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1. Introduction

1.1 Why resilience?

The present age of austerity for the heritage sector has its roots in the credit crunch and the subsequent recession. These reduced the value of endowments and investments held by the major Trusts and Foundations which fund heritage, and hit corporate giving, before subsequently leading to public spending cuts. As funders and custodians of the heritage sector, English Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) are naturally keen to help the sector to navigate the choppy waters of change and to achieve sustainability and resilience.

The concept of resilience is explored in more depth later on in this report, but it is useful to say a few things about it and its relationship to this project here.

- This research is partly exploratory, and is one of several studies aiming to better understand resilience.
- The case studies were chosen for their interesting and positive responses to challenging times. This might be thought of as resilient behaviour. The sample size is not large, though, and we have tried to avoid making sweeping generalisations.
- Resilient behaviour is often a reflection of internal conditions within an organisation – their strength and effectiveness as an enterprise. Making distinctions between a strong organisation and a resilient one is not straightforward. Furthermore, resilience is an ongoing process, one that is affected by particular operating contexts.

1.2 The brief

To gain a better understanding of what resilience within the heritage sector means and what organisations can do to become more resilient, BOP Consulting was commissioned to undertake research on:

- how heritage organisations have adapted to the changing economic, social and political climate and the issues they face, and
- how organisations have changed to become more resilient, the factors which contributed and any further support they need.

The brief specified a case study-based approach to the research, with the aim of identifying a set of organisations which have (successfully) developed to become more resilient in the past years. The aim was to identify the ‘why, what and how’ of their actions, and how these actions have made them more resilient. This approach presented a great opportunity to review how new business models and other adaptive measures are playing out in practice in the heritage sector, and how heritage organisations are dealing with the major changes affecting the sector.

At least some of the resulting case studies will be published within Heritage Counts 2012, which will ensure a wide readership throughout the heritage sector, policymakers and the media. Ultimately, it is hoped that this will encourage knowledge transfer within the sector, while also demonstrating the sector’s adaptability to external parties.

Our full methodology is set out in Appendix 1, and a list of participants is available at Appendix 2.

1.3 Status of this report

The 15 case studies report in detail on the specific challenges identified by each of the organisations, as well as on the responses that were chosen to deal with these challenges to try and secure a more sustainable future for their organisation or project. The experiences of the case study organisations provide valuable lessons that will be of use to readers from across the sector. (The case studies are described in a separate report.)

This report aims to complement the 15 case studies by documenting our overall observations and findings across the organisations. We recognise the limitations of the small sample size, but nonetheless we were struck by some apparent commonalities shared by the 15 organisations that seemed to us to offer lessons for other heritage
organisations. We also conducted a literature review which provided a conceptual framework to shape our conversations with the case studies.

Accompanying the case studies is a separate Heritage Organisations and Resilience report which documents our overall observations and findings across the case studies. It culminates in recommendations for English Heritage and HLF in order to encourage resilience.
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A full list of participants is included in Appendix 2.
2. Apsley Paper Trail

In brief

Location | Apsley, East of England
Online   | www.thepapertrail.org.uk/
Example of | • management and staff interventions
         | • greater use of volunteers
Scale    | • Employees: 3 (FTE) and 6 (PT)
         | • Volunteers: 64
         | • Turnover expected for 2012: £385,000

Volunteers introduce visitors to paper making and printing

Context for change

Apsley Paper Trail Trust is a charity formed in 2000 to preserve and conserve the history of paper-making in the Hemel Hempstead area. It is a social enterprise. It is led by Jacky Bennett, once the chief executive and now chair of the board of trustees. The Trust owns two sites in Apsley; one is the former base of John Dickinson & Co, which produced Basildon Bond paper, while the other, Frogmore Mill, is the oldest mechanised paper mill in the world. A paper machine was installed here in 1803, and more than 200 years on, paper is still made on the site, albeit on a much smaller scale. The Mill also has an archive of material related to papermaking and printing in general and the past activities on the two sites in particular.

The Dickinson site was partially redeveloped by the Trust (with the help of a capital grant) to include office space for small businesses, which the Trust rents out. The revenue this provides is one of the main income supports for Frogmore Mill, which was leased to the Trust at a later date.

Funding has always been a huge challenge, and restoring and maintaining the old steam-driven machines and the building itself is very expensive. There was a need to bring in more visitors and to sell more of the paper produced.

The Trust had always been something of a hand-to-mouth operation, though it has been successful in winning funding grants from various sources. It decided to sell off a strip of land on the Dickinson site for housing. It was hoped this would bring in up to £3m. However, this sale was 'parked' while the Trust applied successfully for HLF funding for a visitor centre at Frogmore. Then the credit crunch hit and the land sale fell through.

“I’ve not come across any hugely successful entirely volunteer-run organisations. You need full-time staff!”
Key decisions
When the credit crunch hit in 2008, the two developers who had been seriously considering buying the Dickinson land melted away, and the Trust was left with a huge shortfall in its future revenue plans. The trustees had to think through the implications for the project, and, while other options were explored, it was decided that staff redundancies were necessary. In 2009 the ‘big’ 1803 paper-making machine was stopped, making 10 machine workers redundant. However, even these changes were not enough to make the Trust viable, and in the end all the staff were made redundant.

If the Trust had been a commercial business it would have closed at this point. However, in this case, the core staff decided to stay on as volunteers. They did so because of their passion for and belief in the project. Both staff and volunteers feel very strongly that paper-making is a hugely important industrial process, but one that is taken for granted. They were determined to keep the Trust going rather than see the history lost forever. To keep the project going, a small core team was re-employed and the management team had to be more flexible in terms of their own work, and to increase their work with and reliance on volunteers. Bennett became the chair of trustees. Meanwhile, three of the machine workers who had been made redundant set up their own company and returned to the Mill to produce paper on the smaller machine.

Implementation
During 2008/09 the management were focused almost 100% on the redevelopment of the staff structure. The Trust was hit so suddenly by its financial problems that it did not have much chance to do any long-term planning at this stage – there was not much time to implement decisions if the Trust was to survive at all.

The trustees were the main drivers in the choices that were made. They are very actively involved people with business backgrounds, and have practical skills and experience in business planning. They worked together with the management team.

Bennett says that letting go of the employees was a very painful process, and required much communication with staff. She says it was crucial that they shared the problems with all staff from an early stage, and explained problems at all stages. The staff are a very close-knit group, so no one was surprised.

Bennett says many organisations would say: don’t tell staff first, they will stop working. This was not the experience of the Trust; they didn’t encounter any absenteeism. She thinks maybe this was because it is such a special place - people are passionate about the project, and loyal to it.

The Trust got advice from a corporate recovery consultancy. Bennett says she did not know of any heritage organisation which had been through similar difficulties, so it was an obvious choice to turn to the business sector for help. As a social enterprise she felt comfortable about doing that. Bennett says the Trust couldn’t have survived the process without the recovery consultancy: the Trust spent a great deal of time with the corporate recovery consultants, and planned a strategy based on their advice. This included a Company Voluntary Agreement with creditors, a plan for the sale of the Mill’s development land which will cover the payments to creditors and a business plan showing that the Trust could sustain itself from various sources of income while awaiting the land sale.

Crucially, they managed to come to agreements with their creditors (with the help of the recovery consultant) to hold off until the Trust can complete the land sale. An agreement put together in 2010 means that that large worry ‘fell off their shoulders’. It has made an enormous difference to them.

When the Trust’s problems became widely known, they had to manage the situation. There was a huge fundraising effort at the time – they raised over £100,000 from individuals and local companies to keep them afloat. But the legacy of their well-publicised problems lives on; people still say ‘oh I thought you’d closed’. It is important to communicate that they have managed to go on.

Results
The Trust is now doing broadly the same type of activities as it was before the credit crunch, but with fewer staff and more volunteers. They
have slowly started to take on employees again – they currently have three full-time and six part-time staff. The majority of these are drawn from the staff who were made redundant, but they have recruited new staff too via apprenticeship and Jobcentre schemes. Flexibility is the key among new staff – people have to be willing to turn their hand to many things. The situation is improving month by month, though still not quickly enough yet to guarantee the Mill’s future.

The volunteers too have to be committed to do more than before. There is now more structure to their recruitment and training. Fortunately the volunteers feel there is a unique proposition here: you can see the production process, see paper being made: ‘people walk out with big smiles on their faces’. However, Apsley is off the beaten track for tourists, which hampers their efforts to bring in more visitors. There is hope though that the new Harry Potter Experience at nearby Leavesden Studios might change this somewhat, by bringing more tourists to the area, who might want to visit other things as well as the Experience. The Trust has a good relationship with Leavesden Studios, and sees some possibilities around the Harry Potter books themselves, and JK Rowling’s interest in recycled paper.

“One of the crucial things is that staff and volunteers are committed, it’s about how they have been selected, they problem solve and work creatively. The team is all.”

Outlook
The Trust is now waiting for the market to improve to sell the strip of land. They have interim income from the paper produced on the smaller machine and from visitors, together with their rental income from their office tenants, which provide a way forward. The land sale is critical, though, for the longer-term viability of the Trust – but there is renewed interest in buying the site.

The Trust feels they are a good example of managing in extreme adversity. The loss of a large source of potential income would have caused many organisations to shut down. Apsley Paper Trail survived by taking sensible advice, by being extremely flexible, by a willingness to keep going come what may, and by everyone pulling together and believing in what they do. This level of goodwill may not be present in other organisations, and reflects the passion that so many of Frogmore Mill’s people have for the place and the industrial process it represents.
3. Arnos Vale Cemetery Trust

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bristol, South West England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arnosvale.org.uk">www.arnosvale.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- New organisational status/structure
- Management and staff interventions
- Bringing in fresh perspectives
- Finding new sources of income

Scale

- Employees: 8
- Volunteers: around 60
- Annual turnover: £221,000

The Non-conformist chapel with adjacent newly built café

Context for change

By the 1980s Arnos Vale, one of the finest examples of Victorian Arcadian garden cemetery design, had fallen into disrepair and featured on English Heritage’s Heritage at Risk Register. The private sector owner was thought to be considering redevelopment. In response to this threat, a dedicated Friends group was established. Eventually, the group successfully engaged Bristol City Council in their campaign. They worked with the Council over many years to secure the site (eventually achieved in 2003 following a Compulsory Purchase Order or CPO), then to raise HLF funds for restoration and to establish the present Trust.

The restored cemetery was relaunched in May 2011, meaning that the Trust is now at the end of its first year of full delivery. Chief Executive Juliette Randall arrived in spring 2011 and swiftly appointed the small team of eight staff, which is organised into Estate Management, Commercial Services and Public Engagement sections.

Key decisions

The key decision at the time of the HLF application was to animate the cemetery by introducing a range of unusual, lively and popular uses (for a cemetery) rather than restoring the site and then ‘quietly’ maintaining it. Preparing the Interpretation and Education Plan for the HLF application helped to inspire discussion about what those new uses could be.

Initial support from Bristol City Council was vital. The Council became the owner after the CPO, and project managed the restoration. It remains the landlord, leasing the site to the Trust. The Council also took the unusual step of gifting an endowment, worth £1.3m, to sustain the site. The plan was also dependent on securing HLF funds.

“One critical period is when capital works are complete and you have to build up operations from scratch. Funders could help by building a modest dowry or start-up allowance into capital awards.
Implementation
The Trust has used 2011, its first year of delivery, to establish the new team and to introduce new income generating activities, typically at a small scale at first. For example the Trust tested demand for Christmas trees with a modest initial batch, which sold immediately. The approach is always to limit upfront investment until it is clear that a new service works. The wide variety of activities on-site now include walks and talks, school visits, yoga and zumba, concerts and plays – all while maintaining and respecting Arnos Vale’s continued role as a working cemetery. The Trust has invested in an excellent website to keep visitors up to date. Web content is managed by one staff member with sense checking by two volunteers and occasional inputs from a professional web engineer (at a discount – the business’ owner is a supporter of Arnos Vale).

The Trust describes itself as receptive to ideas from everyone (staff, trustee, volunteer or member), recognising that there is no ‘accepted’ model for actively managing a historic cemetery and no one has all the answers. It is expected that anyone who contributes an idea will help to deliver it. The Trust takes inspiration from the social enterprise model and is keen to find clever ways to generate income and to avoid grant dependency. The driver for most income generation efforts is simply to bring visitors to the site (and generate repeat visits) while providing services that encourage visitors to spend money while on-site. Charging an admission fee is not felt to be appropriate.

The strong Board includes relevant expertise on legal and finance matters, organisational development, heritage architecture and wildlife. Trustees now focus on offering strategic support and guidance, which is an evolution from their very hands-on roles leading up to the appointment of the executive team. The transition from ‘campaign’ mode to ‘delivery’ mode has required careful management. The Chief Executive holds a quarterly forum for the Trust’s members to explain the activities underway and how they fit the vision and contribute to Arnos Vale’s sustainability. The effort put into communication has driven continued engagement and ownership.

Volunteers remain central to the operation of Arnos Vale. Each executive team works with its own team of volunteers. A dedicated core of volunteers contributes to many tasks, while other volunteers input on specific tasks, and others make an occasional input. Volunteer numbers have increased over the past year from around 40 to around 60. The landscape teams are at capacity and are no longer being recruited for. The range of volunteer opportunities is growing as the Trust introduces new activities. Its improving public profile helps to attract volunteers, as does the current economic climate, which has brought forward more people looking for experience and skills to help them back into work.

The Trust would like, subject to funding, to appoint a volunteer co-ordinator who can match skills to roles and provide a single coordination point.

“Volunteers are here because they want to be, not because they have to. They have different motivation to employees, they suit different tasks and have different ways of feeling rewarded. Make best use of volunteers’ existing skill-sets rather than moulding them into the shape you want.”

Another successful vehicle for supporting the Trust is the Guardian Angels Scheme, initially launched in 2006 as part of the fundraising campaign for the cemetery restoration. The scheme was re-launched in September 2012 to appeal to a wider audience. There are a steady 200 members, with some churn of members each year. The Trust perceives that people join for a wide variety of reasons.

It is clear that Chief Executive Juliette Randall has been a major source of inspiration and fresh perspectives since joining. Formerly at Government Office South West, where she headed up work with the voluntary sector, Juliette is well connected within Bristol and beyond the ‘heritage circle’. Juliette’s philosophy is to network widely and:

“Always have the conversation – you never know what will come out.”
Results
Now, at the end of year one, there is widespread acceptance among volunteers and members of the many new activities running on-site, and understanding that these introduce new people to the site without disrupting Arnos Vale’s operation as a working cemetery.

Promising new income streams have been tested and are now being rolled out. For example, performances in the Anglican Chapel were tested via a bespoke deal with a theatre company to stage a Shakespeare run, splitting the proceeds from ticket sales. Meeting and conference hires are starting to take off. The Trust is careful to promote the uniqueness of the venue, for instance by encouraging site tours as part of the meeting / conference package, rather than competing with commercial venues in terms of specification and price.

Not every income generating experiment is a total success – for example the team found that filming pays well but this has to be balanced against its high maintenance requirements.

Education and outreach work is building up and the Trust now feels it is more a part of the local Totterdown community, which has been helped by participation in the annual arts festival as well as hosting workshops and activities aimed at local schools and residents. All this helps people overcome the feeling that they need permission to come in, as well as getting used to a cemetery being a space for recreation.

The Trust won an English Heritage ‘Angel’ award in October 2011. Overall they are very pleased with their progress towards establishing a sustainable new model of operation. Juliette feels that their focus in year one was correct and that they are building up momentum. Her single regret is not driving the administrative and legal arrangements along more quickly, for example to finalise the lease with Bristol City Council.

Outlook
The Trust has many ideas and plans for the future, continuing to experiment and to scale up successful experiments.

A commercial partner arrives on site in spring 2011 to operate the new café in the Spielman Centre and to cater for event hires.

The Trust is keen to build up the endowment, as they found it necessary to draw capital off the endowment while establishing their operations in 2011. An application to HLF’s Catalyst fund, if successful, would be matched by a major fundraising drive over four years. The Trust feels that the ‘save’ campaign was sufficiently long ago to enable a new fundraising drive. And if the new fundraising drive proves a success, why not keep going?

“Just get on with it and do it. Some things will not work but just move on. Take measured risks. Procrastination is the worst thing.
4. Bat Conservation Trust

In brief

Location | Lambeth, London / UK-wide
Online | www.bats.org.uk
Example of
- Management and staff interventions
- Greater use of volunteers
- New sources of income
Scale
- Employees: 29
- Volunteers: around 3000
- Annual turnover: £1.7 million

BCT activity underway

Context for change

The Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) is a dynamic organisation that has grown substantially since its foundation in 1990. Working to a simple vision for ‘a world where bats and people live in harmony’, BCT has two basic roles:

1. Internal role – sharing knowledge within the bat/wildlife conservation sector, generating ideas and building capacity; and
2. External role – being the national voice of the sector and supporting bats through partnership with other sectors such as the built environment, landscape management, education and health.

This case study provides a brief account of how BCT has grown and evolved as a sustainable organisation, with a particular focus on volunteering – how BCT continues to work with local bat groups across the UK, and how BCT used the HLF-funded Count Bat project over 2008-2012 to diversify and grow the bat volunteering base.

Key decisions

While BCT has grown more or less steadily, one key moment was the preparation of the Bat Biodiversity Action Plan around the Millennium. Under the Plan, with funding from the Esmée Fairbairn foundation, BCT formed a steering group with representation across the bat/wildlife conservation sector. This group successfully engaged the government, NGOs and local authorities. While compiling the Plan, BCT identified further opportunities that it now delivers on. For example, BCT identified a need for bespoke training to help professionals fulfil their responsibilities for bat protection under EU legislation. Such training has become an important activity and source of non-grant income for BCT.

“Raising the game with professionals out there has helped us to be reliable and resilient. We developed the guidelines for surveying bats, working with the British Standards Board. Now professionals pay us for hard copies of the guidelines.”
Implementation
As BCT has developed its own activities, it has worked hard to communicate the added value that BCT provides to existing bat groups. Most counties have had their own local group since the 1980s, when bats gained protected species status. Most groups are volunteer-run and sustained by their own member subscriptions. BCT believes there is a crossover between membership of local groups and of BCT itself. For clarity, BCT has defined three types of relationship it can have with bat groups: Partner, Network, and No Relationship. There is some movement between the types each year. BCT has a Partnerships Officer dedicated to liaising with bat groups and rolling out BCT’s offer based around training, capacity building and information sharing. BCT’s Country Officers also work with bat groups in Scotland and Wales.

Count Bat demonstrates how BCT can design and deliver a major project that drives up engagement with bat conservation, working with local groups. Count Bat set out to involve as wide a spectrum of people as possible, with the aim of permanently diversifying the ‘bat movement’ beyond committed environmentalists. The project sought to reach the most under-represented communities – residents in urban, deprived, ethnically diverse areas as well as the deaf and visually impaired. Bat groups were invited to help run local events with new communities and/or in new locations. Bat group members were trained in working with the target communities, as were BCT’s own volunteers.

Count Bat provided louder – and more consistent – publicity at national and local levels, helping to unlock people’s latent interest in bats and reassuring them that the events would be accessible for them. The project sought to inject extra efforts in the areas where BCT’s presence and profile was lower. In total, over 20,000 people were involved in Count Bat project events.

Results
BCT’s financial base has grown and diversified over the previous decade. Its income is now balanced between grants (from government, trusts and the lottery); contracts and fees; and unrestricted funds raised from the 5,000 members plus corporate support, legacies and private donations. Contracts and fees comprise the professional training mentioned earlier plus BCT’s contracts to operate the National Bat Helpline (for Natural England) and the National Bat Monitoring Programme.

In the recession, BCT’s government and trust funding is decreasing while income from individuals has increased. Therefore projects such as Count Bat, while primarily designed to support engagement, may in time help strengthen BCT’s finances by generating new memberships. BCT always aims for its major projects to leave a legacy of improved organisational capacity or resource in this way. Some of the further legacies of Count Bat are:

- Refreshed communications to attract people new to conservation, then to signpost them to volunteering opportunities and fundraising
- Better understanding of different people’s motivations for getting involved, for example socialising as well as supporting conservation
- Strengthened volunteering base and improved skills for working with under-represented groups (among BCT staff members as well as BCT volunteers, and members of participating bat groups).

What success factors have enabled BCT to grow sustainably, delivering major projects like Count Bat while strengthening its relationships with bat groups? According to BCT staff, flexibility and reasonableness are important. BCT has always sought to provide solutions rather than to police or to campaign aggressively on behalf of bats. Senior managers turn down requests from the media to appear in debates that are set up to be confrontational. BCT also focuses at a strategic level, aiming to change the system rather than single sites.

“Only get involved in areas where we can report back definite progress to our members. Don’t make a noise about things we cannot work and deliver on.”

Communication is likewise seen as important. All BCT staff members speak to external contacts as part of their job, ranging from volunteers to scientists (BCT has no dedicated communications officer). Internal
communication is also believed to be good: for instance, all team members were required to feed into drafting the 2010-15 strategy. BCT staff members list the success factors common to most BCT activities as engaging, consulting, and listening to the many perspectives – and strong opinions – within the bat conservation sector.

BCT trustees are valued for their skills and championing role. A number of trustees also sit on local bat groups, thus further connecting the role of BCT and local groups.

“We have a fantastic group of Trustees, all highly motivated. We look hard at the range of skills needed and headhunt to find those skills.

Outlook
Chief Executive Julia Hanmer acknowledges that BCT always has a massive wish list and is determinedly ambitious. However her focus for the immediate future balances ambition with a measure of caution. While continuing to identify new project opportunities, she aims to focus on growing unrestricted income to support BCT’s core work. Income growth is expected to comprise further development of professional training resources; and growing the membership base and fundraising schemes such as Adopt a Bat.

BCT also hopes to now work more directly with the agricultural sector and large landowners (who are also potentially major donors), complementing its focus to date on urban development and sites.
5. Battersea Arts Centre

In brief

Location: Wandsworth, London

Online: www.bac.org.uk

Example of:
- New organisational structures
- Management and staff interventions
- Bringing in fresh perspectives
- Finding new sources of income

Scale:
- Employees: 59 (FTE) and 12 (PT)
- Active volunteers: around 100
- Annual turnover: around £2.8m

Kneehigh Theatre event in the former Town Hall foyer

Context for change

BAC has delivered an acclaimed theatre programme within the former Battersea Town Hall since 1980. The huge century building is both imposing and inspiring, though it suffers from many of the usual limitations: leaks, ailing wiring and heating, poor energy efficiency etc.

Artistic Director David Jubb renewed BAC’s mission in 2005, ushering in the current process of restoring the building while reshaping and strengthening the organisation. The new mission was ‘to invent the future of theatre’ with a particular remit to develop fresh talent and to use theatre to support civic debate. Inspired by this mission, BAC has pioneered innovative practice in many ways. This case study focuses on:

- BAC’s unique approach to adapting the building (through ‘playgrounding’) and to interpreting the Town Hall’s heritage
- The reshaping of the organisation to maximise its effectiveness, entrepreneurialism and resilience
- How BAC is opening up the building to the local community
- Income generation through BAC Enterprises, the new trading arm.

Key decisions

Previously BAC had worked within ‘black box’ (i.e. flexible and neutral) theatre spaces inserted into the historic building. This has given way to a new method that embraces the possibilities of the building’s 72 rooms and its historic features. The building has become an inspiration for the creative process and an important part of the audience experience.

Punchdrunk and BAC’s acclaimed Masque of Red Death in 2007 was the first production to fully embrace the building’s potential. Leading theatre architects Haworth Tompkins worked alongside Punchdrunk to help prepare the many rooms that were used in the production. One practical output of the collaboration was the restoration of original fireplaces, so that fire could be used within this production and in future. BAC calls the collaboration between theatre production and physical design teams ‘playgrounding’. To date this has been funded and supported by Arts Council England.
Playgrounding is based on experimenting with live performance in situ, inviting feedback and taking time to develop plans. The aim is to uncover new possibilities for using space, rather than to follow the typical design process which seeks to generate a single permanent layout. Hence BAC has invented its own unique approach to adapting the historic Town Hall spaces for theatre, and to restoration.

"By starting the architectural process with the same principles as we would begin a creative development process for theatre, we are trying to invent a method of architectural improvisation.

Meanwhile Sarah Preece, now BAC’s Executive Director, arrived in 2009. Her initial remit – working as a consultant – was to review BAC’s business plan, the needs of the capital development process, and the organisational structure. She swiftly realised that the new BAC needed to evolve out of the existing organisation, and the process of change needed to actively involve all of the staff members.

Implementation
BAC has rolled out playgrounding within the restoration of the building. Around £2 million has been spent on a series of specific projects over the last five years, for example restoring the Grand Hall. An Advanced Feasibility Study for the building was costed at approximately £17 million in 2008. After four years of research and development through the Playgrounding process and the latest Stage C masterplan has reduced to £11 million: the project has been clarified and reshaped through the participation and input of the users of the space.

The restoration project now being developed with an HLF award is based around a new Project Library to showcase 120 years of heritage and stories from the Town Hall and, subject to funding, a full restoration of the parts of the building that do not perform to modern expectations.

The uniquely BAC approach to heritage interpretation will be to showcase Battersea’s radical history via contemporary artist commissions. Permanent installations will draw visitors through the building and aim to make it a heritage destination in itself. The installations will celebrate the early days of the Trades Union movement and the Independent Labour Party, as well as Women’s Suffrage and John Archer, London’s first black Mayor.

"We will retain and celebrate the ghosts of the original Town Hall ... We want the building to reveal itself gradually, like an exciting story, rewarding those who peek behind the curtain.

One of the primary focuses for reshaping the organisation was to move beyond the traditional top-down/silo organisational structure which did not maximise the potential for creativity and entrepreneurialism. While BAC retains its original departments, new project teams focus on cross departmental themes such as production, strategy, and fundraising. The teams draw on staff members from every department of BAC: people put themselves forwards based on their skills and passions. The staff helped design the team structure as well as the Project Guide that sets out the protocols for the teams. Sarah believes that BAC is a receptive environment for new ideas, and that the teams help draw this out. Likewise the Board has been refocused to maximise use of Trustees’ skills. In particular, a new Development Committee and a Capital Committee have been formed, featuring Trustees with relevant experience and financial skills.

Hires and catering recently became the responsibility of a new trading arm, BAC Enterprises. Its income pays for the enterprise team with the surplus reinvested in BAC. Freddie Huntington, the Sales & Business Development Manager has been in post six months and is restructuring the team of five while professionalising event operations and identifying new markets. His aim is to secure hirers who buy into the BAC ethos and the building’s unique ambiance, rather than seek to impose their own identity onto the spaces. One part of the strategy is to forge relationships with established caterers such as Rhubarb that have a strong client base and who understand historic venues like BAC.
Another new idea is hosting Christmas parties for city firms whose staff live around Battersea. Freddie emphasizes the need for good communication and coordination between the enterprise and artistic arms of BAC, in order to support efficient delivery.

The restoration has supported income generation by making the Grand Hall and other spaces more attractive to hires. Next, a smaller self-contained hall with supporting facilities is being refurbished to host regular community hires – for example, dance classes. This new space will join the existing drop-in playroom at the front of the building.

Results
Playgrounding was initially challenging for funders, though they have become enthused by this unique approach. In turn the HLF’s requirements around interpretation, identifying heritage storylines and consulting audiences represented a new approach for BAC, but one that proved helpful. BAC already had a solid relationship with the local community but the HLF encouraged them to go further.

Sarah feels that her aim of enabling every staff member to feel ownership of the capital development has been met. She notes that trying to extract views from staff members is never difficult – the challenge is coming to an agreement. Playgrounding has proved more time intensive than a conventional design/build process but it fits with BAC’s way of working and is ultimately more fruitful.

Income from hires has grown over recent years as the offer has developed, and these operations are expected to continue to expand.

Outlook
During the recession, BAC staff report having to work extra hard to maintain momentum. They have experienced cuts and in particular a severe decrease in Trust and Foundation income. But:

“We have to keep going – if we reduce our level of ambition our support falls away. This means that our staff members have to be very good risk managers.

There is certainly no shortage of ambition or appetite for experimentation. Some of the many developments planned at some point for the building (in addition to ongoing development of the artistic programme) include:

- Continuing to build stronger links with the local community, assisted by making the building more porous, with more entry points
- Adding more toilets and solving access issues
- Continuing to develop the Café Bar
- Growing the capacity to host artists in residence
- Possibly greening Town Hall Road and integrating a new garden or allotments for the local community
- Reducing energy consumption and exploring the potential of local energy production.

The Grand Hall, which continues to fulfil its original purpose to host ‘recreative entertainments of a high class for the people’
6. Beamish Museum

In brief

Location       Northumbria
Online         www.beamish.org.uk

Example of
- New organisational structures
- Management and staff interventions
- Bringing in fresh perspectives
- Finding new sources of income

Scale
- Employees: 270 (FTE) (more than 300 during March-October)
- Volunteers: 350 – 400 (25,000 hrs of help a year); 2000 friends
- Annual turnover: £6.7m in 2011/12

Context for change

Beamish is a well known open air museum telling the story of the people of North East England in the Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian periods.

Established in 1970 by a partnership of North East local authorities, the museum swiftly grew into a major visitor attraction. But by 2008 visitor numbers had declined from a peak of 500,000 to 300,000 and the site needed refreshing. Staff costs were rising and the financial position was perceived to be becoming unstable. This made grant applications more difficult and was creating a lack of confidence among the local authority partners, One North East (the Regional Development Agency) and the HLF. It was clear that Beamish needed to re-evaluate its operating model.

From this point, Beamish has successfully moved back into a position of financial independence, under Director Richard Evans (2008–). Perhaps the best indicator of Beamish’s renewal is the steep growth in visitors over this period. In 2011, Beamish attracted 497,000 visitors.

Key decisions

In 2008 Beamish and its partners decided to be ‘stubbornly optimistic’ and to initiate a business and operational improvement plan with the aim of overhauling and investing in operations, stabilising visitor numbers and securing financial sustainability – providing the foundations for future development. The museum aimed to become financially independent, avoiding dependency on revenue funding from the public sector. Previously Beamish had operated under local authority management systems and aimed to break even in revenue terms, making it vulnerable in years when the museum failed to attract the number of visitor numbers forecast. Staff costs had also risen over the previous years, to around 75% of total turnover. In 2008 operation of the museum transferred to a charity, with the constituent local authorities retaining control of capital investment via a Joint Committee. With a more focussed governance model and its own independent financial and management systems, Beamish has been able to deliver a successful business plan, fundraise, invest and generate surpluses.
A restructure in 2008/9 accompanied the delivery of the museum’s new business plan. Management posts were reduced as eight departments became four and recruitment of seasonal staff was cut by 15%. Since then, the staff headcount has re-grown from 175 FTE in 2008 to 265 FTE in 2012, due to an expansion of the museum into a year-round attraction, paid for by an increase in both visitor numbers and trading income. Many of the museum’s seasonal staff were recruited into permanent but flexible positions in order to help extend the museum’s operation and operate new attractions.

The new Director Richard Evans wrote the new business plan and oversaw the transition. He stresses that the aim was to change the leadership/management, returning to founding principles while preserving the strong identity and character of the museum. Also, that the successful transition was only possible because of the skills and passion of those already present within the organisation.

Implementation
Beamish’s income profile has transformed. Under the new business plan, it looks set to avoid public sector funding dependence in the long term.

In the first two years we simply aimed to arrest the decline, control costs and generate surpluses. But we are now able to invest in our own operations.

Some of the interventions that accomplished the transformation are:

- **Customer focus.** ‘Put the Visitor First’ has become a mantra for the organisation - everyone at Beamish is customer-facing and the museum relies on exceeding its customer’s expectations.

- **Training.** Beamish invests serious time in training, as a customer focussed organisation relies on well motivated, supported people.

- **Year-round events.** New Winter Season, Steam/Transport Festivals Agricultural Festivals, and Georgian Fairs amongst others are diversifying the on-site offer and helping Beamish move beyond its traditional reliance on the summer holidays.

- **Community engagement.** In the management team’s view, the source of Beamish’s strength is its connection to local communities; the sense that it is the community’s museum. Projects such as the re-enactment of the 1890/91 Silksworth Evictions provide a way of celebrating community heritage. Engagement is supported by investing in digital media. Beamish takes a ‘conversational’ tone in its e-communications, rather than hard selling, and updates followers quickly on developments.

- **Review of ticketing model.** Research revealed that tickets were often perceived as expensive by local residents, and that Beamish was somewhere to go to once (often as a child), then not return. New tickets introduced in 2009 now allow unlimited re-entry for a whole year, boosting perceptions of value for money and incentivising visitors to return to sample the expanded range of events (and to spend money on-site).

- **New ways of managing its commercial operations.** The museum manages its commercial/trading outlets in the same way it manages its museum operations. The new coal-fired Fish & Chip shop functions both as a museum exhibit and a profitable catering outlet.

Buy-in to the many changes within the organisation was achieved by restructuring the organisation into teams and committing to communication (monthly meetings for all staff and volunteers) and to transparency (KPIs are shared around, fast), as well as through quick visible wins such as the first-ever Christmas opening. New opportunities to work across departments and to feed in ideas have been created, including the event working groups that steer each event, and the future development process (all staff members were invited to feed in ideas to the management team and to conduct research). These give staff the chance to reflect “around the fringes of day to day operations”. All major plans are shared across the staff.

Despite recent successes, Beamish remains prudent with its financial and visitor projections (weather is still a significant factor). The aim is to “under-promise and over-deliver”. New projects are tested at a small
scale where this is feasible. A formal Risk Register is updated and presented to the Committee twice per year. Staff members are felt to be instinctively good at assessing risk.

Results
Visitor numbers have grown by 65% since 2008, helping Beamish to achieve an operating surplus of £626,000 from a turnover of £6.7 million in 2011. Half of the income is from admissions, and the other half from catering, retail, fundraising, events and on-site franchises. Fundraising has grown too, with major recent donations from the Friends of Beamish (legacies are a significant source) and the Beamish Development Trust.

Success has led to success, by unlocking new opportunities and by projecting Beamish as a can-deliver organisation. Beamish recently secured an Arts Council Major Partner Museums award, with £2.2 million to be shared with the Bowes Museum from 2012 to 2014. Many new partnerships have been formed at local, national and international level.

By early 2012, the museum had established reserves of £0.5 million, which is sufficient to see it through two bad years.

Funders are reluctant to fund struggling organisations. Set out to achieve a surplus.

Outlook
Beamish continues to search for ways to further strengthen its offer and operations. Richard asks, ‘What is the ceiling for an open air museum?’

An ambitious development plan is being prepared for 2013 – 2025 and the museum is now seeking capital investment. The time period for the museum is being expanded into the second half of the century and Beamish plans to offer accommodation on site by 2014. Plans are being developed by the management team, who recognise that there is scope/need for further improvements on-site and that capital developments generate excitement among staff, volunteers and visitors alike.

The events programme also helps fulfil the desire for ‘something new’ each year, and is a priority for further expansion, with the aim of unlocking further repeat visits. Another innovative idea is to introduce overnight visitor accommodation using heritage buildings, probably linked to specific activities or training courses. Meanwhile the staff training plan is being revised to ensure that Beamish has the right skills in place to deliver on its ambitions.
7. Birmingham Conservation Trust

In brief

Location Birmingham

Online www.birminghamconservationtrust.org

Example of
- New sources of income
- New organisational structures

Scale
- Employees: 1 (plus one part-time temporary freelancer)
- Registered volunteers: 74 (12 are Trustees)
- Annual turnover 2011-12: £66,856

Newman Bros Coffin Works, Birmingham

Context for change

Birmingham Conservation Trust (BCT) was founded in 1978 by Birmingham City Council officers. As a building preservation trust, it has been responsible for the restoration of a number of properties in the city over the last thirty years, most notably the Back-to-Backs, now run by the National Trust. BCT has never had more than two (part-time) employees, and currently has just one: Elizabeth Perkins, the director. BCT focuses on derelict properties that are seen as too difficult for commercial developers. One long-running project was a proposal to restore the Newman Bros Coffin Works factory in the Jewellery Quarter.

A feasibility study by Birmingham City Council in 2000 suggested that BCT was the ideal vehicle to take the Coffin Works project forward. BCT applied to Advantage West Midlands, the Regional Development Agency, for a grant to start this process, but AWM thought the project was such an interesting one that it acquired the site in 2003, to allow BCT to try and raise the necessary funds to develop it. However, before construction could begin, the factory’s extensive contents had to be catalogued.

BCT was influenced by what other successful building preservation trusts had done – many of them owned their own property. The original proposal therefore envisaged that the site would be a mix of ‘time capsule’ museum, recreating the original factory; education and community space; and offices for rent. BCT would own the Coffin Works (buying it from AWM), but then lease the museum to a new trust established for the purpose, to be called the Coffin Works Trust. BCT was not intending itself to be based on the site.

Key decisions

In 2009 BCT was proceeding with bids for major funding from HLF and AWM, the latter for £2m. (HLF had indicated that AWM would be expected to support the scheme if HLF were also to fund the project.) Economic difficulties at the time meant that AWM suddenly had to withdraw as a potential funder. BCT had no formal legal agreement with AWM regarding the ownership of the Coffin Works.
Perkins says the collapse of the deal was ‘hugely dispiriting’. However, while AWM theoretically had a number of options open to it, such as auctioning the site, it remained keen for the site to be passed to BCT in some form.

Following the collapse of the original plan, BCT brought together its partners and interested parties such as AWM, Birmingham City Council, the Heritage Lottery Fund and English Heritage, to see whether anything could be done to salvage the scheme. The meeting provided support to BCT to go away and come up with some new options. It produced a new plan within four to five months.

The new proposal that was developed involved scaling down the original plan, which was to have led to the demolition of the 1960s wing of the factory (on the right hand side in the first photo) and its replacement with a new building for education and community work. In the revised plan the 1960s wing is retained but refurbished, and used for a mix of activities including education and office space. In the front range of the building will be what Perkins calls ‘an experimental heritage venue’ while the original back range will be converted into office space for rental to local businesses. BCT itself will move into the Coffin Works from its current base within the council’s Planning and Regeneration department, giving it a ‘public face’ for the first time, and run the heritage venue itself.

The scheme represents a significant shift in emphasis for the project. Rather than including a conventional, if interesting, museum, the Coffin Works will be a place where unusual and experimental events can take place. Artists and actors have already expressed an interest in using the space – Perkins suggests ‘users’ will be a better term than ‘visitors’.

Implementation
The move into the Coffin Works will give BCT a permanent base outside the council for the first time, which should help raise its profile in the city. Perkins believes that while their profile had been growing, its work is still underestimated. She cites their work on the Back-to-Backs, which are widely regarded now as a National Trust project rather than the BCT one it was originally.

The move will also give them space to undertake much more educational and community engagement work. She is also looking to expand their work with volunteers. Although they have had success in the past building a volunteer base at the Back-to-Backs, for instance, the volunteers were ‘handed over’ to the National Trust when BCT’s role in the project was completed. Building a new volunteer base should be helped by the wider level of public interest in the Coffin Works compared with previous BCT schemes: the project has particular appeal to Birmingham’s ‘Goth’ community, for instance.

Perkins also intends to pursue unusual and innovative uses for the Coffin Works. Some of the ideas she mentioned included hosting themed dinners, and film and media shoots.

BCT had also made significant changes to its board in recent years. There has been a conscious effort to diversify the board’s skillset. The board had become somewhat stale, but a series of new appointments with a broad range of skills have brought in new blood. For example, one of these newer board members, Nick Booth, helped mobilise a social media campaign when the original deal fell through, to try and persuade AWM not to dispose of the Coffin Works.

Building new partnerships is a key element of Perkins’ work. She has built partnerships with groups and organisations outside the council, such as University College Birmingham, the National Trust, and the Jewellery Quarter Development Trust. Changes in the council such as the virtual disappearance of its conservation department means that she now has to build relationship with a much wider group of council officers than before: networking is an essential part of her job.

“If you are not resilient, then don’t do it – you need passion and flexibility.”
That’s the way things are moving now, you have to create a programme of activities. That’s what the Trust will be about in future - will be much more about being active in the community than in the past.

Outlook
Perkins believes that the ‘revolving funding’ model for building preservation trusts is now ‘broken’. In her view it used to be the case that enough profit could be made from restoring historic buildings at risk to fund the development of future projects. Because private individuals and developers are now much more interested in historic property, and specialist conservation builders are fewer (and therefore repair costs are higher), it is far more difficult to make any profit, or even acquire buildings at reasonable prices - getting full cost recovery is proving more and more difficult. There may be no core funding (as in BCT’s case), public sector funding is drying up, and new income streams are needed. The solution, she believes, is for such Trusts to become ‘visible organisations’. This means a change in mindset and a willingness to work in new areas, such as education and community engagement.

The current plan is for construction to start on the site by the end of 2012. The site is intended to be open as a visitor attraction by Easter 2014. The Coffin Works has the potential to become a key ‘connector’ in the Jewellery Quarter, an area of Birmingham that has been regenerating steadily in recent years. The board recently agreed to employ a part-time freelancer for a couple of months to support Perkins’ work at the Coffin Works.

The shift in focus for the organisation was forced upon them, but by being flexible and refusing to panic, BCT has found a way forward which should allow it to develop a more viable business model.

This strategy is not without risks, but Perkins feels it offers the chance to establish a more visible presence in the city, while also allowing it to develop an unusual and innovative heritage ‘offer’ that may appeal to non-traditional audiences and volunteers.
8. Colchester and Ipswich Museums

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Essex and Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cimuseums.org.uk/home.html">http://www.cimuseums.org.uk/home.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of
- Management and staff interventions
- Sharing resources

Scale
- Employees: 66 FTE
- Volunteers: 300 (2011)
- Annual turnover (gross): £3 million

Context for change

The idea for the project, a merger of the Colchester and Ipswich museum services, emerged in the mid-2000s. At the time, Colchester Museums was a successful service, while Ipswich’s was perceived to be struggling. Peter Berridge, Colchester’s Museums Manager, was approached by Ipswich for advice (with the encouragement of the MLA). After a period, he was asked to carry out a short review of Ipswich’s museums service. One of the many recommendations he made was that Ipswich should consider new governance arrangements. Ipswich subsequently asked Colchester if it would consider merging their respective museums services. It is unusual in that it is not just a cross-district merger but a cross-county one.

Key decisions

The merger was led by Peter Berridge. The merger offered opportunities for both sides. For Ipswich there was a chance to learn from Colchester and improve its offer, while for Colchester there were opportunities to share resources and talent. Combining the two also gave the joint service a bigger ‘voice’ and regional presence, which has proved useful in funding applications. Colchester and Ipswich museums had complementary collections and buildings, so the move made sense in that respect. The merger also offered opportunities for cost savings.

An interviewee observed that new mindsets were needed to make the merger work, though the two councils ‘got it’, which was brave of them as the process involved a loss of control of their part. The political climate at the time was receptive – senior managers at the two councils were already talking about shared services more generally. In any case, relations between the two authorities have historically been good.

A move to trust status, which was theoretically an option, was never seriously considered. Councillors in both authorities feel passionately about the service, especially in Colchester, where the flagship museum, Colchester Castle, is an important part of the town’s identity. The greater loss of political control that trust status entails (compared with a merger) would not have been acceptable.
Berridge went out and banged the drum for the merger, by going to talk to all of the relevant groups. A log was kept of all the people talked to, which was important for ascertaining the level of support for the project. When the responses were analysed, the large majority supported the merger, although one or two could never be won round. (Worries tended to focus on the mechanism of the merger rather than the outcome.)

Colchester Borough Council is the employing body. Berridge was advised by others that having two employing bodies would not work. It is very important to be clear about issues like line management and who owns the collections (there is a ‘firewall’ between the two museum services in this respect – both local authorities still own their own collections). But the service has a genuinely joint board, with the chair and vice chair always coming from different authorities, with the positions being rotated on a regular basis. The joint service has also kept separate brand identities in each town, though there is a sense now that a joint identity is starting to emerge.

‘Management by walking around’ is important – maybe we didn’t do enough of this at certain times. Don’t neglect relationships – you need to keep explaining your case.

Implementation

Although the merger was under consideration for two years, the formal planning stage took one year. The museums had to develop an outline business case. It also had to be borne in mind that the two local authorities had slightly different procedures and processes; both sets had to be observed. The formal decision to merge was made in January 2007, to start on 1 April 2007.

The merger is a good example of the Gershon review principles in vogue at the time – of delivering more with less. The performance of the service has significantly improved, especially in Ipswich, and more people are employed than before. (TUPE regulations limited the scope for redundancies, even had they been desired.) Visitor numbers at Ipswich have risen after years of decline, with organised school trips to Ipswich growing by 200+%. Ipswich museums are now regarded locally as ‘a jewel in the crown’, and they are at the heart of the town centre masterplan being developed for the town.

There were no significant monetary costs associated with a joint service – costs were absorbed in existing budgets. There were of course costs in time, though. Amalgamating IT services took longer than expected – they had to ‘park’ it for a year.

Colchester and Ipswich did try and look at examples from elsewhere to learn from, but couldn’t find many in the cultural sector, although Norfolk has a county-wide museum service shared between the districts. They also looked at examples of business mergers, but felt that these usually didn’t add value to the merged company.

Most of the advice Berridge received came from internal sources, especially the two heads of legal services in the two councils. A merger like this, while challenging, is less complicated than, for instance, becoming a trust.

The two museums are also able to share specialist posts – they were able to recruit an Art Curator, who works across the two services – and to lend each other work, which strengthens the overall quality of the displays. For example, Colchester had an Egyptian mummy, but Ipswich did not, even though it had a strong Egyptian collection otherwise. Lending the mummy to Ipswich makes the collection there more effective.

The relationship between Ipswich and Colchester districts works well. The museums service is allowed to carry over any surplus/debt it has at the end of the year, which it probably wouldn’t be able to do if it were run under a single local authority.

The results of the merger have been positive: before the merger they were getting 50p return for each pound spent; now they get £1.50 per pound spent. In the last four years they have also received £10m in external funding, and are aiming for £20m in the next four. One unexpected benefit has been the degree of expertise unlocked, especially in Ipswich. The merger has provoked a culture change in
Ipswich, which given the state of the service at the time might otherwise have taken several years to realise.

Some mistakes were made – Berridge says that dealing with one or two difficult staff decisions was postponed, when in hindsight it would have been better to bite the bullet and tackle them. He also feels that certain external partnerships were neglected at some points. This too was a mistake – you can’t take people for granted. Generally, though, the implementation went smoothly.

Outlook
The joint service merger is now close to running its course in terms of financial benefits and savings achieved, though there still might be some scope for shared building management, and shared insurance. They have cut out £500,000 of costs, hitting their three-year savings target, but have just lost £750,000 of Renaissance money.

The recession has obviously made things more difficult, but the joint service is weathering the storm. The service has had to bear its share of cuts but hasn’t been specifically targeted – indeed, the service has been spared deep cuts after the loss of its Renaissance money, as the councils have not wanted to make things worse. Nevertheless, they are currently having to restructure, but this presents an opportunity for the service to take stock.

While they are facing challenges, the interviewees felt the joint service is more resilient that the two services would be separately. The greater scale gives them a certain ability to absorb blows. They are focusing on projects which will enhance future sustainability, by bringing in new income streams such as retail or cross-marketing of services. They are currently managing two big capital projects: Colchester Castle (which is being HLF funded) and Ipswich museum (for which an HLF bid is being submitted).

“\nWe are having to reduce capacity, but we don’t want to reduce our potential – our aspirations haven’t changed. We want to be able to apply for major grants in the future.\n
A young visitor at Ipswich museum
9. Drystone Craft International™

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Main office based in Lancashire, UK; business arms in Scotland, Rexham, Stoke-on-Trent, Northumberland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drystonecraft.co.uk">www.drystonecraft.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of</td>
<td>• Bringing in fresh perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding new sources of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>• Employees: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteers: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual turnover: commercially sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the Boundary Wall project

Context for change

When Paul Scott and his siblings took over the management of their family’s dry stone walling company, it already had a long history reaching back to 1846. Throughout this time, the company was a relatively small company, later to be a limited company, based solely in the UK, with a focus on heritage and farm boundary wall work. Although Paul and his siblings were trained in the craft when they were young, they all decided to pursue professional careers first – Paul as a manager and lecturer in the environmental management field.

When they eventually took over the management of the company 16 years ago, it was decided that it would be necessary to develop and expand the company in order for it to have a sustainable and successful future – one that this new generation could leave their established careers behind for and provide a platform for the next generation, currently in training. Aware that the skills and experiences they had gained in their work outside the company, such as staff management, quality assurance, landscape design, civil engineering and organisational development, would be key to this process, as a first step they created a flow chart, detailing the skills that they could each bring from their other jobs to this new joint venture along with their varied stonework skills.

Key decisions

One of the first major decisions that were taken under the new management was to dissolve the previous limited company and re-establish it under its current name, Drystone Craft International™. The new company is managed as a family ‘workers’ cooperative’, with Paul and his siblings, based in various locations across the UK and abroad, each responsible for a different business area depending on their previous experience. As the name suggests, Drystone Craft International™ was set up with the aim of generating new markets in specialist bespoke stonework – architectural, decorative and heritage - across the UK and abroad. At the same time, the decision was made to move the company beyond its focus on heritage work and into new areas of work such as new developments for private clients and civil engineering work for public bodies.
The team felt that, in order for the company to progress successfully, the sector’s image and reputation needed addressing. As Paul said, there was a keen awareness that they would have to move beyond the old-fashioned images of the ‘drystone waller’ and ‘stonemason’, and start communicating an image of a skilled craft which ‘is a work of art’. Similarly, from their customers and from works they had been commissioned to take down and rebuild, they were aware of low-quality work being delivered by some other ‘contractors’ within the sector. Paul believes this problem has been largely generated through a system in which people get low-level qualifications or certificates after a short training course and claim professional status, but lack the experience needed in such a highly skilled job. To address both of these issues, the company decided to invest substantially in new ways of communication as well as education training opportunities at all levels.

Implementation
For Paul and his colleagues, the self-critical business ethic they have cultivated at Drystone Craft International™ is key to its success. The directors have weekly video conferences, and the whole company comes together once a month to discuss new projects and ideas. Difficulties are seen as positive opportunities and the team aim to constantly question how they can improve on what they do, make things better and how to use and build upon new experiences and develop the business further. Openness to new ideas and the professional development training of their staff, which the company takes very seriously, are crucial. Based on this overarching business ethic, the company has in the past 16 years succeeded in implementing planned changes in a range of different fields.

A first step that was taken in order to generate ‘new work’ and move away from the focus on heritage work was a big awareness-raising campaign in the local area. Simply by door-to-door flyering and talking to people and organisations, the company was able to pick up a range of new jobs from private customers and organisations. Many of these have remained clients over the years and, through word-of-mouth, have supported the development of a stronger client base ever since.

The company’s move into its third field of work (after heritage/farm boundary wall work and private work), civil engineering, began in 2004 and developed further when they were approached directly and subcontracted as ‘nominated sub-contractor’ by a major international civil engineering company in September 2009. The project involved building a stone amphitheatre in a local school, under the Lancashire Building Schools for the Future Programme. This was their largest project to date, and ‘woke them up’ to the potential new market in civil engineering and new ways of expanding their business. The considerations they faced in this job around issues such as public access, health and safety and management of such a large project, drove them to apply for membership of the Federation of Master Builders. Successful candidates receive access to a wide range of support such as health and safety training and legal support, which have been extremely beneficial for Drystone Craft International™. For example, they are now ‘more legally sound’, with standard contracts and their own debt collector – developments which have made them feel more secure in their work.

At the same time, the company’s international work started ‘almost by accident’ during a holiday in Turkey, when Paul met some British expatriates and took on some demonstration stonework from them during his holiday. This link to the expat community has continued to thrive, and the company’s international work is for the moment largely...
focused on Turkey, although contracts in France and Austria are currently under negotiation.

Whilst Drystone Craft International™ always strongly believed and engaged in putting the needs of its clients first, they felt that they were not fully communicating this approach to their clients. They overhauled the company website to include more information on their business profile and philosophy as well as features on existing work and new ideas.

The company also engages in a range of more adventurous marketing campaigns to develop their local profiles. One of the main projects they have recently been working on is the rebuild of a 365m 19th century boundary wall, which Paul initiated and which is funded by both the company (under their own grant aid scheme) and other source funding. The work has generated considerable local interest. Drystone Craft International™ will organise a small ‘opening event’ for locals and customers when the wall is completed, and is planning to use the wall as a gallery space for photos of their contemporary work. To tie in with their new enhanced communications approach, they have written a blog for their website documenting their progress with the rebuild, and are considering extending this approach to other projects over the coming years.

Alongside these new developments within stone work, three additional strands have been added to the company.

The company has built up a successful education and training offer and works together with local higher education institutions, trusts and groups. Regularly supported by training grants from HLF, the company has trained up four apprentices in the past four years (one funded by HLF), all of whom stayed on once fully trained. Letting apprentices learn on the job is crucial to this success. Training is linked in with actual projects – two apprentices were taken on to work on the amphitheatre project, whilst another has received HLF funding to learn the craft through working on the boundary wall project until March 2013. Paul is also regularly engaged by colleges to give lectures on issues such as countryside management, or provides 6-week training courses in dry stone walling on site.

A second new strand to the company which has gradually emerged is that of supplying stone. The company realised they were in a much better position to source good quality stone than many of their customers, and have now started pulling together high-end stone supplies through various sources from auctions to their own leftovers, which are then sold on.

A third new strand to the company is bespoke stonemasonry for a wide variety of architectural applications such as stone pillars, stone nameplates, mullions and cills. The company for example produced a hand carved replacement centenary stone for a local council. The demand for high quality architectural stonemasonry pushed the company into full time employment of Paul’s uncle, a talented architectural and memorial mason.

“Sometimes things go wrong – it’s a part of business, you have to take risks.”

Results

Results from the above developments have been very encouraging so far. Communication levels through the website are rising, and 30% of their clients are now attracted through the website (70% still come through word of mouth).

The company has built up a substantial client base in Turkey, and Paul and his brother regularly travel back and forth for new projects. Nevertheless, 90% of the company’s work at present is still in the UK, and they are keen to expand their international work in the future.

The company has successfully diversified the types of work it does – in 2012, around 60% of their work was domestic work (this figure continues to rise, reflecting their success in establishing a new client base in this field), 10% civil engineering and 30% general boundary wall work. This portfolio of work that they have built up in past years, with more varied stone work and a successful education arm, is central to the future of the business. Not only has it offered new opportunities and spread risks, but, as Paul says, it also ‘makes them different from the average builder’.
Linked to this is the company’s belief in delivering high quality work, even if it means they are more expensive than their competition: ‘private clients want a work of art; there is a good market for high quality bespoke work’.

While many competitors are cutting prices to undercut their rivals, Drystone Craft International™ is finding their approach is paying off: they rely on their reputation, and are indeed often called in to repair and rebuild work done by less-skilled, cheaper competitors with considerably less experience. Customers also greatly appreciate their level of professionalism: ‘It lies in the way we speak to our clients, the transparency of our operations, a company uniform, sophisticated communication, sweeping up before leaving a building site. All these things matter. Our clients need to feel we are putting them first, and we certainly do that’. The company believes that their development and success comes down to the ambition expressed in their mission statement: to ‘consistently provide outstanding services to our clients in all that we do’.

“The whole company comes together once a month to discuss new projects and ideas, to talk about how to make the business better, how to take experience from new jobs on in useful ways.

**Outlook**

With these achievements already under their belt, the company is confident about their future, though aware that they will have to continue building on the steps already taken. They are planning to invest further in marketing activities, focusing on local publicity through events like their boundary wall project. Expansion abroad is a further firm project for the future.

The company is also looking to apply for further training grants for their current apprentice and are planning to recruit a new apprentice in April 2013.
10. Glasgow Building Preservation Trust

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gbpt.org">www.gbpt.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and staff interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sources of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 5 (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers: 16 (Board members, including 8 representatives of organisations and 8 individuals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual turnover: £700,000 for 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context for change

GBPT started 30 years ago, with a project at the Fishmarket on the Clyde. It was originally intended just to carry out that one project, but it has grown over time into an organisation that has completed 19 major projects. It is currently led by its Chairperson John Entwistle, with the staff team lead by Anne McChlery. The Trust, which is a registered charity, took on the ownership of two buildings early on – St Andrews in the Square and Wellpark Enterprise Centre – but these were the exceptions rather than the rule, as the Trust does not aspire to own property, rather repair and restore for others. Generally, GBPT partners with another organisation on a project and hands it over for a consideration on completion.

GBPT’s involvement in the Castlemilk Stables project marked a big turning point in the Trust’s recent history. Funding was brought together from 23 organisations to deliver this high profile £4.2m project. It raised the profile of GBPT and created more of an appetite for what they do – they were approached by more organisations during and after the project. By this point GBPT was an incipient delivery vehicle, and the mood in the city was quite sympathetic to their work – Glasgow had been European Capital of Culture in 1990, and UK City of Architecture and Design in 1999.

This project provided a platform for GBPT to build on the work it had done to that date and move to another level, becoming a larger and more ambitious organisation.

Key decisions

Castlemilk Stables is a Georgian block on the former Castlemilk agricultural estate. It was closed down by its then owners, Glasgow City Council, in 1992. It was quickly vandalised, there was a fire, and it gradually became overgrown with vegetation. Cassiltoun Housing Association (CHA) carried out a feasibility study on restoring it in 2000. Although private sector developers considered Castlemilk Stables too high risk, CHA decided that the building was sustainable as a community-driven project.
In 2001/02 CHA had to find key partners for funding. GBPT came on board initially to carry out a scoping study but went on to lead the project. GBPT was sympathetic to the values and ethos of Cassiltoun Trust, the subsidiary of CHA set up to fundraise for the project with a view to eventual ownership.

Cassiltoun Trust was responsible for sourcing around 20% of the funding for the Stables project, while GBPT sourced 80%. GBPT is very well networked and has access to funding channels that Cassiltoun Trust did not have, though Cassiltoun could access some funds that GBPT couldn’t.

GBPT has stayed with the project all the way through. This has been a boon to the project; Cassiltoun Trust believes that a development consultant would not have got involved with additional fundraising, for instance, in the way GBPT did.

"Cassiltoun Trust would not have achieved what it did [at Castlemilk Stables] without Glasgow Building Preservation Trust"

Implementation
The Castlemilk project marked a turning point for GBPT. It wrote its first proper business plan at this stage (2005/06), which gave it a sense of strategic direction. It was decided to focus on options appraisals, to increase the flow of future work and to increase the staff base to deal with more projects. The number of staff has grown from two at that time to six now. (This was partly a response to increased funding from Glasgow City Council granted on the promise of an increased activity.) GBPT receives £50,000 a year in revenue funding from Glasgow City Council. This is a key part of their funding, and provides a certain stability even though it covers only a relatively small share of their total costs. GBPT now meets every year to review its business plan, but the bottom line in response to programme changes is discussed monthly.

This expansion was driven partly by Anne McChlery, partly by the board. The board has been restructured in recent years. It is now composed of 16 members, with an executive group of 6. The executive board meets monthly, the full board quarterly. The board is a mix of nominated members – chosen by Glasgow bodies such as the City Council and the Glasgow Institute of Architects – and recruited ones. For example, when Steve Inch retired as director of Development and Regeneration at Glasgow City Council, GBPT pursued him to become a board member. The board includes conservation expertise, engineers, planners, lawyers and quantity surveyors.

GBPT did not get external help to manage this change, and was not inspired by other organisations – its changes were very much a response to local conditions, working in partnership with others.

Having a strong structure and having people with strong business skills are increasingly important in the current economic climate. GBPT’s business model has to be able to adapt to circumstances, but they won’t change the principles behind their business model for the sake of a particular project – even if that means they sometimes have to ‘educate the client’ about what is possible, and have to be able to say ‘no’ to projects.

GBPT can now run multiple projects: they currently have one onsite, one about to go onsite and five being worked up. They aim to achieve full cost recovery on their projects.

Outlook
GBPT prides itself on its adaptability. While it has grown steadily it has also been willing to change its focus to deal with changing circumstances. It has also been able to look beyond the day-to-day managing of projects to think strategically about ways to secure its future. It has built a visible presence in Glasgow - it runs Glasgow Doors Open Day, for instance – and has therefore raised the historic environment agenda in the city and further afield. GBPT ‘ringfence’ themselves to Glasgow – there are 120 potential projects in the city alone.

GBPT is increasingly well-placed to take the lead in its field. Glasgow City Council is losing building conservation skills as a result of cutbacks and retirements, so it is not really in a position any more to do options
analysis, brokering of partnerships or the community consultations that are needed around heritage projects. GBPT has built up the skills and reputation that let them do this better. GBPT is also seen as independent of the council (despite the core funding it receives), which can be an advantage when doing, for instance, community consultation. GBPT does high quality work and can achieve leverage with funders partly as a consequence of the track record it has built up.

GBPT is also committed to an open, sharing ethos. It often works as an enabler/mentor for other organisations trying to restore old buildings, helping them with capacity building and governance, and has a good working relationship with the two smaller building trusts that work in Glasgow. Its relationships with the likes of Glasgow City Council and Cassiltoun Trust are given committed attention, to ensure lasting organisational bonds are established. GBPT is said to be very good at maintaining a flow of information, which also builds mutual confidence.

The Trust believes that all UK big cities need a Building Preservation Trust – it offers strategic value to the city. The GBPT ethos is that a rich architectural heritage helps drive the economic success of cities by attracting people and businesses. While the economic climate is tough, GBPT is large enough and flexible enough to be able to adapt to and benefit from the opportunities such thinking creates. However, the Trust also recognises its potential fragility in the current economic climate, for example it owns two historic buildings which are very susceptible to falls in property values and negative rental income fluctuations.

“Big cities need a BPT – it offers strategic value to them. A rich architectural heritage helps drive the economic success of cities by attracting people and businesses.
11. Headley Forge

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Surrey, England. Main office of building companies Building Edge and Meadowcroft Properties Ltd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://buildingedge.co.uk/our-showroom.html">http://buildingedge.co.uk/our-showroom.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of</td>
<td>• Bringing in fresh perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>• Employees: n/a – part of larger property development company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteers: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual turnover: n/a – part of larger property development company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Headley Forge following restoration by Paul Furr’s company and transformation into Building Edge’s main office

Context for change

Headley Forge is an 18th century forge which has been updated and modernised over time. It was listed in 1973 (at grade II). The building remained a working forge until 2009, when the blacksmith who worked there left due to financial difficulties. Headley Forge was then left empty for two years. Its condition deteriorated in that time.

The property was bought at auction by Paul Furr, a local property developer who specialised in executive homes. Furr had worked with the blacksmith, so knew the property. He then refurbished the Forge, (including replacing the roof); a process which took seven months.

Key decisions

Paul Furr is clear that he did not buy the building solely for conservation reasons. He saw an opportunity to develop quirky business offices, and was looking for a main road location. He has brought a blacksmith back to work at the Forge, along with two other local businesses.

Paul worked with the local authority’s historic environment officer, Peter Mills, on the refurbishment. There was a certain amount of give and take, but Furr feels that Mills was very pragmatic. Peter Mills for his part welcomed the decision to keep the building in light industrial use, and is particularly pleased that a blacksmith has been brought back to the premises, as it connects the present of the building to its past. Mills had been approached on a number of occasions to see whether the Forge could be converted into residential use, but this would have involved significant internal changes to the building.

"It’s important [in such cases that] you consider the commercial side [of a development] – it’s better to achieve 75% of your conservation goals and give a building a new use than let it crumble." (Paul Furr)

Implementation

The refurbishment lasted seven months. Paul Furr brought in two craft specialists with experience of working on listed buildings to help him,
especially with the wood-work at the property. They helped make and fit the replacement windows and sourced appropriate materials.

A number of minor structural changes were made to the building.
- Kept old front door but allowed to put glass door (shop door) inside
- Replaced old plaster board with glass
- Turned actual old forge into conference table by placing huge glass plate on top

The roof was replaced. The new roof echoed the texture of the old by using clay pantiles as before. The restoration kept the existing fabric of the building, although the forge’s architecture is a mix of styles and time periods. The project was entirely funded by Paul Furr.

“If you can afford it, grants are not for you.” (Paul Furr)

Property before restoration

Results
Peter Mills observes that Headley Forge works well as a building now. It’s used every day by people who appreciate it, and you can ‘read’ the building’s history inside. The refurbishment has preserved some of the building’s ‘rough edges’, and has given a ‘problem’ building a positive future.

For his part, Paul Furr believes there have been benefits to his business from undertaking this project. He now has experience in conservation, and would consider further refurbishment jobs. The local community is very pleased the Forge has been restored and not lost – the Forge sits at the entrance to the village of Headley. Furr has also developed a good working relationship with the local authority; and the Forge project has been good for his company’s reputation. It is also an expression of his company’s range – it is not just about executive homes.

Outlook
Paul Furr’s company tends to market itself on its good reputation. The Forge has helped in this: it is very visible and well-known. The building has also won an award from the Surrey Historic Buildings Trust (ahead of larger projects), in part because it was an unconventional project that showed ‘you can do conservation on a low budget’. The citation for the award explained that ‘the project is sensitive and, whilst not spectacular, is a model for such building conversions’.

The building is seen as a success and all parties seem happy with what has been done.

The transformation of the old blacksmith’s forge into the company meeting table
12. Hodsock Priory

In brief

Location Blyth, Retford, Nottinghamshire

Online http://www.hodsockpriory.com/

Example of
- Bringing in fresh perspectives
- Finding new sources of income

Scale
- Employees: 25 (FT/PT/seasonal) + 20 extra for Snowdrops
- Volunteers: 600 Friends of Hodsock
- Annual turnover: £865,000

Context for change

Hodsock Priory is a historic house in north Nottinghamshire. The oldest parts of the house and grounds date back to Tudor times, but the main house is mostly a combination of Georgian and Victorian styles. It is a grade II listed building. The house has been in the hands of the Buchanan family since the mid-eighteenth century (1765) – the current owner, George Buchanan, is the ninth generation of the family to occupy the Priory.

The 800-acre estate has long been run as a farm, but the costs of maintaining the house and gardens have weighed heavily on the family, and efforts have been made to develop a diversity of income streams. Some of this took place within the farming ‘strand’ of the business under Sir Andrew Buchanan (George’s father) – the farm takes part in the higher level stewardship scheme, which manages land in a more environmentally friendly way, and cricket bat willows have been grown at Hodsock since the 1990s. Sir Andrew’s primary innovation started just over 20 years ago, when the gardens were opened up to visitors every February to see the superb display of snowdrops in the house’s gardens. However, when George Buchanan took over the running of Hodsock from his father in 2006, the process of diversification was accelerated. The result has been to change what was once a largely private property into a public one.

Key decisions

In 2006 George returned to Nottinghamshire from London and took over the running of the house. George had been working in theatre management (the company he worked for is now part of Live Nation) for a decade. He feels the high-quality management training he received there has stood him in good stead in his current role – he sees strong parallels between managing theatres and running a historic house, around customer service and managing staff.

In order to improve the business’s finances, George sought to further diversify the Priory’s income streams. His primary idea was to turn the Priory into a wedding venue. At the time there was relatively little competition in that field locally, though this has since grown. The house
is comparatively small – it has 13 bedrooms available in the house itself and in a B&B development called the Courtyard – so it is not able to compete directly with hotels. Instead it markets itself around the theme of ‘secluded splendour’. A wedding party has exclusive use of the house, and the staff pride themselves on their hospitality and high levels of service and support to their guests. An extension has been built to the house to create a large room for the use of wedding guests – whether for the service itself, or for eating or dancing.

The wedding programme has been the main new source of income for Hodsock Priory, and it has helped shape other changes at the Priory. The Courtyard B&B development was driven in part by the need to provide more accommodation for weddings. In keeping with the secluded splendour theme, the development has been finished to a very high specification – it has received a five-star rating from Visit England.

The house is also developing other activities. It hosts business meetings, though because of the limited number of rooms, this tends to attract smaller groups, such as company boards rather than conferences.

There has also been a determined effort to build a year-round events programme to supplement other activities, and to raise the profile of Hodsock Priory. The events programme is not regarded primarily as a money-spinner; its value lies in marketing Hodsock Priory, in getting visitors to come back. Lindsay Jones, the events manager, commented that many local people she comes across in her work still haven’t heard of Hodsock Priory. Events are a way of getting the word out, but it has been a ‘huge battle’ to raise awareness.

**Implementation**

The wedding programme has built steadily over the last six years, though with a recession-related downturn in 2011. Hodsock Priory averages 35-40 weddings a year, though it aims to expand to 50-60 in time. As part of its service it is able to customise its packages – it is more flexible than a hotel. It is now developing a snowdrop-themed wedding package for February – the early signs for these look very promising.

In the last few years, Hodsock has started to develop an events programme. The origins of this lie in the Snowdrops openings, but Snowdrops itself is now declining in popularity. It currently receives less than 20,000 visitors, compared with a peak of 40,000. A new programme is being devised to boost numbers again, with events planned for each of the weekends during the time the garden is open during February and early March. Visitors will be routed away from the house itself, which will allow the snowdrop-themed weddings to be held at the same time.

The events programme has also been extended to all the year round. Hodsock now tries to hold at least one event per month (it has held 15-20 in the last two years). Among the ideas it has introduced is ‘picnic theatre’ in the grounds. In 2011, they hosted Shakespeare’s Globe theatre company for three consecutive nights, though they also host children’s theatre and musical events. Events are usually held in the week, to avoid clashing with weekend weddings, which generate more revenue.

**The Courtyard B&B development**

George takes a long-term view, and is happy to try new things to see if they work, and persevere with them if they are thought to have potential.
The picnic theatre programme, for instance, has had a difficult year due to the poor weather, but will continue. They have started evening openings in conjunction with the Historic Houses Association. In its first year (2011) only 20 people attended; this year they sold out two events. George has also introduced history talks as part of Snowdrops this year – they were very well received.

"Customers demand more quality now; they are more web-savvy."

Results
The theme of secluded splendour underpins the programme at Hodsock Priory – some ideas are rejected because they don’t fit this ethos. The weddings strand has been a success, and weddings now account for around 45% of the house’s total income, the same as farming. Visits to the gardens, principally during Snowdrops, are the third main strand of income. The other sources of income, from events and conferencing to the growing of cricket bat willows, remain relatively small but useful contributors to the overall total. There are also some opportunities in new avenues such as film/TV location shoots. The house now ‘washes its face’ in terms of income generation.

George feels he has an entrepreneurial spirit, and he has been the main driver of change at the Priory since his arrival. However, he is open to ideas from others, and the Priory will bring in outside expertise if it needs it: a social media expert helped them to launch their efforts in that field.

“The advantage of being a family business is that we can think long-term – the odd knock-back doesn’t faze us"

Outlook
Hodsock Priory has been through 5 or 6 years of upheaval as new ideas and staff have been introduced, and new buildings have been completed. This was necessary to secure the future of the house, but George is now looking to consolidate, to think more strategically, and to build up its profitability. He feels that as a family business, he is able to take the long view, and they are able to ride out the inevitable ups and downs.

George’s next ambition is to ‘professionalise’ the business, and to start planning ahead for the next generation (he has a young family). While he is open to ideas from other people, decisions have generally been taken by him or his father to date. He is intending to introduce a formal board structure involving people from outside the family to bring in wider expertise and ensure that decisions are examined more rigorously. Maintaining such a property is an ongoing process, and he hopes that doing this will help secure the future of the Priory.

Hodsock Priory and gardens
13. London Metropolitan Archives

**In brief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City of London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>via <a href="http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk">www.cityoflondon.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Management and staff interventions
- Sharing resources
- Finding new sources of income

**Scale**

- Employees: 90
- Volunteers: 70
- Turnover: approx £4m

**Context for change**

London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) was formed through the phased merger of three Corporation of London services: COLRO (the Corporation’s own archive), the London regional archive (which was inherited from the former Greater London Council) and the Guildhall manuscripts room. Post-merger, LMA is one of the largest municipal archives in the world. It remains managed and core-funded by the Corporation of London, the local authority for the City of London.

Under the leadership of Dr Deborah Jenkins, LMA has used its resources to pioneer new ways of working for archives. This case study focuses on LMA’s:

- Remodelling of in-person services within its new single site
- Digital access and income generation via a deal with Ancestry
- Proactive approach to partnership working on film archives.

**Key decisions**

Today, virtually all of the collection and LMA’s services are based in a converted print warehouse in Clerkenwell. A small number of truly iconic items, such as a 1297 Magna Carta and 1087 William I charter, remain at the historic Guildhall. Consolidating onto one site released a handful of properties that the Corporation of London was able to dispose of or find more suitable uses for. This in turn helped the Corporation to invest in state of the art equipment for the new site. While the move made clear financial sense, at the time there was resistance from a small core of staff and users who were attached to the Guildhall site. Since then virtually everyone has been won over by the improved facilities at Clerkenwell, though, in recognition of some users’ preferences, manuscripts can still be accessed at the Guildhall (given 48 hours notice).

To offer worldwide access to LMA collections – and to generate income – LMA decided to work with www.ancestry.co.uk. Ancestry digitises LMA materials then sells online access to them, with LMA receiving income via a royalty agreement. Users are able to access the digital copies for free at the LMA site. This deal is similar to The National Archive’s deal with Ancestry (indeed TNA provided LMA with advice).
The majority of Ancestry users are family historians. Phase 1 of the deal digitised the 12 most popular LMA collections for this market.

A different approach to sectoral partnership is embodied in the partnership to store and digitise London film collections, led by LMA, the BFI and Birkbeck University. This is wholly public sector (and enabled by HLF funding), with no private sector interest.

**Implementation**

When moving to the new site, LMA found that outreach to existing users became “paramount”. Deborah took inspiration from the more energetic museum model of outreach events and activities, which she became familiar with when Keats House museum joined LMA’s directorate. The focus of LMA’s outreach programme is evolving: as the needs of lone researchers are increasingly serviced digitally, LMA’s public programme tends to focus on group learning in-situ. Outreach also helps to raise the profile of LMA, both with communities who are potential new users, and with politicians (the latter particularly through the displays that LMA curates in Mansion House to mark the visits of international dignitaries).

The Ancestry website also makes LMA’s collection accessible to a new audience, worldwide. It has proved very popular, attracting 18 million page views in 2011. By working with LMA, Ancestry has learnt that there is a market for a more diverse range of sources than they originally perceived. Conversely, LMA has recognised that a commercial partner like Ancestry brings far more effective marketing and sales operations than LMA or any other public sector body could. However, LMA staff note that collections need to be of a sufficient scale to attract commercial partners – which implies that this route is limited to larger County and City archives or to consortia of smaller archives. This embodies one strand of LMA’s philosophy: individual archives benefit from teaming up if they are to bring their collections to a large audience.

**Results**

LMA staff and external partners believe that LMA now punches at the same level as a major public cultural institution or museum. (In fact more and more national museums are now requesting loans.) The commitment to outreach has brought many London communities into LMA (for instance, Chinese, Ugandan, Tamil and Jamaican) and helped them to feel they are seen as part of the story of the city.

LMA managers feel that they are good at harnessing ideas from all employees. Staff members are encouraged to think about solutions, and there tends to be lots of cross-fertilisation from department to department and people passing on ideas and information.

LMA’s momentum and its effective structures enabled it to weather 16% cuts in 2011. This was a painful year, with redundancies, but LMA managed to cut costs while continuing to respond to evolving user patterns. The approach was to close one day per week but open into the evenings on other days. This is in line with the gradual shift among users to accessing content online and communicating with LMA staff in advance of their visit, to maximise the time they spend at work in-situ. The evening openings are appreciated particularly by users travelling into London. There has been no fall-off in the number of users.
Outlook

LMA continues to review and develop its services. They feel a logical next step is to encourage more users to pre-order items from the collection, thus cutting down staff time spent accessing items on the day. LMA is also learning how to work with social media, for example seeing Twitter posts by users as insights into the user experience.

A next phase of digitisation with Ancestry could focus on images in the collection (mainly prints and maps). LMA would ideally like to form a consortium with other suitable collection holders. More generally, they see lots of potential for shared local archive services, which they are starting to test by providing services to a West London borough.

They identify a key success factor up to now and into the future as strong leadership, defined as:

"Leadership is about vision and forward thinking. It’s about being well networked with the rest of the profession and able to horizon scan; and being willing to review and change delivery methods."
14. Luton Culture

In brief

Location  Luton, East of England
Online  www.lutonculture.com
Example of  
- New organisational structures
- Shared resources
Scale  
- Employees: 201 (144 FTE)
- Volunteers: 111
- Turnover: £7.9m

Grounds of Stockwood Discovery Centre

Context for change

Luton’s arts, museums and libraries services became an independent Trust in early 2008. It is a registered charity, and is responsible for 13 sites, including Stockwood Discovery Centre, Wardown Park Museum, Luton Central Library and the Hat Factory.

The move to a Trust was planned over the two years before 2008. It was driven partly by financial concerns but also by a desire on the part of the council to protect and enhance the cultural service. Non-statutory services are always vulnerable to cuts, and moving to Trust status was seen as a positive move in response to that risk. Another Trust (Active Luton) had been set up to cover sport and recreation in Luton 18 months earlier. It was seen as a success, and provided a template for Luton Culture.

Luton Culture is currently led by Maggie Appleton, its Chief Executive.

“The council has to believe in the move to Trust status – if it’s just trying to get rid of an underperforming service, the move is unlikely to be a success.”

Key decisions

The move was initiated by council officers, at a high level within the council hierarchy. They already had a role model in Active Luton.

There were discussions about the organisational size of Luton Culture. A number of options were considered. The initial thought was that the new Trust should just include museums. However, the council ultimately felt that there would be more opportunities for economies of scale in a larger trust. Merging cultural services into Active Luton was also explored, along the lines of trusts in Wigan and Peterborough, but the council decided that this would dilute culture’s role. In the end it was agreed that it made most sense to put arts, libraries and museums together.
Appleton thinks this mix has worked well in Luton’s case, though she suggests each case is different, and must choose the option that works best for its own audience and communities.

Implementation

In many ways the staff have been the key focus of the move to Trust status. An interviewee observed that every charity has its own complexity; Luton Culture’s is its large number of employees, which is quite unusual in the charity sector (as opposed to having many volunteers, for example). The staff were transferred ‘as they were’ under TUPE regulations, so the challenge was to build a new, more entrepreneurial and flexible culture with its existing staff.

This process started with the Board. Appleton helped recruit a new Board and trustees – a mixture of people they knew, together with new people (they advertised, and held open meetings). She also developed a skills matrix to identify the type of skills they needed. The matrix included a range of skills, such as business and commercial skills, accountancy and finance, and legal and marketing skills. She says the Board members are positive critical friends and she and the chair, Nick Gibson, have a strong working relationship. The Board leads and is committed to Luton Culture’s values and work.

The Trust then started to develop a new vision for itself. One important step in the process was holding an all-staff workshop early on. All Luton Culture’s facilities were closed for a day to allow people to attend. People from the different services were mixed together to encourage cross-fertilisation of ideas. Some of the ideas developed continue to influence the Trust’s thinking to this day. This has been sustained with quarterly staff forums, which are a vehicle for culture change. Luton also currently has a four-session programme supported by action learning sets in place for its senior management group (some 25 people).

There was a lot of reassuring staff that everything would stay the same during the transfer – in hindsight, perhaps too much. Luton Culture needed employees to think of themselves as working for a charity and to be more entrepreneurial by, for example, cross-promoting events or pointing out the donations box to interested customers. Another difference is that in the public sector there is a rush from Christmas to March to spend all the year’s budget. Luton Culture needed to get people into the mindset that saving money is a good thing, to create reserves. Dealing with resources in a charity is very different to that in the public sector.

Some staff found this switch hard, but Appleton feels that the vast majority have made the adjustment well and few staff have left. Communication is the key to this change: Appleton says you can’t communicate too much with your staff, and she still devotes a huge proportion of her time to it.

This is also true of her relationship with councillors. Some councillors found it hard to ‘let go’ of the cultural services, sometimes for good reasons – libraries, for instance, are often particularly important institutions in some communities. While there were relationships prior to the transfer, it was important to maintain those and reassure councillors that, although Luton Culture is a separate organisation, it shares the community cohesion principles that guide the Council. The Trust prides itself on being a values-based organisation – it states clearly that it exists to open up cultural opportunity in Luton, and aims to ensure that its actions reflect that vision. Appleton feels that face-to-face talking is a key part of this, and has helped her build trust among councillors as a result.

Results

For the three services, working together as a charity has been very different to the way they worked before. It is a much more integrated and more flexible approach and has achieved the hoped-for benefits; Appleton wouldn’t want to go back to the way things were. However, the initial financial gains from making the move have largely been negated by the recession. This has been compounded by a serious mistake over the charity’s VAT status. A full VAT audit was not carried out, and Luton Culture has found itself responsible for a large recurring bill that was not accounted for at transfer. Luton cautions any service undergoing a transfer to seek specialist VAT advice.

There have nevertheless been other benefits. The relationship with the council is much improved. It has become more ‘grown-up’; Luton Culture is seen as a more equal partner (even though the council still funds
them), and as a sizeable charity it has a higher profile in the town. Their service level agreements with the council have also turned out well.

They are also exploring new service options such as national citizen service pilots (with central government) and day care users’ pilots. They feel there is potential for new things to be tried, even though contracts are getting shorter and smaller.

The Trust has also successfully introduced a Luton Culture Card, which allows people to access discounts and offers across the three services. It helps to strengthen the ‘brand’ of Luton Culture.

Luton Culture is exploring the opportunities that charitable status gives it. They have looked at the experience of other charities in developing fundraising initiatives and using Gift Aid, and they have hosted joint events with local charities. However, they feel there is still plenty of scope for further learning.

Outlook
While the move to Trust status has been a success, there are challenges ahead. The council has not made many cuts to date, but some are almost inevitable before long. Luton has lost its Renaissance funding, though this was expected and budgeted for. They also have only tiny reserves – they were not set up with any to start, and have only been able to build up a small amount, due to their ongoing VAT liability. However, their 25 year service agreements and five-year management and finance agreements mean that the council can’t ‘salami slice’ the service by cutting little by little every year, and the additional income-raising opportunities independence has given them have been invaluable.

Appleton feels confident about the future. 2011 was a hard year for them (as 2012 will be), but she feels they are in a good place, and they have the skills and knowledge they need going forward. The staff have responded well to the challenges they have faced.

Appleton’s advice to others in similar positions is to be clear with staff from the beginning. Don’t be afraid of change: the flexibility of a Trust is a good thing, and you don’t want to give people the impression that nothing will change. Culture change is hugely important in such a situation – you can’t communicate too much with your staff.

Luton Culture is four years old. It is still a youngster – it has learned a lot, but still has much to learn.

The relationship with the council remains important. The council is still the largest funder of Luton Culture, and there is a need for a good long-term relationship. The Trust has to demonstrate to elected members that Luton Culture will help them meet their needs and goals.
15. North West Film Archive

In brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nwfa.mmu.ac.uk">www.nwfa.mmu.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Example of | • Fresh perspectives  
|           | • Shared resources |

| Scale | • Employees: 9 (8.4FTE)  
|       | • Volunteers: occasionally placements and volunteers  
|       | • Annual turnover: £363,000 estimated for 2012/13 |

Geoff, at the North West Film Archive

Context for change

The North West Film Archive (NWFA) was originally set up 35 years ago as a research project within a faculty of the then Manchester Polytechnic, to explore the history of the region’s film and cinema industries. It became part of the Polytechnic’s library services in the mid-1980s, providing services across faculties as well as to the public. The NWFA became a separate charity in 1993, but in 2004 Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU, as the Polytechnic had become) took over overall responsibility for the NWFA, made the staff permanent, and disbanded the Trust.

The university now maintains an arm’s length relationship with the NWFA. According to the Service Manager, Marion Hewitt, a relationship of trust has been built.

The NWFA is currently based at the MMU site on Chorlton Street in Manchester. MMU has been planning for some time to rationalise its various sites across the city and concentrate its services on two campuses, implying that NWFA would have to be relocated at some point.

The hardest thing for organisations working in partnership is recognising that while they have many shared values, they will have different priorities in some areas. You have to accept that, and concentrate on finding a core vision that all can share.

Key decisions

Manchester City Council (MCC) had developed an innovative project to house various archive partners (not all of them owned by the council) on a single site at the Marketplace in the Northern Quarter. A Stage 1 application in support of the idea was submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund, but was unsuccessful. A thorough options review followed, one of
which suggested the archive partners should move to the Central Library.

In 2009 MCC announced it intended to redevelop Manchester Central Library, as part of the wider Town Hall Complex transformation programme. Following discussions, it was proposed that the archive partners along with the NWFA should relocate to the Library as part of a wider initiative called Archives+. The project’s core vision is to create an archive centre of excellence in the heart of Manchester.

“...You have to put yourselves at the meeting table at every opportunity, jump up and down, be thick-skinned – be a presence that won’t be forgotten.

Implementation

MMU, while retaining the role of parent body, was very receptive to the notion of the NWFA moving to the Central Library. It helped to release the Chorlton Street site and also provided strategic value by strengthening MMU’s links with the City Council, thus demonstrating their commitment to external partnerships in general and the link with MCC in particular. It also contributes to MMU’s commitment to engage with the public and the community. The city’s two universities are also involved (with the City Council and others) in the Manchester Corridor—a knowledge partnership, which is designed to promote the city’s cultural and scientific offer along Oxford Street/Oxford Road. Archives+ works with the grain of the Corridor initiative and supports efforts to promote the cultural heritage of the city.

For the City Council, the Archives+ scheme should help enhance the Central Library’s offer and improve its chances of meeting its ambition of attracting 2m visitors a year. Film will bring in a different audience to the other archives, and by sharing services such as ‘front-of-house’, and a proposed joint digital and content management system, both MCC and MMU expect to be able to offer improved services while making savings.

Outlook

In one sense, the prospects for NWFA look good. They have secured a new location and are involved in the planning and design of the new space. They have also been able to position themselves within the wider agendas of both MMU and MCC, and have become a symbol of external partnerships for both organisations. This status should have some strategic value for the Archive in the future. Nevertheless, challenges remain. The NWFA has not seen itself as a destination before – people want to see the content of its films, not the original film stock itself.

Serving visitors in large numbers will require a radical change in service style, but Hewitt is confident that the Archive’s staff can rise to the challenge of finding new ways of working.

Another partner in Archives + is BFI Mediatheque, which will be prominently located near the main entrance. The NWFA will build on its current relationship with BFI – the Archive will contribute North West content to the Mediatheque, will run the Mediatheque’s booking system, and will be the first point of call for archive queries for both organisations.

Hewitt is also conscious that she will have to work to maintain and develop the Archive’s profile within MMU, once it is no longer housed on an MMU site, and across the North West region, to counter any perception that only Manchester is benefiting from the changes.

The NWFA is also affected by the tough spending climate, which is making it more difficult to secure grants. There are wider ambitions for the Archive, which will be difficult to realise in the current climate. For example, putting all their material online for viewing (digitising, encoding, streaming) would require an investment of millions of pounds.

Hewitt is exploring collaborations with other regional film archives through Film Archives UK, a voluntary body representing the sector. The new partnership with Archives+ offers some other possibilities, as there are new networks and relationships to tap into, such as higher education funding councils. Archives+ has already received a first round pass from the HLF of £72,500 in recognition of the way in which bringing the archives together is creating a more resilient organisation.
The NWFA is going to experience significant change in the next few years, resulting in a different pattern of service emerging – more outward-facing and publicly engaged, but with at least one foot still in the university’s academic community. While its mission has not fundamentally changed, the way it is delivered will adapt to the new priorities and partnerships.

Impression of Central Library refurbishment
16. Woodland Trust

In brief

Location  Grantham / UK-wide

Online  www.woodlandtrust.org.uk

Example of  
- Management and staff interventions
- Greater use of volunteers

Scale  
- Employees: 320
- Volunteers: 1,100 (plus 11,000 for the Ancient Tree Hunt and 54,000 for the Nature’s Calendar project)
- Annual turnover: £26,997,000 for 2011

Context for change

The Woodland Trust has three clear aims: to create new native woodland; to protect and restore ancient woodland, and to inspire people to value woods and trees. It has over 200,000 members and owns more than 1,200 woods across the UK. Around half of the staff is based in Grantham with many more working on site, plus teams in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The Trust has undergone steady growth since its foundation 40 years ago. Trust staff emphasize that recent changes form part of the natural development of the Trust and they favour long-term planning over short-term reactions. Nonetheless there has been significant progress in recent years enabling the Trust to maximise the value of its supporter base. This case study focuses on two areas in particular:

- The new Supporter Relationship Management System (SRMS)
- New organisational structures to underpin volunteer-driven projects.

Key decisions

With the Trust seeking to maximise the value of its supporter base, the upgrade of the Trust’s SRMS “had to happen”. It was decided to make an investment in a powerful new system capable of streamlining and storing in one place all contacts and records of interactions with the Trust. The system would also reveal insights into supporter behaviour and help to coordinate campaigns and projects.

During the same period, the HLF-funded ‘Ancient Tree Hunt’ project was instrumental in opening the Trust’s eyes to the full potential of volunteer-driven projects. The project initially set out to engage 15 volunteers to help map ancient trees across the UK. It swiftly established a network of over 100 people. The Trust opted to establish a regional structure for the project with a lead volunteer for each region co-ordinating efforts and reporting to the centrally-based project manager. Lead volunteers were chosen for their specific skills and ability to make the time commitment, and given appropriate training. Following the Ancient Tree Hunt, the Trust identified volunteers as an important area for development with
Case studies of resilient heritage organisations
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major potential to recruit more volunteers and to augment the staff’s skills base.

Implementation

SRMS was delivered on budget, in 2010. The main challenge along the way was gaining buy-in across teams for designing and using the new system. This was achieved by recruiting a project manager backed by a strong steering group; by demonstrating support from the highest levels; and by nominating ‘super users’. They interviewed each Trust team to ensure everyone’s perspectives and needs influenced the specification of the new system. The super users meet on a monthly basis.

One year on, the hoped-for culture change is occurring and all the staff recognise the SRMS’s importance. The data inputted to the system is allowing the Trust to build up a profile of the 13 stages of commitment that supporters progress through. This helps the Trust to target specific supporters with offers and requests appropriate to their level of commitment. (The culmination of the process is represented by active volunteers who are fully equipped to act on their own initiative.)

The new Volunteer Development Champion arrived in 2009 to:

• Oversee volunteer strategy
• Provide central support to all Trust managers who manage volunteers including providing training for staff
• Lead the induction programme for volunteers.

Ann Rooney, the Trust’s Fundraising Manager, recalls that some colleagues were sceptical at first about increasing their work with volunteers, but that everyone is now firmly behind this development. The success factors were strengthening the central support available to staff, and successfully delivering high quality work using volunteers. The Trust was careful to train staff appropriately and to help them feel supported.

The Volunteer Development Champion has been instrumental. As importantly, volunteers are now fully trained and feel that they are supported and recognised as a full part of the team.

It has helped that the Trust has been able to draw on the expertise of some highly qualified volunteers, expertise that it could not have afforded to buy in from paid consultants. For example, a former Head of Planning for a local authority has – as a volunteer – guided the Trust’s input to the complex consultation process for the high-speed rail link between London and Birmingham (HS2).

Results

There has been shift in the way that supporters and volunteers are perceived across the organisation. Trust staff are better placed to ‘see the whole picture’ – to identify where opportunities arise and (using the SRMS) to contact the right supporters for each opportunity.

The number of Trust volunteers is rising, as is the range of skills that those volunteers use to support the Trust. The regional structure pioneered for the Ancient Tree Hunt has been transferred to other projects since. Some of the newer volunteer opportunities are:

• ‘Woodland Creation Champions’, a one year pilot of local groups of volunteers (around 140 volunteers in total) that will support communities and individuals to create new woods
• New HLF-funded project to restore ancient woodlands, drawing on a regional network of volunteers trained to liaise with local landowners.

The Trust notes that many of its volunteers are retired, but a growing contingent is in-between jobs and looking to enhance their CVs (they can be anything from students to senior executives). This contingent often stays for a short period of time. The Trust aims in the medium term to maximise the potential of its existing supporter demographic, rather than to target new demographics. But, as with their campaigning work, they are careful not to over-use their supporter base:

“Only ask people to get involved when you know they will make a difference. And use the right communication channel.
Outlook
Ann Rooney feels that the Trust has seen big changes over recent years: it is stronger in particular in terms of its volunteer base and management system; and it has more confidence. The Trust has a renewed focus on its core priorities, while working more extensively in partnership with others to deliver those priorities (for instance, working with existing landowners rather than just aiming to buy woodland itself). The economic situation has only modestly influenced how the Trust operates: the economic situation has reinforced changes that were being made anyway and has helped the Trust to prioritise.

Trust staff members feel that the Trust’s successes are underpinned and enabled by its strong organisational culture. They suggest that this strong culture is based on:

- **Passion.** The trust tends to attract high quality people who are committed to its conservation aims, both as staff members and supporters.

- **Looking beyond the day to day.** The organisation values forward thinking, and has a project development team tasked with horizon scanning for the ‘next big thing’ for the Trust.

- **Challenge.** Top management are open to challenge. They encourage staff to generate fresh ideas, and are willing to develop those ideas.

- **Accountability.** Staff members are very conscious of how each Trust activity ultimately contributes to the conservation aims, and how each activity can help supporters to feel that they are making a difference.

- **Communication.** Weekly management team meetings take place between the heads of departments, often followed by department meetings which help to disseminate top-level decisions. Notes of the management meetings are posted on the intranet.

Also underpinning the Trust’s successes is its robust and balanced income model. In 2011, over half of its income came from membership subscriptions and legacies, providing a solid base that is relatively insulated from the effects of private sector recession and public sector cuts. The remaining income is derived from a wide range of sources, thus reducing the risk of reductions in any one area. The other sources include fundraising and appeals, donations from companies and trusts, merchandise and woodland management income; with public sector grants – typically for specific projects – comprising less than 10% of total income.

“Don’t look to solve problems through ‘quick fix’ measures; it is important to consider where you want to be in the long-term.”

Lavethan Wood
17. Appendix 1: Research methodology

As a first step, BOP Consulting established a selection framework to inform the selection of a number of case studies, which would be suitable for this research project. The framework was built around a set of identified 'dimensions of change', which organisations might typically apply in order to become more resilient. More information about the framework and how it was used to identify the case studies can be found in Section 3 of the report.

The framework was informed by another project BOP Consulting is currently engaged on, for DCMS’s CASE (Culture and Sport Evidence) programme. The CASE project is investigating the question of 'What characteristics of publicly funded organisations in the culture, heritage and sport sector contribute to their sustainability'. Research is based on both a substantive literature review and an analysis of secondary data, and provided useful insights that could be transferred to the Heritage Organisations and Resilience project. Our observations are laid out in detail in Section 3 and 4 of this report.

Based on the framework, and with input from English Heritage and HLF, 15 organisations were selected to be included in the research and presented as interesting case studies of good practice in the report. Throughout the selection process, special care was taken to include as wide a group of organisations as possible, in order to ensure representation of a diverse range of heritage domains. The selected list thus includes organisations from the natural heritage sector, the built environment and from organisations based on collections - as well as a variety of sizes and ages of organisations.

In the course of the research, we held telephone interviews with the directors of each of the 15 selected organisations and completed 12 site visits. These visits were aimed at gaining a first-hand impression of the organisation and included focus group meetings, which provided an opportunity to talk to a larger group of stakeholders. Attendees at these focus groups included a wide range of people, from senior staff such as education or fundraising managers, to volunteers, Board members and local council representatives, who were able to bring different points of view to the discussion. In several cases, the site visit was followed by further telephone interviews. In one case (Glasgow Building Preservation Trust), a range of telephone calls with various stakeholders was substituted for the visit for logistical reasons, while for Drystone Craft International and Headley Forge a site visit was deemed unnecessary. In total, 69 people were consulted.

Following the completion of the interviews and site visits, 15 case studies were prepared for sign-off by English Heritage and HLF as well as by the directors of the organisations.

BOP Consulting subsequently reviewed all case studies in order to identify a set of key findings across the 15 organisations. BOP Consulting also hosted two workshops - an internal workshop with English Heritage and HLF managers and a subsequent external workshop to which all directors of the case study organisations were invited – at which our findings were presented and feedback invited from the participants. Of the 12 case studies which had been selected at that point, 11 organisations confirmed their attendance at the external workshop, with one representative dropping out at the last minute due to unforeseen circumstances. The 'missing' organisations were subsequently informed of the results of the workshop via email and invited to feedback by telephone. Three additional case studies were added to the process after the workshop.

More information on the content as well as lists of the participants at both workshops can be found in Appendix 2.

---

1 Led by DCMS in association with Arts Council England, English Heritage and Sport England
18. Appendix 2: Research participants

18.1 Case study organisations

We would like to thank the following key contacts from each of the 15 organisations we consulted for the time and thought they put into this project. These thanks are extended to the many more people who participated in the focus groups we held at each of these organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsley Paper Trail</td>
<td>Jacky Bennett</td>
<td>Chair of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Burford</td>
<td>General Manager and HLF project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnos Vale Cemetery Trust</td>
<td>Juliette Randall</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Arts Centre</td>
<td>Sarah Preece</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Hunter</td>
<td>Strategic Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Julia Hanmer</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beamish Museum</td>
<td>Richard Evans</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Elizabeth Perkins</td>
<td>Trust Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester and Ipswich Museum</td>
<td>Peter Berridge</td>
<td>Museum Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drystone Craft International</td>
<td>Paul Scott</td>
<td>Part/Owner and Director of Stonework Construction, Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Building Preservation Trust</td>
<td>Anne McChlery</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Chalmers</td>
<td>Vice Chair of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headley Forge</td>
<td>Paul Furr</td>
<td>Owner and Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodsock Priory</td>
<td>George Buchanan</td>
<td>Owner and General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Metropolitan Archive</td>
<td>Deborah Jenkins</td>
<td>Heritage Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Harris</td>
<td>Head of Access and Buildings Archivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton Culture</td>
<td>Maggie Appleton</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Film Archive</td>
<td>Marion Hewitt</td>
<td>Service Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Trust</td>
<td>Ann Rooney</td>
<td>Fund-raising Manager (Grants &amp; Trusts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.2 Workshop attendees

18.2.1 English Heritage and HLF managers workshop

30 April 2012, Offices of the Heritage Lottery Fund, London

This first workshop was held in order for BOP Consulting to present our preliminary findings from both the literature review around the concept of ‘resilience’ and the site visits to a wider group of representatives from EH and HLF, and to invite their feedback. Following a presentation by Chris Gibbon and Alex Homfray from BOP Consulting, the discussion focused on examining understandings of ‘resilient’ heritage organisations and on possible responses to the research by the funding bodies, as well as further steps in the development of the project.
The participants were:

**HLF**
Gareth Maeer, Head of Research
Anne Young, Head of Strategic Business Development
Karen Brookfield, Deputy Director (Strategy & Business Development)
Fiona Talbott, Head of Museums, Libraries and Archives
Jo Reilly, Head of Participation and Learning
Drew Bennelick, Head of Natural Heritage
Ian Morrison, Head of Historic Built Environment

**English Heritage**
Jenny Frew, Head of Social and Economic Research
Owain Lloyd James, Historic Environment Intelligence Analyst (Local Government Impacts)
Russell Walters, Head of Operations
María Ala-Kauppila, Policy Adviser, Yorkshire
Louisa Moore, Policy Advisor, West Midlands

**BOP Consulting**
Alex Homfray, Director
Chris Gibbon, Senior Consultant
Bethany Lewis, Research Consultant

18.2.2 Case Study project managers workshop
18 May 2012, the Archive Room at St Andrews Church, London

The second workshop provided an opportunity for BOP Consulting to present our findings - including our initial impression of the characteristics of a ‘resilient heritage organisation’ based on the site visits - to the project managers of the initial 12 case studies, and invite their feedback. A subsequent discussion was lead by Alex Homfray and focused specifically around the questions:

1. Do heritage organisations have unique strengths or weaknesses that influence their resilience?
2. What leadership and skills are particularly important at present, to underpin resilience?
3. What can heritage organisations do to improve their resilience?
4. What can lead agencies do to help?

The participants at this workshop were:

**Case Study Representatives**
Peter Burford, Apsley Paper Trail
Juliette Randall, Arnos Vale Cemetery
Jo Hunter, Battersea Art Centre
Julia Hanmer, Bat Conservation Trust
Elizabeth Perkins, Birmingham Conservation Trust
Peter Berridge, Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service
Patricia Chalmers, Glasgow Building Preservation Trust
Tim Harris, London Metropolitan Archive
Marion Hewitt, North West Film Archive
Ann Rooney, Woodland Trust

**HLF**
Gareth Maeer, Head of Research
Anne Young, Head of Strategic Business Development

**English Heritage**
Jenny Frew, Head of Social and Economic Research

**BOP Consulting**
Alex Homfray, Director
Chris Gibbon, Senior Consultant
Bethany Lewis, Research Consultant