BEFS - HES climate workshop 12th June 2019

Historic Environment Working Group, organisations present included:

BEFS, Historic Houses, IHBC, Glasgow City Heritage Trust, Scottish Civic Trust, Society of Antiquaries, Heritage Trust Network, Landscape Institute, AHSS, National Trust for Scotland, Archaeology Scotland and SPAB.

Question 4 – assessed after the other questions were discussed in full – dot voting.
How relevant are the themes in the action plan?

Topic	Not at all relevant	Slightly relevant	Relevant	Very relevant		Total votes
Climate impacts et al			3	11		14
Energy and carbon management			2	12		14
Sustainable travel			3	9		12
Biodiversity		3	8	2		13
Behaviour change				14		14
Research, education and training			5	7		12
Sustainable procurement		4	2	10		16
Circular economy		1	2	10		13

Question 5: Are there any themes missing?

More widely discussed as - What's missing?

- Misses wider impact of how to inform, inspire and change behaviours (external and internal).
- Agricultural land, & rural advice, particularly in face of loss of subsidy
- **Sustainable water management plans** (drainage and use of water)
- Biodiversity should be biodiversity *and landscape*
- **Tourism**: No mention of limited visitor numbers to alleviate car travel (and other issues). Site access, how 'we' all get there and how to reward those who come by greener means.
- No apparent review of funding outcomes to include specific climate change outcomes. (Sector assumes this action is taking place but the documents facing the sector need to join these up much more explicitly.)
- No mention of the public – could be an exemplar for them too.
- Partnerships could play a more prominent role.
- No offsetting – purposeful choice? If so, say why.
- Owners of HE sites/places are left out.
- Examples often fall to the large, or smaller scale – more examples that could be of use to the sector more widely would be appreciated. (Edinburg Castle seen as too large to be beneficial example.)

Comments

- Technology itself is not a sustainable product. Eg – mining of minerals to make ipad etc. is that worse/better than printed paper. How will tech. be renewed and recycled?
- Page 40 – Item 7 – few people will see the Engine Shed facilities – how to make access wider? Can there be replication of technologies at major tourist attractions. Is the Engine Shed fulfilling the hub and spoke model?

Question 6 – Under each theme, we have listed our proposed actions. How ambitious and achievable are these actions?

Discussed under the heading of: Actions: ambitious and achievable?

- Overall the plan falls more towards achievable than ambitious

BEFS

125 PRINCES STREET (3rd fl) EDINBURGH EH2 4AD | info@befs.org.uk | 0131 220 6241 | www.befs.org.uk

Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee No 250970. Scottish Charity No SC034488.

- Not creative or inspiring in the solutions suggested
- Connections unmade (eg drainage and biodiversity)
- Could be far more influential externally
- A document for HES or the Historic Environment more widely? Emphasises being an exemplar and leader but not much about dissemination that isn't internally focused
- Need to prioritise and commit to OPEN DATA
- Fund external experts to complete research – benefit from different methodologies and cultures
- No mention of limited visitor numbers to alleviate car travel (and multiple other issues)
- 3.24 more emphasis on collaborative working on climate change for funded schemes (eg CARS)
- More learning from other funding bodies and local information.
- Could go further in how HES can support wider behaviour change (ie use green champions to inform the wider sector, and perhaps HS members, – sector may not be able to afford consultants to help them become more energy efficient, but they can learn from trained ambassadors)
- **Behaviour change needs to be central to all themes, not separate**

Question 7 – Please make suggestions on how we can improve the plan, including comments on what's missing.
Broadly defined here as, potential changes.
- Needs to reference – OPiT KPIs and Scotland Performs, as well as ensure meeting other SG/UK objectives.
- No KPIs – no way to measure success. (Need to align/adopt relevant SG targets.)
- Missing opportunity to demonstrate/help SG achieve its ambitions. - Eg by giving studies which illustrate: "if we don't do x then y <frightening loss scenario> will happen!"
- LINK to other HES and HES related documents – whether that's OPiT Climate Change group – or Built Heritage Investment Plan – or Policy (HEPS) which is not mentioned, and is a primary way of protections being put in place for the built environment. Protections which enable the long-term use of assets.

Not using the levers HES has to best effect – grant conditions and measures, entry prices, HS Membership information (as way of disseminating and informing more widely) etc.
- Perhaps too many themes, felt it could be streamlined (particularly by inclusion of behaviour change within each section).
- Behaviour change should run through whole document. Putting it in its own section makes it 'other' when it should be integral.

Question 8 – How clearly does the plan express the role of Historic Environment Scotland in tacking climate change?
Clearly – but misses the opportunity to enable the sector and public to be more engaged and informed.

Question 9 – How clear is the language and wording in the plan?
Broadly defined as, comments on the document:
- Positive about clear writing. Comprehensive. Coherent.
- Each section was felt to be unnecessarily wordy, more editing could be beneficial.
- 'Science bit' seen as necessary and helpful.
- Short executive summary required. (Multiple respondents!)