Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Executive Board

Minutes

Thursday 16 July 2026, 10:30am-12:30pm
Amesbury History Centre
Minutes agreed: 07.08.26

Chair: Andy Miller **AM** (WHS Expert & Stakeholder Group Chair)**.**

Present: Claire Selman **CS** (WHS Coordination Unit), Cllr Jill Turner **JillT** (Avebury WHS Parishes), Laura Corbett **LC** (Avebury WHS Farmers), Rachel Hosier **RH** (Stonehenge WHS Farmers), Cllr Alan Hagger **AH** (Stonehenge WHS Towns & Parishes), Jan Tomlin **JanT** (National Trust), Ross Simmonds **RS** (Historic England), Cllr Paul Sample **PS** (Wiltshire Council), Lynn Trigwell **LT** (Wiltshire Council), Georgia Butters **GB** (English Heritage Trust, deputy), Howard Davies **HD** (Consultant, online).

Minutes: George Downs **GD** (WHS Coordination Unit)**.**

Apologies: Sarah Nichols (WHS Executive Board Chair), Steve Bax (English Heritage Trust).

Abbreviations: United Nations Educational Scientific & Cultural Organisation **UNESCO**, Coordination Unit **CU**, World Heritage Site **WHS**, National Lottery Heritage Fund **NLHF**, Management Plan **MP**, Executive Board **EB**, Expert & Stakeholder Group **ESG**, Wiltshire Council **WC**, National Trust **NT**, English Heritage Trust **EHT**.

Item	Action log	Lead	Completion / notes
5.2	Send letter of support for parish requests on the A4 speed limit.	**CU**	**Completed**
7.0	Consider potential fundraising advice for the CU.	**WC, EHT, NT**	**Underway**

1.0	**Welcome**
1.1	Apologies were noted (listed above). The meeting was recorded as quorate (two thirds). No declarations of interest were made.
1.2	Minutes of 24.03.26 meeting were agreed without further amendment. Members reviewed the previous actions and noted the following: • Action Plan will be considered at agenda item 2.0. • Letter of support regarding parish requests on the A4 speed limit, and a meeting between partners and WC on WHS byways, will be both considered at agenda item 5.0.
2.0	**Partnership Action Plan**
	HD gave an update on the action plan: • The actions were derived from the EB theory of change workshop on 30.01.26. • Three categories of actions are proposed: 1) delivery actions, relevant to a wide range of partners and to be detailed in the new Management Plan; 2) governance actions, relevant to EB members and to be logged in EB meetings; and 3) enabling actions, some of which may be relevant to both the EB and the new Management Plan. • Governance actions will be mitigations of the partnership's corporate risks. Members discussed the distinction between operational and governance matters, acknowledging there will be a flow of action-related information between the ESG and the EB on key challenges, such as the management of byways and highways. **RS** endorsed this distinction as bringing clarity to partnership roles, noting defining the individual owner of each EB action would be useful, along with any timescale or capacity considerations.

	Members proposed that the EB action relating to schemes of delegation should be reviewed every two years or as necessary, as well as the inclusion of budget-setting as an EB action.
3.0	**Risks**
	HD introduced the production of a Corporate Risk Framework. The framework will support the EB to monitor risks to the delivery of the partnership's Strategic Goals, including consequences, likelihood, current controls and further mitigations. Members discussed key potential risks including those related to climate change, resourcing, advocacy, capability, and reputation. The ESG will be best placed to consider operational risks to WHS management, which will be addressed in the Management Plan within a Risk Preparedness section.
4.0	**Board Effectiveness Review**
	HD introduced an upcoming effectiveness review of the EB: • Ensuring the EB has got the right information, culture, and ways of working. • Regular reviews can strengthen governance and give confidence to partners, in relation to accountability of decision-making. • Methods could include self-assessment, structured discussion, independent observation, partner feedback, and learning from global good practice. Members reflected on a range of issues including: • Revision of the WHS Management Plan is progressing ahead of expectations. • There is increased positive, friendly and thoughtful conversation at EB meetings. • There is enhanced clarity on partnership roles, and honesty of the outstanding risks. • Feedback from partners, the ESG and the CU will be useful to assess effectiveness. • Review should consider the less obvious activity, advocacy and collaboration taking place between partners and other stakeholders outside of formal EB meetings. • Concentration is needed on responding to the views of ESG members, avoiding frustration, and delivering a WHS experience which is good for all (e.g., byways). • Clear communication channels and proactive resolutions should be prioritised. • Understanding the capabilities and limits of different partners and authorities. • Suggestion of induction or training for new EB members. • General consensus for a light-touch review, perhaps with a 360 review at a future point.
5.0	**Information Flow between ESG and EB**
5.1	**HD** presented on information flow between the ESG and the EB; • Information has different purposes including updates, consultation, recommendations, and decision feedback. • Important for the EB to seek advice from the ESG before taking decisions. • Information flowing back-and-forth, but without progress, becomes a challenge in need of resolution. • Important for the ESG to communicate any technical advice, operational risks, stakeholder concerns, and any conflicting partner views.
5.2	**PS** raised that the revised Management Plan should include clear improvement actions to the WHS byways, endorsed by a wide range of partners and stakeholders including WC. **PS** proposed that there should be joint ownership of the byway issue by promptly bringing together all those with expertise needed to work towards a solution with the Highway

ACTION	Authority. **RH** reflected on increasingly impactful issues on the AMES12 byway as recently noted in the ESG meeting on 29.06.26. **JanT** noted recent damage to barrows groups adjacent to the AVEB5 byway. Members concurred that a stakeholder meeting on the WHS byways is long overdue and supported the recent ESG action (29.06.26) to request a prompt meeting with WC highways before the next ESG meeting. **JillT** noted that parish representatives had met with WC in April regarding the A4 speed limit; the parishes are awaiting a response to a recent update request (07.07.26). Members agreed to send the EB letter of support for parish requests on the A4 speed limit.
6.0	**WHS Management Plan Review**
	The ESG achieved general agreement (29.06.26) on the first four chapters of the draft WHS Management Plan, with a couple of paragraphs to finalise with partners. Thematic discussions will follow to inform the drafting of the fifth and sixth chapters. EB members should expect to receive the full draft for agreement in the new year 2027 ahead of public consultation.
7.0	**Business Development Strategy**
	Focused strategic planning has taken place, and the EB will discuss this in the autumn. **PS** raised the potential for WHS procurement and supply chains to prioritise Wiltshire suppliers.
8.0	**40th Anniversary of Designation**
ACTION	**CS** gave an update on the celebration of 40 years: • Potential NLHF funding application for the 40th anniversary of inscription, with a key focus on community activity with a local outcome including for young people. • Meeting of the task group will take place in August. Members raised suggestions as follows: • Celebration may be an opportunity for learning about shared problems across WHSs. • Future opportunities for collaboration between local authorities such as devolution. • World Monuments Fund organise talks and events, including on climate change. • Potential consideration of inviting senior UNESCO leaders, royal dignitaries or ministers. • Consider the role of the WHS in work experience placements for local schools, and the importance of interactive career-focused activities for young people. **LC** proposed that celebration activity could include a competition where young people produce their vision of the WHS in 2066. Members agreed that WC, EHT and NT could consider potential fundraising advice for the CU.
9.0	**World Heritage Committee**
	The draft decision for Stonehenge & Avebury WHS will be considered at July's UNESCO World Heritage Committee, which welcomes the new WHS governance arrangements, the Setting Study, Condition Survey, and Stonehenge education facilities.
10.0	**AOB**
	Members reflected on the generally positive Summer Solstice arrangements, the increased uptake of public transport options, and learnings for next time, as recently noted in the ESG meeting on 29.06.26. Enforcement of inappropriate parking has become more effective but issues remain in some places and improving this remains a priority. The importance of

	preventative measures for anti-social behaviour were also raised. Members thanked all partners, stakeholders and agencies for Summer Solstice collaboration. **AH** thanked the EHT team for accommodating the upcoming Amesbury Mayor Making at Stonehenge. **CS** thanked the EHT team for working with the CU to host a regional UK National Commission for UNESCO workshop for South West UNESCO Coordinators.
11.0	**Confirmation of actions / next steps**
	Actions include: • Send letter of support for parish requests on the A4 speed limit (CU). • Consider potential fundraising advice for the CU (WC, EHT, NT).
12.0	**Next Executive Board Meeting**
	Autumn 2026, details will follow.

Meeting ended: 12:40pm