

## GIVE FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN FOR HISTORIC ENGLAND

We are developing a Corporate Plan for Historic England. The plan will set out Historic England's purpose, role and values and include its strategic priorities for the period from 2015 to 2018.

We want your views on all aspects of our [draft Corporate Plan](#), including on how we might measure our success in achieving our objectives.

This consultation is open until **midnight on 12 November 2014**. We expect to publish the final Corporate Plan in March 2015.

It would be helpful if you would group any comments you would like to make around the following three areas:

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the draft Corporate Plan explain Historic England's purpose, role and values clearly?</b>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know</p> <p>If no, please tell us why: We have put no because we are disappointed that, while the mechanics of HE are adequately explained, there is little by way of vision beyond the rather dry description of HE's role in functional terms. <b>Government has considered this separation of functions as an improvement on existing arrangements and therefore the prospects and activities of the newly separated Historic England has fostered a sense of optimism and raised expectations within the sector (irrespective of whether they can be fulfilled) which need to be channelled with more visionary force if the work of the sector as a whole is to be harnessed through for example the NHPP Mk.2</b></p>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Are the aims and objectives the right ones for Historic England?</b>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, but...</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know</p> <p>If no, please tell us what you would change: Broadly we think the aims and objectives are appropriate. However we do feel that HE's needs to work in partnership with <b>a multi-faceted sector: professional institutes; statutory amenity societies; and the many voluntary charities, trusts and other bodies</b> <del>the multitude of conservation trusts, institutes and other bodies (some of which have statutory significance) could</del> <b>should</b> be more directly <b>and overtly</b> expressed that the handful of vague references to "partners". The form of words used on page 6 of the current EH Corporate Plan might be a starting point.</p> <p>We think that HE's commitment to research (which is mentioned several times) should be articulated</p>	

in Aim 2/4 as:

“ [We will] ... undertake research and articulate the significance of heritage, and encourage others to do likewise...”.

We are concerned at omission (from previous Corporate Plans) to the annual grant support for the role of the statutory amenity societies who perform a unique and invaluable independent function in the regulatory system. This should be reinstated.

3.

**What criteria should Historic England use to evaluate successful achievement of the plan’s aims and objectives?**

We are disappointed that the draft Corporate Plan does not itself propose measurable outputs and outcomes. While some of these may be articulated through the NHPP Mk.2 (and as a sector-wide not just a HE document) other aims could be derived from the output (and gaps) in the background work for recent editions of Heritage Counts and the in consistent collection of baseline and trend data needing analysis.

We think that the information on finance is too sparse to be able to judge whether the Government's proposals for HE given the necessity to provide logistical support for English Heritage throughout the period of this Plan, the failure to properly articulate the cross-subsidies for such services and the failure to provide for a range of eventualities for the targets that English Heritage has set itself (visitor numbers, unearned income, grants, acts of God etc.) and which may impinge on Historic England’s own operations and budget, ~~(in partnership with , and in cross funding with)~~ are workable.

**Any other comments?** We are concerned about the repeated use of the term “constructive conservation”. We fully support the processes the Consultation defines for this term. However, we feel that the qualification “constructive” adds nothing to the normal definition of “conservation” (that is representing a constructive approach to outcomes as opposed to mere preservation) but could be wrongly interpreted to mean “allowing unnecessary, inappropriate and unjustified intervention in the supposed pursuit of progress” which is not conservation but destruction.

We find it extraordinary that a consultation on the future of the government’s statutory heritage advisor and the biggest change to the professional part of the sector in 30 years should confine itself to just three anodyne questions when so much is at stake for the heritage sector as a while.

Name:

James Caird (on behalf of)

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>Institute of Historic Building Conservation</b>
----------------------	--

Please return this form by one of the following methods:

email: [corporateplan@english-heritage.org.uk](mailto:corporateplan@english-heritage.org.uk)

post: **Historic England Corporate Plan Consultation**

FAO Deborah Lamb

Director of National Advice and Information

English Heritage

1 Waterhouse Square

138-142 Holborn

London

EC1N 2ST

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY