Built to Grow. Designed to Stall.

THE HIDDEN COST OF KEEPING THE FOUNDER AT THE CENTER OF EVERYTHING.

By Gabrielle Hargrove
Co-Founder, Hargrove & Co.

Now, where were we?

There comes a point when the business outgrows the way it was built to operate. You can keep pushing the existing structure harder, add people, meetings and tools, or ask everyone to communicate more. Some of it may create relief for a while. If the business still relies on one person to connect the context, make the trade-offs and calibrate the standard, though, the foundation is carrying more than it was built to hold.

The shift from founder to foundation.

It starts with simple questions. Do people understand where the business is going and what matters most right now? Is there a reliable way for work to move through the company? Do customers still experience the thing that made the business special when the founder is not in the room? Do people understand how they are expected to work together and make decisions? Has the founder been clear about what they are trying to build beyond themselves?

Every company has a direction, a way the work gets done, something that keeps customers connected, a feeling created by how people work together and a history that shapes what comes next. The question is whether those things have become part of the business or still live predominantly in the founder.

The founder's judgment, standards and intent remain incredibly valuable. The work is to make more of that value understandable and usable by the organization. Strategy needs to be clear enough to guide choices. Accountabilities need to tell leaders what they own. Decision authority needs to sit with the people expected to deliver the outcome. Ways of working need to carry context and standards through the business, while measures need to tell people whether the company is performing before a problem becomes urgent.

It's surprisingly easy to get this wrong. I have seen businesses create approval matrices, templates and governance structures that look incredibly sophisticated and somehow still require the founder to make every meaningful decision.

You can document dependency, colour code it and put it in Monday.com. It is still dependency.

Structure only matters when it changes how the business actually operates.

You are allowed to choose

I do not believe every founder has to make this transition. A founder can decide that the business exists because they exist. Their craft, relationships, judgment or presence may be inseparable from the company and, without them, there may be no more company.

That can be a choice. I may not be the right person to help you make it, and there is a reasonable chance I will keep trying to convince you otherwise, but it is still a choice.

The difficulty comes when a founder wants the outcomes of independence while continuing to protect the conditions of dependency. They want leaders to take ownership but continue to correct every decision. They want more time but remain involved in every detail. They want the company to carry their vision but have never really explained the judgment underneath it.

At some point, you have to be honest about what you are trying to build.

For founders who want the business to grow beyond their daily presence, the next question is deeply personal: where do you create the next level of value? There is no universal answer. Some founders are extraordinary product people. Some build relationships in a way nobody else can. Some can see the future of an industry before anyone else in the room. Others create the culture and energy that makes people want to be part of something.

Figuring out the founder's future role is a journey specific to the person and the business they built. It starts with trust and an honest look at what the company still requires from them today.

The goal is to stop requiring the founder's presence for the business to be itself.

What disappears with you?

There is another side to founder dependency that I have become increasingly preoccupied with: what happens when the founder is not there?

Businesses spend a lot of time preparing the formal structures for that possibility. Boards are created, leadership teams are appointed, succession plans are written and decision authority moves on an org chart. All of those things matter, but a business can do every one of them and still leave an extraordinary amount of its identity inside one person's head.

Think about the instinct behind a product decision, the nuance in how a customer is understood or the history behind a principle everyone repeats but few people can explain. Over decades, hundreds of tiny judgments accumulate until they become, “That’s just how we do things here.”

The risk is easy to miss because the business appears prepared. There are capable people in the roles, governance is in place and there is a plan. I think we need to ask a slightly different question: if the founder disappeared tomorrow, what would the organization know how to do, and what would it only know how to remember?

Memory is a dangerous operating system.

People remember different things. They fill in gaps and interpret old decisions through new circumstances. With the best of intentions, history slowly shifts. I have watched this happen, and it changed the way I think about founder transition.

I do not believe the goal is to preserve a founder’s decisions forever. A decision made 15 years ago belonged to the customer, market and business of 15 years ago. The valuable thing is understanding the judgment underneath that decision. What did they see? What mattered to them? What were they protecting?

Years ago, someone described me as “the keeper of the history, but never beholden to it.” It remains one of the most meaningful things anyone has ever said about me, and I think businesses need to learn how to do the same. They need to understand the history deeply enough to protect what matters while still allowing the company to become something new.

The founder’s history, judgment and intent need to become clear enough that the organization knows what should be carried forward. Then the business needs enough confidence to keep moving.

Preserving a founder’s legacy cannot mean spending the next 20 years asking what they would have done. At some point, the organization has to know what it will do.

“I took care of it.”

A while ago, I sat at a table with four people trying to make a decision about a client. The decision was tiny. I cannot emphasize this enough. Tiny. There was almost no risk attached to getting it wrong.

The founder was there, along with a senior leader, the person managing the client and a support team member. Four people were discussing one tiny decision.

I listened to three different conversations happen around it. People offered context, someone explained the history and another person suggested an option. Then, one by one, everyone looked at the founder and asked, “What do you think?”

Sitting there as an outsider, the noise was almost deafening.

Over the next few weeks, I kept working with the team. We didn't launch an empowerment initiative or unveil a new decision-making framework. Most of the work happened in tiny moments. Every time someone looked to the founder for an answer, we'd stop and ask why. Every time a decision landed on the wrong desk, we'd move it back. Every time someone hesitated, we'd talk about what they already knew instead of what they thought they needed permission to do.

None of it felt particularly significant at the time.

About a month later, I was sitting at the same table with the same four people when a similar question came up.

Someone said, “I took care of it.”

I noticed it immediately.

Nobody looked at the founder. Nobody asked what they had done. Nobody checked whether the founder agreed. The conversation simply moved on to the next thing.

The founder didn't notice that moment the way I did. Later, they told me they just felt… lighter. Like they finally had room to think again. They couldn't point to one big thing that had changed.

I think that’s the point, there wasn’t one.

Founder dependency is usually created through hundreds of small moments that slowly teach people to wait, check and escalate. It makes sense that the way out often looks exactly the same. Hundreds of small moments where people stop waiting, stop checking and quietly start owning the work.

It reminded me of standing in a kitchen with the exhaust fan running. You have been listening to it for so long that your brain stops registering the noise. Then someone turns it off and the relief is almost physical. Holy s***. Was it always that loud?

I think organizations can be like that. More often than not, the people inside them do not even know they hear the noise. Decisions are checked, context is repeated, meetings get bigger and everyone becomes accustomed to the constant hum of coordination.

Then someone says, “I took care of it.”

Nobody flinches. The meeting moves on.

And for the first time, you realize just how loud it used to be.

It was the little things that got you here.
It turns out it’s the little things that get you out, too.

About Hargrove & Co.

Hargrove & Co. works with founder-led businesses navigating the messy stage between growth and a company that can perform consistently at scale.

We help make sense of how the business is operating, where dependency and friction are building, and what needs to become clearer across strategy, leadership, accountability and execution.

Calm when it’s messy. Practical when it matters.