

NLHF Consultation on its Strategy Refresh

Points for consideration regarding **OBJECTIVES**

*** IMPORTANT – PLEASE READ ***

These points for consideration are just that – for your consideration, when writing your own response.

This note concentrates on NLHF Objectives, questions on which are found in both the longer and shorter surveys.

Give the very short timescales for this consultation, and its occurring during the holiday season, this document has not been through HRBA's normal process of validation, and it should not be assumed that the points made here represent HRBA's views.

We hope you find this useful in working out what *you* want to say. **If you do use any of these points, please express them in your own words – don't cut and paste.**

HRBA, August 2022

www.hrballiance.org.uk

hrb@theheritagealliance.org.uk

Objectives (both surveys)

Current	Proposed	Points for consideration
continue to bring heritage into better condition	a better future for the UK's heritage	<p>Focus on future rather than condition <i>may</i> be neutral in impact, <u>if</u> POWs can argue that the future of the heritage depends on it being in good condition. But some concern at losing the straightforward 'condition' ambition which was easy for POWs to demonstrate.</p> <p>The change may bring capital works (e.g. toilets) into scope.</p> <p>New objective may give the opportunity to focus on the enjoyment of future generations through saving the building, which would be helpful.</p> <p>Possible risk that repair and authenticity are downplayed to making everything more subservient to change to meet commercial or other objectives.</p> <p>Where does 'heritage at risk' play into this?</p>

Current	Proposed	Points for consideration
		Does this represent an attempt by NLHF to move into policy setting, which we would regard as very unhelpful.
inspire people to value heritage more	heritage is a source of inspiration and enrichment	<p>This is helpful, playing to an agenda of deep human needs which historic religious buildings are well placed to meet. It focuses on the heritage itself and what it means, not the need to ‘inspire’ people to value it.</p> <p>Will this reduce the assumption that new interpretation etc is needed each time a repair is done?</p>
ensure that heritage is inclusive	heritage is for everyone	<p>This may be helpful, allowing local circumstances to be taken into account when considering the need for diversity.</p> <p>Not every heritage site needs to be or can be all things for all people.</p>
support the organisations we fund to be more robust, enterprising and forward looking	heritage is valued, resilient and sustainable	<p>This may be helpful, widening attention from the organisation and more to the heritage. It may also open the door for funding for sustainable capital investment.</p> <p>Does it still include organisational support where relevant?</p> <p>Does this include providing support for applications, especially for volunteer organisations?</p> <p>Will it allow existing activities be taken into account when assessing NLHF investment?</p> <p>Is the implication that NLHF itself will value heritage for its own sake?</p> <p>Will demonstrable economic and social sustainability become more important in assessing applications? – this might create difficulties for smaller and more rural congregations.</p>
demonstrate how heritage helps people and places to thrive	heritage enables people and places to thrive	Previous wording was about showing it is happening which was rather odd, current wording is about making sure it is happening – this is more logical, but will probably have little impact.

Current	Proposed	Points for consideration
grow the contribution that heritage makes to the UK economy	local economies are strengthened through heritage	<p>The focus on the local economy rather than overall UK economy is welcome, as many historic religious buildings have a local not a national impact, for example through local partnerships, or encouraging micro-tourism.</p> <p>Query whether proving this may be difficult for typical historic religious buildings</p> <p>Is there a risk that this weights funding towards game-changing projects, rather than maintaining what we already have?</p>

What do you think is missing from these objectives? (both surveys)

Possible points to consider relating to historic religious buildings

- More focus on heritage at risk, as per the strategy
- Use of expertise within the sector by the Heritage Fund
- Appropriateness of application processes
- Funding strategically allocated