

## Shaping the future – for heritage, for everyone

We very much appreciate your views and suggestions - the consultation is open from 31 January to 26 April 2011.

### WELCOME TO THE CONSULTATION

Please indicate below which sections you wish to respond to:

Section 1 – Our strategic framework and how we work Section 2 – Our current grant programmes Section 3 – New opportunities and challenges **All sections**

Name **Richard Cartwright**  
Organisation **Institute of Historic Buildings Conservation**  
Job title **IHBC Scotland Consultations Secretary**  
Address Postcode **c/o North Lanarkshire Council, Cumbernauld G67 1JW** Telephone **01236 616537**  
Email **cartwrightr@northlan.gov.uk**

How are you responding to this consultation (tick one)?:

- **As an individual on behalf of an organisation**

### SECTION ONE – OUR STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK AND HOW WE WORK

To what extent do you agree or disagree we should express our current three strategic aims of conservation, participation and learning as a single aim in future – ‘making a positive and lasting difference for heritage and people’?

Strongly agree **Tend to agree** Neither agree nor disagree **Tend to disagree** Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

Why do you say that? **Simplification yet retaining scope for bids to demonstrate what can be offered in training and community participation.**

#### Balance and direction of funding

To what extent do you agree or disagree that we should target more funds to identified strategic needs and reduce the amount of funding available through open programmes?

Strongly agree **Tend to agree** Neither agree nor disagree **Tend to disagree** Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

Why do you say that? **Both programs are valuable, the current balance may be about right**

To what extent do you agree we should solicit applications more frequently, in order to focus our funding on strategic priorities for heritage? Strongly agree **Tend to agree** Neither agree nor disagree **Tend to disagree** Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

Why do you say that? **Keeping the approach as is now will allow the peoples' priorities to come to the fore, ie through open programs**

To what extent do you agree we should give priority to funding for heritage identified as being at risk?

**Strongly agree** Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree **Strongly disagree** No opinion Don't know

**Why do you say that? In order to strongly assist the preservation of heritage that has been identified as 'at risk', and by definition under threat of being lost without intervention.**

**Taking account of the achievements of Lottery funding since 2002 (see annex), what areas of heritage (if any) do you consider to be still in need of funding?**

<b>Heritage area</b>	No funding need	Some funding need	Significant funding need	Don't know
Archaeology		<b>YES</b>		
Archives		<b>YES</b>		
Cultures and memories, languages and dialects		<b>YES</b>		
Historic buildings and monuments			<b>YES</b>	
Industrial heritage		<b>YES</b>		
Landscapes		<b>YES</b>		
Library collections		<b>YES</b>		
Museums and collections		<b>YES</b>		
Parks			<b>YES</b>	
Places of worship			<b>YES</b>	
Ships and maritime heritage		<b>YES</b>		
Transport heritage		<b>YES</b>		
Wildlife and nature conservation		<b>YES</b>		

**Why do you say that? IHBC is acutely aware of the significant need for funding in the built heritage sector, including historic buildings & monuments, places of worship and historic parks, through its professional membership and expertise. We are also aware of some need in the archaeology sector (despite a greater opportunity for developer contributions funding here), industrial heritage and landscape sectors.**

**How we work**

**How important are the following aspects of how we currently work as a Lottery funder?**

- A. Working closely with organisations and responding to needs at local level as well as operating within a UK-wide strategic framework **Essential****
- B. Providing support (as described) to applicants and grantees throughout the grant administration process **Essential****

### C. Giving locally-based help to organisations less experienced in making applications **Essential**

Why do you say that? **If help is needed by local organisations that are able to help meet the needs of the HLF program/ priorities, then this help should be available.**

Has your organisation ever received a grant from HLF? Yes/**No**/Don't know

Which statement below most closely reflects your opinion of the amount of work involved in the application process, bearing in mind that Lottery money is public funding?

The work involved was in proportion to the amount of money we asked for

The work involved was excessive in relation to the amount of money we asked for

The work involved was relatively little in relation to the amount of money we asked for

**We have never applied for Heritage Lottery funding**

Why do you say that? **We would add that feedback from our professional members (who as individuals are familiar with the HLF process) indicates that the work involved in the application process is generally regarded as excessive.**

What more could we do to improve our current grant-making processes?

1. Simplify it.

2. Strongly consider in some way joining with or supporting Historic Scotland's CARS program, which has delivered well on built heritage projects (with similar aims to HLF's THI's) and has been oversubscribed. We understand from verbal evidence from our members that THI funding in contrats has been undersubscribed and that this is at least in part due to some organisations- inc Local Authorities familiar with making grant applications- deciding NOT to apply for THI's due to its onerous administrative requirements/ over-complexity.

#### Spread of funding

We focus our development work on geographic areas and communities who may not have applied to us before with the aim of encouraging good-quality applications. In deciding on a local basis where to focus these resources in future, to what extent do you agree or disagree that we should take account of the following:

- A. Geographical areas that have received least funding from us in the past (e.g. local authority areas) **Tend to agree (rather than strongly agree), because any project must be of acceptable standard and HLF should not fund projects just to 'fill a geographical gap'**
- B. Social groups that have benefited least from our funding in the past (e.g. people with disabilities, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, Lower socio-economic groups) **Strongly disagree- it is the projects that must be assessed for funding, and this should be irrespective of who has made the application.**
- C. Types of heritage that have benefited least from our funding in the past (e.g. archives, land and biodiversity, industrial, maritime and transport heritage) **Tend to agree (rather than strongly agree), because any project must be of acceptable standard and HLF should not fund projects just to 'fill a heritage type gap'**

## Support for the changing needs of the UK's heritage

### Protecting our investment

Which one of the following statements best reflects your view?

- A. HLF should give more priority to ensuring the financial sustainability of an organisation that has already received Lottery money, to build on what has already been achieved, rather than new projects
- B. HLF should give more priority to new projects that will bring new and different benefits, rather than to projects that have already received Lottery money
- C. HLF should aim to strike a balance between the two
- None of these
- Don't know

Why do you say that? Further funding of previous projects should be subject to detailed individual scrutiny, as should new projects, so we suggest no fixed allocation between these different approaches.

### Building a more resilient heritage community

As a Lottery funder, to what extent do you agree or disagree that we should seek to extend our role to build the financial sustainability of voluntary organisations with initiatives to support organisational development?

Strongly agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Strongly disagree  
No opinion Don't know

Why do you say that? Again, there should be detailed individual scrutiny of any application before agreeing to funding through such a new approach (so HLF should not set a target for how much funding to channel in this way).

### Encouraging a culture of giving

What role should HLF play to encourage philanthropy and more private supporters for heritage at all levels? Agree with above suggestions, especially wrt trusts & foundations and incentivising private giving to heritage.

What more could HLF do to help achieve a thriving and resilient heritage community in future? Remove the clawback clause for Revolving Fund Building Preservation Trusts. This would allow them to build on their own resources and make them less reliant on HLF funding in the future.

## SECTION 2 – OUR CURRENT GRANT PROGRAMMES

### GENERAL GRANT PROGRAMMES Small

#### Grants from £3,000 to £10,000

To what extent do you agree or disagree with a simplified approach to grants under £10,000? Strongly agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

#### Medium-sized Grants from £10,000 upwards

To what extent do you agree or disagree we should offer a medium sized grants programme with a single round application process? Strongly agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

What should the upper threshold be for an open, single round community heritage programme starting at £10,000? (tick one) £50,000 £100,000 £150,000 **£200,000** Other amount (write in) Don't know

Do you have any other comments on small and medium sized grants?

### Heritage Grants (grants over £50,000)

What should our requirements for partnership funding contributions be after 2013?

A. Return to their previous levels? **B. Stay the same as they are now?** C. Be reduced even further? Don't know

Do you have any overall comments on our Heritage Grants programme?

**TARGETED PROGRAMMES** Our current targeted programmes:

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following continue to be the right priorities for our targeted programmes?

Young people/ Landscapes Parks/ Places of worship/ Townscape regeneration

**Strongly agree** Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Strongly disagree  
No opinion Don't know

Why do you say that? **IHBC are very familiar with the high value of Parks for People, Places of Worship and THI projects. Encouraging young people to get involved in heritage projects is inherently a good idea. We recognise there is also value in supporting landscape projects.**

### Young Roots

What should the upper limit for Young Roots grants be? (tick one) £25,000 £50,000 £75,000 Other amount (write in) **£100,000 (if the project and the expertise is good enough, it should not be overly restricted by the young age of applicants)** Don't know

How could our Young Roots programme be improved?

### Landscape Partnerships

What are your thoughts on our proposals for the Landscape Partnerships programme? How could they be improved? **IHBC members would be pleased to engage with HLF on these.**

### Parks for People

What are your thoughts on our proposals for the Parks for People programme? How could they be improved? **IHBC strongly agrees with these proposals, in light of the above statistics and also our members' knowledge of the value of the Parks for People projects supported to date. We are also aware of the significant heritage maintenance issues in cemeteries.**

### Places of Worship

What are your thoughts on our proposals for supporting places of worship? How could they be improved? **IHBC agrees with both continued support on the past basis (to recognise the exceptional physical heritage value of many places of worship); but also agree with giving some additional recognition/ support criteria where there will be extended community benefit arising from a proposal.**

## Support for local places and communities - Townscape Heritage Initiative

To what extent do you agree that heritage-led regeneration should continue to be a focus for HLF? **Strongly agree** Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Strongly disagree No opinion Don't know

How can HLF best support place-based heritage, and communities' engagement with it? **1. The match funding requirements for HLF schemes should be reviewed in light of current realities of, in particular, Local Authority funding, so that this extremely valuable program continues to deliver the heritage and economic regeneration positive outcomes we are aware it has secured.**

**2. See our comment above suggesting that HLF should support Historic Scotland's CARS program, which has delivered well but has been oversubscribed.**

**3. IHBC would welcome increased support also to assist the transfer of heritage assets to community ownership, where this can help secure the future of a heritage asset.**

### **SECTION THREE – ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES**

#### **Challenges of climate change**

...In future we propose that all projects asking for a grant of more than £10,000 will be asked **how they will be affected by predicted changes in the local environment and how any risks are to be addressed.** ...

How strong would you say your support for our proposals to address climate change is on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong?

1 = very weak support

2

3

4

**5 = very strong support**

Don't know

**Why do you say that? This area has become widely recognised as of increasing importance. We suggest a wider additional question (to the one set out above), along the lines: "Please explain how your project will contribute to long term sustainable development?"**

#### Digital heritage

How strong would you say your support for our proposals for digital heritage is on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong?

1 = very weak support

**3**

5 = very strong support

Don't know

**Why do you say that? We are concerned there should not be a requirement for a digital heritage aspect of a worthwhile project proposal, but are open to some support being given to this area. We recognise that this is already a strongly evolving area, with a lead being taken currently by Historic Scotland and other publicly funded bodies.**

**What types of heritage should be priorities for digitisation, and why? IHBC members would be pleased to engage with HLF on developing proposals in these areas.**

**What types of innovation are most important for HLF to fund, and why? IHBC members would be pleased to engage with HLF on developing proposals in these areas.**

## Skills

How strong is your support for our proposal to run further targeted initiatives on skills in future, on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong?

1 = very weak support

2

3

4

**5 = very strong support**

Don't know

Why do you say that? **We are aware that despite good initiatives including by the HLF and others, there is still a very significant traditional skills gap and training need in the built heritage sector.**

What skills should be priorities for our support in a future initiative, and why? **This should include traditional building skills in stonework, slatework and ironwork.**

What role could or should HLF play in helping the passing on of knowledge and skills within the sector? **HLF could consider funding community groups who are seeking to promote a heritage project, to hire a conservation professional (recognising that such expertise may be available following redundancies/ early retirements).**

## **Heritage in private ownership**

..... **We welcome views on partnership approaches that could secure significant public benefit from funding heritage in private ownership.** We also welcome views on whether there are ways of accurately measuring private gain and assessing that against public benefits, to enable us to support heritage in private ownership, outside of a wider partnership, in exceptional circumstances.

To what extent should HLF do more to support heritage in private ownership?

A great deal **A fair amount** Just a little Not at all Don't know

Why do you say that? **This will be of extra importance in climate of public sector cuts. ON HIGHLIGHTED QUESTION ABOVE, there is merit in considering the wider economic benefits of investment in private property, particularly where it is in a prominent location eg town centre, where it is an established visitor attraction or offers potential to become a new visitor attraction.**

## Buying heritage items

To what extent do you consider the purchase of heritage items in future to be important?

Essential Very important **Fairly important** Not very important Not at all important Don't know

Why do you say that? **There should be scope for successful bids to acquire heritage items by community groups and for public benefit and display.**

How strong would you say your support for our proposal to simplify the process for urgent acquisitions is on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong?

1 = very weak support 2 3 **4** 5 = very strong support Don't know

How strong would you say your support for our proposal for a new Collecting Cultures initiative is on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong? 1 2 **3** 4 5 Don't know

**How strong would you say your support for our proposal for mainstreaming the principle behind Collecting Cultures within our general grants programmes is on a scale of one to five where one means your support is very weak and five means it is very strong?**

1 2 3 4 **5= very strong support** Don't know

**Why do you say that? As above, we think there should be reasonable scope for successful bids, where suitable opportunities arise, and yet without unduly pushing this as a separate new program. We are also concerned that there should be close scrutiny to ensure good value for money in any use of HLF funds for heritage acquisition.**

**OVERALL Overall what do you think HLF has done particularly well? As stated above, IHBC's main expertise is in the area of the built heritage environment and in that context of a body representing built heritage professionals, we are aware that the following aspects of HLF programs have been particularly successful:**

- 1. THI schemes**
- 2. Places of Worship grants**
- 3. Parks for People projects**
- 4. Individual building projects**

**And what should we change? 1. We are concerned at the very small percentage of HLF funds allocated to THI's, in contrast to the very high value we see (ie physical heritage plus economic benefit results) such projects have delivered AND the very significant scope which remains for the continuation of such projects. Townscape Heritage Initiative projects are highly visible projects that are well thought of locally. We are concerned that, without a change of policy (see our comments above) this small percentage could fall further.**

**2. Overall, there is a need to make the administrative, reporting and bidding requirements less onerous.**

**Please give us your views on any other issues you would like to raise with us.**

**The survey is now complete. Please click OK to save your responses and send them for analysis. Thank you for your contribution to our consultation.**