

The Heritage Alliance

Consultation Response: National Lottery Good Causes: Fund what matters to you

September 2026

About Us

The Heritage Alliance is the national umbrella body for the heritage sector. We unite more than 200 organisations including the National Trust, English Heritage, the National Landscapes Association, the Association of Independent Museums, Historic Houses, and the Canal and River Trust. The vast majority of England's historic environment is owned, managed and cared for by Heritage Alliance members. We are responding to this consultation not only on behalf of ourselves, but on behalf of the majority of our membership who have benefitted from lottery funding. We welcome the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

Consultation Response

Question 1. Rating our awareness of impact:

Very aware across all three dimensions: local area, nationally, and our organisation/sector.

Question 2. What is the most positive impact you have seen to your organisation or sector from the funding?

Lottery funding has been transformational for the heritage sector, and for The Heritage Alliance as the sector's umbrella membership body. Since 1994, the Heritage Fund has invested £9.2 billion into 48,900 projects across every postcode area in the UK. 75% of our members have benefitted from this funding at some point, and 9/10 describe the impact as significant or transformational.

For The Heritage Alliance, lottery-funded programmes have enabled us to deliver national sector support at a scale that would otherwise have been impossible. With lottery funding, The Heirtage

Alliance has not only been the recipient of transformative lottery funding that has sustained our resilience, but we have delivered capacity building programmes in support of the wider sector with lottery funding. With lottery funding we have reached over 2700 organisations and 5500 participants, delivered 95 courses and workshops and 179 training webinars and resources for the sector. Through the Heritage Fund's support, we were able to design and deliver a suite of programmes that directly strengthened the resilience and capacity of heritage organisations across the UK:

- Giving to Heritage (2015-2017) — fundraising training in partnership with the Institute of Fundraising, equipping heritage professionals with skills to diversify their income.
- Resilient Heritage Alliance (2019-2021) – A transformative programme for our own resilience to develop the capacity, expertise and skills to enable the growth of us and our members, their audiences and beneficiaries
- Heritage Digital (2020–21) — a digital business support programme providing strategic and operational digital tools to hundreds of organisations navigating an increasingly online world.
- Rebuilding Heritage (2020–23) — a crisis-response programme that provided free business advice, coaching and training to mitigate the impacts of the pandemic and the cost-of-living crisis. This programme reached thousands of heritage organisations across England at a moment when many were facing existential financial pressure.
- Creating Connections (2025–27) — our current programme, building new regional networks and events, facilitating heritage-academic partnerships, and establishing peer support networks for heritage professionals.

These programmes demonstrate that lottery funding for national membership bodies like The Heritage Alliance creates a multiplier effect: investment in one organisation enables us to support hundreds (and in some cases thousands) of smaller organisations that would not otherwise have access to professional development, fundraising support or peer networks.

Lottery funding has therefore not only benefitted our own capacity but has strengthened the ecosystem of the entire sector. An independent economic assessment of heritage lottery funding has found that its grants can generate a return of over three times the original investment, testament to the value of this funding model.

Question 3. What is the most positive impact you have seen to your local area from the funding?

Heritage lottery funding has transformed places and communities across the UK. The Heritage Fund's open and inclusive definition of heritage, which encompasses landscapes and nature, cultural traditions, oral histories, marine and industrial heritage, and community archaeology, means that its investment reaches into every kind of community and place.

We have seen lottery funding renovate the Piece Hall in Halifax into a world-renowned cultural venue, create the St Fagan's Museum of National History in South Wales, reopen Chatham Historic Dockyard, restore the Kennet and Avon Canal, and establish the UK's first national marine park at

Plymouth Sound. These were major anchor investments that generate economic activity, attract visitors, strengthen civic identity, and provide communities with places in which to gather, celebrate and learn. They also illustrate the long-term value of investment in major nationally significant projects alongside grassroots community funding. Heritage is social and cultural infrastructure, and lottery funding is one of the very few mechanisms capable of unlocking investment in it at the necessary scale.

Question 4. You said you have some awareness of how the National Lottery good cause funding has impacted your local area or the UK more broadly. From which of the following, if any, did you see, hear or read about this good cause funding?

Direct from a funding recipient / Official National Lottery channels / Word of mouth

Question 5. How do you think the National Lottery could better communicate how it is investing good cause funding in your local area?

There is untapped potential for the Heritage Fund and the National Lottery more broadly to celebrate the impact of their investment more visibly and act as champions for the causes they fund. This could include:

1. The Heritage Fund's existing open data tools (including the Project Search and the Open Data Viewer) are valuable resources, but they are not widely known outside the sector. Proactive promotion of these tools, particularly to local authorities, community groups and the media, would help to make the scale of lottery heritage investment tangible to a much wider public.
2. Storytelling could also be made more powerful using the archive of programme evaluations held by funded organisations and the Heritage Fund itself. There is a wealth of compelling evidence about social impact, economic returns and community transformation brought about by heritage projects. We would welcome a more active role for the Heritage Fund as an advocate for heritage's value by sharing data publicly, celebrating outcomes, and communicating not just what was funded but what it achieved.
3. Regional presence: in-person contact, local business networks and heritage-specific communications through regional teams are highly effective in raising awareness of funding opportunities, particularly among smaller organisations and communities with less experience of accessing public funding. Investment in regional visibility would both improve communications and widen the pipeline of applicants.

Question 6. Which of the following areas, if any, do you think should be prioritised for receiving National Lottery good cause funding? As a reminder, good cause funding should

only be spent on projects and activities which do not typically receive core government funding - this is known as the additionality principle.

Heritage.

We note that the Heritage Alliance represents the breadth of heritage, including landscapes, mobile, academic, skills, living heritage, collections and archives, as well as built heritage and archaeology. We support the Heritage Fund's continued broad and open definition of heritage as 'anything from the past that [we] value and want to pass on to future generations.'

Question 7. What percentage of funding should each area receive?

We strongly recommend that heritage's 20% share is maintained as a minimum. Heritage receives comparatively little central government funding relative to its economic and social contribution, and relative to the other lottery good causes. The Mendoza Review estimated total public funding for the museum sector in England alone at around £850m per year, and even a broader estimate covering all heritage across all four nations is unlikely to exceed £1.5bn per year, set against a heritage sector contribution to GVA estimated in the region of £40bn annually. This is not a large outlay, and the case for protecting the current share is strong.

Beyond protecting the existing allocation, we note the precedent for temporary reallocation of lottery funding, most notably to prepare for the 2012 Olympic Games. Given that a recent government-commissioned (Purcell) report identified a £7 billion repair and maintenance backlog in public and third-sector heritage alone, and given that a third of organisations responding to the Heritage Pulse Monitor reported they cannot adequately care for the heritage in their charge, we recommend that this critical need is reflected in lottery funding allocation.

We support the Fabian Society's recommendation that a further 5% of lottery funding be temporarily reallocated to heritage: ringfenced for capital works to maintain cultural infrastructure, conservation works and retrofit projects. This could take the form of a crossover fund with the Community Fund, specifically targeting the repair and regeneration of historic assets with strong community value.

We would also caution against any change that reduces the arts or heritage share in favour of areas such as health, education and transport that receive core government funding and therefore do not qualify under the additionality principle. Diluting this principle would put at risk one of the very few remaining sources of dedicated heritage funding.

Question 8. Are there any further areas you would like to see supported by National Lottery good cause funding?

The Heritage Alliance would draw attention to the need for core operational funding for national sector support organisations. Unlike the arts sector, which benefits from Arts Council England's National Portfolio Organisation (NPO) system providing stable multi-year funding, the heritage

sector has no equivalent mechanism. The Heritage Fund is not currently set up to deliver such a scheme, but there is a compelling case for exploring a combination of grant-in-aid and ringfenced lottery funding that could provide heritage sector bodies with the stability to deliver continuous training, advocacy, research and peer support to the wider field. The case for this support is further explored in our [On the Brink](#) report (2024).

We would also highlight the need to recognise heritage as cross-cutting infrastructure. Heritage underpins arts, sport and community activity, providing the buildings, landscapes and traditions within which much of civic life takes place. The framing of good causes as discrete silos does not adequately reflect this interdependency. We would welcome greater recognition of, and provision for, the role heritage plays in supporting outcomes across all the good causes categories, including wellbeing, environment and social inclusion. Numerous [Heritage Alliance reports](#) underscore the contribution heritage makes to these public goods, including through dozens of lottery funded projects.

Finally, we note that a significant proportion of the UK's heritage is independently owned and managed privately rather than by charities or public bodies. The recent increase in the Heritage Fund's cap for privately-owned heritage from £100,000 to £250,000 is welcome, but many owners of important historic assets remain effectively barred from accessing public funding. Consideration should be given to how lottery funding could be better structured to support private stewards of nationally significant heritage, particularly where those assets provide clear public benefit and access to nationally significant heritage.

Question 9. How often should the proportion of funding each area receives be reviewed?

We do not have a strong stance on this but would support a review every five years as a reasonable interval, provided that any such review is preceded by substantive sector engagement and is evidence-led. Reviews more frequent than this risk introducing uncertainty that undermines long-term planning for both distributors and applicants.

It is important that any review process is transparent, includes meaningful consultation with the heritage sector and lottery players, and is explicitly governed by the additionality principle. The timing of reviews should also take into account the Heritage Fund's own strategic planning cycles, to ensure coherence between statutory allocation decisions and distributor delivery plans.

Question 10. Should large-scale national projects or small-scale community-level projects be prioritised?

Both should receive roughly the same amount.

We wish to be clear, however, that this is not an either/or question, and the framing should not be allowed to create a false binary. Lottery funding is most effective when it supports heritage at every

scale, from nationally significant capital restoration projects to small grassroots initiatives run by volunteers. The heritage sector ecosystem needs both, and they are complementary rather than competing. It is also important not to forget that national sector support programmes fit into neither category, as expanded on elsewhere in our response.

Small local projects restore civic pride, engage marginalised communities, and sustain the everyday heritage that matters most to people in their immediate surroundings. Large national projects generate economic activity, attract tourism and inward investment, create employment and provide anchor institutions for cultural engagement at scale. They can also induce a positive impact on disparate communities across the country who share an interest or an identity relating to the project – for example the creation of the Welsh Jewish Heritage Centre which will be a meaningful destination for Jewish communities across Wales and beyond, not only in Merthyr Tydfil. National sector support programmes, such as those delivered by The Heritage Alliance, can also reach thousands of organisations in every region through a single grant.

We are also concerned that the consultation's framing focuses primarily on a binary between local and national, overlooking the important regional tier. Some of the most impactful heritage work happens at the level of regions, local authority areas or city-regions. This is at a scale that is neither hyper-local nor national, and which risks being insufficiently served if decision-making is pushed to the extremes of either community-level participatory grant making or centralised national investment.

Further to this, we note an emerging gap in the current funding landscape between very small grants and the mid-range. The step from a small community grant to projects at the £250,000 threshold represents a significant increase in scale and complexity for many organisations, and the current threshold structure does not adequately bridge this. We would welcome renewed consideration of how a low-barrier small grants scheme (modelling the clarity and accessibility of the former Awards for All programme) could serve first-time applicants and smaller projects, whilst a stronger mid-tier offer could support the many organisations that are beyond micro-scale but not yet ready for the full complexity of large capital projects.

Question 11. How should National Lottery good cause funding be spent across the UK?

None of the above

The answer to this question is nuanced. We would argue that lottery funding should be allocated on the basis of public benefit and the additionality principle, rather than solely on the basis of deprivation indices or geographic equity metrics. That said, we recognise the importance of reaching disadvantaged communities, and we note that the Heritage Fund already allocates 27.5% of its funding to the top 20% most deprived local authorities in the UK. This existing commitment should be celebrated and maintained.

However, deprivation indices can be blunt instruments: wealthy areas often contain pockets of significant disadvantage that are not visible in aggregate metrics, whilst some heritage-dependent communities may not score highly on standard deprivation measures despite having genuine need. Our members have shared examples of heritage assets located close to both affluent developments and secondary schools where the majority of pupils receive free school meals: communities where standard deprivation indices give a misleading picture of local need. Communities that rely on heritage for tourism income, cultural identity or civic cohesion are also deserving investment regardless of other metrics.

We also note that some of the most important lottery-funded work (such as digital programmes, national sector support, research, training and network building) has no fixed geographic boundary. These programmes reach heritage organisations and communities across the country and should not be disadvantaged by a framework that equates value with place-based specificity.

Question 12. Should the amount of good cause funding an area receives be linked to how many lottery tickets are sold there?

Strongly oppose.

Linking lottery funding allocation to ticket sales would systematically disadvantage the communities and places that stand to benefit most from good causes investment. Rural and remote communities are often home to significant heritage assets that are vital to local economies and communities. These places typically have smaller populations and lower ticket sales volumes, and would lose out disproportionately under such a model. It would also mean that the communities which purchase the fewest lottery tickets (potentially because of lower disposable income) would be the least likely to see funding return to their area, creating a perverse inverse relationship between need and investment. The National Lottery's social contract with the public rests on the principle that ticket sales generate collective benefit for communities across the UK. That principle would be undermined by tying distribution to sales geography.

Question 13. How much influence does your community have over decisions about where National Lottery good cause funding is spent?

A fair amount of influence.

We commend the Heritage Fund for the significant effort it already invests in local decision-making. 98% of Heritage Fund funding decisions are already made at a local level, and the Fund actively partners with community groups, providing them with secondary funding to distribute directly. The Heritage Fund's recent delivery plan also commits to supporting cross-cutting strategic projects alongside place-based funding, a welcome recognition that the two are not mutually exclusive. These achievements must be understood by government before drawing conclusions about the degree of community involvement. We note that some programmes require a higher level of

decision-making that accounts for the wider sector support needs. Community decision-making would, for instance, be much less appropriate for support awards to infrastructure bodies or B2B organisations that serve national audiences.

Question 14. What approach did your community take to achieve influence over funding decisions?

The heritage sector has engaged with the Heritage Fund through a variety of channels: strategic consultations during the Fund's ten-year strategy development, representation on advisory panels, and participation in regional committee processes and stakeholder events. THA hosts funding panels, insights and briefing sessions for the sector, and we share regularly share evidence and insights into sector needs which feeds into the design of lottery programmes (e.g. during the pandemic). The Fund's regional investment teams have historically been an important point of contact for local organisations seeking a steer on priorities and an opportunity to build relationships ahead of formal applications. We note that this regional infrastructure has diminished in some areas in recent years and would welcome its reinstatement.

Question 15. How could the National Lottery and Distributor Bodies give communities more of a say over where good cause funding goes?

There are several practical ways in which community voice could be strengthened without compromising the expertise and consistency of the grant-making process:

1. Participatory grant making, already practised effectively by the National Lottery Community Fund, could be extended into heritage funding in a carefully designed way. Secondary grants (distributed by trusted local or regional heritage organisations to community groups on behalf of the Heritage Fund) would allow hyper-local decision-making without requiring micro-organisations to navigate the full application process independently. We note, however, that this model requires careful design to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest for support organisations.
2. Regional advisory structures with meaningful community representation could provide a more consistent route for community priorities to influence funding decisions at a sub-national level. The Heritage Fund's existing regional investment teams provide a strong foundation for this. Our members have highlighted the value of being able to engage directly and informally with committee members to gain a steer on local priorities, even where this does not guarantee a particular outcome. Accessible, personal contact is highly valuable for organisations without experienced fundraising staff, and we would support investment to maintain and extend it.
3. Youth voice deserves specific investment. We are encouraged by the Heritage Fund's Future Leaders initiative and its inclusion of young people in decision-making and would support

this being continued and made more systematic. The government has expressed a particular interest in hearing from younger people through this consultation, and the lottery ecosystem could reflect this priority in how funding decisions are made.

4. We would caution, however, against the assumption that more community involvement in decision-making necessarily means more effective decisions. The Heritage Fund already engages communities effectively; the risk is that further devolution without adequate support infrastructure simply shifts the burden onto communities without the capacity to bear it. Any new participatory mechanisms must be resourced accordingly.

Question 16. Which of the following statements best describes your organisation's experience with the National Lottery good cause funding application process?

My organisation has applied/ is currently applying for a grant.

Question 17. How easy or difficult, if either, did you find the process of applying for National Lottery good cause funding?

Fairly difficult.

Question 18. What was difficult about the application process?

Our response to this question reflects our own experience as well as the cumulative feedback of our members. We recognise and welcome the significant improvements the Heritage Fund has made to its application process in recent years, in response to stakeholder feedback. These changes have made the process more accessible and proportionate for many organisations. We also note that the Heritage Fund is generally regarded by our members as more accessible and straightforward than applying through other distributors, reflecting the Fund's open and flexible approach to defining heritage.

However, some barriers have been identified:

1. For smaller and volunteer-led organisations, the volume of information required, and the complexity of full cost recovery calculations remain significant deterrents. Members of The Heritage Alliance have reported that the wording and structure of application forms is not always well-suited to community-led or less conventional projects, and that the process can feel designed for experienced fundraising professionals rather than passionate local volunteers.
2. Match funding requirements present a particular challenge. The escalating costs of construction, materials and specialist conservation skills mean that the match funding ask is

now substantially higher in real terms than it was a decade ago. Many match funders are moving to invitation-only application processes as demand rises, reducing the return on fundraisers' time and adding risk to projects that are reliant on securing co-funding alongside a Heritage Fund grant. For volunteer-led or small organisations, assembling match funding whilst simultaneously managing the application is extremely demanding, and the cash flow implications of grant timelines can deter otherwise viable projects from coming forward.

3. Large capital projects face barriers due to long development timescales, high upfront costs for feasibility work, and the difficulty of maintaining board, volunteer and audience engagement throughout a process that may span several years. A £10 million grant does not go as far in construction costs as it once did, which increases match funding requirements and places greater pressure on smaller co-funders. Match funders also carry the risk of being contractually bound to NLHF's own timescales, meaning they can be left exposed where a conditional grant offer depends on a related NLHF application that is subsequently declined.
4. There is also a lack of clarity, particularly for smaller organisations, about whether an application is better suited to the Heritage Fund or the Community Fund when projects have both heritage and community dimensions. A clearer pathway for joint or streamlined application route for projects with clear overlap between the two funds would reduce duplication and enable applicants to maximise their chances of success at an earlier stage.

Question 20. And was your application for a grant from National Lottery good cause funding successful or unsuccessful?

Successful — we received good cause funding.

Question 21. Which of the following bodies have you applied for National Lottery good cause funding with? Please select as many as apply.

National Lottery Heritage Fund.

Question 22. Thinking about all the times you have applied for National Lottery good cause funding in the past, approximately what has been the total amount of money you have applied for?

£1,000,000 to £4,999,999.

Question 23. From which of the following, if any, did you hear that you/your organisation could apply for National Lottery good cause funding? Please select as many that apply.

Official National Lottery channels, social media, word of mouth, and work conferences and networking events, Other: through The Heritage Alliance's own sector communications and membership networks.

Question 24. What changes would you like to see made to the application process?

We would welcome the following improvements:

1. Streamlined and proportionate forms that are relative to the scale and nature of the project, with clearer guidance on what is and is not required at each stage. In particular, the early expression of interest stage should be light-touch, enabling organisations to test their idea without committing extensive staff time before receiving a signal of interest from the funder.
2. Better signposting between funds. At the outset of the application process, Heritage Fund advisers should proactively help applicants identify whether a co-funding model with the Community Fund might be appropriate, and guide them towards a joint or coordinated application where possible.
3. Project development support, particularly for organisations that are new to grant applications or that lack fundraising expertise. The Heritage Fund has previously facilitated effective in-person coaching and regional partnership working, models that are highly valued by smaller organisations. We would support renewed investment in pre-application support, including hands-on coaching, regional networking presence, and accessible online resources and templates.
4. Greater clarity on full cost recovery and how to present it in applications, with worked examples suitable for different types and sizes of organisation. Fundraising remains the single biggest area of concern for many heritage organisations, and reducing the complexity of this aspect of the application would have a disproportionately positive impact on the breadth of organisations able to apply.
5. We would also note the importance of maintaining the integrity and quality of the grant-making process as simplification proceeds. The current level of scrutiny reflects the significant sums involved and the importance of good stewardship of public funds. Any simplification should enhance accessibility without reducing confidence in the process.
6. National level support projects on behalf of the sector, such as those the Heritage Alliance delivers, also require a great deal of input with no guarantee of success. An alternative joint development and design process for national sector support projects would be a more effective mechanism of handling the unique nature of such projects which have sector-wide beneficiaries.

Question 25. Which of the following, if any, would most encourage you or your organisation to apply for National Lottery good cause funding? Please select all that apply.

Confidence that the application would be successful / a simple and easy application process; opportunity to work with the National Lottery / access to supportive resources and templates when applying.

Question 26. Which of the following, if any, would you say are the biggest barriers that you or your organisation would encounter when thinking about applying for National Lottery good cause funding? Please select all that apply.

Lack of confidence that an application would be successful / complexity of the application process / the volume of documentation and administration required/

Question 27. How could the National Lottery and Distributor Bodies encourage more people to apply?

The most effective mechanism for widening the pipeline of applicants is in-person, local and regional engagement. The Heritage Fund's regional teams have historically been invaluable in building relationships with organisations that are new to grant-making, providing a route in and a human point of contact that online guidance cannot replicate. We strongly support reinvestment in this infrastructure, including a presence at regional business and heritage networks, trade events and local authority partnership forums.

Sector intermediaries such as The Heritage Alliance, regional heritage networks, and specialist bodies like the Architectural Heritage Fund are well-placed to support this outreach and could be better supported as delivery partners. We are trusted by small and grassroots organisations, we understand their needs, and we have a track record of delivering training and coaching at scale. The Heritage Fund could explore deeper partnerships with these bodies to extend its reach, including through secondary grant making arrangements that allow trusted intermediaries to distribute small grants directly to community organisations.

Celebrating success stories, particularly from unexpected places or types of organisation, would help to broaden perception of who the Heritage Fund is for. Many potential applicants assume that lottery funding is only available to established institutions or built heritage; showcasing projects delivered across the breadth of heritage subsectors and by volunteer-led groups, faith communities or community interest companies would challenge this assumption and inspire a wider range of applications.

For organisations that have previously been unsuccessful, there is a significant opportunity to provide better feedback and follow-up support, helping them to understand what would strengthen

a future application. Currently, unsuccessful applicants can be left without a clear pathway to reapplication, which wastes the investment they have already made in developing their project idea.

Question 28. Is there anything else you would like to tell us as part of this call for evidence?

Yes, we would like to reinforce the following points:

1. Heritage is enduringly popular and strongly valued by the public, and is therefore a fundamental beneficiary of lottery funding. 81% of people value local heritage as a key factor in making their area a good place to live¹, 66% of people think more public money should be allocated to heritage², and 75% say the government have a moral duty to protect it.³ The economic and emotional value people place on heritage is striking: 65% of the British public would rather forgo £100,000 than lose historic buildings in their area.³
2. The additionality principle must be protected. The National Lottery's defining contribution to heritage rests on the principle that lottery funding does not substitute direct government funding. As national and local government funding for heritage has fallen sharply in real terms, this principle has become more important than ever. Diluting this by directing lottery funds towards areas that already receive core government investment, or by allowing the allocation of potential uplift from Allwyn's growth ambitions to be diverted to other priorities would fundamentally undermine one of the very few remaining sources of dedicated heritage funding.
3. The heritage sector faces an ongoing funding and maintenance crisis. A government-commissioned report has identified a £7 billion repair and maintenance backlog in public and third-sector heritage. A third of organisations responding to the most recent Heritage Pulse Monitor reported they cannot adequately look after the heritage in their care. 80% of our members say funding is a significant concern, and public funding for heritage has declined significantly in real terms over the past decade. In this context, protecting heritage's 20% share of lottery funding is a minimum baseline. We ask the government to consider how lottery funding, including any uplift from Allwyn's growth projections, could be directed to address this backlog, and to explore the Fabian Society's recommendation of a temporary 5% reallocation to heritage for this purpose.
4. There is no equivalent to the National Portfolio Organisation model for heritage. Unlike the arts, where Arts Council England's NPO system provides stable, multi-year core funding to a range of organisations, the heritage sector has no equivalent mechanism. This means that national organisations which provide training, advocacy, peer support and resilience programmes to hundreds of smaller bodies are dependent on time-limited project funding. This creates unsustainable uncertainty and limits our ability to plan for the long term. We

¹ Britain Thinks (2022) National Lottery Heritage Fund Strategy Development Research.

² Historic England, Heritage and Society 2020

³ PublicFirst, [Local history, local heritage and local pride](#), 2025

would welcome the government's consideration of how a heritage equivalent of the NPO model (potentially through a combination of grant-in-aid and ringfenced lottery funding) could address this structural gap and place the heritage sector on an equal footing with the arts.

5. Project-based funding alone cannot secure a resilient sector. Time-limited, project-based grants are the dominant mode of heritage lottery funding, and whilst they have achieved remarkable results, they fall short of building long-term sector resilience. Core funding, endowment-building and multi-year operational grants all have an important role to play in securing the future of heritage organisations. We would welcome a commitment from the government and the Heritage Fund to explore these models as part of the review's legacy.
6. The heritage sector must be recognised for its significant contribution to national strategic priorities and public goods. Heritage generates economic growth, supports health and wellbeing, strengthens community cohesion, enhances environmental sustainability and underpins the creative industries. Total taxpayer support for the heritage sector is modest relative to the returns it generates (no more than £1.5bn per year, set against a GVA contribution of approximately £40bn). It is important to ensure that heritage is recognised not as a cost but as a solid investment, and that lottery funding continues to reflect the breadth and depth of what the heritage sector contributes.

The Heritage Alliance is the largest coalition of heritage organisations in England, representing over 200 independent heritage bodies. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss any aspect of this response in further detail. Please contact Lydia Gibson, Head of Policy and Communications (policy@theheritagealliance.org.uk) to arrange this.

ⁱ European Commission (2018) 'Special Eurobarometer – Cultural Heritage'.