

Notes of meeting between NRM and Darlington Borough Council

11 September 2019

10:00am, [REDACTED] office, NRM

Present: [REDACTED], National Railway Museum; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Locomotion; [REDACTED], Darlington
Borough Council; [REDACTED], Darlington Borough
Council; [REDACTED], National Railway
Museum – from 10:40pm

[REDACTED] welcomed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to the meeting and thanked them for coming to York.

Outline of Darlington Borough Council plans for the Rail Heritage Quarter, North Road, Darlington

[REDACTED] explained that a high-level outline of the plans for the proposed Rail Heritage Quarters were going to public scrutiny tomorrow before being submitted to Cabinet in November/December. It was also explained that some of the detail was contained in the masterplan business case for the site, but this was not due until the end of September. It was noted that the interpretation plan for the Stockton & Darlington Railway HAZ was due about the same time.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presented an overview of the plan. The key points being:

- There is an intention to purchase land to the east of Head of Steam near Skerne Bridge. This land would be used as a car park for the new development and would allow visitors to access not only the site of the RHQ more easily but provide better access to the historically important Skerne Bridge. The area around the bridge would also be landscaped to provide a better experience. Traffic management measures, including closing roads and making some roads open to local traffic only, are also being considered.
- An existing goods shed will be turned into a visitor welcome centre. This would act as the arrival point but would also include additional facilities for visitors including a shop, café (probably around 40 covers), and a small event space. The centre will also include some interpretation pertinent to the whole site. This building would be linked to the existing museum by an outdoor plaza area.
- To the west of the site, it is proposed that a play area will be developed. This will be based on the theme of railways. It is hoped that this will attract visits from the local community.
- A show field will be created to the north of the existing museum building, capable of hosting large scale events.
- There are 2 other large buildings on site which could be repurposed as part of the development. One is currently occupied by the A1 Trust. The A1 Trust have expressed a desire to expand their operation but recognise that there is no capacity in their existing building. As a result, they are in discussions with Network Rail to acquire the nearby 1861 shed (owned by NR but not used) and relocate their business. The other building is currently used by DRPS who have also indicated that they are happy to be

relocated. There is also a further smaller building which is currently used by NELPG. They are happy to remain in situ or move to a new building as required.

- A new engine shed could be built to the east of the branch line. This could be used to accommodate some of the displaced workshops. The engine shed can be connected to the mainline via a private siding. [REDACTED] advised that NR require an indemnity when connected to and running next to mainline.] This building could also accommodate learning spaces and conference facilities.
- The existing museum would be the main focus for interpretation. This would focus on the S&DR and Darlington and its role in the railway story – a reimagining of what is currently there. The museum would also feature a ‘wow’ feature. At the moment this is envisaged as a black box digital immersive experience where visitors would take a ride on Locomotion No1 and end up in the future. Much work has yet to be done on this. The plan is to have multiple variants to encourage repeat visits. Once visitors have interacted with the experience they would then be able to engage with the rest of the museum including the real Locomotion No1.
- The museum will be moving to free entry as part of the developments, although the immersive experience, special events and parking will be charged to assist with cost recovery.
- It was indicated that approvals would be sought in the next few months.
- Funding was also discussed. At the moment, it is envisaged that £5m will be sought from NHLF (regional level) to add to the £20m already promised from the local authorities. The biggest part of the project is the work to upgrade the Goods Shed as this requires significant structural work and there will also be some decontamination work. [REDACTED] commented that we had received advice from NHLF about approaching it as one large project rather than compartmentalising it]. Under the current funding plans, it is expected that the full submission will be made in December 2021 with the intention on work beginning on site by 2023 and opening in September 2024. This would allow time for bedding in before the 2025 celebrations.

Plans and aspirations for Locomotion

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] outlined the plans and aspirations for Locomotion. The desire to work together to ensure that the visitor offer fitted together across both sites was expressed. The use of a Pacer to connect to the two sites was briefly discussed.

NRM collection, including location of Locomotion No. 1

The discussion moved on to NRM collection vehicles and objects. [REDACTED] explained that NRM was currently considering where the national collection should be to give the greatest benefit to everyone. This included dispersal of the collection around the country, not just the North. Part of this process was to look at which vehicles and objects were best suited to different locations to tell the best and most appropriate story. It was stated that there was a keen desire to see Locomotion No 1 return to the Group.

[REDACTED] joined the meeting at this point. [REDACTED] asked if he could talk about how the desire to make best use of the collection impacted on Darlington. [REDACTED] stated that Darlington was an important centre for the locomotive industry from the 1850s to the late C20th and there were some vehicles in the national collection that supported this story, including Derwent,

first/oldest loco to be built in Darlington and one that became a template for rest of locomotives built in Darlington; and an original SDR composite carriage. ■ also pointed out that of all the vehicles currently on display in Head of Steam, only Locomotion No 1 had no connection to Darlington.

■ asked ■ and ■ if there were any aspirations to own vehicles rather than have them on loan. It was explained that museums in Swanage and Swindon had gone through a similar process where we had transferred relevant vehicles from the national collection into their ownership. It was stated that this was something that could be considered for Darlington.

The conversation returned to other vehicles and other objects that could support a story focusing on the importance of Darlington. This could include more modern vehicles such as the prototype MGR, diesel shunter, 910, KOYLI as well as objects. Objects discussed include a model steam crane, a step used by Joseph Pease, archival material, items from the uniform collection

■ and ■ reported that the location of Locomotion No 1 was very sensitive in political terms and that it was a significant issue for local people and for the combined authority. It was stated that it had been in Darlington for a long time and that the new development had been sold on Locomotion No 1 being there as a star attraction.

■ replied saying that we had to make sure its location was tied into the wider strategy of putting vehicles in the best place. ■ also reiterated our commitment to working together to develop an exciting offer and there was no intention to withdraw Locomotion No 1 before the current loan agreement expires. It was agreed by everyone that 2025 was a national celebration and that we should all support each other going forward. ■ suggested that this group reconvened in c.6 weeks to discuss next steps and how we can work together. She agreed to ask ■ to find a mutually convenient date. It was also suggested that the next meeting should be at Head of Steam and/or Locomotion.

Notes of meeting between NRM and DBC, 23rd October 2019, 10:30am

Locomotion

Present: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Apologies: [REDACTED]

Funding

The meeting opened with a discussion of funding updates. [REDACTED] confirmed that NRM had been awarded £18.6m from DCMS for Vision 2025 and that an EOI had gone in to NLHF (national round). IT stated that TVCA had submitted an EOI for the national round based on the S&DR. He also confirmed that DBC have submitted an EOI to the regional committee for the Railway Heritage Quarter. This was submitted around 11 October and expect to hear in November. They are currently working on a Stage 1 application to be submitted asap. This application will contain an ask for funding to help them move to a Stage 2 application.

Update on plans and future location of Locomotion No1

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] gave an update on our plans for both York and Shildon with indicative dates. Areas covered included Central Hall, South Yard, Wonderlab, Great Hall and Locomotion Building 2.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] followed with an update on their plans. They were continuing to have discussions with key partners on the and around the Head of Steam site, particularly focusing on their requirements. Attempts were also being made to get costings together. They want to have finished writing their Masterplan by the end of this month so that it can be submitted in time to go to Cabinet in December. Once approved, this will give them the permissions to start moving ahead. The focus remains the Stockton & Darlington Railway story and they see Locomotion No 1 as being fundamental to that story. They were keen to express the long association of Locomotion No 1 with Darlington (it has been in Darlington since 1857 etc). It was also stated that the museum would be closed between 2022 and 2024 which would provide an opportunity for it to be on display elsewhere.

[REDACTED] stated that it was the hope of NRM to have Locomotion No 1 at Locomotion and asked if there were any other engines that could fill the space or whether they had a back-up plan if Locomotion No 1 was recalled.

[REDACTED] replied that all the plans for the RHQ have been built around having Locomotion No 1 at Head of Steam. It was also stated that local people were bought into the idea of having Locomotion No 1 on display at Darlington following consultation that was done as part of the Masterplan developments and that it was a key part of the Darlington story. The concept of the immersive experience linked to seeing the real locomotive was talked about.

[REDACTED] replied by saying that it was also a key part of the Shildon story. That it was put on the track at Heighington and then moved to Shildon where it picked up the wagons and began its historic journey in 1825, that Shildon is where it was kept and that Shildon was the operations base for Locomotion No 1 and other engines until it moved to Darlington in the 1850s.

■ reiterated that their plans were built around the story of the S&DR and Darlington's role within that, which is why having Locomotion No 1 is so important. He also stated that there will be political consequences if it is not there and the DBC Leader is not enamoured with plans to move it out of Darlington.

■ stated that Locomotion No 1 could also be seen as critical to the story that we are trying to tell at Locomotion and that visitors could reasonably expect to see it here.

■ stated that the report had to be completed by the end of October and asked us to give them an indication of what our intentions are by the end of next week. ■ restated that we wanted it returned. ■ stated that people might not want to invest if Locomotion No 1 wasn't there. ■ talked about the authenticity of the offer (particularly that North Road station was not there on the first day) and asked whether expectations about what should be on display are based on a false understanding of history. ■ replied saying that they saw themselves as being a complimentary offer to us, that they were not trying to be us.

■ then asked about the other locomotives currently on loan to HoS and what the plans were for those. ■ replied saying that they were still thinking of what to do. There was the possibility of using the 1861 Shed to display other vehicles from DLPG etc there. He also said that they would be happy to share the Masterplan and the Interpretation plan with us. It was confirmed that the Interpretation plan had been done by TG&A (who have also done the Interpretation plan for the whole of the line as part of the HAZ). ■ talked about how the interpretation was designed to connect the whole of the site and make it a cohesive experience. ■ briefly talked about plans to bring the replica Locomotion No 1 back in to operational use and said that it was a possibility that this could be used at the RHQ on special occasions.

■ stated that they were working on a projection of 230k visitors per year, a large proportion of which seem to be park and café users. Both ■ and ■ talked about how it would become a resource for the local community, an area of intense social and economic deprivation. ■ asked if the café and park users would be counted as visitors or whether a model would be used to assess numbers. It was stated that it was their intention to count users towards Museum visitor numbers. It is their hope that the café becomes a destination and they also want to keep the park open after the museum closes. It was restated that the museum will be free and that visitors will only pay for the immersive experience.

■ again asked that we communicate our intentions about Locomotion No 1 by the end of the month. It was also stated that if we did not agree then it would get political. The Leader and Mayor would be informed and it is likely that appeals would be made to government.

All parties agreed to keep communication open and to support each other.

Notes of meeting between NRM and DBC, 23rd October, 10:30am

Locomotion

Present: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
Apologies: [REDACTED]

Funding

The meeting opened with a discussion of funding updates. [REDACTED] confirmed that NRM had been awarded £18.6m from DCMS for Vision 2025 and that an EOI had gone in to NLHF (national round). [REDACTED] stated that TVCA had submitted an EOI for the national round based on the S&DR. He also confirmed that DBC have submitted an EOI to the regional committee for the Railway Heritage Quarter. This was submitted around 11 October and expect to hear in November. They are currently working on a Stage 1 application to be submitted asap. This application will contain an ask for funding to help them move to a Stage 2 application.

Update on plans and future location of Locomotion No1

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] gave an update on our plans for both York and Shildon with indicative dates. Areas covered included Central Hall, South Yard, Wonderlab, Great Hall and Locomotion Building 2.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] followed with an update on their plans. They were continuing to have discussions with key partners on the and around the Head of Steam site, particularly focusing on their requirements. Attempts were also being made to get costings together. They want to have finished writing their Masterplan by the end of this month so that it can be submitted in time to go to Cabinet in December. Once approved, this will give them the permissions to start moving ahead. The focus remains the Stockton & Darlington Railway story and they see Locomotion No 1 as being fundamental to that story. They were keen to express the long association of Locomotion No 1 with Darlington (it has been in Darlington since 1857 etc). It was also stated that the museum would be closed between 2022 and 2024 which would provide an opportunity for it to be on display elsewhere.

[REDACTED] stated that it was the hope of NRM to have Locomotion No 1 at Locomotion and asked if there were any other engines that could fill the space or whether they had a back-up plan if Locomotion No 1 was recalled.

[REDACTED] replied that all the plans for the RHQ have been built around having Locomotion No 1 at Head of Steam. It was also stated that local people were bought into the idea of having Locomotion No 1 on display at Darlington following consultation that was done as part of the Masterplan developments and that it was a key part of the Darlington story. The concept of the immersive experience linked to seeing the real locomotive was talked about.

[REDACTED] replied by saying that it was also a key part of the Shildon story. That it was put on the track at Heighington and then moved to Shildon where it picked up the wagons and began its historic journey in 1825, that Shildon is where it was kept and that Shildon was the operations base for Locomotion No 1 and other engines until it moved to Darlington in the 1850s.

■ reiterated that their plans were built around the story of the S&DR and Darlington's role within that, which is why having Locomotion No 1 is so important. He also stated that there will be political consequences if it is not there and the DBC Leader is not enamoured with plans to move it out of Darlington.

■ stated that Locomotion No 1 could also be seen as critical to the story that we are trying to tell at Locomotion and that visitors could reasonably expect to see it here.

■ stated that the report had to be completed by the end of October and asked us to give them an indication of what our intentions are by the end of next week. ■ restated that we wanted it returned. ■ stated that people might not want to invest if Locomotion No 1 wasn't there. ■ talked about the authenticity of the offer (particularly that North Road station was not there on the first day) and asked whether expectations about what should be on display are based on a false understanding of history. ■ replied saying that they saw themselves as being a complimentary offer to us, that they were not trying to be us.

■ then asked about the other locomotives currently on loan to HoS and what the plans were for those. ■ replied saying that they were still thinking of what to do. There was the possibility of using the 1861 Shed to display other vehicles from DLPG etc there. He also said that they would be happy to share the Masterplan and the Interpretation plan with us. It was confirmed that the Interpretation plan had been done by TG&A (who have also done the Interpretation plan for the whole of the line as part of the HAZ). ■ talked about how the interpretation was designed to connect the whole of the site and make it a cohesive experience. ■ briefly talked about plans to bring the replica Locomotion No 1 back in to operational use and said that it was a possibility that this could be used at the RHQ on special occasions.

■ stated that they were working on a projection of 230k visitors per year, a large proportion of which seem to be park and café users. Both ■ and ■ talked about how it would become a resource for the local community, an area of intense social and economic deprivation. ■ asked if the café and park users would be counted or whether a model would be used to assess numbers. It was stated that it was their intention to count users. It is their hope that the café becomes a destination and they also want to keep the park open after the museum closes. It was restated that the museum will be free and that visitors will only pay for the immersive experience.

■ again asked that we communicate our intentions about Locomotion No 1 by the end of the month. It was also stated that if we did not agree then it would get political. The Leader and Mayor would be informed and it is likely that appeals would be made to government.

All parties agreed to keep communication open and to support each other.

Note of meeting held between NRM, [REDACTED] and Darlington Borough Council

06 March 2020

10:00am, [REDACTED], Darlington

Present: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] opened the meeting by providing an update on plans for Head of Steam and the Rail Heritage Quarter. Space have been appointed as the architects. Plans are now entering into the detailed development phase and it is expected that the first phase of work will begin in Spring 2021 and will be complete by 2024. It was also mentioned that a meeting of all the stakeholders in the RHQ had been held about 10 days ago. All stakeholders are very excited and have bought into the process. Plans are now being developed for S&DR 2025, alongside SMG and other partners, as part of the S&DR 2025 programme.

[REDACTED] commented that there was a high level of enthusiasm in the House for national celebrations of 2025. [REDACTED] stated that there was also enthusiasm in the modern rail industry. This was particularly true of Network Rail but also others connected to the supply chain. The TOCs are less interested at the moment but this is because of the turnover in franchises.

[REDACTED] asked about sustainability of the development plans for Head of Steam and the RHQ post-2025. [REDACTED] replied that this was one part of a wider programme of regeneration. The site is located in one of the poorest wards and the development was very much seen as being about improving the life chances of those who lived in the area, particularly through play and education. [REDACTED] commented that there were other schemes of development in progress, including Victoria Road. Improving Victoria Road as well as Northgate was critical to the rejuvenation of the town centre. There were also plans to develop Bank Top (main line) station. £20m had been allocated from TVCA and a bid had gone in for an additional £73m from Government. If successful, this money was thought to come from DfT to TVCA. HS made the point that there was an ambition to link all railway and industrial sites in the town, such as the pumping station.

[REDACTED] talked about the status of Darlington as 'the birthplace of the railways.' This was disputed by [REDACTED] who presented various reasons why the claims made by Darlington were based on a misunderstanding of history. [REDACTED] pointed out that as part of the recent discussions about Locomotion No 1, a lot of additional historical research had been carried out which had revealed a lot of new information, particularly around the subject of ownership.

[REDACTED] responded by saying that this wasn't about legal ownership but about identity and the connection of Locomotion No 1 with Darlington. He stated that Locomotion No 1 was integral to the identity of Darlington – it appears on the town's coat of arms, the football club badge, a memorial plaque to the fallen. He stated that he understood why SMG wanted to move it but that he did not

agree with it. He also said that he did not want a public fight when there were vested interests in working together.

■ asked why SMG wanted to remove Locomotion No 1 now. ■ replied that there had been previous discussions, in 1992 and then again in 2015 and 2016. He stated it was his belief that when DBC discussed closure of Head of Steam with the NRM; to either put Locomotion No 1 at Darlington Station or to turn the museum into a small brewery with restaurant and Locomotion No 1 at the centre - it was SMG's refusal to countenance these options as suggested by DBC, that led to a reprieve for Head of Steam when it was threatened with closure in 2016. ■ expressed surprise at news of the proposed closure of the museum made in 2016 and asked who from the council had requested the meeting with the NRM to discuss closure and request NRM's permission to move Locomotion No.1 to Darlington Bank Top station. ■ replied that it was ■, former ■ of the council.

■ stated that it was important to understand the history of the locomotive. It was in the ownership of railway companies until 1968. ■ countered by saying it was restored by 'a Darlington company' but ■ pointed out that this was in fact British Railways under the direction of the then Curator of Historical Relics. ■ also stated the money for building Locomotion came from Darlington. this was again disputed by ■ who pointed out that the money came directly from the S&D company and most money for building the Stephenson Works in Newcastle came from outside Darlington. ■ countered that history is important and that history is also about it being in Darlington for 160 years.

■ disputed the ownership, saying that SMG are just custodians but not owners and that they only came to this by accident. As regards the latter statement ■ stated that you could say the same for all the national collection. Both ■ and ■ also corrected the situation regarding ownership of the National Collection and how this was confirmed by legislation, notably the National Heritage Act, 1983, the British Transport Act, 1968 and the Railways Acts, 1921. In response to ■ comment that his researcher has visited the National Archives to look into the ownership of Locomotion No.1 and found nothing regarding ownership belonging to the S&D, ■ pointed to an S&D ledger held in TNA which confirmed S&D ownership into Locomotion's preservation phase in the 1850s. ■ raised the issue of the loan agreement saying that there are international ramifications if it is not adhered to, particularly the impact that it would have on immunity from seizure. This is the reason why DCMS will not get involved.

■ again asked why now? ■ replied that NRM have been going through a curatorial process of assessing where collection objects should be displayed, and this included Locomotion No 1. ■ also raised the issue of the Head of Steam collection development policy which does not mention Locomotion No 1. ■ added that according to that document, Head of Steam was signed up to the accreditation process and the MA Code of Ethics. ■ also stated that the DBC collection development policy is explicit about identifying the risk of not owning the collection (particularly rail vehicles) and that the aspiration is to own engines that are built in Darlington. Locomotion No1 has more connections with Shildon. It was also stated that everyone at NRM/Locomotion wanted the RHQ and Head of Steam to succeed.

■ said that what DBC wanted was a museum that attracts significant numbers; after Locomotion joined the group, all non-museum events were stripped out of the programme. Visitor numbers fell but now that the story of Shildon has been introduced and a greater emphasis has been put on engagement with collections and education, the numbers are heading back up to 200k. There was a similar story at York. The same could happen at Head of Steam if the decision was made to tell the Darlington story not the story of the first day.

■ replied that people come to Head of Steam to see Locomotion No 1 and that there was a risk to the project of not having it there. The issue of the true history of the locomotive was returned to, with an emphasis on ownership and the Pease family and statements made recently by ■. ■ stated that to get a neutral opinion, it would be useful for people to look at the most recent issue of Steam magazine, ■, which contains an article by Rob Langham that explains the legal title.

■ repeated that Locomotion No 1 was central to the identity of the town. ■ said that it was a disproportionately large issue for Darlington. ■ also said that he and ■ are answerable to the electorate and therefore won't stop lobbying for it to stay.

■ said that they did not dispute SMG ownership or the position of the loan agreement – but that as they are responsible to the electorate, they had to dispute the move from Darlington.

■ responded by saying that NRM/Locomotion will not respond to threats, and that it was unfortunate that the threats to NRM had been publicly made – it made it challenging for both organisations to move forward. For Head of Steam there will be the future challenge that other organisations may feel uncomfortable to loan objects with concern that the loan agreement would not be abided by, and objects not returned. For NRM/SMG that any borrower following the same path as DBC for their own ends.

■ stated that we absolutely want all other objects (28) to stay at Head of Steam and to continue to work with DBC. There is a loan object (rail vehicle) that is up for renewal in June 2020, and DBC must engage with SMG to renew; to date DBC have refused to enter discussion on other objects until Locomotion No 1 is resolved.

■ asked how he could go back to electorate. ■ replied that it could be achieved by choosing the stories that were told. That we could work together to tell a positive story that would also be about jobs into the future, health and well-being and other aspects that are important to DBC. ■ said that Locomotion No1 puts a cloak over the story of Darlington and that people will come to Darlington if the right stories were told. ■ said that all museums are more than one object and asked DBC to think about how they talked about the loan agreement.

■ asked are you saying that you won't change your mind over Locomotion No 1. ■ replied saying that it wasn't a case of won't but can't. And that it is a can't because it could mean that any other museum could threaten/cause a political argument to keep objects that they don't want to return. ■ replied saying that ■ could say that she had met with them and now understood the situation

and will agree to extend the loan agreement. ■■■ replied saying that DBC and ■■■ could say the same in return.

■■■ stated that NRM and DBC have different perspectives. As a national museum, NRM is looking at a global story and in that story, it is important that Locomotion is in Shildon as this is the starting point for a bigger story. This also fits in with the grand narrative that is being used by the S&DR Rail Heritage project that has Locomotion acting as the hub for technological development, Darlington acting as the hub for innovative systems and Stockton as the hub for social impact.

■■■ stated that Locomotion could lose an object from display and it wouldn't make a difference but the cost-benefit to Darlington of not having Locomotion No 1 was huge.

■■■ made reference to a letter sent from NRM to ■■■, stating that she took exception to free entry at Locomotion. She also asked for evidence of the decision made by the Board of Trustees. ■■■ explained that it was not a Board of Trustees decision, that it was a curatorial decision as a delegated power but that the Trustees had expressed support. ■■■ replied saying that there are other parts of the letter that could be challenged and that the campaign would be continued. ■■■ also requested a copy of the current loan agreement and it was pointed out that as co-signatories to that document DBC should have their own copy.

■■■ said that as a museum professional, she had to look at the object and the story that it tells. Locomotion No 1 is significant because of what happened when it set off in 1825 and that was from the Mason's Arms in Shildon. It is not significant because it stood on a plinth in Darlington for 160 years.

■■■ raised the issue of the Locomotion No 1 replica and the desire to have live steaming at the RHQ. ■■■ replied saying that it was the case that they wanted to run trains on the site. ■■■ raised the issue of consulting about whether this would be an acceptable alternative. ■■■ said that she could not agree to this but that she could discuss with the cross-party grouping.

It was agreed that the next steps should involve having a meeting about what alternatives, - stories, vehicles and other objects - could be developed. ■■■ agreed to liaise with ■■■ about suitable dates. It was also agreed that another meeting of this group would be held in May and that in the meantime, there would be no public discussions.

Notes of a meeting between NRM colleagues and [REDACTED].

3:30pm, 1st May 202 via Microsoft Teams

Present: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The meeting opened with introductions. [REDACTED] gave a brief overview of the position of Locomotion within the group and explained how it had come into SMG following a successful and ongoing partnership with, first, Sedgefield Borough Council, and latterly with Durham County Council. It was stated that DCC remain a supportive and committed partner, contributing annually to the running of Locomotion and also investing in the major capital projects, including a £2.5m contribution to the cost of the new building. [REDACTED] also provided an outline for Vision 2025 and how this would be realised at Locomotion.

[REDACTED] provided a background on the change of approach that had occurred since Locomotion joined SMG as a full member in December 2017. This included refreshing the interpretation, making significant changes to the engagement programme and repositioning Locomotion within the local and regional community and cultural setting. It was noted that although the changes to programming had initially seen a fall in visitor numbers, these had returned to 186k in the year ending March 2020. [REDACTED] also talked about the changes made to the schools programme to take it from one focused on local history to one much more aligned with SMG objectives and how the partnership with Hitachi worked.

[REDACTED] then outlined the vision for Locomotion, explaining how there would be a strong focus on Shildon as the first railway town and as a small town that changed the world. This is not to say that Locomotion would become a local history museum but that it would use its Shildon connection as a golden thread that would run through a global railway story. It was also stated that this ensured that the whole site could be pulled together to tell a coherent story. Overall, the ambition was to tell a strong story that was distinct from that told at York, [REDACTED] outlined how the collections of the NRM would be used to support this vision across the two buildings, telling the story of the earliest rail vehicles to the most modern, including the UK's fastest locomotive which is still in service.

The conversation moved on to the subject of Locomotion No 1. [REDACTED] provided an overview of conversations with Darlington Borough Council to date, including previous approaches made by DBC when they were talking about closing Head of Steam. These approaches had included putting Locomotion No 1 on display at Darlington Station or having it as a centrepiece of a brewery-based pub, both of which had been rejected by NRM as not being suitable conditions for such an iconic locomotive. [REDACTED] explained that our role of a national museum is about the best place to tell particular stories, and that we also need to think about the next 20 or 30 years. Clearly there has been a concern about the protection of Locomotion No1 with previous approaches from DBC to re-display in inappropriate conditions.

[REDACTED] also explained how the discussion had moved into being played out in the media which was not helpful to either party, as it meant that both DBC and NRM had been backed into corners. The legal position and the importance that the museum loan process was not put under threat was also discussed. [REDACTED] also reported

that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], Trustees of SMG, had agreed to meet with [REDACTED] [REDACTED], following a letter sent from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] but this had not yet taken place. [REDACTED] stated that she had had a conversation with [REDACTED] when the issue was first raised. She had told [REDACTED] that she would not comment on his campaign but that she would be talking to people from NRM and in her constituency and that she would be supportive of Locomotion No 1 returning to Shildon, "its rightful home". She also stated that she would be happy to come to the meeting with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] if it would help, even if it was only in the capacity of an observer. It was agreed that this would be very helpful.

[REDACTED] provided an update on recent conversations with [REDACTED] from DBC about how we could work together to support DBC to tell a story that would inspire visitors at Head of Steam and that could be supported by vehicles and objects from the national collection. This included the use of the Locomotion No 1 replica. [REDACTED] mentioned that the transfer of objects (including vehicles) to DBC was still a possibility and that this course of action had been undertaken at other museums such as Steam in Swindon.

[REDACTED] thanked everyone for their time and for the briefing which was very useful. She asked that we kept her updated about any plans and reiterated that she wanted to support Locomotion. It was agreed to keep in touch.

Note of meeting held between NRM and Darlington Borough Council

22 October 2020

11:00am, by Teams

Present: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

(to be clear these are not minutes but a file note of main points discussed)

[Post meeting note: the meeting was not as the NRM/LCM team expected – we were anticipated a discussion about Locomotion No 1 following correspondence with DBC (including the Telling Tales paper by [REDACTED] for DBC), instead the DBC team refused to enter into that topic and instead focussed on their plans for 2025 and their expectations of NRM/LCM to deliver in their plans (early vehicle loans and steaming vehicles). With a significant focus on our partnership working for Darlington.]

Meeting notes:

[REDACTED] opened the meeting and invited everyone to make introductions. He then stated that he didn't feel that it was useful to discuss Locomotion No.1, both sides understood each other's position and that wasn't going to change. [REDACTED] stated that DBC *will continue to campaign [for it to stay in Darlington] but that they wouldn't stand in the way of NRM doing the things we need to do*. DBC are keen to maintain partnership working (whilst continuing their campaign).

[REDACTED] said that DBC have major plans for 2025 and thought it would be useful for them to provide an update on what DBC have been doing and where they are up to with their plans. [REDACTED] replied that there seemed to be a lot of common ground as 2025 was a national celebration that would showcase what the railways have done for Great Britain and the rest of the world, so it would be good to hear about the DBC plans. [REDACTED] stated that the NRM/LCM will be working with other organisations to ensure it is seen as a national celebration; showcasing the railways past, present and future.

[REDACTED] added that she did want to discuss Locomotion No 1 today; to which [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] shook their heads.

[REDACTED] gave an overview. The Rail heritage Quarter (RHQ) continues to progress. The majority of the team are now in place; the architects, the M&E contractors, the interpretation design team. It is expected that work will begin on site in summer 2021 with the initial focus being on building the new shed and refurbishing the 1861 shed. It is expected that this work will continue to September 2022 at which point the A1 Trust and DRPS will relocate. Work will then start on the Head of Steam site. It is expected that this will complete at the end of 2023 and open late that year or early 2024.

During the remodelling of the Head of Steam site all the objects will move to the new shed. [Post meeting note: we need to ensure that the conditions of the shed are suitable for SMG loan objects.]

■ also gave an update on thoughts around the 200th anniversary celebration. There are 4 elements to this at the moment for Darlington celebrations:

1. an exhibition focusing on early locomotives,
2. a live steam event,
3. an education project called 'Little Inventors'
4. a theatre performance.

DBC have commissioned consultants [REDACTED] [REDACTED]] to do feasibility studies on the first two elements.

The early locomotives exhibition is intended to run from Easter 2025 to late October 2025 at Head of Steam and would feature early locomotives (original and replica) from around the world. A list of possible exhibits and their owners was currently being compiled by [REDACTED] and the study would also include a plan of what needed to be done to make the exhibition happen and outline costings. The focus would be on Darlington, Stockton and Shildon. The feasibility study is intended to be complete by the first quarter of 2021 and it will then be assessed to see if it is viable to take it to the next stage.

[Post meeting note: It is intended that this exhibition will be held in the new shed. It is unclear how much consideration has been given to ensuring the right environmental conditions and security arrangements will be put in place. There might also be concerns from other museums about lending to an institution that had previously campaigned against returning a loan object.]

■ noted that many of the early locomotives are likely to belong to SMG, many of which are currently on permanent display in our museums; ■ agreed. ■ stated that we need to know their plans, however many of these (naming *Agenora*, *Puffing Billy*, *Rocket*) would be unlikely to move as they were star objects in our museums – a more detailed conversation was needed. But ■ did make the point (learning from past experience) that we would not like to think that DBC would “blame” us for not loaning these objects when we have been clear on our plans from the outset (ie they are all on permanent display).

■ replied saying that he understood and that the exhibition was intended to make the best use of space in Darlington, Stockton and possibly Shildon. If their plans are successful, then the exhibition would attract tens of thousands of people from across the world and there would not be a hotel bed left in the NE.

■ asked what counted as “early” and noted that the exhibition could have an impact on other locomotives that belong to SMG and are currently on display in Head of Steam i.e. they would be displaced by the exhibition and a home would need to be found for them.

■ then discussed the live steam event. This is intended to be a series of events, leading up to and including the 27th September anniversary. It would include elements such as narrow gauge displays on the RHQ site, use of the private siding at the RHQ to display replica engines as well as Tornado and the Prince of Wales. There was also an ambition to bring a Wild West locomotive over (an ambition of ■).

■ also stated that it is hoped that A1 trust would also be able to run charter trains from the RHQ.

There is an ambition to take *local deprived children on Tornado*, something they would never normally be able to do. It was also hoped that A1 would be able to operate a plandaff (??) style service where steam rides pull service trains, subject to funding [post meeting note: not sure they have considered the costs of becoming an operator in this way, or the involvement of the incumbent “franchisee”, or NR].

The pinnacle of the live steam programme would be on the 27th September itself when the replica Locomotion No 1 would run across the Skerne Bridge as part of a cavalcade. [Post meeting note: Locomotion No 1 is currently on loan to SMG from Beamish; to date DBC representatives ■ have not had successful negotiations with Beamish to either take the loan or a transfer].

■ accepted that it was not possible to do a repeat of the 1975 cavalcade but should look to the “art of the possible” and work within current parameters. It was intended to have a turntable at the RHQ and use could also be made of the Hitachi site for operating up and down the line [neither Hitachi or NR have committed to these plans at this time]. It was stated that this feasibility study was also due for completion in Q2 of 2021.

■ was asked who was leading on the studies. He replied that Darlington & Stockton were funding them. ■ said that Darlington is at the centre although the intention is to make it work across all three areas. ■ stated that she was the portfolio holder for transport on TCVA so the idea was that it would be across the whole of Tees valley. All areas are buying into it as it is seen as something regional.

■ replied saying was it both a regional and a national event. She also asked how this fitted with the S&DR 2025 Board structure.

■ replied saying that they were aware of the plans [our understanding is that this was presented to the S&DR 2025 Board last meeting, but to date no partnership working has been agreed]. Stockton wanted to lead on theatre as that fitted with their specialism from running SIF so successfully and DCC wanted to lead on an international conference, working with the Friends, and to see how it fitted in with Lumiere.

■ stated that the reason that DBC had taken the lead was because things had not been moving quickly from a TCVA point of view. As a result DBC had taken it forward with Stockton and the *others will have to start catching up*.

■ then outline the Little Inventors package of work. This was currently being scoped out for Darlington & Stockton based on a test pilot in Darlington. Children from the Northgate area were included in this pilot as it was one of the most deprived wards. It is currently aimed at Y4&5 children but it is hoped to expand it to KS1 and KS3 children. ■ said that this sounded very excited and linked to a lot of the work that we were doing in STEM. ■ also noted that there were links to our Future Engineer programme.

■ gave an update on the Townsfund scheme which is being used to invest in the Northgate area. As part of the scheme they are hoping to purchase Edward Pease's house. Work is also planned for Bank Top station. DBC have told Network Rail that the work must be done by 2024.

■ said that a lot of money was being invested in the Northgate area. There was also a hope to improve the connectivity between North Road and Bank Top. They very much want people from that area to use the site as they are not typical museum goers. Adding that this fits with wanting to engage young people.

■ and ■ gave an update on the performance element of the programme. Stockton would be the site of major outdoor performances whereas Darlington are edging toward a procession style event. It was hoped that a *Kynren* style event could be delivered across all three sites. ■ stated that theatre was a very effective way of engaging with new audiences. The Railway Children at NRM and Waterloo had been very successful.

■ also asked if conversations had been had with Weardale Railway. ■ replied saying that they had a meeting with them about TAP joining the HAZ which they seemed to be keen on.

■ then gave an update on a project being led by the Mayor of Darlington to link mayoral cities across the world that have some connection with rail firsts. This had been launched on 27 September 2020 and it is likely that another event would be held on 19 April. It is believed that this will lead to a number of smaller events in Darlington and other countries. ■ replied saying that this would be a pattern repeated in 2025 with lots of places, including stations and heritage railways, across the country wanting to be involved.

■ asked when it was hoped to have live steam operational by. ■ replied by the end of 2022, start of 2023 with the A1 Trust being operational by that point. ■ noted that there were two important anniversaries that year – the establishment of the Stephenson works [in Newcastle] and the centenary of Flying Scotsman.

■ said there was a lot for us to go away and think about. We have our new building in Shildon coming along as well plans in York.

■ added that it would be helpful to talk about Locomotion No 1, that there had been a very useful meeting yesterday to find a mutual way forward with another planned for a couple of weeks with ■ attending. DBC attendees shook their heads and did not wish to discuss Locomotion No 1 at this meeting.

■ thanked people for attending, finally adding that their campaign around Locomotion No 1 remaining in Darlington would run its course but it was important to maintain a working relationship.

Catch-up meeting: ■ and ■
11 Jan 2021

This meeting was held at the request of ■ following an email sent by ■ on 8 Jan outlining a proposed agenda for a meeting due to be held on 15 Jan regarding the move of Locomotion No 1.

■ explained that as Tees Valley and then the whole of the country was subjected to increased lockdown measures in response to COVID, it had been decided by DBC that the move of Locomotion No1 was not a priority and could be classed as business critical.

■ explained that for SMG, it was still seen as business critical and that we had been supporting loans to other museums as that was part of that institution's business critical pathway. It was admitted that DBC and SMG would, understandably, have different views on what business critical meant. ■ explained that there was money set aside for the move in this financial year but no guarantee that it would be carried over. ■ also explained that it was planned to undertake an asbestos survey of locomotion No1 when it returned to LCM and that this would help facilitate future moves between sites (under REACH). ■ said that he hadn't considered the financial implications and would report this back.

■ said that had to consider clashing with use of HoS as a test centre. ■ asked about its location and whether it is used 24/7. ■ replied that it is situated in the office and learning spaces to the right of the museum [opposite end of the museum to where Locomotion No1 is located] and was currently not operating 24/7. ■ stated that we could factor the move in around when the test centre was operational and that most vehicle moves were normally carried out out of hours to reduce the risk. ■ also said it was possible that other enabling work could be carried out as part of the haulage contract. ■ agreed to feedback at his end.

It was agreed that the meeting on Friday should still go ahead. ■ asked whether comms could be added to the agenda as it was something that it would be good to work together on giving how contentious the move could be. ■ agreed and said that the NRM Comms team were very good and were also used to dealing with similarly contentious issues.

File Note of:

Section 1. Meeting between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 11 January 2021 Section 2. Advice to SMG team from in-house counsel

Section 1. Meeting between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 11 January 2021

Following an email/letter exchange from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] on Friday 8 January, [REDACTED] met with [REDACTED] primarily to discuss the MoU sent to DBC on 02/12/2020 (this is the first response to the MoU).

Collection of L1

At the start of the virtual meeting [REDACTED] took the opportunity to explain that [REDACTED]/DBC does not believe that SMG can collect L1 at this time (w/c 22 Feb has been communicated at collection date):

- Because it is not essential activity and therefore the council will not allow it – although [REDACTED] did make the point that they are not stopping us collecting it, just not now (although he did also say that they want it to remain at HoS till end of summer 2022).
- HoS has now become a COVID test centre; this was announced at the end of last week (07/01/2021), and started as a test centre today (11/01/2021).

[REDACTED] explained we are working with other borrowers to move rail vehicles (NRM/LCM have two moving to Doncaster in Jan and Feb), and have many other works going on with loans and object moves that fit with Gov guidance – remembering, if the work cannot be done from home, then you may travel. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to re-think this position – and [REDACTED] is meeting [REDACTED] (DBC officer) on Friday (15/01/2021) to plan how the move could work.

[REDACTED] explained that the move of L1 is critical to SMG as the costs of the move (and the enabling works at HoS) are in this year (2020/21) budget, as we always expected to move it in 20/21. Also we have a significant amount of rail vehicle asbestos checking and remedial works underway before year end; L1 contains asbestos and to meet the REACH regulations to enable ongoing moves of L1 we need to either remove or remediate – we need L1 at Locomotion over a pit so we can do the works to enable future moves. [REDACTED] asked if SMG would transfer the money in SMG budget to DBC, so that DBC could transfer it back to SMG in 2022/23 for SMG to pay for the move – [REDACTED] said no that was not the policy of how SMG operate.

MoU

On the MoU – [REDACTED] raised three things they want changed:

1. Keep L1 until HoS closes at the end of Summer 2022 – [REDACTED] said no as SMG could not be confident that DBC would undertake the same campaigning in 2022. [REDACTED] explained that they would have a legal agreement between DBC and SMG, and that DBC would have to adhere – [REDACTED] explained that we currently have an existing legal agreement in the form of a loan agreement, and DBC are not adhering to that.
2. For HoS to have L1 in 2025 during their early loco exhibition from March till the end of October – covering all the main holidays; Locomotion would not have L1 for any of the main celebration points. [REDACTED] pointed out that the terms in the MoU were far fairer and equitable giving both museums 6 months of the year. [REDACTED] explained that SMG would not change our position on this.
3. After 2025 DBC propose that SMG take L1 until 2030, and then it returns to HoS for 10 years until 2040, and then agree a 50/50 share from that point. [REDACTED] pointed out that once again this wasn't equitable and reminded [REDACTED] that SMG own the vehicle. [REDACTED] agreed that SMG owned the vehicle and had the choice to do as they wish. [REDACTED] stated that if he were in [REDACTED] shoes he would take all the objects back from HoS and not allow them to have any; [REDACTED] stated that

SMG did not want to do this but did want to find a far more equitable way forward remembering that SMG owned the vehicle.]

█ explained to █ that the MoU was not a negotiation, this was our best and only offer; again reiterating that SMG own the vehicle and we would not offer this type of agreement to any other borrower. Explaining that SMG do not offer 8 year loan agreements, as 3 years are best practise.

█ made the general point that DBC actions (outside of the meetings) did not reflect what was said in these meetings – there was much talk about working together for a positive outcome, but DBC continue their campaigning and the petition (which continues on the HoS website) and the general comms from DBC is to continue to campaign. █ stated that DBC have *stepped right back* – but that they were aware that a public group had now come together, but not led by the council; █ expressed that although the public group were not branded DBC they were very well informed on DBC position. █ reminded █ of the press coverage before and during Christmas that remained with those from DBC campaigning.

█ reminded █ of the commitments from NR were on the basis of this MoU being signed, █ agreed – and added that they were not sure what they would do with the last Darlington loco and how it fitted with their plans. █ reminded █ that the *Stivies* was a time limited offer – and we need to reach agreement by Friday for the MoU; █ stated it was doubtful that they could make any commitments of agreement for a few weeks.

It was agreed to meet again on Thursday to ascertain if either party would change their position.

Section 2. Advice to SMG team from in-house counsel

- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Note from meeting held to discuss relocation of Locomotion No1

25th February 2021 via Zoom

Present: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
member of [REDACTED] administrative team.

[REDACTED] opened the meeting by thanking everyone for coming and asked [REDACTED] to give an update of the situation and latest developments. Key points from [REDACTED] were as follows:

- MoU offered to DBC in December containing the offer, amongst other things, of a 6 month loan in 2025, two further loans in the period 2026-2030, offer of joint engagement eg Flying Scotsman being made available. The MoU was rejected by Darlington.
- Conversations have continued at a senior level with a series of meetings occurring between [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. A further meeting is planned for this week.
- A Facebook campaign group was established at the start of the year. This group has been very vocal and has been personally abusive to SMG personnel, particularly to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Some of these slurs are damaging as they call [REDACTED] professionalism into question which is untrue and unfair. This Facebook group is also leaving comments on other sites including other Facebook groups and our website.
- The move will be taking place before the expiration of the loan agreement at the end of March.

[REDACTED] commented that the SMG team had exhibited great professionalism throughout and in trying circumstances. The Facebook Group had issued threats against the move and Shildon businesses were getting caught up in the argument (the local brewery had been attacked for producing a beer called Locomotion No 1). The situation was being escalated by DBC politicians who needed to show some leadership.

[REDACTED] reported that many people from Shildon had contacted her following the media interest. One Shildon resident was very upset, saying that DBC spoke of Shildon in detrimental terms and also downplayed the new building calling it a 'shed'. This resident was also worried by the fact that Darlington were saying that the PM was going to stop it. [REDACTED] had reassured her that this was not the case.

[REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] about security. [REDACTED] reported that we were having to take it very seriously and were having to bring in additional security support to protect staff, contractors and the object. This is highly unusual and stands in stark contrast to the move of Green Arrow which was completed last weekend without incident.

[REDACTED] raised the issue of how people in the meeting could assist with deescalation and how we could rightly celebrate the relocation of Locomotion No 1, which is very important to Shildon, without being hostile to Darlington.

■ said she was going to be speaking to ■, although she had the sense that he was embarrassed by the actions of DBC.

■ said that it seemed that there were 2 key issues for ■. The first was a commitment to saying where Locomotion No 1 would be after 2030. SMG cannot tie the hands of our successors which is why we can't agree to this. The second was the use of certain phrases that tie the vehicle back to Darlington. ■ commented that this was a very emotive and emotional issue which means that it is harder to deal with. ■ agreed that this was the case. ■ then said that there were still ways that DBC could claim the win. They could accept the MoU or walk away with nothing. ■ commented that MoU was very generous and offered far more than we or other museums do to DBC. ■ also talked about the forensic/archaeological investigation that is planned and how this could be used as a means of celebrating Locomotion.

■ asked for an update of the meeting with ■, ■ and the Darlington reps and suggested that we held another meeting in a few weeks to update on the move. ■ agreed to this.

Everyone in the meeting was asked for final comments. ■ responded by saying that Shildon had been downbeat for years but the move of Locomotion provides an opportunity to celebrate its railway heritage. 1975 put Shildon on the map and the plans for Locomotion will help do that again.