

VISION ADD	VISION CHANGE	VISION DELETE
<b>plain English -glossary if necessary</b>	start document again - from scratch	any mixed messages
policy should make statutory provision for on-going survey of historic assets	"gain maximum benefit for change"	"avoid or minimise adverse impacts"
<b>explicitly mention people should be able to benefit NOW from hits envy - address needs and improve lives, now</b>	<b>clarify AIMS of the policy - rewrite with stronger purpose</b>	<b>too many principles</b>
<b>sustainable development goals - clarify relationships to national goals /vision</b>	Heritage needs to be mainstreamed	1.10 "detail"
<b>1.9a more emphasis on conservation and protection Add Funding (incl govt support, polluter pays) Social, Cultural, Economic Benefits</b>	<b>1.9a - only keep this from this section / expand to include b-d - 1.9 needs to be less vague/fluffy 1.9c - concerns over word order</b>	<b>1.9b (contradicts 1.9a)</b>
Not "include all", but "strive to never exclude"	<b>vision should state more clearly that hits envy is understood and valued BY EVERYONE</b>	1.11 unnecessary at 'principle' level
"use HE for sustainable development and to address inequality"	Aim is to develop culture values for the HE such that the dependence on designations is reduced	1.8 - move to intro and simplify
<b>Add principle - planning as core/central/corporate/Tier 1 for all LAs, with statutory Chief Planning Officer in each LA</b>	cultural identity is too vague	1.8
Enhance need to evidence based decisions	<b>better subheadings - to navigate document</b>	1
<b>Pro-active - Tools/Practice re: public participation/engagement</b>	<b>from passive to ACTIVE language</b>	1.16
Enhanced APL / LLL	Title: HERITAGE PRINCIPLES	1.18
Succession plan to volunteers	suggest 12pp maximum - 1 A4 summary	1.24
Role of other key partners - eg LAs	Conservation statements - 1 A4 only	1.25
Public Benefit - (better than listing all other types of benefit/s for the public)	<b>Conservation is the Management of Change / insert Managing Change</b>	1.12
Tax, energy etc and their impacts on assets	National Identity - Local Identity	1.15
Supply chain -delivery mechanisms, materials, assessors	what words - 'historic environment' or 'heritage' - and how to distinguish between cultural, built and natural heritage	first sentence /background
<b>Living use- Interaction &amp; engagement &amp; participation</b>	"historic environment" not understood by all - replace with "Scotland's heritage"?	<b>reduce to fundamental principles</b>
<b>Intangible Heritage</b>	improve clarity of cross-ref's between documents - SPP, OPiT etc	<b>1.10 abc - condense to ONE</b>
1.10 -add ref to public benefit to justify actions. Incl Community Benefit	clarify public ownership of vision& relationship to govt policy	<b>1.10 d&amp;e COMBINE</b>
Public Benefit, include Community Benefit	<b>language - "incur only" - "having regard to" - SIMPLIFY</b>	policy = headlines, demolition tests could be covered by suitable 'managing change' publication
Add sense of timeframe	HES or HE - clarify who/what the document is for	
Add continuity provision	Detail is important - but vision should be overarching.	
Who is responsible-shared, complexity, resourcing	Little ref to WORLD HERITAGE sites	
<b>Recognition of Placemaking -relevance of HE to wider environmental, cultural and heritage context</b>	1.8 - 5 line sentence, dense language, not clear,	
holistic conservation management	1.8 - when economic growth appears & relating that to heritage. Benefits of heritage to economic growth, but this is incidental and should come after guardianship	
stewardship	too much nesting of government/organisational policy - un pick	
SPP-add "enhance"	clarify role of planning authority	
SPP -keep ref to change and future use	<b>1.10 while generally good assumes a high level of knowledge of the sector in order to extract info . limited ref to SPP</b>	
Clarify function and use of HE	vision needs to be translated into actions	
SPP retain 137 - 1st aim as is	1.7 clarify that it is vision for OPiT not HESPS - move to intro?	
Non-designated sites/ buildings	More focused principles - fewer - eg: -understand / record asset -skills -delivery -resourcing -integrated systems	
"Management of HE is adequately resourced" - fundamental to delivery of 1.10	New clear vision necessary - currently reiteration of visions of others, refer to other statements, but be clear on vision	
Vision should be: shared, relevant, achievable, realistic, positive, challenging	too many statements that are not a vision	
	improve refs to intellectual, physical access etc for hard to reach groups	
	Needs to be more sector friendly, not just HES	
	Recognition of diversity - stronger role to promote social cohesion	
	sustainability needs to be more than economic growth	
	Ref to high quality places	
	Keep focus on Hist Env	
	<b>Overemphasis on Tourism - heritage not simply valued as a tourism resource</b>	
	Ref to relevant bodies - who? Majority of owners are private, single asset holders.	
	enhance' needs too many riders, change focus for clarity of aim/vision	

VISION - QUESTIONS
Q If for HES how does vision intend to shape other Govt Practice - natural, forestry, agriculture, planning etc
Q - Is HESPS setting policy or advising on policy
Q - What is going to happen with supplementary guidance when it is altered in the Planning Act
Inconsistent vision for HE - rest of the document seems to be about designation
Q - target audience

Key:
Points connected across ADD/CHANGE/DELETE categories
Points made by multiple respondents

DESIGNATION ADD	DESIGNATION CHANGE	DESIGNATION DELETE
<b>2.45 in consultation with the local community</b>	Clarity on principles of designation and what we're trying to achieve	Should be policy statement - not the place for detail of criteria for designations
2.48 and social cohesion	Approach to all HE designations and change decisions should be closely integrated with Nat Enviro issues, SEA, statutory consultations and call-in advice	Legal and Administrative context for each designation- should be in HE Circular
2.50 + social value/interest + social/local history is properly understood	silos thinking - 'survivability' not considered , eg risk from coastal erosion / river flooding	Class consents
financial, physical and intellectual access as criteria	Dual designation Listed building v SM Conservation Areas v 'ordinary' Cat C listing	
diagrams and flow-chart - infographics to break up the text	Don't dilute heritage from the outset. Keep HE aligned with climate change, social and economic balance	
strengthen status of conservation areas with statutory requirement for assessments, public consultations, incl in LDP and Action plans	Statement of significance vital to listing	
Listed Building - what does setting mean, needs explanation	Designation section needs common preamble to cover all themes rather than repeat criteria individually throughout the document	
Annex 3: 1-4 + social value	Conservation area designation should be of 'national importance' (reserve power)	
Conservation Areas 2.41 "areas of special, arch, historic, social interest, character, appearances and configuration"	Need better clarity on who deals with 'designations' on a day-to-day basis as opposed to who 'designates'	
2.42 social media	Language still too fussy.	
2.43 consultation with LA and local community	Embrace change - take into account rapid changes due to globalisation, climate change, artificial intelligence.	
<b>Community aspect to all designation criteria</b>	Listed building entries are not clear about what is included in the listing	
Provide planning authorities with statutory role and capacity to be proactive towards all designations	equal consideration' - it's not all about the designation...	
relationships between designations and their wider context - whole environment - use of CA to protect and improve understanding	designation of conservation area is too strong - not the same as a SM	
<b>context based approach</b>	Listing does not mean no change	
place based approach	Make the policy statement more interactive as a document - enabling community involvement and participation in designation	
adopt a people centred approach	Consider HE / designations as part of LPP	
Introduce a "call for assets" as part of Dev Plan process to give communities opportunity to promote valuable buildings and places	Community listings to be part of LDP	
Policy for World Heritage Sites and Buffer zones	Understand/recognise that local value and knowledge to be valued	
<b>Shelf-life for designations -(assess every 10 years) - review process necessary</b>	Policy should celebrate designations as an asset not a hindrance	
participative events	Policy makers hands can be tied by designation document (and its taken on face value) - process to change this is currently cumbersome and time consuming	
currently no sense of progression / decline	LISTING as a unified term for all designations	
Integration of nature and culture in the overall thinking on designation, and the impacts one has on the other ☒		
Community Value - can miss the valued use (some uses not as well articulated as others - pub vs theatre)		
Values front and centre		
terminology explained		
World Heritage Sites need to be explained/clarified, confusion where they don't relate to CA designation		
For all designations we need to define "value"		

DESIGNATION QUESTIONS
Removal of PD rights, introduction of fees - is this justice.
<b>Empowering or disabling/disempowering ? - Policies have the power to do both</b>
<b>What do we designate and why? Purpose</b>
Public interest can change, be transitory/ generational - Fabric doesn't change. How to establish and manage this as part of designation.
What happens where communities and LA/experts do not agree on designation?
<b>Purpose of CAs - academic or nimbyism? State reasons - character, significance</b>
Battlefields: how do communities & LA -relate to inventory -deal with it day to day who decides what can be built on?
Should communities be involved in review/management of designated sites rather than in their designation?
Balance of CA - top down v bottom up?
Potential to reach scheduling saturation point without review process.
Consider potential new listings - incl implication of longevity of construction materials
Consider implications of listing -higher costs (lack of skilled trades) - restriction on change -could lead to physical deterioration of fabric
Open Leith - case study of community engagement in placemaking and identifying local assets
Is there a danger of placing too many demands on designations and overloading them?

Key:
Points connected across ADD/CHANGE/DELETE categories
<b>Points made by multiple respondents</b>

MANAGEMENT ADD	MANAGEMENT CHANGE	MANAGEMENT DELETE
Compliment prepared LPP with a framework for integrated management of local heritage	<b>Historic Environment Service!</b> <b>Create local staff base and devolve responsibility to staff there to build relationships with the community - take decisions in the round</b> <b>Area teams</b>	Should be a separate document - so delete all from this one.
Community - good in principle but how to make representative, skilled, resourced?	Digital tools has to be an important tool to enable evidence based, consistent, justice-led community participation by people of all ages - needs to be resourced	<b>HES is not the only player - and needs to be clear on this document being for all - delete "I want to be alone" attitude . Write as 'lead body' not as HES.</b>
Define key terms -management -stakeholders -actors	Marine sections more concise/recent - use them to rewrite earlier verbose sections	Excess words! Excessive preamble.
Add New Chapter for enabling action in both public/voluntary/private sectors: grants advice partnering listing regeneration	<b>Needs to set out relationships and responsibilities - who does what!</b> <b>Clarify language/roles - direction - management - administration.</b> <b>HES. LA.</b>	Conservation Area - delete "conservation area consent" - limits vision
In PLG process: -reliance on digitisation of the record - where's the dot? -use of national address gazetteer -address listing (statutory part) needs to somehow relate to CURRENT address	Simplified management trail for WHS	<b>Remove Ecclesiastic Exemption for Listed Buildings</b>
Clearer guidance on how to manage battlefields	Rather than putting HES / SNH in one place put the skills into new professionals to manage assets in the round, within context- interdisciplinary professionals!	<b>Delete "encouragements" for LA - not workable . Concern that encouragement to designate and manage is not supported with information relating to identification and significance</b>
More references to Managing Change series, clarify its role and add a guide on creativity in the HE	Sections need key points with pointers to context and process. However whether this context should be in a visioning document is a key question, makes it too long.	Do not need to explain designation process work in this document.
World Heritage Sites - role and purpose of WHS management plans	Guidance should be prepared in consultation / collaboration w/ planning, transport, infrastructure	3.10 Delete where Ministers to be notified of work to SM, incl cleaning, conservation. Can be regular 'maintenance' - time consuming and unnecessary.
<b>Align policy and people - respect for implementation, determination, skills and expertise.</b> <b>How to find/ask for expertise when necessary.</b>	Demonstrate pathways for greater return on investment.	Policy doc should only state that change can happen (inline with separate guidance docs).
SMC - add a worked example	Collapse into Guidelines to Enhance Heritage Assets	Battlefield Consent - blunt tool, have to consult HES on window replacements regardless of whether appropriate
SMC - management plans to cover abuse or worse	Pre Application Advice -Planning authorities and HES	Demolition tests could be in a managing change leaflet.
3.31 could these be an equivalent for SMC	Combined Consents - CAC causes confusion	
LBC - bring back "duty to notify"	All info on "significance" should be included from the outset. HES not always the decision maker.	
	<b>Set out the principles to follow change.</b> <b>Guidelines for managing change should be clearly set-out and signposted</b>	
	More legal context to a circular	
	3.77 Management plans for gardens/designed landscapes are supposed to be prepared by owners and obtained by LA - these could say anything about the area - needs definition	
	Clarity of the difference between certain heritage consents (LBC AMC) and planning consent for heritage related matters ie combined consents NOT possible but planning has statutory ref to development plan and materials considerations	

MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS
Why do we manage heritage?
Should the body responsible for designation be the one which is responsible for management?
Does there need to be an assessment of consent / determination process to understand if it's working?
Designation - remove categories - relate to consideration of 'setting' etc. Related group value.
Designation and determination by same body
Refresh 17/1987 Circular
Proactive v Reactive management. Eg BARR, CARS schemes, Forward Plans

Key:
Points connected across ADD/CHANGE/DELETE categories
<b>Points made by multiple respondents</b>

This Event has enabled me to actively engage in the future of heritage policy		
Agree	26/26	100%
Disagree		

