

Response to the English Heritage consultation on the National Heritage Protection Plan, submitted online on 2nd May 2014.

Survey answers are highlighted in blue.

SECTION 1: About you

1. Are you responding as an individual or formally on behalf of an organisation?

Individual

[Organisation](#)

If you are responding on behalf of a group or organisation, which one?

[National Heritage Science Forum](#)

2. What best describes you or your organisation, please select one?

English Heritage member

Private individual

Public sector organisation

Private sector organisation

[Charity or voluntary organisation](#)

Community group

Professional institution or association

3. What are the main areas of heritage work that you or your organisation get involved in? Please select up to three options from the list below that best describe your work or that of your organisation.

Answers highlighted

Training/ professional accreditation

[Policy development](#)

Funding

[Advocacy](#)

[Public engagement](#)

Education

Repair and reuse of heritage assets

Advice and support in the planning system

Owning/managing an estate including heritage assets

Land management

Collections/archive / curatorial

Specialist advice on the historic environment (eg conservation plans, character assessments)

Academic Research

Managing heritage for public access (visitor attraction)

Fieldwork / survey / research

Commercial/local authority archaeology

Local/family history

Other (please specify)

SECTION 2: Your priorities for the heritage

4. In your opinion, what are the top three threats to England's historic environment over the next five years? Please limit your answer to 100 words.

1. Cuts to local government funding including museum services and Historic Environmental Records.
2. Climate Change impacts and consequent adaptation measures such as flood defences, coastal realignment and alterations to buildings to increase energy efficiency.
3. Lack of recognition of movable heritage assets within NHPP as a key part of cultural heritage.

5. In your opinion, what are the top three opportunities for England's historic environment over the next five years? Please limit your answer to 100 words.

1. The UK population and visitors to this country value and appreciate our rich cultural heritage. We need to harness this enthusiasm and gain support for the resources needed for research to inform understanding and protection.
2. The rapid development of digital technologies has the potential to engage people in understanding their past in new ways as well as to increase access to historic environment reference resources.
3. Investment in heritage science research is increasing and provides an unparalleled opportunity for us to establish this discipline as means of bridging the gap between the humanities and the sciences in order to answer big questions about our cultural heritage and ensure its survival.

6. In your opinion, what are the top three priorities for England's historic environment over the next five years? Please limit your answer to 100 words

1. Supporting research aimed at understanding materials and environments.
2. Increasing collaboration and making better use of resources.
3. Building future capacity and capability.

SECTION 3: The first NHPP (2011-2015)

7. Prior to this survey, had you heard of the NHPP?

Yes

No

8. How familiar would you say you or your organisation is with the the NHPP? Please rate

Not at all familiar

Not very familiar

Fairly familiar

Very familiar

Extremely familiar

9. Have you or your organisation previously engaged with the NHPP in any way?

Yes

No

Don't know

10. In what ways have you or your organisation engaged with the NHPP?

Please tick all that apply.

Participated in a previous consultation

Aligned organisational action plans to NHPP

Delivered a project which you understood fitted into the NHPP framework

Member of a NHPP project steering or advisory group

Don't know

Other (please specify)

Taking NHPP into account as part of developing the NHSF delivery plan

11. If you or your organisation have not previously engaged with the NHPP, could you provide the reasons why?

Not relevant to my/our work.

Seems like a plan for English Heritage only.

Don't quite understand it/language too difficult.

Priorities don't match ours.

Don't have the training to deliver NHPP actions.

Don't have the capacity to deliver NHPP actions.

Not clear how to become involved.

Outcomes of plan are not clear/not sure how to link in.

Heritage covered doesn't include ours.

Other (please specify)

In the following questions, please rate your agreement with the statements presented about different aspects of the existing NHPP.

Completely disagree

Disagree slightly

No opinion

Agree slightly

Completely agree

Don't know

Questions 12 to 17 were not answered by NHSF

12. Aims and objectives

The plan provides a clear strategy to address heritage protection needs.

It is clear what the plan aims to achieve.

13. Scope

The plan doesn't sufficiently respond to emerging government agendas.

The scope of the plan is too limited to tangible protection of heritage assets.

Community or public engagement with heritage features strongly in the plan.

The heritage categories covered by the plan are not broad enough.

There should be a greater emphasis on the role of the Supporting Actions in the plan framework.

14. Priorities

The strategic measures or priorities are the most relevant for the sector.

The plan identifies the most pressing needs for heritage.

The plan focuses too much on large and outstanding sites.

The opportunities and threats for the historic environment identified by the NHPP are generally the right ones.
The NHPP has helped ensure that funding from the wider heritage sector has been targeted towards the greatest opportunities and threats facing the historic environment.

15. Language and presentation

The plan is too detailed
The language of the plan is hard to understand.
The plan is primarily a plan for English Heritage.
The NHPP is clear and easy to use.
I like the way the current plan sets out the priorities for action.

16. Getting involved

It is clear how to become involved with the plan.
It was easy to input into developing the priorities of the plan.
I believe I / my organisation can influence the NHPP.
I would be comfortable recommending that my organisation developed an action plan against the priorities in the NHPP.

17. Impact

Compared with the situation before 2011, the NHPP has not made a positive difference to the state of the historic environment.
The NHPP has been a positive mechanism for bringing the sector together.
I have used the NHPP framework to help set my own or my organisation's priorities and projects.
The NHPP has had no influence on my own or my organisation's priorities and projects.
There have been improvements in making the NHPP more accessible to those with an interest in the historic environment.

SECTION 4: THE NEW NHPP (2015-2020)

18. What is the most important thing that the sector acting together could achieve to improve the management, understanding and appreciation of England's historic environment? How should the NHPP evolve to support such a development? Please limit your answer to 200 words.

Position the historic environment as integral to our cultural identity. Work to increase collaboration and bring together the different parties within the sector from galleries, libraries, archives and museums to architectural practices, commercial archaeological units and universities to champion the historic environment and increase public support for research and protection. Ensure that the knowledge base is not eroded and we have the skills and resources needed to deal with a period of rapid change including the challenges of climate adaptation, continued austerity and urban and rural development.

19. Which of the following do you think could improve on the existing NHPP framework? Please tick all that apply. –answers highlighted

Include smaller, less outstanding heritage asset types in scope of plan
Ensure the role of expert advice is clearly in scope of plan
Make it easier for grass roots groups to engage with the plan
Address training/capacity building /learning in the scope of plan
Simplify language used in the plan
Simplify the structure of the plan
Focus priorities on pragmatic management of heritage
Improve public interface, e.g. more accessible format, structure, website
Increased emphasis on local priorities, rather than national

[Guidance on how to become involved](#)

Set up an online community of practice, e.g. on LinkedIn

Regular regional meetings

Don't know

[Other \(please specify\)](#)

Ensure that movable heritage assets fall within the scope of the plan.

20. Among the framework priorities (called Activities), are there any which you feel are not significant enough to warrant inclusion in the next plan framework? If so, what are they? Please limit your answer to 100 words.

[Some activities are very specific and could be combined into a single activity \(for example 4F1 and 4F2\).](#)

21. If any, what specific priorities do you feel are missing in the current plan? Please limit your answer to 100 words

[Heritage Science needs to be better articulated within the plan. There should be specific activities relating to understanding of material culture, past human behaviour and populations, and 'natural history' within the plan. The supporting actions of the NHPP should be measures in their own right.](#)

22. Do you intend to engage in the NHPP in the future, assuming any previous barriers to your participation are removed?

[Yes](#)

No

Don't know

23. Is the name National Heritage Protection Plan still appropriate for the second plan period?

[Yes](#)

[No](#)

Don't know

If no, do you have a suggestion for a new name?

[Heritage Protection Plan](#)

- End -