendations were agreed for the addition of standing agenda items: Annual Action Plan and Chair's Review*			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Complete</b>
27.06.23	4.3	Circulation of ASAHRG minutes to PP: discuss with Colin & ASAHRG chairs <i>Update: CSe/Admin Officer to add minutes to WHS website</i>	CSe	
27.06.23	7.1	Complete draft revision of processes for agreement by email. <i>Update: CU continue this work when admin support is in place</i>	CSe	
26.09.23	2.0	Address items regarding State of Conservation Report formulation in collaboration with CU	PF	
26.09.23	3.4	Add standing item on the agenda for annual action plan	CSe	
26.09.23	4.2	Enquire regarding approach to scheduled monuments within Condition Survey	CSe	
26.09.23	5.2	Review TTB minutes for clarity on partner funding	CSe	
26.09.23	5.4	Work on CIO by Foundation Constitution	CIO WG	
26.09.23	5.5	Review governance proposal in October	All	
26.09.23	10.2	Add process of chairs review/appointment as a standing agenda item from January*	CSe	
26.09.23	10.3	CSe: include timescale for return of minutes into revision of processes	CSe	

<b>1.0</b>	
1.1	No apologies
1.2	Minutes from 27.06.23 agreed with following amendments: - Add ASAHRG update within Partner Updates

1.3	<p>Actions and matters arising, outstanding actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>CSe</b> to work with ASHRG to add minutes to WHS website</li> <li>- <b>CSe</b> to continue revision of processes when admin support is in place</li> </ul>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Update from DCMS: A303 and WHS Committee</b>
	<p><b>PF</b> gave overview of the 45<sup>th</sup> World Heritage Committee meeting 10 – 25 September in Riyadh, with next steps before taking questions. The draft decision was accepted and passed without discussion or amendment. Next steps are now engaging with the World Heritage Centre and through the advisory bodies such as ICOMOS and committee members ahead of next year's committee meeting which is likely to be in July. Deadline 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 to return State of Conservation (SOC) Report to World Heritage Centre, work has begun on this and partnership will be updated.</p> <p><b>ES:</b> as with last year, is the expectation for the partnership to funnel comments for SOC report through the Coordination Unit to DCMS and Historic England and what are the deadlines for this? <b>PF</b> confirmed the same method will be followed as last year, the SOC report will contain reports beyond A303 work, and work on the report is starting now.</p> <p><b>NH:</b> ref points 8 and 9 of WH Committee report, the request for additional work to proposal from Amesbury to Berwick Down. Are they being discussed by DfT and National Highways or are they being delegated to WC Highways to respond and potentially reflect and amend? <b>PF</b> confirmed this is led by National Highways to engage with WC Highways team.</p> <p><b>NS:</b> re protocol for SOC report input, will Highways input will be going through Coordination Unit? <b>ES</b> raised challenge last year of CU not viewing input from Highways or DfT before submission. <b>PF</b> confirmed to address this.</p> <p><b>Action PF: address items regarding SOC report formulation in collaboration with CU</b></p>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Coordination Unit Update</b>
3.1	<b>Update</b> CSe circulated CU Work Update July – Sept 2023 with meeting papers.
3.2	<b>New part-time admin support</b> CSe: part time Senior Admin Officer Becky Banbury (role description circulated in papers) joining the Coordination Unit next week, working two days a week for six months which will make huge difference to the delivery of coordination unit's work. Will be making introduction during induction period.
3.3	<b>New file sharing system</b> As part of work to increase independence of Coordination Unit, access to information and clarity of communication, <b>CSe</b> is working with WC to develop a shared drive for the partnership to access files independently to support information available on the WHS website and shared via email. Will notify partners when shared drive is ready to launch. Members welcomed the new filing system, which will be available to all Steering Committee and Partnership Panel members.
3.4	<b>Annual Action Plan</b> <b>CSe</b> referred to Annual Action Plan update paper, detailing timetable, and roles of SCs and PP as described in Management Plan. Annual Action Plan will be discussed at November's Steering Committee meetings, reviewed at January's PP meeting to identify resources for delivery, and finalised at March's SC meeting. Members supported a standing item on the agenda for the annual action plan.
<b>Action</b>	<b>CSe: add standing item on the agenda for annual action plan</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Update on key projects</b>
4.1	<b>Management Plan Review</b> <b>CSe</b> reported Management Plan Review Group meeting 26 October. Agenda will include reviewing an overview project timeline, identifying resources for the review and analysis of other Management Plans. It will also be essential to incorporate timing of key projects eg Setting Study and Trust Transition Project into timeline.
4.2	<b>Condition Survey</b> Report submitted from Naomi Brennan, Wessex Archaeology, leading the project: The condition survey is currently focusing on the Avebury part of the WHS. All the monuments

	<p>have been reviewed and a number prioritised for fieldwork survey based on factors such as their previous condition and other aspects such as proximity to PRow. We have looked to make contact with the landowners and tenants of those monuments to explain the what the survey would entail and see if they have any concerns. We are now at the stage of co-ordinating dates between the volunteers and those landowners who are happy for the survey to take place in order to undertake the first survey placements in October. <b>CSe</b> confirmed project meeting is taking place in October. <b>GS</b> raised she had been contacted as a landowner, and questioned the exclusion of scheduled monuments.</p> <p><b>Action</b> <b>CSe: enquire regarding approach to Scheduled Monuments within Condition Survey.</b></p>
4.3	<p><b>Exploring the WHS</b>  <b>CSe:</b> List of 12 prioritised actions, CU last year made progress in identifying smaller group to take forward. Made contact with Esther Gordon-Smith, National Highways. Next steps: confirming key dates to be aware of and when best to hold project board meeting.</p>
4.4	<p><b>Setting Study</b>  <b>LT</b> updated on current status and next steps for Setting Study. For the document to carry significant weight in the planning process, the study is being developed as a Supplementary Planning Document which has a strict and rigorous process to reach approval. <b>LT</b> explained how consultation process is resource intensive to progress report from current draft form, from confidential internal sign off and key stakeholder comment through to public consultation before returning to cabinet and Full Council and allowing time for modifications. Following completion of Design Guide consultation, there will be capacity to progress stakeholder engagement in the spring before Cabinet late spring and public consultation in the summer, returning to Cabinet by autumn/early winter.  <b>RS</b> supports formalizing as supplementary planning document and will find it incredibly useful in terms of planning conversations.  Members gave acknowledgement of the timescale required while also the importance for progress as soon as possible for a number of reasons: impact of Setting Study timescale within consideration of DCO amendments; timing associated with July 2024 World Heritage Committee; and referencing the Setting Study in February's State of Conservation Report.</p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Funding of the Coordination Unit 2024 -25 (item brought forward)</b>
6.1	<p><b>CSe &amp; LT</b> reflected positive discussions with NTa English Heritage Trust, JT National Trust and RS Historic England, and WC is grateful to the partners for their support. While there won't be confirmation until March next year, all three partners have confirmed or have reacted positively to putting funding bids into their organisations towards the core costs of the Coordination Unit with Manager and Officer post for 2024-25 with CU hosted by WC.</p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Continued discussion from TTB</b> <i>The minutes from this item have been grouped into themes to give a summary of discussion.</i>
5.1	<p><b>ES</b> gave a summary of TTB 15.09.23: agreement in principle to move forward with a smaller CIO with fundraising focus for projects arising from the Management Plan, with need to define review points to identify what success looks like to make that decision as to a CIO to host CU. <b>ES</b> confirmed a firm pledge from the local community of £15,000 upon creation of CIO.</p>
5.2	<p><b>CU Hosting</b>  Confirmation that EHT funding for CU isn't tethered to it being hosted by WC. NT could consider a modest contribution to the funding of the Coord Unit, provided the Unit remained separate from the CIO. NT's preference would be for Wilts Council to continue hosting the CIO, supported by multiple partners.  <b>CSe review TTB minutes for clarity on partner funding statements</b></p>
5.3	<p><b>CIO</b>  Fundraising capability:  Members identified need for fundraising to be ambitious. <b>ES</b> reflected how a smaller CIO without management responsibility may be more of a challenge for donor and the philanthropic market. <b>CSe</b> raised that not having responsibility for core costs may give more freedom, and NLHF funded Fundraising Strategy and Business Plan will help deliver ambition.   CIO Projects:</p>

	<p><b>ES</b> gave example of work CIO could support: Dark Skies project identified as priority by Exploring World Heritage Site work which CIO could support with NT as a partner.</p>
5.4	<p><b>Governance</b>  There was discussion of the need for clarity around the difference between governance for the CIO and governance for the partnership.</p> <p>CIO Governance:  Discussion of how a CIO would be governed through trustees. Independent from TTB and PP, with need to identify skills required before recruiting with clear interview process. NLHF funds available to support Trustee recruitment. There was also discussion around if trustees for a smaller CIO would be appropriate to transition into a larger CIO.</p> <p>CIO WG has reviewed CIO by Association Model, with trustees plus members, as a way to address concerns but it is a complicated model. Foundation model more suited for smaller CIO with potential for CIO Chair to sit on new governance model. WG will now work on Constitution for Foundation model.</p> <p><b>Action</b> <i><b>CIO WG: Work on Constitution for CIO by Foundation</b></i></p> <p>Partnership Governance:  Members discussed how best to prepare information to support the SC Chairs in leading consultation on partnership governance at the November meetings. Recognition of need to move forward from previous governance models, of being informed by this work to support the creation of a new model that all partners can support rather than starting from a scratch.</p> <p><b>SS:</b> suggest CIO WG in Oct produce draft summary report for SCs, something reasonably concrete for discussion and debate to support making progress. Support reference to previous models to progress our own, but not be bound by them and to look at what works elsewhere. Potential for Avebury PC to have a WHS group to engage with community, and acknowledge the more joint operation between the parish councils the better.</p> <p><b>HM:</b> mirror SS thoughts, emphasised the need to develop something that SCs support and particular work needed around future proofing CIO, representation on the executive and advisory boards and how they are referred to. Importance to keep SCs informed of progress with transition project. When considering community representation, WHS is covered by several parishes so consideration required as to an approach for this. Support having landowner representation from both sites as they are different.</p> <p><b>JD:</b> highlighted the need for: more community representation to harness their interest and enthusiasm, to streamline with fewer groups, and for clear terms of reference.</p> <p><b>CS &amp; GS:</b> need for community representation in line with UNESCO</p> <p>Key partnership governance considerations raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balancing community and landowner representation with efficient and effective decision making, with a structure that filters to a smaller representative board that ensures all voices are heard.</li> <li>• Number on smaller representative board not critical as non-voting</li> <li>• Merit of an annual forum to extend communication beyond partnership structure.</li> <li>• A structure that allows for items that effect either half of the WHS to be addressed in the round.</li> <li>• Clear cascade of information within the partnership to ensure all partners are cited</li> </ul>
5.5	<p><b>Next steps</b>  A governance proposal is needed to inform consultation with SCs in November, taking into consideration consultation of survey and workshop. The support of members of TTB and CIO WG is welcomed to support the preparation of this information either through attendance of</p>

	meeting 10 October or consultation via email.
<b>Action</b>	<b>All: review governance proposal in October</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Wiltshire Council update regarding significant progress by Sept 2023</b>
7.1	<b>LT</b> gave an update against the two criteria given by WC: funding and governance Funding: significant movement forward with funding requests in or being discussed and WC is grateful to those partners. Governance: although we are making progress from last year, we're not yet 100% certain that work to governance isn't at risk of moving backwards. Moving in the right direction, but can't confirm until partnership agreement of a new governance structure.
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Partner Updates**</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Summary of outcome of this meeting</b>
	See page 1
<b>10.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>
10.1	<b>NTa</b> leaving EHT end of October, Rebecca Eade appointed interim Territory Director and will be briefed on PP. Hope to recruit and appoint before Christmas, may not be in post until March. <b>ES</b> thanked <b>NTa</b> for her commitment and input to the partnership.
10.2	<b>LT</b> , Chair's Annual Review: WC launched survey 18 months into <b>ES</b> 's role and are grateful for partners' input. Members discussed consideration of Chair's review within revision of governance and processes, with opportunity to reflect within first six months in post followed by a review annually. <b>LT</b> proposed for the process of Chair's review/appointment to be a standing agenda item from January, agreed by members*.
<b>Action</b>	<b>CSe: Add process of chairs review/appointment as a standing agenda item from January</b>
10.3	Following a wait for minutes, discussion of importance given to producing a timescale to return minutes when Coordination Unit returns to full capacity.
<b>Action</b>	<b>CSe: include timescale for return of minutes into revision of processes</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>
	9 January 2024 11am – 1pm 14 May 2024 11am – 1pm 19 September 2024 11am – 1pm

Meeting ended: 12.15pm

\*Please note this discussion took place after the meeting was scheduled to finish. As a result not all members were present for this decision, which will be revisited for clarification at the subsequent meeting.

\*\*Partner Updates guidance: members are encouraged to send Claire in advance of the meeting updates on news and matters that affect the partnership, require strategic input or offer opportunity for collaboration.