



Department  
for Culture  
Media & Sport

# English Heritage New Model

Consultation Response

October 2014



# Contents

---

Chapter 1: Foreword from Ed Vaizey	4
Chapter 2: Executive Summary	6
Chapter 3: Introduction	9
Chapter 4: Government Response	11
Annex A: Organisations which responded to the consultation	33

# Chapter 1: Foreword from Ed Vaizey

---



Our heritage is a precious asset which makes an important contribution to people's quality of life, their sense of identity and to a successful and sustainable economy. It is therefore important that the mechanisms for enabling it to play a full role in our national life are effective.

English Heritage operates in a fundamentally different environment to the one in which it was created in 1983. Like many public bodies, it has been considering how to respond to the economic, social and regulatory changes that have taken place.

That is why English Heritage has proposed, and the Government supports, an eight year vision to 2023 to establish a new model for the management of the National Heritage Collection which contains some of our most important historic sites including Stonehenge, parts of Hadrian's Wall and Dover Castle.

The Government consulted on these proposals earlier in the year and we are very grateful for all the valuable feedback we received. We are delighted that the majority of respondents recognised the need for change and the benefits the new model will bring. Our responses to the various comments raised during the consultation are set out in full in this document.

We strongly believe that the proposals to create a new model for English Heritage will enable the Government's responsibilities for England's historic environment to be discharged more efficiently and effectively. The eight year new model will offer a secure future for the National Heritage Collection and savings to the taxpayer, while keeping the properties themselves in public ownership.

Overall, the proposals will ensure that future generations – as well as those of us around today - will be able to enjoy and benefit from England's unparalleled historic environment. We are very much looking forward to working with English Heritage over the coming months to make the new model a reality by April 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed Vaizey'.

**Ed Vaizey MP**

*Minister for Culture and the Digital Economy*

# Chapter 2: Executive Summary

---

2.1 The Government announced plans in 2013 for an eight year programme to establish an innovative new business model for English Heritage (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England – the ‘Commission’).

2.2 Under the proposals, English Heritage will split its organisation into two. One part will become a charity whose purposes will be the conservation, public knowledge and enjoyment of the National Heritage Collection (the ‘Collection’). The charity will take on full responsibility for delivering an eight year programme and running the Collection until 2022-23. The charity will use the name “English Heritage”. The eight year new model will offer a bright future for the National Heritage Collection and savings to the taxpayer, while keeping the properties themselves in public ownership. Managing the properties under a licence from the Commission will ensure their historic integrity is preserved.

2.3 The charity will use an £80 million investment from the Government, plus money raised from third parties, to undertake an ambitious programme to remedy conservation defects, create new exhibitions, renew existing ones and continue to improve the visitor experience through investment in presentation of the properties and visitor facilities. The charity will continue to receive resource Grant-in-Aid from the Government on a declining basis from 2015-16 until 2022-23 when the Grant-in-Aid will cease and the charity will become self-sufficient. The Government investment and the declining Grant-in-Aid will enable it to continue to grow its income, and by the end of the eight years the management of the National Heritage Collection will be completely self-financing.

2.4 There will be no change to the Commission’s duties and responsibilities for preserving England’s wider historic environment. Those services will be delivered under the new name of “Historic England”. Historic England will aim to make the heritage protection system work better for owners, developers and infrastructure providers, reducing unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape without reducing protection for heritage. It will look to develop a stronger public-facing role. It will continue to develop its constructive approach to conservation demonstrating that heritage supports sustainable economic growth and job creation.

2.5 The Government consulted on detailed proposals for the new model between 6 December 2013 and 7 February 2014. There were around 600 responses to the consultation, approximately 450 of which were received through the online consultation and the remainder through email and post. Two hundred and eighteen organisations responded, around 200 responses were from individuals and the remainder did not identify themselves.

2.6 Overall the majority of respondents recognised the need for change and the benefits the new model would bring. 60% of those who responded agreed or strongly agreed with the proposed benefits of the new model for the Collection. This is a real endorsement from stakeholders for the innovative approach set out in the new model.

2.7 The main points made by respondents regarding the charity included:

- Respondents required more detail to make a better informed judgement about the resilience of the proposed model. Many would like to see the more detailed information, in particular the evidence for the earned income projections and fundraising sources.
- Some respondents including those with experience of running/owning heritage assets expressed concern that it would be challenging to meet self-sufficiency within the projected timeframe. Related to this point was a desire for further clarity on what would happen if the charity did not become self-sufficient in the time period.
- Some respondents voiced concern that the charity would be bidding for funding sources that other organisations rely on. Respondents did not want to see the charity gaining at the expense of others.
- There was concern that the charity should remain the owner of last resort, with respondents wanting greater clarity on how this would work including funding and resolving disagreements between the charity and the Commission.

2.8 The main points made by respondents regarding Historic England included:

- Respondents felt the consultation was “lighter” on Historic England. They required more detail on how Historic England would operate and its priorities before drawing a firmer conclusion on the direction of Historic England.
- A key point made by respondents was the need for Historic England to be adequately funded and able to fulfil its functions. Funding for Historic England should be completely separate from the charity and not be available to the charity to make up any shortfall.
- Many respondents requested that they continued to be involved in shaping Historic England through further consultation and stakeholder engagement.
- Some respondents felt there was not enough emphasis on heritage protection as the ultimate aim for Historic England and that there was too much focus on sustainable development and the needs of customers (owners/developers etc). However others welcomed a renewed focus on working with organisations, businesses and individuals involved in shaping a sustainable historic environment.

2.9 This document sets out in detail the points made by respondents and the Government's response to them. In particular, in the light of the consultation responses, the Government and the Commission have decided to:

- Publish a summary of the business case, which has now been approved by Government. This summary covers the charity's business plan and conservation maintenance programme.
- Publish a letter from the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to the Chairman of English Heritage, making clear the Government's commitment to the success of the new model and guaranteeing that no reduction will be made to the Commission's allocated budgets for 2014-15 and 2015-16.
- Ensure the charitable objectives for the new English Heritage charity encourage and enable it actively to support the Commission in making additions to the National Heritage Collection.
- Publish a draft of Historic England's corporate plan for public consultation. This has been informed by the results of the consultation on the new model and on the National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP) and a series of informal workshops over the summer. The Government plans to hold a Triennial Review to review the role, functions and needs of Historic England in more detail in 2016-17, once the new model has got off the ground.



## Chapter 3: Introduction

---

3.1 This chapter provides a summary of responses to the public consultation on the English Heritage new model, which closed in February 2014. It focuses on the key points and themes which emerged from the responses rather than summarising all responses in-depth.

3.2 This response has been written in consultation with English Heritage, reflecting the fact that many of the issues raised by the consultation responses lie within the authority of the Commission.

3.3 The consultation was open from 6 December 2013 and ran for nine weeks until 7 February 2014. There were 600<sup>1</sup> responses to the consultation. 139 responses were made via email or post and the remainder were through the online survey tool.

3.4 222 responses came from organisations and 192 from individuals. The remaining respondents did not provide this information. It is likely that the majority of respondents who did not provide information on who they were responded as individuals rather than as organisations.

3.5 92 responses were from English Heritage members or volunteers and 15 were from owners of listed buildings.

3.6 The breakdown of responses by organisation type is below. For the respondents who provided more than one organisation type, the most appropriate description was chosen. The full list of organisations that responded can be seen in Annex A.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Responses' defined as responding to at least one question.

**Table 1: Responses to consultation by organisation**

<b>Type of organisation</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Local Authority	66
Other	47
Organisation representing heritage professionals or other heritage groups	30
Civic Societies	18
Organisation representing owners of historic assets	13
Owner of heritage assets	12
Organisation involved in regulatory and statutory work related to the historic environment	10
Organisation representing volunteers /communities	9
Visitor attraction – heritage	6
Organisation providing grants to the historic environment sector	4
Organisation representing visitor attractions / tourism	4
University or other research organisation	2
Not given	1

# Chapter 4: Government Response

---

4.1 This chapter provides a summary of responses to the consultation. Where respondents have provided a response which does not follow the question format laid out in the consultation, the points raised are included in the summary of the most relevant question. A Government response follows each key issue and theme raised.

## **Question 1: The benefits of the new model for the National Heritage Collection**

4.2 Of those that answered the question “the consultation outlines the benefits of the new model for the National Heritage Collection, do you agree/disagree”, 20% strongly agreed with the proposed benefits for the National Heritage Collection and 40% somewhat agreed. 14% somewhat disagreed and 8% strongly disagreed. The remainder neither agreed/disagreed or provided a don’t know response (18%). (497 responses to this question.)

4.3 The majority of respondents could see the benefit of this model for the Collection.

4.4 Many respondents, including those from within the heritage sector, recognised that the current funding model was unlikely to present a secure future for the Collection and that change was required.

4.5 In particular respondents welcomed the additional Government funding and the recognition of the importance of maintenance and conservation of heritage sites in providing a secure future to heritage assets.

4.6 Many respondents were also pleased that under the model the Collection will remain in public ownership and as a group so that the properties can continue to support each other.

4.7 There was also recognition that the new model would have benefits over the status quo, particularly in terms of commercial freedoms, innovation, the ability to plan more efficiently and access to funding.

## **Question 2: Why respondents did not agree with the benefits of the proposed model**

4.8 Of those that did not agree with the proposed model and its benefits, the main reasons given were the level of investment provided by Government not being sufficient (a

significant minority of respondents did not feel the £80m was enough to clear the conservation deficit and support the development of a capital programme), concern over the setting up of a charity and a duplication of effort with existing organisations, and a view that shorter term financial considerations were driving the decision making process, rather than a consideration of what was most effective for the long term future of the collection.

4.9 A much smaller number of respondents did not agree with the benefits of the model based on the principle of the Collection as a public good which therefore required on-going Government funding. Some respondents also questioned whether this model did offer significant additional benefits over other potential models, for example the freedoms and flexibilities recently offered to the national museums by Government.

4.10 In addition respondents who did not agree with the benefits, especially those who gave a “don’t know” or “neither agree or disagree” response, stated they gave this answer not because of a disagreement with the principle of the model, but because they required more information on the business case and funding portfolio to make an informed decision on the benefits and whether self-sufficiency for the charity was achievable. This included a desire for further information on Grant-In-Aid (GIA) to be provided to both the charity and Historic England and the other sources of funding for the capital works.

4.11 A request for more information on the detail set out in the business case and confirmation of funding was also a common request among respondents who agreed with the proposed benefits.

### ***Government response***

4.12 The Government notes that while the majority of respondents agreed with the principle of the model and the proposed benefits, there is a strong wish among many respondents to assess the level of detail provided in the business case to allow them to reach greater clarity on the proposed benefits.

4.13 In response to the issues raised we are also publishing today a summary version of the business case for the new model. This includes a summary of the charity’s business plan and conservation maintenance programme.

4.14 We are also publishing a letter from the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to the Chairman of English Heritage, making clear the Government’s commitment to the success of the new model and guaranteeing that no reduction will be made to the Commission’s allocated budgets for 2014-15 and 2015-16. It also expresses the expectation that future governments would want to take the new model into consideration in making funding allocations.

### **Question 3: Further benefits of the proposed model**

4.15 The key suggestions given by respondents for potential further benefits delivered by the model include:

- Greater member involvement in making decisions about sites.
- The ability for sites to make decisions more quickly/more flexibly and increased autonomy.
- Development of a commercial conservation team.
- Extension of the local management agreement model.

4.16 Below are the more specific issues cited by respondents in relation to the model and proposed management of the Collection. Each key issue is followed by the Government response.

#### **Further financial information**

4.17 A significant number of respondents, including a number with experience of running heritage attractions, questioned whether the additional £80m was sufficient in size to allow English Heritage to tackle all priority 1 and 2 defects and to support the organisation in delivering the capital investment programme needed to deliver self-sufficiency.

4.18 There was a request for further information on how the £80m was calculated and for access to the business plan to help respondents assess the case for self-sufficiency in eight years.

#### ***Government response: Further financial information***

4.19 Many respondents to the consultation wanted further details of the business case to be reassured that financial self-sufficiency is realistic and will not be at the expense of the services provided by Historic England. The business case summary published alongside this response shows the assumptions that have been made on growth in income.

4.20 The summary business plan for the charity sets out the reasoning behind English Heritage's growth assumptions. Government has tested these assumptions as part of its scrutiny of the business case and agrees with English Heritage that they are ambitious but achievable. For example, the number of paying visitors is assumed to remain constant and the projected growth in visitor numbers does not make any allowance for the overall projected growth in population. Most of the growth results from the increase in membership.

4.21 Some respondents challenged the assumed growth in membership. This is the area where English Heritage believes there is most scope for change as the current membership represents a very low base. At present English Heritage only recruits members at sites. It

believes that shifting to recruiting membership offsite, as other organisations do, offers the potential for a very significant increase in members.

### **Self-sufficiency in eight years and contingency plans**

4.22 A significant number of respondents, including those with experience of running heritage attractions, stressed the difficulty in setting long term targets for visitors/members and earned income and suggested that various factors (including those outside of the control of the charity) could impact on these targets.

4.23 A number of respondents also stated that the visitor/member targets and earned income levels were ambitious. Some also questioned whether they had been sufficiently tested and challenged. They questioned whether contingency plans were being developed in the event of the charity not meeting its proposed targets. Specifically respondents wanted clarity on potential sources of funding which would be used to fill any funding gaps if the earned income targets were not met. Respondents were clear that they would be very concerned if Historic England GIA was drawn upon to meet any shortfall in the charity's earned income. Many respondents expressed the view that Historic England funding should be ring-fenced.

### ***Government response: Self-sufficiency in eight years and contingency plans***

4.24 Government and the Commission believe that the business plan targets are achievable. Many respondents to the consultation have pointed out that unforeseen events can arise which affect visitor numbers, such as particularly bad weather (as we saw in 2012) or major incidents which have an impact on tourism such as the foot and mouth outbreak in 2001 or security threats. English Heritage has responded to such events in recent years.

4.25 The business case explains how English Heritage's tight control over budgeting was able to deal with the impact of the bad weather in 2012. It also explains how English Heritage would propose to respond to the cumulative impact of several unforeseen circumstances. In future it will be easier for the charity to move funds between years, as other visitor attractions do, to manage the impact of events such as bad weather.

4.26 A major advantage of the new model is that any surpluses can be carried forward into future years. Government and the Commission intend that any surpluses generated by the charity will be able to be held as reserves to provide some contingency against unforeseen events. After year 8, when the charity is financially self-sufficient and there is no longer any GIA relationship, the business plan shows that a surplus will be built up.

4.27 The property licence agreed between the Commission and the charity will require an annual report to be made to the Commission and Government including financial performance. This will enable the Commission to take a view on whether financial targets are being met.

4.28 Government and the Commission recognise that there may be good reasons why financial targets in a particular year are not met. In such a situation they will expect the charity to develop a plan to bring financial performance back on track, in the same way that English Heritage has in the past. In the case of very significant failure the Commission will require the charity to put in place remediation measures. If these are unsuccessful, as a last resort the Commission will have the power to terminate the property licence and make alternative arrangements for the management of the National Heritage Collection. Government and the Commission believe that such circumstances are extremely unlikely, but if they were to take place, staff and assets would in the first instance be transferred to the Commission.

## **Fundraising**

4.29 Some respondents, including heritage attractions and local authorities, stated that the figure for third party funding was ambitious and questioned whether it was a realistic expectation. They asked for clarity on the evidence base used to develop this figure.

4.30 A small number of respondents also expressed concern that the increased importance of corporate and commercial sponsors could lead to a consequential privatisation of the assets, and stressed this should be avoided.

4.31 Some respondents also expressed concern that the charity would be targeting funding that existing heritage attractions relied on, both grant providers and philanthropic sources. It was clear that respondents did not want to see the growth of the charity to be at the expense of other heritage attractions. While there was some acceptance that the charity could help increase the funding portfolio for all heritage attractions, it was not felt that this would be possible in the short term.

### ***Government response: Fundraising***

4.32 Some respondents felt that the fundraising target to support the capital investment programme for the National Heritage Collection is too ambitious.

4.33 The business case explains that the fundraising target to support the capital investment programme averages just over £7.4m per annum. In the four years of the current Spending Round, English Heritage will have raised an average of £8.6m per annum and over the last ten years it raised a total of £55.5m. Government and English Heritage believe that, against this background, the fundraising target is achievable. The clear status of English Heritage as a charity will make it easier to raise funds both because there will be less confusion with an organisation also giving grants and because there is a bigger potential pool of funders as there will no longer be a conflict of interest with the statutory role which will be carried forward by Historic England. The broader mix of projects will also provide more funding opportunities, for example at the local level.

4.34 Some respondents expressed fears that increasing philanthropic funding for the English Heritage charity could be at the expense of other heritage sector organisations. Government and the Commission do not believe that the scale of increase in fundraising is sufficient to justify these fears. In addition, Government believes there is scope to grow both the overall amount of philanthropic funding for culture and the proportion of this going to heritage. Currently, fewer than 50% of the population give philanthropically, and of that, only approximately 3% comes to culture and heritage. This leaves significant scope for the charity to grow its share of philanthropy without damaging other organisations.

### **Conservation defects**

4.35 A number of respondents, including those with experience of managing heritage assets as visitor attractions, questioned the calculation of the conservation deficit and consequently whether the proposed Government funding was sufficient in size to clear the conservation deficit for the priority defects. In particular some questioned the fact that the size of the conservation deficit was based on projections from January 2013 and will have grown by the time the charity goes live.

4.36 A particular point made was to question whether the business case factored in an increase in the likely repair and maintenance costs due to the rise in visitor numbers.

### ***Government response: Conservation defects***

4.37 Some organisations have challenged the figure of £52m for priority 1 and 2 defects, believing this to be too low. The additional information published by English Heritage during the consultation period explained how the value of the conservation defects had been calculated on the basis of a substantial bottom-up survey programme. It is worth bearing in mind that the National Heritage Collection contains relatively few roofed historic houses which are much more expensive to repair and maintain than the ruined castles and abbeys which form the majority of the sites in the Collection.

4.38 English Heritage has now updated its conservation maintenance programme. This shows that the value of the priority 1 and 2 conservation defects has not risen as originally feared. This is due to English Heritage being able to address a number of conservation defects as part of major capital projects such as at Kenwood. The quality of data about the condition of sites is also being constantly updated and improved. Government and the Commission are therefore confident that the current figure of £52m is an accurate estimate of the cost of addressing the priority 1 and 2 defects and that other conservation work can be undertaken within the existing and ongoing budget for cyclical maintenance.

4.39 English Heritage has had to deal with unforeseen conservation issues, such as the permanent stabilisation of Silbury Hill in 2008, following a series of collapses. Just as in the past, in such cases work and budgets will be reprioritised to deal with the most urgent issues. Emergency conservation works will have first call on the reserves which, as



explained above, the English Heritage charity will be able to build up and carry forward, in a way which English Heritage is currently unable to do.

4.40 The content of the property licence will ensure that the Collection in its entirety is looked after and its condition improved or maintained over the eight year period 2015-16 to 2022-23. The property licence will require the English Heritage charity to report annually on its conservation and maintenance programme and the impact of works undertaken on the conservation defects. This report will be made available publicly. The charity will also establish a committee of independent experts to review the state of the conservation of the National Heritage Collection and report to the Commission.

4.41 A specific point was raised about the impact of extra visitors on maintenance requirements. English Heritage does not believe that the assumed growth in visitor numbers (from 5.2million to 6.8 million by 2026-27) would have a significant effect on the cyclical maintenance programme since these levels of visitation have been achieved in the past.

### **Charity governance**

4.42 The reason the Commission needed to have a significant role in the governance of the charity was recognised by many (because the Collection will remain in public ownership), but it was felt to be a temporary solution which would not be optimal going forward. It was suggested that primary legislation should be considered after the initial eight year period.

4.43 Within the responses, there was no consensus on the “right” level of involvement of the Commission in the charity’s governance, with some respondents stating their involvement was needed to help manage risk, whereas others stated that the role of the Commission should be minimised to give the charity a greater degree of autonomy to exercise judgments in the face of changing circumstances. This latter view was held by many in the heritage sector.

4.44 Respondents were clear that trustees should be appointed on the basis of merit and the contribution they can specifically make to the charity.

4.45 Overall there was a request for more information on how the governance framework will work and in particular how the Commission will deal with issues of poor performance by the charity and the mechanisms for dealing with any conflict between the charity and Historic England which may arise, particularly towards the end of the eight year period.

### **Government response: Charity governance**

4.46 The detailed relationship between the Commission and the charity will be set out in the property licence. This will put in place the right structures at the outset to allow autonomy and independent decision making for the charity in order to maximise its

effectiveness, while ensuring an appropriate balance of monitoring and support from the Commission.

4.47 Government and the Commission recognise the value of maintaining close cooperation between Historic England and the English Heritage charity during the charity's initial years. One way of achieving this is for a minority of charity trustees also to be Commissioners. The shared board membership will be helpful in managing the shared responsibility for caring for the historic properties and ensuring they are open to the public. Government and the Commission agree with the comments made that charity trustees should be appointed on the basis of merit and their specific contribution to the charity.

### **Investment priorities**

4.48 There was concern that the new model, and specifically the aim of self-sufficiency, would lead to a situation where commercial factors would become the only or principal driver for investment in the Collection. Some respondents envisaged a situation where sites in the Collection which did not generate income would not receive investment or would be sold. There was also some concern that services (such as education) that do not directly generate income for the charity would not be improved, or even maintained.

### ***Government response: Investment priorities***

4.49 Fears were expressed that English Heritage's investment programme will focus on the larger commercially successful sites at the expense of smaller sites, including free sites. £10m from the additional £80m to be provided by Government will be dedicated to smaller and free sites. This would, for example, include refreshing the presentation of all the Hadrian's Wall sites, building on the work English Heritage has undertaken at Housesteads. This would include interpretative projects at Chesters, Birdoswald and Corbridge, as well as new graphic panels for all the free sites. In addition, English Heritage's capital investment programme assumes an average of around £1m to be spent each year on projects at smaller sites.

4.50 Market research shows that part of what visitors value about English Heritage sites and events is what they learn about England's history. English Heritage will therefore continue to provide high quality interpretation based on research and scholarship. The property licence will oblige the charity to continue to provide free educational visits which will be promoted extensively to encourage schools and other educational groups to take up the offer. This is not solely because of the terms of the licence but also recognises that one of English Heritage's charitable objectives will be to promote the public knowledge and enjoyment of the National Heritage Collection. There is also a long term benefit in growing support for heritage. The Taking Part survey has shown that engaging children with historic properties at an early stage results in a continued interest in later life. In this sense, free educational visits represent an investment in the future of the business. Visits by children as part of free educational visits often result in follow up family visits, increasing the overall number of visitors.

## **Access to the Collection in developing historic environment guidance**

4.51 A number of respondents outlined the benefits of English Heritage staff being able to work/undertake research on the Collection in the preparation of guidance for the wider historic environment. They would not want this to end under the new model.

### ***Government response: Access to the Collection in developing guidance***

4.52 Staff in Historic England will continue to have access to the sites in the National Heritage Collection in order to research issues which will result in guidance for the benefit of England's wider heritage.

## **Guardianship sites**

4.53 There was a request for more information on what the new model would mean for guardianship sites in the Collection.

### ***Government response: Guardianship sites***

4.54 There will be no change in the ownership of sites in the National Heritage Collection. Sites which are currently in the guardianship of the Secretary of State will remain so. The only change is that the charity will be licensed by the Commission to look after them and open them to the public.

## **Acquisitions policy/owner of last resort**

4.55 It was very clear that respondents believe it is critical that the charity can take on new sites to the Collection and act as owner of last resort for heritage at risk.

4.56 There was a consistent request among respondents for more information on the decision making process surrounding this function. For example whether the charity could reject a request from the Commission to take on a property or whether the charity could add to the Collection, as well as confirmation of the factors or values that would drive acquisitions.

4.57 There was also a request for more information on funding for the owner of last resort function. A number of respondents stated that further additional Government funding should be made available to the charity if it took on new properties and that Historic England GIA should not be used for this purpose.

4.58 There were also some calls to add ownership of last resort to the charitable objectives.

### ***Government response: Owner of last resort***

4.59 Government and the Commission agree that English Heritage's ability to act as owner of last resort should not be diminished. English Heritage has a number of strategies for saving heritage at risk, including advice and grants, and where there is no alternative, it takes sites into direct ownership and does the work necessary to put them into good order. Following this, sites may become part of the National Heritage Collection on a permanent or temporary basis, such as Harmondsworth Barn or the JW Evans silver factory in Birmingham, or they may be passed on to other owners.

4.60 This is an important and unique function and Government and the Commission fully intend that the ability to respond to heritage at risk in this way will continue under the new model. The Commission and the charity will agree Acquisitions Guidelines for this purpose.

4.61 For properties falling within the Acquisitions Guidelines, Historic England would initially be responsible for taking on a site if no other option existed and for doing the work to get it into good order. At that stage, having removed the major risks, it may be possible to pass it on to a private sector or charitable owner.

4.62 If that is not possible, the Commission would be able to ask the English Heritage charity to take on the management of the site as part of the National Heritage Collection. The ownership of the site would remain with the Commission. The Commission will expect the charity to take on any site which has an annual liability of up to £25,000. This value is calculated to reflect the average operating deficit at English Heritage's less commercially successful sites and represents an acceptably small level of risk for the charity. If the deficit is more than £25,000, or the charity is asked to take on responsibility for a number of properties, there would need to be some negotiation and agreement between the Commission and the charity.

4.63 This would be no different from the current situation where English Heritage has to make a business case for taking on a new site, including taking a view on its long term future. The charitable objectives of the English Heritage charity will enable it to support the Commission in taking on new sites and the property licence will reflect the above requirements.

### **Clarity on arrangements post 2022-23**

4.64 A number of heritage organisations stated that they would like greater clarity on the proposals for managing the Collection post 2022-23. Some suggested that the review of the future contractual arrangements scheduled for 2019-20 should be subject to public consultation.

### **Government response: Clarity on arrangements post 2022-23**

4.65 The consultation document stated that the contractual arrangements between the Commission and the English Heritage charity will be reviewed in good time before the end of the eight year period so that decisions can be made about arrangements for the longer term. We would expect there would be a public consultation at that time.

### **Questions 4 and 5: Other key opportunities for the Charity to increase earned income**

4.66 28% of those that answered this question stated that there were other opportunities to increase earned income. 59% stated don't know and 12% stated that there were no further opportunities (338 responses).

4.67 A summary of the opportunities identified is below:

- More autonomy for sites to make local decisions.
- Providing consultancy services.
- Building on services already provided (film, private events, and partnerships with arts/cultural organisations).
- Use of non-historic asset base including office and residential premises.
- More live events and streaming of them.
- Paid for opportunities for public engagement, for example archaeological digs.

### **Government response**

4.68 Government and the Commission welcome respondents' views on income generation for the charity and will encourage the charity to consider these as part of normal business planning processes. A key benefit of the new model is that the charity will be able to have a clearer commercial focus and greater freedom to generate income and develop its business. Some of the ideas proposed English Heritage already undertakes, such as making use of the non-historic properties and hiring out properties for filming or special events. Most of the commercial opportunities suggested are extensions or developments of what English Heritage does at present but there will be some new opportunities, for example in areas of licensing and sponsorship, which are currently not possible because of potential conflicts of interest with the statutory side of English Heritage's work.

4.69 It is already a policy of English Heritage that its sites should strongly reflect local interests. For example, as far as possible, they use local suppliers and produce and encourage support from local volunteers. Government and the Commission intend that this should be continued and strengthened, recognising that there are also benefits in being a national organisation, for example in terms of purchasing power.

**Question 6: Aspects of the current service provided by English Heritage important to retain**

4.70 The following services were highlighted as being important parts of the current English Heritage offer for the Collection:

**Maintenance and conservation of the Collection:** That the Collection in its entirety is maintained and enhanced and standards kept to. There was a desire for the conservation or asset management plans to be placed in the public domain.

**Standards of excellence:** In terms of the complete charity offer but particularly in terms of conservation, interpretation, research, access and visitor offer.

**Accessibility:** Respondents were very clear that they see public access to the Collection as critical. For respondents, the need to increase earned income should not lead to a situation where the Collection becomes a private space. Access to free sites should continue, as should English Heritage engagement with groups with protected characteristics (including disabled people, older people and people of different religions and beliefs).

**Public engagement and education:** Respondents emphasised the importance of positive engagement with the education agenda by the Collection and emphasised that this went beyond school/education visits to include education in, for example, conservation and investment in off-site resources (including online).

**A continuing research role:** A number of respondents emphasised the importance of the continuation of the Collection as a research tool for heritage professionals. They would also expect the charity to continue to undertake professional research in the Collection which enhances public knowledge.

**Developing expertise:** The charity continues to be an expert organisation, with access to individuals with a wide variety of skills including archaeological, conservation and heritage science, and from backgrounds including academia and research.

**Innovation:** The charity continues to be at the forefront of innovation in the sector, particularly in relation to interpretation both on and off site.

**Ownership of last resort:** As stated above it was seen as critical that the charity should remain an owner of last resort where it is the most viable solution for the heritage asset.

**Partnership working:** Sites continue to work with partners where it is beneficial and appropriate.

**Working with local communities:** Sites should continue to develop relationships with local communities.

### **Government response**

4.71 The eight year new model will retain the current arrangements for the ownership of sites in the National Heritage Collection, including those sites in guardianship. This maintains the public interest in the National Heritage Collection. The Commission's responsibilities for the care and opening to the public of the sites will not change but it will fulfil those responsibilities through the property licence which will form part of the contract with the charity.

4.72 The property licence will include the following points to respond to some of the concerns raised during the consultation:

- While the charity will be given some flexibility in terms of opening hours, permanent changes which would reduce opening hours of any property to less than 75% of the current total annual opening hours would require the Commission's consent.
- The charity will be required to take on the existing membership scheme.
- Free educational visits will be maintained.

4.73 English Heritage's brand values are based on the highest academic and curatorial standards. Government and the Commission are committed to ensuring that those high standards continue.

### **Question 7: Opportunities further to enhance the public services offered by the charity**

4.74 Respondents were asked to outline whether there were further opportunities to enhance the services offered by the charity. The responses tended to fall into the following categories:

**Public involvement:** Respondents saw the new model as an opportunity to develop greater links with the public. This could include the increased use of volunteers, the involvement of local communities as decision makers at sites and enhanced links with local schools and economies. However while respondents were generally supportive of the use of volunteers, they noted the cost and effort in relation to maintaining a volunteer workforce and suggested that volunteers should be an addition to and not a replacement for expert staff.

**Training and development role in heritage craft and other specialist skills:** A number of respondents stated that the charity should have a role in this area, including continuing to offer opportunities for businesses and individuals to develop

their heritage craft skills, a requirement for contractors to take on apprentices, making available the charity specialist staff to the wider historic environment sector, and offering training courses for the public and professionals.

### **Government response**

4.75 Government and the Commission agree there are opportunities to increase public engagement and volunteering. This would be as an addition to and not a replacement for expert staff.

4.76 English Heritage already has partnerships with other organisations and Government and the Commission expect these to continue and new partnerships to be developed wherever practicable.

4.77 The additional £80m provided by Government will enable a substantial programme of conservation and development work at sites in the National Heritage Collection. Given that a greater continuity of work than at present will be possible, contractors will be encouraged to provide opportunities for apprenticeships and similar skills initiatives for local labour to be used and up-skilled.

### **Questions 8 and 9: Charitable objectives**

4.78 72% of respondents agreed that the suggested charitable objectives were broadly the right ones, 14% stated they were not and 14% gave a don't know response (355 responses). Among organisations the percentage who agreed with the charitable objectives was 69%.

4.79 The responses to this question indicated that while respondents did not in the main disagree with the charitable objectives, they felt the objectives could be improved or enhanced.

4.80 Respondents felt the charitable objectives (page 14 of the consultation) could be improved through a wider definition of education beyond "providing educational facilities and services", that there should be a commitment to securing public access to the Collection as well as enjoyment and knowledge, an increased emphasis on the condition of the Collection (including ensuring that investment is not driven only/principally by income factors and that standards are maintained and improved) and a charitable purpose related to owner of last resort.

4.81 A number of respondents also questioned whether the charity's public knowledge and enjoyment role should be extended to include the advancement of public knowledge of heritage more generally.



4.82 Other suggestions for charitable objectives included the continuation of high standard research and a commitment to working to address the skills shortages in heritage craft.

4.83 There were also some calls for a charitable objective which covered the proactive extension of the Collection, particularly into areas where it was perceived to have less representation, for example maritime heritage.

4.84 A number of respondents emphasised the importance of the objectives in that they were likely to outlast the property licence.

### ***Government response***

4.85 A number of respondents wished to see an explicit objective in relation to the owner of last resort function. The proposed approach to this issue is outlined in some detail above.

4.86 A number of other specific suggestions were made to be added to the charitable objectives. The view of Government and the Commission is that these are adequately covered by the existing objectives and the property licence. In some cases, the proposed new objectives (such as advancing public knowledge of history and heritage and developing new techniques and services) have not been included because they would result in extending the scope of the charity into areas beyond the National Heritage Collection.

### **Questions 10 and 11: The success criteria for the charity**

4.87 48% of respondents agreed that the proposed success criteria were the right ones to ensure that the benefits of the model were realised and 24% did not. The rest gave a don't know response (28%) (345 responses).

4.88 Of those that did not agree, a key concern was that the criteria were too focused on financial targets and in particular the emphasis on reduction of tax payer subsidy. They also felt the condition of the Collection needed to be made a stronger success criterion.

4.89 A number of respondents also stated that there needed to be a clearer link between the charitable objectives and the success criteria. For example success criteria linked to the charitable objective around advancing public knowledge of the Collection.

4.90 Some respondents stated that there was not enough information on the success criteria to make an informed decision.

4.91 Proposed additions to the success criteria included:

- The level of volunteering and community engagement.
- Enhancement of public knowledge/education offer.
- Investment in the training and skills needed in a workforce able to look after the Collection in the future.
- On-going research into the Collection.
- Criteria related to increasing financial independence and the building up of reserves, rather than emphasising reduction in GIA.
- Removal of conservation deficit related to priority 1 and 2 defects and up to date management plans.

### ***Government response***

4.92 Government and the Commission have always been clear that the success criteria for the charity should be broader than financial targets. The suite of governance documents providing the framework for the relationship between the charity and the Commission, including the property licence and the funding agreement, will therefore contain provisions around public access, free educational visits, support for new acquisitions and maintenance, repair and conservation as well as financial targets.

### **Question 12: Future opportunities and priorities for Historic England**

4.93 Overall the majority of respondents were supportive of English Heritage's statutory and wider heritage activities and welcomed the continuation of an independent, expert organisation which constructively champions the historic environment.

4.94 In the main respondents generally welcomed the "broad vision for the historic environment" and agreed that the opportunities and priorities were the right ones for Historic England.

4.95 However many respondents stated that they would welcome more information on Historic England. There was some concern that structure of the consultation reflected a view that Historic England, and its role in the wider historic environment, was not considered as important by the Government as securing the future of the Collection. For many respondents Historic England will play a more critical role than the charity.

4.96 The majority of respondents were pleased to note that there would not be changes to the duties and responsibilities of Historic England. However some respondents questioned whether this was an opportunity for greater change or review than that proposed in the consultation, particularly in light of decreased central Government funding and local authority resources.

4.97 There was a request for greater clarity on what is meant by "...review the landscape for heritage services and to develop recommendations" (page 18 of the consultation) and

more generally the process for further consultation on Historic England. Many respondents did not feel that consultation through the NHPP would be sufficient.

4.98 Below are the key points made by respondents in relation to Historic England:

**Funding:** Many respondents, including those involved in planning and place making, emphasised the requirement for Historic England to be properly funded to fulfil its roles and responsibilities. Respondents stressed that historic environment funding should not be reduced as a direct result of this model and that Historic England funding should not be used to make up any shortfall of the charity.

There was a clear request for more information on future Government funding for Historic England.

A number of respondents questioned what constituted the additional source of funding for Historic England beyond GIA (page 18 of the consultation). Organisations stated that any proposal for income generation must not be made in isolation and must correspond to improved services. Some local authorities also expressed concern whether this would lead to their organisations having to contribute towards funding Historic England services.

**Better and more responsive services:** Many respondents, especially those with a role in the planning system, welcomed the consultation's aim to make the "heritage protection system work better for owners, developers and infrastructure providers" (page 18). However there was concern among some respondents, particularly those with a specific heritage protection role, that providing a better service for customers and/or reducing bureaucracy and red tape should not come at the expense of the longer term protection of the historic environment.

Some respondents also questioned whether it would be possible to deliver a more responsive and better service within the context of static or reduced funding.

In the section on better services, some respondents noted that local authorities or the wider heritage sector were not explicitly mentioned. Respondents emphasised that working with local authorities and the voluntary heritage sector is a central role for Historic England. A number of respondents wanted clarity on how Historic England would deal with potential conflicts between owners/developers and local authorities if it was to offer more guidance and advice to the former group.

**Public engagement:** The majority of respondents were positive towards a public facing role, in particular towards heritage property owners. There was though some concern that with limited funding this should not be at the expense of Historic England's planning and conservation work. A public facing role should be targeted and proportionate.

**Constructive conservation:** The majority of respondents, including most local authorities who responded, were supportive of the continuing emphasis on constructive conservation and felt that in the main this had been a successful approach.

**Grants:** While it was recognised that the level of English Heritage grants had fallen in recent years, they were still seen as important, particularly in terms of leverage for partnership funding and in providing grants for organisations unable to accept or qualify for lottery funding.

**Heritage at risk:** Many partners, both national and local, were pleased to see the continued emphasis on heritage at risk and the last resort option of taking into ownership the most important vulnerable at risk sites for which there is no other solution. There was though a request for more information on how this would be funded.

**Archives and heritage data:** A significant number of respondents, in particular those involved in the planning process, highlighted the importance of the existing English Heritage archive and heritage data function. A number of respondents wanted clarity that the exclusion of the existing English Heritage services (g) to (l) (page 8) from the services Historic England will provide (page 17) was an editing mistake rather than a deliberate omission.

A number of respondents questioned whether Historic England could play a greater national role in co-ordinating access to heritage data and archives.

**Importance of research and technical advice:** A number of respondents, in particular those in the archaeological sector, emphasised the importance of English Heritage's research. Local authorities also stressed the importance of English Heritage's technical advice. Respondents also stated they would want to continue to have access to existing English Heritage staff who gain experience and knowledge through working on the Collection.

**Skills:** A significant number of respondents, including many local authorities, emphasised the importance of English Heritage's existing skills and capacity building programme, particularly in response to changes in local authority resources.

**World Heritage:** A number of respondents commented on the absence of world heritage from the consultation and asked for more clarity on the perceived role for Historic England in this area.

## **Government response**

4.99 Government and English Heritage recognise that the consultation provided less detail on the priorities and opportunities for Historic England. This in no way means that the Government and English Heritage see the activity of Historic England as less of a priority than the maintenance and operation of the National Heritage Collection, but reflects the fact that the consultation focused on the plans for the Collection which, at the time of the consultation publication, were more advanced.

4.100 The responses to the consultation are a very clear and positive endorsement of the activities undertaken by those parts of English Heritage which will become Historic England. Government and the Commission are pleased that there was support for a broad vision for the value of the historic environment and for Historic England. Government and the Commission are committed to continuing the services which are clearly highly valued including research, access to data and archives, expert and technical advice, capacity building, grants and support for heritage at risk. The reference at the beginning of chapter 4 of the consultation document to points (b) to (f) at paragraph 2.3 was an editing mistake and in no way implies that the services listed at (g) to (l) will not be continued. Similarly, there is no change envisaged to Historic England's role in advising on World Heritage Site policy and casework. Government and the Commission also welcome the positive endorsement of constructive conservation and a stronger public engagement role for Historic England.

4.101 While both Government and the Commission expect that Historic England will continue to deliver the services in support of England's wider heritage, there is scope to respond to changing priorities. The priorities in Historic England's new corporate plan will take account of responses to the consultation on the next NHPP. The Commission is reviewing Historic England's priorities and how it should work with other partners. The Commission is very keen to engage others in the development of the Historic England NHPP action plan and the corporate plan and therefore held a series of informal workshops over the summer. The feedback has informed the Historic England corporate plan which Commission is publishing for consultation.

4.102 Government acknowledges the concern expressed by respondents about the impact of local authorities spending less on heritage services. It will expect Historic England to take account of the current review of local authority archaeological services and how it can further support local authority conservation services as part of the development of its NHPP action plan and corporate plan. It is already consulting with the sector on new and more effective ways to manage heritage data.

4.103 The letter from the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to the Chairman of English Heritage published today makes clear the Government's commitment to the success of the new model and guarantees that no reduction will be made to the Commission's allocated budgets for 2014-15 and 2015-16. It also expresses the expectation that future governments would want to take into consideration the new model in making funding allocations.

4.104 The Commission is keen that its services should be better and more responsive and would welcome further discussion with stakeholders as part of the consultation on its corporate plan about what changes stakeholders would like to see in how services are delivered. Government and the Commission are clear that improvements in services for users will not be at the expense of heritage protection. As mentioned in the Executive Summary, the Government plans to hold a Triennial Review to review the role, functions and needs of Historic England in more detail in 2016-17, once the new model has got off the ground.

### **Questions 13 and 14: Success Criteria for Historic England**

4.105 45% of respondents agreed that the proposed success criteria were the right ones and 30% thought that they were not (25% gave don't know response) (345 responses).

4.106 A key point made by many of the respondents was that the success criteria did not include an overall success criterion related to ensuring the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.

4.107 Respondents also stated that there should be a clearer alignment with the statutory legal duties of the Commission.

4.108 A number of respondents also highlighted potential issues with using customer feedback as success criteria when Historic England may provide advice customers do not agree with. Respondents also made the point that customers include local authorities as well as owners and developers. Overall respondents concluded that while it was important to gain customer feedback, this must be within the context of other criteria.

4.109 The emphasis on NHPP action plans was felt not to be an appropriate measure of success as it relied too heavily on the actions of external organisations over which Historic England would not have direct control.

4.110 A number of respondents also called for more clarity on what was meant by "more up front work with developers" (page 19).

4.111 There was a request, particularly among the heritage sector responses, that there should be a success criteria related to progress on the skills agenda and measurement related to high quality research.

4.112 A number of local authorities would like to see the success criteria include recognition of the role of the historic environment in economic growth.

4.113 There was a request for clarity on whether the success criteria would be prioritised.

## **Government response**

4.114 Government and the Commission note the concern outlined by some respondents that there was no overall success criteria of improvement/protection of the historic environment in the success criteria. The state of the historic environment is at the heart of Historic England's purpose. Tools including 'Heritage Counts' and the Heritage At Risk Register will continue to be used to help assess the state of the historic environment.

4.115 Government and the Commission are committed to providing an excellent service to Historic England's customers. We recognise the limitations of customer services measurement and acknowledge that part of Historic England's role is to address the needs of the future rather than respond only to today's priorities, but we are committed to understanding the experience of customers to improve services. For example English Heritage is currently working with four other statutory agencies<sup>2</sup> to develop a single customer survey for local planning authorities which will allow Historic England to assess its performance while reducing the consultation burden on this audience.

4.116 English Heritage will be consulting further with partners on the success criteria as part of the consultation on Historic England's corporate plan.

## **Questions 15 and 16: The National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP)**

4.117 56% of respondents agreed that the NHPP should form the basis for the business plan for Historic England and 22% did not, the remaining responses were don't know answers (21%). (344 responses.)

4.118 In the main for those that did not agree that the NHPP should be the basis for the Historic England business plan, it was not because they did not agree with the NHPP in principle, but because they did not think it was fit for purpose in its current form.

4.119 It was felt the NHPP in its current form was not suitable because it is too narrowly focused on direct heritage protection outcomes and does not include, for example, public engagement and education, is not customer focused and is not clear and easy to follow.

4.120 Many in the heritage sector saw the NHPP as belonging to the sector, and suggested that the Historic England business plan should respond to, but be separate from the NHPP.

---

<sup>2</sup> A local planning authority customer survey will be launched later in 2014. It will be a partnership between English Heritage, Natural England, Environment Agency, Highways Agency and Health and Safety Executive.

## ***Government response***

4.121 Government and English Heritage recognise that changes need to be made to the NHPP in order to build on the successes of the first plan.

4.122 Since the publication of the consultation document on the new model English Heritage has consulted internally and externally on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing plan and its future priorities. A draft of the successor framework, to be named Heritage 2020 and published in collaboration with the heritage sector, will be issued very shortly. It is already clear that Heritage 2020 will have a broader scope, focusing on capacity, skills and public engagement as well as on understanding the significance of heritage assets and managing change.

4.123 Historic England will take the results of the NHPP consultation into account in preparing its corporate plan, but the NHPP sector-wide framework will be a distinct document from Historic England's corporate plan and NHPP action plan.



# Annex A: Organisations which responded to the consultation

---

Albion Historic Environment  
Amwell Society  
Ancient Monuments Society  
Archaeology Data Service  
Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland  
Arts and Humanities Research Council  
Arts Council England  
Association of English Cathedrals  
Association of Local Government Archaeology Officers  
Association of North East Councils  
Avenues & Pearson Park Residents' Association  
Barry Shaw Associates  
Bath and North East Somerset Council  
Bath Preservation Trust  
Battlefields Trust  
Beacon Planning  
Birmingham City Council  
Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
Borough Council of Wellingborough  
Bournemouth Borough Council  
Bowerbird Jewellery  
Bradford Building Preservation Trust  
Bradford City Council  
Bradford Museums & Galleries  
Brentford Community Council  
Brighton and Hove City Council  
British Destinations  
British Property Federation

British Sub Aqua Club  
Buckinghamshire County Council  
Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust  
Bucks Archaeological Society  
Burton Upon Trent Civic Society  
Calderdale Local Authority  
Cambridge Conservation Officers Forum  
Cambridge Past, Present & Future  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Camden Civic Society  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Canal and River Trust  
Cannock Chase District Council  
Charnwood Borough Council  
Cheshire East Local Authority  
Chester Archaeological Society  
Chester Civic Society  
Chichester District Council  
Church Monuments Society  
Church of England, Cathedral and Church Buildings Division  
Churches Conservation Trust  
Civic Voice  
Colchester Borough Council  
Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site  
Partnership Board  
Cornwall Council  
Cotswolds Conservation Board  
Council for British Archaeology  
Country Land and Business Association  
Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
Cranfield University  
Cullompton Preservation Trust  
Daventry District Council  
Dayle Bayliss Associates  
Derby City Council  
Derby Diocesan Advisory Committee

Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee  
Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site  
Design Council  
Devon Buildings Group  
Diocese of Durham  
Diocese of St Albans  
Diocese of Worcester  
Donald Insall Associates  
Dorset County Council  
Durham Cathedral  
Durham County Council  
Durham University  
East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
Elmbridge Borough Council  
English Heritage  
English Heritage Foundation  
Federation of Archaeological Manager and Employers  
Fjordr Limited  
Foreign & Commonwealth Office  
Friends of Lewes  
Glass and Glazing Federation  
Gloucestershire County Council  
Gour Kernow  
Great Yarmouth Local History & Archaeological Society  
Greater London Assembly  
Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust  
Harborough District Council  
Heritage Crafts Association  
Heritage for Transformation  
Heritage Lottery Fund  
Heritage Railway Association  
Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire  
Hertfordshire Gardens Trust  
High Peak Borough Council  
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council  
Historic Chapels Trust

Historic Houses Association  
Historic Royal Palaces  
Historic Towns Forum and the Association of Small Historic Towns and Villages  
Hull City Council  
ICON  
Industrial Heritage Support Officer Steering Group  
Institute for Archaeologists  
Institute of Historic Building Conservation  
Ironbridge World Heritage Site Steering Group  
Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee  
Kenilworth Town Council  
Kent County Council  
Lancaster City Council  
Landguard Fort Trust  
Landguard Partnership  
Lathams (Architects)  
Leeds City Council  
Lincolnshire County Council  
Listed Buildings Initiative  
Living Streets  
Local Government Association  
London and Middlesex Archaeological Society  
London Borough of Bexley  
London Borough of Havering  
London Borough of Lambeth  
Maldon District Council  
Manchester City Council  
Mansfield District Council  
Mary Rose Archaeological Services  
Merit Thornton Ltd on behalf of Masterframe Ltd and a network of Installers companies  
National Churches Trust  
National Farmers Union  
National Federation of Roofing Contractors  
National Heritage Science Forum

National Parks England  
National Trust  
Natural England  
Nautical Archaeology Society  
Nene Valley Archaeological Trust  
Network Rail  
New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership  
Newark & Sherwood District Council  
Newcastle City Council  
Newcastle University  
Norfolk & Norwich Archaeological Society  
North East Historic Environment Forum  
North Lincolnshire Council  
North of England Civic Trust  
North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership  
North Tyneside Council  
Northampton Borough Council  
Northamptonshire Archaeological Society  
Northumberland County Council  
Nottingham City Council  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
Oxford Archaeology  
Oxford University  
Pennine Lancashire Local Authorities  
People First  
Peter Studdert Planning Ltd.  
Peterborough City Council  
Picketts Historic Building Conservation  
Plymouth University  
Pony Access  
Princes Regeneration Trust  
Prospect – English Heritage branch  
Public and Commercial Services  
Purcell Architects  
Railway Heritage Trust  
Ramboll Consulting Engineers

Reading Borough Council  
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council  
Register of Architects Accredited in Building Conservation  
RESCUE – The British Archaeological Trust  
RIBA South Conservation Group.  
Royal Archaeological Institute  
Royal Collection  
Royal Historical Society  
Royal Institute of British Architects  
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors  
Rugby Borough Council  
Ryedale District Council  
Salisbury Cathedral  
Society for Church Archaeology  
Society for Lincolnshire History and Archaeology  
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings  
Society of Antiquities  
Somerset Archaeological & Natural History Society  
South Downs National Park Authority  
South Downs Society  
South East Association of Preservation Trusts  
South Gloucestershire Council  
South Kesteven District Council  
Southbank Centre  
St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance  
St John's Church Preservation Group  
Stephan Reinke Architects  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
Stonewest Ltd  
Suffolk Preservation Society  
Sunderland City Council  
Surrey Heath Borough Council  
Sussex Conservation Officers Group  
Sutton Borough Council  
Tameside Archaeological society  
The All Parliamentary Archaeology Group

The Architectural Heritage Fund  
The Association for Industrial Archaeology  
The Heritage Alliance  
The Ironbridge (Telford) Heritage Foundation Limited  
The Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust  
The Joint Committee of the National Amenities Societies  
The Kenilworth Civic Society  
The Landmark Trust  
The Lulworth Estate  
The National Association for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)  
The Theatre Trust  
The Trevor Osborne Property Group Limited  
The Victorian Society  
The Vindolanda Trust  
Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire  
Timothy Ambrose Consulting  
Tyne & Wear Archives & Museums  
UK - Local Authority World Heritage Forum  
UK National Commission for Unesco  
University of Birmingham  
University of Bristol  
University of Manchester  
University of York  
Urban Vision Enterprise CIC  
Victorian Society West Yorkshire Group  
VisitEngland  
Wakefield Council  
Walsall Council  
War Memorials Trust  
Warwick District Council  
West Berkshire  
West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service  
Wigan Council  
Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Society  
Wiltshire Council

Woolwich & District Antiquarian Society  
Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service  
York Consortium for Conservation and Craftsmanship  
York Minster  
Yorkshire & Humber Association of Civic Societies  
Yorkshire Gardens Trust



