

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE- OUR CORPORATE PLAN 2019-22

About this survey

Thank you for taking part in our survey about Historic Environment Scotland's Corporate Plan 2019-22.

We are very interested in your views, but please do not feel obliged to answer every question.

Your responses

The survey asks 14 questions and should take approximately 5 minutes to complete.

This opportunity to give your feedback will close at midnight on **2 November 2018**.

Contacting us

To speak with us about this survey or the wider programme of consultation, please contact us on: corporateplan@hes.scot

Corporate Plan Manager, Historic Environment Scotland, Longmore House,
Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH

Privacy notice

You have the right to access your data, receive a copy of it, request corrections or removal and object to the processing of it. More information about your rights regarding the personal data we collect from you can be found at the [HES Privacy Notice](#) (See Annex 1).

Further information

If you would like further information please contact the Data Protection Officer:
Telephone: 0131 668 8600

Email: dataprotection@hes.scot

Historic Environment Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH

You can complete this survey online, if you prefer, by clicking here
www.historicenvironment.scot/draft-corp-plan-consultation-web

The Questionnaire: Consultation on Historic Environment Scotland's 2019-22 Corporate Plan

Q1. Are you answering this consultation on behalf of yourself as an individual or in another capacity?

- As an individual
- On behalf of an organisation, public body or charity**
- On behalf of a local authority
- As a private business, such as an architect or developer
- Representing a community group
- Other (please specify)

BEFS, Built Environment Forum Scotland

**Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our vision for HES?
Scotland's historic environment is cherished, understood, shared and enjoyed with pride, by everyone.**

Strongly agree / **Agree** / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

What do you like, dislike or what would you change?

The final bold paragraph on P4 was universally described as, 'good, strong, meaningful language'. If the plan fulfilled the final line – and kept this clarity of language and strength of voice – it would be a useful, relevant document for the sector.

- Much was said about the clarity and ease of read that this plan provided. The brevity was also appreciated. Accessible language and structure but substance more difficult to pin down. Concern that aiming a corporate document at the 'person on the street' compromises its effectiveness for sector professionals.
- Great - but HOW, more detail, KPIs necessary to 'read' the document effectively.
- Public have a strong voice within the document – sector, LA and how HES works with government needs to be foregrounded more strongly (lack of demonstrable partnership with government and LAs was mentioned by several participants).
- Concern that resource allocation priorities for moving towards a Carbon Neutral Scotland are not expressed (this will be an area of development over the lifespan of this plan). Ref IPCC SR1.5, Stern Review. 3years is a quarter of the IPCC timeframe. A sense of urgency is lacking.
- Other topics which it was felt are not addressed within the plan are Brexit and the move towards Participatory Budgeting.
- Lack of quantification in relation to HES budget. What is delivered for the money invested? What is prioritised should the amount change?

- Tighter focus on what HES does to make a difference to the Priorities listed.
- does the current document fulfil the role of a HES Corp Plan as defined within the HES Act as main objectives, outcomes and activities – perhaps this is just a matter of language, rather than content; but maybe more clarity is needed?
- it was felt the Plan should also explicitly demonstrate the interconnected nature of all the Priorities listed, but also the interconnected nature of the wider heritage sector more widely.

The Priorities

There was general agreement that the hierarchy of data on the page diluted the points made.

SOCIAL (and other values) should be front and centre, not diminished by parentheses. If they are to replace LEAD, VALUE etc then they should be the elements which demonstrate a value-driven rather than asset-driven corporate plan.

Many of the current bullet points lost their 'punch' when buried beneath the preamble.

Suggest format:

- **SOCIAL** – priority one.
- Text for what HES will do – clear bullet points which are *specific to the organisation and clearly demonstrate impact and relevance of historic environment to the field in question (social, economic, culture etc)*.
- Any additional blurb (potentially reduced).

Suggestion for bullet points throughout the document – remove repetition of 'we will' and make stronger definitive statements.

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for: HES? The historic environment makes a real difference to more people's lives (social)

Strongly agree / **Agree** / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

- The environment is experienced in its totality. The historic environment, the natural environment, the management of these places all play a part in the interaction between people and place. This may need additional emphasis.
- Additionally, in reference to above Priority 1 – intangible/tangible and landscape all form part of the seamless expression of place.
- Many questions raised by attendees were linked to HES POLICY – touchpoints which signpost to HES POLICY (and other relevant Strategies and Legislation) would be a useful addition (this applied throughout the document).
- Language around 'create heritage' was seen as problematic. Suggested 'recognise and ensure' heritage without boundaries. There was an assumption inclusiveness and parity of access, rather than fences, was what was meant here?
- HES have a role in facilitating changing perspectives in the definition of 'heritage'. This could be within Priority 1.
- The language of 'wellbeing' is now well recognised and could be included within the final bullet point.

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES: The historic environment is looked after, protected and managed for the generations to come (environmental)

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

- As regulator only HES have the agency to fulfil and lead on many of the actions in this section.
- In the final bullet point there was concern that both 'local businesses' and 'owners' were absent from those being worked with by HES.
- The potential links to HES POLICY were reiterated.
- *Tackle the consequences of climate change*. Was not seen as strong enough by participants. Language around investing, targeting resources, and preventing further negative behaviours - rather than only dealing with 'consequences' would be a more active and necessary statement.

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES: The historic environment makes a broader contribution to the economy of Scotland and its people (economic)

HES need to engage with other groups, not just heritage or seldom-heard. Businesses, communities not specific to heritage interests – their voices could be seen as lacking.

- In this section infographics, illustration and examples were seen as essential – the document *is* easy read, but for those out-with the sector this section may need fuller exposition.
- There were concerns expressed over the phrase 'sustainable tourism' – some saw it as increasingly problematic.
- Whilst skills were mentioned under economic benefit, there could be greater clarity as to the growth sector to be found in traditional building skills and the increasing market for the maintenance of our historic built environment.
- Concern that there was no mention of threats and of heritage-loss. There seemed to be a complacency that 'heritage would always be there' and to work from that standpoint.
- In the final paragraph of explanatory text it was strongly felt that '*prosperous* and more equal nation' would be more appropriate than 'wealthier'.
- **In paragraph 3 of the explanatory text to Priority 3 – there is positive, strong language where the organisation is championing the economic benefits. This clarity and strength of language should be applied throughout the document.**
- Language around investing in environmental solutions for co-benefits would be well placed within the ECONOMIC section.

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES: The historic environment encourages approaches that are more inclusive and diverse and inspire creativity (cultural)

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree or disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree

- Potential for this section to link to the Culture Strategy – clearly stating case for the historic environment as part of our cultural heritage. This then broadened-out conversation of HES acknowledgement of other Strategies where relevant.
- Collaborative was suggested as being a central part of Priority 4's text. ... *collaborative approaches that are more inclusive and diverse...*

Q7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES: The historic environment is cared for and championed by a high-performing organisation

Strongly agree / Agree / **Neither agree or disagree** / Disagree / Strongly disagree

- Advocacy for the sector should be part of this section.
- How does HES' working operation relate to other organisations, particularly Local Authorities; this could be made more explicit.
- Collective strategic drive necessary for quality of data and up-to-date information being collected, collated and made available.
- Concerns expressed over 'high-performing' – *efficient and effective* had less 'business-y' overtones.

**Q8. What would success look like for the Corporate Plan?
Do you have comments on our suggested approach to measurement?**

BEFS believe it is key to keep measurable, longitudinal data – new KPIs where applicable should add to the collective historic environment knowledge, not reinterpret current data. It is disappointing not to have had sight of any sector KPIs prior to publication.

**Q9. Do you think any of the objectives in the Corporate Plan will impact differently on people because of their age, disability, gender, gender identity, race and/or ethnicity, religion or belief or sexual orientation?
(please see the draft Equalities Impact Assessment)**

No comment

**Q10. Are there any key issues or opportunities we should consider to make sure that the Corporate Plan positively works for different equality groups?
(please see the draft Equalities Impact Assessment)**

No comment

Q11. Please refer to our Strategic Environmental Assessment of the draft Corporate Plan. Have the key issues associated with the environmental implications of the draft plan been identified?

- Yes**
- No (please comment)

Whilst the SEA is positive about the actions suggested in the Corp Plan – BEFS would highlight that the SEA suggests the plan could be more explicit in relation to the information about 'managing and mitigating' effects of climate change. The Corporate Plan is an opportunity to put significant emphasis on sustainability – and the potential of exploring managed change to make more of our buildings assets fit for the future. BEFS believe that the response within the SEA that statements relating to these measures,

will be within the Annual Operating Plan does not send a strong enough message.

Q12. Are there any key areas relating to HES's impact on you or your organisation, business or other interests that should be considered in our Corporate Plan?

No comment

Q13. What can you or your organisation do to help us deliver our Corporate Plan?

BEFS role as a strategic intermediary body, and critical friend within the sector - providing considered sector responses, from a broad membership expertise base and beyond, to consultations and critical issues will help inform and enable aspects of research, exploration and delivery of key elements over the time-frame of the plan.

Q14. Please use this section to provide any other comments you think are relevant to our Corporate Plan.

Summary of suggested *critical issues areas*:

a) Loss of local authority expertise.

Need to consider the dramatic and continuing decline in Local Authorities to provide experienced, trained, staff in relevant disciplines who are able to recognise, and take action on, heritage issues.

Consensus that the Corp Plan needs to reflect that major player, LAs are shrinking, and less able.

Should HES should be encouraged to allocate resources to local areas, could staff be distributed more across Scotland?

b) Asset Transfer - expectations and consequences

There was significant discussion regarding Community Ownership and Community Assets. With concerns expressed around:

-what happens if these takeovers should fail in coming years/lack sustainability?

-communities often cannot see the pit-falls until the asset has already been taken on.

Where does the ultimate responsibility lie?

- Tools to enable communities are missing and/or tools are there, just hard to find, and not always sector specific.

- Even when a building can keep itself open and supported, it may not be able to build up funds for ongoing maintenance and repair issues.

- Currently difficult to model asset transfer as we don't know how large the uptake will be

-There is interest but maybe a lack of connection between aspirations and reality/obligations/management

-There are also different challenges between rural and urban.

Are the above aspects to be built into the HES 'values' of understand, and protect? And in turn, the notion of acceptable change for communities/commercial/private owners to be highlighted in HES *Policy*.

ANNEX 1

Privacy notice

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) are committed to protecting your personal data and your privacy. This privacy notice explains how we process any personal data we collect from you through this survey.

Personal data

Personal data includes your name, or other information about you that could be used to identify you. In the case of this survey the only personal data we ask for is your name (which is optional) so we can contact you further for more information if appropriate.

We will not ask for any special categories (previously referred to as 'sensitive') of personal data.

The personal data we collect from this survey will be used by HES to inform the development of our Corporate Plan.

Usage of personal data

The legal basis we are using to process your personal data is Public Task, as the processing is necessary for HES to perform our official function.

We limit access to your personal data to those HES employees with a business need to know. It will be processed confidentially for this specific purpose only.

Third party processing and security of personal data

We require Survey Monkey, like all third parties, to respect the security of your personal data and only permit them to process your personal data in accordance with our instructions for a specified purpose. You can see more details on how Survey Monkey manage your personal data in their Privacy Policy which can be found here <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/legal/privacy-policy/>.

Storage of personal data

HES will hold the information collected through this survey for 2 years. Information collected through this survey will be deleted from Survey Monkey servers after the survey closes, however may remain on backup servers for approximately 12 months.

You have the right to access your data, receive a copy of it, request corrections or removal and object to the processing of it. More information about your rights regarding the personal data we collect from you can be found at the HES Privacy Notice which can be found here <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/privacy-notice>.

Further information

If you would like further information please contact us at

Telephone: 0131 668 8600

Email: dataprotection@hes.scot

Data Protection Officer
Historic Environment Scotland
Longmore House, Salisbury Place
Edinburgh EH9 1SH