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1. Introduction

Responding to concern that there may be gaps in the recording of investigations and sustainable archiving of digital data and reports on standing buildings, the Archaeology Data Service has undertaken a five month project to research current practice and the user needs of conservation architects, surveyors, engineers and their specialist teams. The project was funded by an External Engagement Award from the University of York. Building on a previous needs survey (ADS, 2015) about historic building recording data and the needs of conservation officers and historic building specialists, the follow-on project planned to increase understanding of how conservation professionals in the commercial sector archive and access digital historic building data.

Practitioners are generating considerable quantities of high quality digital information including reports, CAD drawings, photogrammetry and high resolution laser scanning. The Archaeology Data Service sought to work with external partners to research how their existing world-leading digital heritage data systems might be extended to improve practice in the management of historic building recording data. It is known that access to free and open format data has had a significant impact in terms of research in the archaeological community (Beagrie & Houghton, 2013). It is anticipated that increasing the catalogue of historic buildings data lodged in an open searchable database linked to a sustainable archive could have similar impact to both buildings research and conservation practice.

Currently there are around 3000 reports in the ADS grey literature library of unpublished fieldwork relating to historic buildings and structures reported through OASIS but it is anticipated that there is significant potential for increasing this resource. The project sought to raise awareness of digital archiving and increase deposition of data by professionals working on historic building conservation. The study was also used to inform HERALD, the current development of OASIS, by understanding the experience of professionals reporting investigations through the system.
2. Research Context

‘Below ground’ and ‘above ground’ archaeology are two cultures – they stem from different intellectual traditions – the former from Prehistory, the latter from Architectural History. They each have their own research agendas, legislative systems, management systems and terminologies. The Department of Archaeology in York has pioneered the adoption of a below-ground approach to standing buildings but to date their digital agenda has had little impact on the standings buildings professions, something which this project sought to address.

The ADS is an internationally recognised digital archive which preserves data and makes it freely available via the Internet. ADS research pioneered approaches to digital preservation and access, including metadata standards and good practice, charging models, access to grey literature and international interoperability. The impact of the ADS already extends across national heritage agencies, local government, commercial contract archaeology, and the general public. ADS resources are widely used with a total of over two million page impressions per month with almost half of users outside of the HE sector. A recent study has concluded that the ADS is worth £5m per annum to the UK economy (Beagrie & Houghton, 2013). The ADS has helped shape the digital preservation policy of Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland and informed practice in the United States, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Germany.

A key project undertaken by the ADS from a commercial archaeology perspective was the creation of the so-called Grey Literature Library. With initial funding from the UK Research Support Libraries Programme and support from English Heritage, Richards led the OASIS project (1999–2013) which led research into the capture, flow and usability of data from producers, such as contracting units and community groups, to users, such as local and national data managers. The outcomes of this research have expanded the ADS’s remit to facilitate preservation of and access to the results of commercial and community archaeology, but the focus of OASIS has so far been on excavation. Capturing information about historic buildings recording is a key strategic objective for national partners.

The Impact of the project will be further extended through our work within the Digital Heritage theme of York’s new EPSRC-funded Digital Creativity Labs (in which Richards is a Co-I). This is seeking to extend the use of OASIS by community groups, which provides an additional target audience.

We further anticipate impact on the Knowledge Economy for the commercial historic buildings community (conservation architects, architectural historians). Anecdotally, it is known that historic environment professionals working in the built environment would like to see better access to information. The ADS has proven impact in terms of its economic impact in below ground archaeology - estimated to be £13 million per annum - see The Value and Impact of the Archaeology Data Service (Beagrie and Houghton 2013) and the object of the project would be to see this impact begin to be transferred to the above-ground sphere as well.

There were two interlinked strands to our strategy to engage with Buildings Archaeology & Conservation:

(1) The OASIS online recording form was pioneered by ADS in 2000 and has become the de facto national online system for recording the outcomes of archaeological fieldwork, having been adopted as a requirement by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland and most local authorities in Scotland and England. It is also under current consideration for adoption in Wales and Northern Ireland. As part of the current development of their Heritage Information Access Strategy, Historic England have placed it the core of their information strategy. To date, they have invested £150,000 in the redevelopment of OASIS, indicating their strong commitment to the system, which is a core deliverable in the Heritage Information Access Strategy. However, we believe that our partnership could be extended and enhanced if we could
engage with conservation officers and buildings archaeologists, who have so far been resistant to adopt a system which has been perceived to be for below-ground archaeology.

(2) Project archiving through OASIS and ADS-Easy
OASIS also encourages users to upload their unpublished fieldwork reports to ADS. This service is a key feature, and to date has contributed to the preservation of over 35,000 reports. ADS-easy allows reports to be accompanied by more rich content (for example digital photography, survey data). Neither system have, however, been widely taken up by buildings archaeologists, conservation architects, engineers and surveyors.

Both strands can be covered by actions which address wider adoption of OASIS, awareness of ADS and promotion of best practice in data management.
3. Methodology

To reach a new audience and stakeholder organisations the project set out to:
(i) Undertake market research and user needs study
(ii) Investigate the implementation of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of built environment archiving

In response to the results of the above research the project also included initiatives to:
(iii) Develop professional training/awareness materials with a video, leaflet, brochure and presentation
(iv) Conduct regional training/awareness events for built heritage community
(v) Distribute a mailshot to IHBC and members of professional conservation accrediting bodies.
(vi) Raise awareness via short articles and attend events and conferences
(vii) Develop a grey literature showcase from existing deposited reports

This report concerns itself with items i) and ii) – establishing an evidence base for the ADS to use in plan making for future engagement. An account of items iii-vii can be found in ‘Archaeology above ground: Extending our Digital Impact to Buildings Archaeology Final Report’ (Richards & Matthews, 2016).

3.1. Online Survey of commercial historic building professionals

Previous work had sought feedback from local authority conservation officers and buildings archaeologists but had elicited little engagement from commercial practitioners. Survey respondents were sought from a range of geographic locations throughout England and from a range of practice size. Members from four key professions were identified and consulted:
- The Register of Architects Accredited in Building Conservation (AABC)
- The Conservation Accreditation Register for Engineers (CARE)
- Royal Institute of Chartered Engineers (RICS) with Building Conservation Accreditation
- Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists (CIAT) Accredited Conservationists

In order to extend engagement beyond these professional groups, generators of historic building information were identified from all Historic England regions by consulting supporting documentation for Listed Building Consent applications identified through local planning authority public access portals. ADS-easy registered users who were identified as historic building data depositors were also consulted. A total of 662 professionals were invited to contribute to the research.

The following research themes were explored (See Appendix 1 for the survey questions):
- The type and extent of digital data being generated
- Current archiving practice
- Attitudes the benefits and barriers to deposition
- Awareness of the Archaeology Data Service and OASIS

The online survey was designed, distributed and analysed in Qualtrics (Insight Platform, 2016) which allowed for personalised invitations and flexibility in how respondents could complete the survey over time if necessary. This software also enabled respondents to be sent reminders and thanked for their input, an important consideration when improving communication with a potential user group.

3.2. Interviews with historic building professionals

A more in-depth questionnaire about work flows, attitudes to the deposition of digital data online and open access to this resource was developed from the online survey responses. Semi-structured telephone interviews were carried out and recorded to enable transcription. Interview subjects were selected from respondents who had given more descriptive responses during the online survey and care was taken to cover all the target professions. Anonymity was offered to all respondents and the resulting transcriptions were qualitatively analysed utilising NVivo.
Recording the interviews enabled the discussions to be responsive to the concerns of the participants rather than the interview script and freed the interviewer to follow unexpected lines of enquiry. Transcriptions were cleaned and edited to extract content relevant to this research.

3.3. Investigate the implementation of the NPPF in respect of historic building data

‘Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.’ National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012, p. 32).

In order to establish how the implementation of the NPPF is impacting the archiving of digital data on historic buildings generated as part of the planning permission system, requests for information were sent to 332 local planning and national park authorities (see Appendix 2). Questions sought to quantify the amount of data; to ascertain how it is archived in the long term; and how public accessibility was maintained.
4. Online Built Legacy Survey Analysis

The following section details responses to the online survey as described in 3.1 above.

**4.1. Survey results – Statistical Analysis**

The first part of the analysis presents quantitative data used to inform our conclusions. The second part (section 4.2 below) provides insight into pertinent commentary on survey questions provided by participants.

**4.1.1. Interests and Disciplines**

The survey was targeted at particular conservation professions and geographic locations so initial questions sought to confirm whether the intended range of respondents had been achieved.

In addition to the respondents from the target professions of conservation architects, engineers, surveyors and architectural technologists, the inclusion of listed building consent applicants revealed historic building information is also being generated by Buildings Archaeologists, Architectural Historians, Heritage Consultants, Town Planners and Conservation Craft Practitioners.
Although IHBC members had not been specifically invited to participate, around a quarter of respondents had IHBC membership. There was an even spread of practitioners in sole, small or medium practices, and a few in large multi-disciplinary organisations, with all parts of England represented in the work locations.
Figure 3 Regions in which participants have conducted work in the last two years
4.1.2. Historic Building Information Generated

The historic building investigation work and the terminology was varied and as expected the more specialist fields such as rectified photography, laser scanning and materials analysis were less common as an output. In addition to dendrochronology, paint and mortar analysis, respondents also reported carrying out or commissioning metallurgical analysis, timber condition and rot assessment, identifying brick types and petrology.
Figure 5 Types of data produced
4.1.3. Workflows

In order to understand commercial work flows respondents were then asked who commissions or instructs
their work, and who writes the briefs, scopes of work, written schemes of investigation or defines the level
of survey. In the majority of instances (72%) the client or building owner commissions the investigation
although responsibility for defining the extent of investigation was more evenly split between the owner,
others on the project team and often consultants themselves. Sometimes local authority planning or
conservation officers define the investigative work and occasionally funding bodies.

Figure 6 Who most frequently commissions work

4.1.4. Scope of Works
Figure 7 Who defines the scope of works
4.1.5. How is information used?

When asked how the information is used, the majority cited the planning process as being a major driver for why this information is produced with 82% saying it was frequently used for listed building consent or planning applications. Informing decision making by both owners and the project team were also key motivations for the work with assisting funding applications of less importance. Tender documentation, risk management and cost accuracy were also cited as important triggers for historic building investigation.
4.1.6. Historic Building Digital Data Archiving Practice

Having established what information is produced, why and for whom, the next theme of enquiry was how this data is archived in the long term. In the majority of cases reports and data are issued on completion of investigation in a digital format although it would appear many professionals also issue reports in hardcopy to their clients.

![Figure 8 Where data is held in the long term](image)

Respondents who chose ‘other’ gave the following hugely varying answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Locations of Data</th>
<th>HE records and files</th>
<th>Planning Records</th>
<th>Digitally on our own archive server and often hard copy in our files our own archive/filing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>digital copy with tpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy of written documents with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own archive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself; LPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our archives store the data confidentially for 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard and digital file</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In house office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Additional responses to the question of where data is held

Respondents were asked to consider where this information would be in ten years’ time and how it might continue to contribute to public understanding of the historic built environment.

‘Who knows? We cannot operate as the County Archive.’

‘Cynically, on a scratched out of date CD in the back of a cupboard in a probably damp vestry.’

‘If past experience is anything to go by, forgotten. Clients have short memories (including those who know better) and I cannot see archives and records being much of a priority in the public sector, certainly not a local level where cuts and closures are rife.’

‘Digital Scans (cloudpoints) are generally retained by the survey company; however we don’t currently require them to hold this data (and curate it to ensure it remains legible to future software versions) for any period of time.’

‘We have projects 15 years old for which we no longer can read the electronic data.’

‘I am concerned that some Heritage Statements, which contain important new research are within reports primarily aimed at supporting Planning Applications and therefore look like advocacy documents so may not be archived.’

‘Quite possibly in our own archive, but not guaranteed.’

These descriptive responses showed the complexity of the issues of curation including locating and sorting data, obsolescence, validation and identification of responsibilities.
4.1.7. Public Engagement and Future Information Resource Requirements

Participants were introduced to the concept of value with regard to archived information. In the first instance they were asked to describe their experiences of enabling better public understanding of the historic environment in their work to date.

Figure 9 indicates some of the recurring themes in answers to the question, and indicates that much is dependent on individual projects. It was clear from reading the 74 individual responses that many professionals understood their work contributed to publicly accessible knowledge about historic buildings, however, much of this took a ‘passive’ form such as being part of the planning process, unless specifically required (e.g. HLF funded projects). Further analysis of this data was beyond the scope of the project, but may prove fruitful in the future.

Participants were then asked to consider the information or resources they themselves would like to be able to access in the future. There were 84 descriptive responses to the question. Again, because of the nature of the question, quantitative analysis of the question (i.e. what the most popular requests would be) was not possible as the intention was to invite creativity. Some of the responses included:

‘There is a national database of EPC ratings (energy assessments) for domestic properties which operates quite well https://www.epcregister.com/. I’d be interested to see if this system can be adapted for Heritage Statements, Statements of Significance, and possibly even Heritage Asset Condition reports - I think this would bring the existing body of work prepared in planning applications and listed building consents to a much wider audience (of property owners and non-academic researchers).’

‘The equivalent of a ‘log book’ type of resource (lodged with the local authority perhaps?) which collates the available records and continues the record.’
‘Drawings and photographic records, particularly of repair projects. In assessing problems with buildings, one of the main issues is the lack of good records of works carried out in the past.’

‘A data base recording sources of information, articles, and dissertations, published and unpublished material would be useful. Often knowing what is available and/or where to look is critical to access and timing of research.’

### 4.1.8. Impact of Access to Data

When asked to consider and how free and open access to information might impact their work including reducing the cost of investigation, improving the quality of their work and enabling them to respond more quickly to their client’s needs, the majority confirmed that free and open access to historic building data would benefit their practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free and open access to historic building information would reduce costs</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and open access to historic building information would improve the quality of our work</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and open access to historic building information would enable us to respond to our clients’ needs more quickly</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 Potential impacts of open access data for the historic buildings community
4.1.9. The barriers to deposition

In order to better understand the barriers to depositing data, professionals were then asked about how important they rated concerns about client privacy, intellectual property rights, skills required to prepare data, the time or cost of deposition or commercial advantage of their competitors having access to the material. More open narrative responses were also sought to help capture barriers not previously anticipated. The table below indicates the barriers and how important participants perceived they were. Participants used a sliding scale from one to one hundred to indicate how important they felt the barrier was. The figures indicate the mean of all the responses in order to give a sense of the relative strength of feeling.

Additional statements can be found in the appendices.
I do not think my client would agree to information being made available online.

I would be worried about tackling intellectual property rights with my client.

I would not have skills necessary to prepare data for deposition.

I do not think I can convince my client to cover the cost of archiving.
‘In some cases where we store the data for contracts signed as deeds (rather than under hand) or for attachment to leases, this will be available for up to 12 years, subject to our terms of contract. Public interest disclosure would be possible; as would disclosure with the client’s consent (which I think could not be unreasonably withheld). We encourage clients to make a HER deposit of data which we believe may enhance the public’s enjoyment and understand of historic environments, but many items have to be redacted and this has caused issues (redaction can be a costly and risky undertaking for which there is little appetite amongst practitioners, clients or archivists). Moreover, the formats and resources for making HER deposits are neither uniform nor user-friendly, so materials are seldom deposited. Finally, the practice of charging for HER consults causes some disapproval amongst clients, who wonder why data which has been acquired for free, in the public interest, should be charged-for during normal enquiries - clients who have been charged for HER searches tend to then resist making deposits. Most people we encounter are sympathetic to the resourcing issue but find the business case poorly thought-through, and the management of records to be inconsistent. I’d suggest a much better-resourced digital-only central archive, with sift of deposit materials by voluntary groups, and revenue funding by HLF to act as a national historic environment learning and outreach centre.’
4.1.10. The benefits of data deposition

Attitudes to the advantages of deposition were also investigated including demonstration of good practice and contribution to the sector, the resultant commercial advantage, securing a long term secure archive of work, accessibility of the information for clients and others.

The more information that is made freely available would, it was widely considered, greatly facilitate improvement in conservation knowledge and, thereby, skills in practice.

- I would be able to gain commercial advantage through demonstration of my professional work
- I would be able to demonstrate good practice in terms of making a contribution to the historic buildings community
- I would have a secure, long term and future proof archive of my work
4.1.11. **Awareness of the Archaeology Data Service and OASIS**

Only the heritage consultants and conservation officers, professions not directly targeted during this project, reported using ADS to access information about built heritage. The majority of professions consulted showed little or no awareness of the ADS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you used ADS to access information about built heritage?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 Perceived benefits to archiving and open access
All the target groups reported accessing historic buildings information in their professional role through other online sources.
When asked about what they understood about OASIS most conservation architects and engineers reported that they had never heard of it. The majority of conservation buildings surveyors had heard of but never used OASIS and only Buildings Archaeologists and Heritage Consultants reported being familiar and regularly using OASIS.

![Figure 12 Awareness of OASIS](image)

A couple of Buildings Archaeologists reported some frustration with data entry and one Heritage Consultant reported:

‘Training with Historic England (very useful) and deposition of archaeological reports where requested in a brief or WSI. But it is time consuming and the information required is quite detailed when it is just a report being deposited. Difficult to justify the time spent as a sole practitioner with a heavy workload. Deposition with ADS even more difficult due to request that I caption every photo deposited rather than just direct readers to the photos with captions in the report.’

Encouragingly there were 31 requests for OASIS training which were passed on to Historic England who deliver these sessions.

Most conservation architects, engineers and surveyors reported no experience of depositing information or data to a trusted, standards compliant digital archive. Only Buildings archaeologists and heritage consultants reported any experience of using ADS-easy and the few architects who reported digitally archiving data overwhelmingly reported other archiving processes, most not digital archiving.
4.2. Survey Results – qualitative data on digital data archiving practice

The concluding question asked respondents what they thought would need to happen for the historic buildings community to enjoy similar economic and research benefits as those enjoyed by the below ground archaeological community through ADS archiving. Over forty descriptive responses, although not offering simple solutions, showed that many conservation professionals had considered the issues and were keen to see more digital archiving taking place.

Comments included issues such as:

4.2.1. The need for increased awareness and promotion

‘The service ought to be better publicised, more information needs to be made available and perhaps web links with historic building websites. This is definitely something which would benefit historic building research and something I shall be looking to find out more about.’

‘An initiative of promotion in conjunction with Historic England and other nationally-orientated conservation bodies.’

‘Write articles in the IHBC to promote and generally make the community more aware of the service.’

‘Greater awareness of this resource and the ability to use it.’

4.2.2. Making the process obligatory through planning permission or funding requirements

‘The requirement to be built into HLF and other funding grant bids’.

‘A requirement through planning and other permissions processes.’

‘Tell those in the sector that the service is available and make sure bodies curating the work require it.’

4.2.3. Coordinating the service with existing systems

‘Widespread adoption of the service would be essential. Close working with existing HERs/SMRs would be essential to ensure that the two services complement and strengthen one another.’ Validation and quality of content

‘Data would need to be sorted into categories so that future users can determine the level of trust that they can put in the data.’

‘Professional historic buildings consultants would perhaps need reassurance they wouldn’t become undermined by unskilled people.’

4.2.4. Confidentiality, Privacy and Security concerns of clients and owners

‘Discussions about what should and should not be in public domain - many buildings are people’s homes and personally I would not like my home to be digitally accessible to all and sundry.’

‘A change of policy... and people relaxing about privacy and confidentiality’

‘Security risk for public buildings would have to be assessed.’
4.2.5. Intellectual Property and Commercial concerns of consultants

‘Better inter-disciplinary working between the academic, archaeological, architectural and property management communities - there is currently a system of 'gateways' that building owners have to pass through to access each community, and the practitioners themselves are encouraged very strongly to 'stick to what you know' / 'not exceed competency', (with good reason!), but I have observed that the way data is collected and stored now (in other fields, such as flood data) tends to be less fussy about these distinctions and I suspect the generation of digital natives will, in future, wonder why we’re so snobby. We must explore more fluid ways of working that support the lay person - whether building owner, agent or user, to engage with the data to extend intellectual access to our historic places.’

‘It might be better for the data to be collected at the point where a company is to be dissolved or is disposing of records, to minimise problems with commercial value. It would be easy to gather information like surveys etc. but we tend to make substantial alterations to historic buildings and therefore the initial survey is not terribly informative - the value of our work is in the drawings of the proposed alterations and it is this content which is more difficult to share and distribute for commercial/liability reasons.’

4.2.6. Liability

‘Liability issues if people rely on data in ways and timescales that it was never intended to be relied upon.’

‘Professional Indemnity providers might resist publication of data within the 12 year liability period for architects/engineers.’

4.2.7. Costs of deposition

‘Significant reduction in costs involved as the fees to produce a heritage statement or buildings assessment etc. are often in the region of £1000 so difficult to justify deposition costs of £200-£300 to clients.’

4.2.8. Ease of deposition

‘Rationalization and simplification of the accompanying information required to deposit i.e. form filling!’
5. Telephone Interview Analysis

ADS sought to identify typical workflow practice of professionals working on historic buildings by asking questions about at what point in a project a consultant’s involvement typically commenced, who engaged them and defined the extent of work and what impact the planning process had on their work practice.

5.1. Conservation Professional Work Practice

Mapping typical work practice was challenging because of the number of professional disciplines involved in a typical conservation project, the wide range of contractual arrangements in the project team and the cyclical nature of historic building investigation. Key points of information generation were identified as:

- **Project inception including feasibility study and concept design**
- **The permissions process including planning permission and listed building consent**
- **Additional information required to develop the design and produce tender documentation**
- **Building recording conditioned by consent**
- **Additional opportunities to record information during the construction phase**
- **Facilities Management, use and aftercare**

5.1.1. Project Brief and Concept Design

Many consultants reported a high level of trust established between them and their clients and that they were frequently responsible for defining the extent of their investigatory work at inception. This was particularly true of conservation architects who frequently saw themselves as project leads in the conservation team. Engineers were more often brought into a project team to advice on specific structural issues but one noted that conservation engineers can equally take the lead role when the project concerns historic structures such as historic city walls or railway bridges. Heritage consultants, architectural historians, building archaeologists and conservation specialists were brought into the team with the project lead, usually an architect, defining the scope of their works.

It was clear that all the conservation professionals consulted took this responsibility very seriously and were keen to be involved from as early in project as possible. Several mentioned, without prompting, the pressure to post rationalise intervention decisions already made prior to their appointment and that they resisted taking on such work when possible.

Frustration was expressed about how some funding bodies apply competitive tendering criteria to the detriment of continuity on a project. It was acknowledged that professional’s commitment to a project during early stages ‘wanting the project to go ahead’ often resulted in them doing more work than they were paid for compounding the disappointment of not getting later stages.

“I’m usually the first point of contact for my client, we like to work with a client to work out the extent of investigation required but so much work in the historic field is dependent on Heritage Lottery and quite often they’ve got a certain distance in preparing a project before the architect is appointed which is unfortunate. Sometimes funding bodies have defined our brief but we don’t let that stop us challenging and changing it although it means we occasionally don’t get the job. We’re often involved because we know the client or we’ve done something in the past in doing the feasibility work that leads up to a successful heritage lottery bid’.

-Respondent 323
5.1.2. Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent
Conservation architects reported that although the planning process is a major prompt for investigatory work on historic buildings, it is also an essential tool to help inform the design process when change is proposed. The historic buildings research both for desk based assessments and recording surveys varies widely in format and quality which was not explained by the requirement for proportionality.

5.1.3. Design Development and Detailed Design
All the interviewees were keen to point out that in good practice investigatory work required as part of consent process also informed the design development through the project.

‘I take an interest in the creative side of change and usually insist in being actively involved in that so that there is a direct influence coming from the analytical work I do. I find it very unsatisfactory and generally don’t agree to be drawn in to projects were I’m asked to simply asked to endorse something that has already been designed and is a ‘fait accompli’. It’s much more satisfying if one takes a more ethical stance on it.’

-Respondent 104

By concentrating the research on conservation architects, engineers and surveyors it is likely that both commissioning owners and their consultants were more invested in historic buildings data impacting the design process and it would seem likely that in general practice this is less often the case. Further research would be needed to confirm this.

5.1.4. Conditioned Historic Building Recording
The conservation professionals interviewed reported that they were increasingly coming across conditions to record historic buildings prior to change although it’s still not common. They also sometimes suggested recording to clients themselves as good practice when working on significant structures or buildings.

‘Increasingly I come across conditions to record and often suggest it myself. Planners are getting better and understand the need for recording historic buildings if consent is going to lead to some degree of change. On the whole clients are quite happy about that, I don’t think I’ve ever come across (when I’ve suggested historic building recording) an instance when it’s not been accepted by a client.’

-Respondent 104

5.1.5. Opportunities to Record during Construction, Use and Aftercare
The discovery of information during the adaptive or repair process was often cited but there appears to be no process in place to record and archive information during the construction phase of a project unless a watching brief is placed as a condition of consent. Furthermore, during the ongoing management of historic buildings during repair and maintenance, the capture of such information appears to be wholly dependent on the owner or their facilities management in place. A number of professionals referred to the ‘log books’ required by the Church of England for Parochial Church Councils to keep an active record of historic church fabric and lamented that there was not a similar requirement for all secular listed buildings to maintain a similar document.

‘If architects swop churches we’ll swop files (if we’re talking to each other) and we’ll hand over files with it but there are so many bits of paperwork that a lot of the relevant stuff gets lost in the paperwork. QIs and the church log book would be a very useful thing to have up to date and downloadable but that doesn’t happen and we’re lucky
every five years if we get to see a log book to find out what has gone on. I haven't come across anyone in the secular world maintaining a log book.’

- Respondent 276

5.2. Digital Historic Building Data in the Long-term

Interviewees all reported issuing reports in digital format, as pdf, and many also issue clients a hard copy. A few also mentioned depositing copies with other organisations such as County Archives but this appeared to be individual preference rather than an established procedure. When asked where their information would be in ten years’ time most expressed concern, several responded that they were nearing retirement age and that their own body of work, stored as paper archive, was at risk. The demographic of the respondents meant that many had experienced changes in technology resulting in digital data becoming unreadable and, although none had directly lost professional output as yet, they could foresee their digital output becoming similarly inaccessible.

Digital recording of historical buildings through laser scanning and photogrammetry was appreciated for its speed but it was acknowledged that the process of digitally archiving the resulting digital data was rarely taken into consideration.

‘Rapid development in digital surveying technology and potential obsolescence of equipment, software programs etc. can make it difficult to ensure future access for legacy planning and successors in an HBIM (Historic Building Information Management) approach.’

(Maxwell, 2014)
5.3. Benefits of and Barriers to Deposition

5.3.1. Benefits

All the consultants interviewed used existing sources of online information about historic buildings and could see the advantages for their professional practice of increasing this resource.

‘Clients often don’t understand how one assembles information or the sources of information so when I provide a fee proposal or a definition of what I’m going to be doing, I do set out the tasks that have to be done which typically involve going to local record offices or in certain cases the RIBA library in London which obviously takes time and involves travel. If one could access more online it would be helpful. Most record offices have catalogues but don’t have much information online so you have to allocate a day to go and sit in a library and get one record at a time which is a laborious business.’

Respondent 104

‘The majority of clients understand their custodial responsibility and take it seriously.’

Respondent 104

5.3.2. Barriers

One buildings archaeologist in senior management reported the restriction on the number of digital photographs being one of their primary difficulties with the existing archiving services offered by ADS-easy.

‘I cannot record a small hospital on ADS-easy, there’s not enough scope. It's the limit on photos. The minimum amount of photos my staff managed to get, despite having being told to keep it to a minimum, we thought we could keep it under 500 and the best we could manage was 800. The limits on being able to upload it are quite restrictive and that wasn’t a massive building recording job, it was 3 houses, a couple of wards and a few outbuildings. In comparison to the general hospital in Hereford which is two floors of massive wards and a major historic structure on 5 floors with wings. The limits are quite restrictive for building recording and yet I don’t think because we've got a higher volume of photos that there’s any greater complexity in uploading them. We take a lot more photos for historic building recording.’

Respondent 151

5.4. Awareness of OASIS and ADS

There was little awareness of either the resources available through ADS or archiving tools such as ADS-easy or OASIS. Interviewees were keen to learn more and help spread awareness with suggestions of a conference or articles in publications such as IHBC Context.
6. Local Planning Authority Requests for Information Analysis

It was apparent from the online survey that complying with planning permission and listed building consent validation requirements is a significant driver in commissioning historic building investigation. Telephone interviews and anecdotal evidence suggests that agents, often conservation architects or surveyors, acting on behalf of clients and building owners, are under the erroneous impression that the information that they upload to the public access planning portals is held in the long term.

Our research indicates that there were likely a minimum of 33,600 listed building consent applicators in 2015. Assuming that only some of these result in planning consent, it is clear that vast volumes of information is being generated, either as heritage statements, or more involved investigatory work, but the vast majority of this information is only stored on a temporary basis before being lost.

6.1. The extent of Historic Building information generated to support Planning Applications

Establishing the extent of historic building investigation and recordings associated with these listed building consent applications was more problematic to investigate. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should ‘require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected and record and advance the understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact’.

When asked to quantify the number of applications that included a heritage statement or heritage impact assessment, 132 local planning authorities were able to respond. 46 reported that submission of a heritage statement is a validation requirement for all applications that affect designated heritage assets and an additional 40 reported 95%-100% of applications included a heritage statement. The wide range of responses received from the remaining 46 may be due to differing local terminology for historic building investigations and reports or the practice of sometimes including such information in design and access statements.

When asked how many times a planning advisor or specialist advisor requested supplementary information such as a historic building survey or report during the decision making process, some authorities noted that few are requested because of the thoroughness of the pre-application process which generally results in high quality submissions at application.

6.2. Conditions to Record

In 2015, 101 local planning authorities imposed a total of 247 conditions to record historic buildings and structures. 216 planning authorities do not track their use of recording conditions.

On occasion the loss or significant impact on a designated heritage asset as a result of works can be mitigated by the planning authority imposing a condition to record and advance the understanding of a historic building prior to demolition or alteration works taking place. In the online survey, 101 local planning authorities reported imposing a condition to record in 247 cases in 2015. Unfortunately 216 planning authorities did not record or hold in a searchable format how many times such a condition was placed on an applicant.

6.3. Securing the information in the long term and public accessibility

The NPPF states that the requirement to record and advance understanding of the historic environment includes making the evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. The survey questioned how local authorities ensure that historic building information submitted as part of the listed building consent process or to satisfy a condition is accessible to the public in the long term. Only 19% made reference to
the Historic Environment Record, County Records Office or County Archive. A few local authorities reported that if a heritage statement contained original research or investigation works not already available, heritage officers would consider its submission to the HER or required applicants to submit a copy of any conditioned historic building recording to the HER.

Of the 247 conditions to carry out historic building recording, only 89 included a requirement to archive the digital data resulting from such investigation. It was clear from the more descriptive responses that many local authorities view recording as a measure for ‘preservation by record’ and only applicable in cases when large scale demolition is proposed.

The majority of the 272 local planning authorities who replied to this question rely on the public access planning portal (usually IDOX) alone to both archive and disseminate the historic building information submitted to support planning applications. Comments such as ‘for the foreseeable future’, ‘kept forever’, ‘viewed in perpetuity’, ‘there is no expected end to this information being available’ revealed the perception of this as a long term archive. However, some other local authorities acknowledged that they did not have a process in place to submit to the HER, ‘the council does not currently have the capacity to digitally archive documents’, ‘listed building applications are kept for 3 years’, ‘the information is not archived’, ‘all applications are available on the website however after 6 months a majority of the documents will ‘drop off’ the website’.

More worryingly, in addition to data storage capacity limiting retention of this resource in the future, one local authority was not able to respond to the request for information about any applications in 2015 because:

‘Following a system failure and in the light of new data management systems, it was agreed that only the most urgent reports would be salvaged, and the above reports were not among them.’

Only 7 out of the 272 replies (2.5%) made any reference to OASIS and even fewer mentioned Archaeology Data Service. Most respondents seemed to be unaware that there are existing resources and tools available to help capture and preserve digital historic building information

‘There is no requirement for digital data generated as part of the operation of planning consents to be archived with the Historic Environment record, useful though this would no doubt be. Any new archiving of data would require an additional resource.’

One of the few local authorities who were familiar with the work of ADS noted:

‘In general, a requirement to upload a copy of any Historic Building Recording report to OASIS/ADS is made as part of preservation by record. A specific requirement was made to collect and process the digital data from the Steam Mill in a way suitable for archiving (including full photographic indexes and raw laser scan data). A copy of this data was requested to be sent to the HER and to City Archives once the project is complete. However neither of these places are suitable repositories for long term digital archiving and it is hoped that alternative arrangements are made with ADS.’

By requiring more than deposition of a report in pdf format with an OASIS record, one local authority reported measures were in place to ensured that the raw data would be available for reuse in the future but this was a single response.
‘We only accept digital records in pdf format. Where relevant we also request GIS data and our briefs request that digital data is archived with the Archaeological Data Service (ADS).’

What is clear from the requests for information is that the public access planning portals are not in a searchable format to facilitate wider understanding of building types or periods and require individual analysis of each case and property in order to extract such aggregated information. Specific information about individual buildings may be publically accessible through the public access portals for an undefined period of time, but it would seem probable that much of the evidence gathered is support of applications or to satisfy conditions may be lost and is unlikely to contribute to a wider understanding of our built heritage.

‘Material provided in support of applications is available to view on the council’s website around the time of the application. Material such as this is typically removed after a period of six months, but continues to be held electronically and can be made available in response to specific requests.’
7. Discussion

7.1. Awareness

The online survey and telephone interviews revealed a widespread lack of awareness about the basic issues of longevity and reuse of digital data. Many confused archiving with back-up and failed to differentiate between digitised historic information and digital born data and the opportunities for reuse afforded by archiving to ensure long term accessibility.

There was negligible awareness of ADS or OASIS amongst the majority of professionals that work with historic buildings with only 14% of responders reporting frequent or occasional use of OASIS. Although low this is similar to the 12% of community archaeology groups who report uploading to OASIS (Hedge & Nash, 2016).

7.2. Who commissions vs. who defines the investigation brief

It is clear that professionals are often defining the type and extent of investigative work (Jubb, 2016) and therefore what archiving is appropriate and advising the client accordingly. Although both the planning system and need for information to inform design decisions appear to be the triggers for such work, how and where it is archived is frequently dictated by the knowledge and experience of the originator.

There are two significant occasions when other parties may influence archiving practice:

- **When historic building recording is conditioned as part of consent**
- **When public accessibility to information is required by the funding body**

With a few notable exceptions, it is clear that future reuse and public access to information is not given sufficient consideration, in spite of the requirements in the NPPF for local authorities to ensure it is.

7.3. Attitudes to long-term public access to historic building data

There was concern expressed by all the professionals consulted about long term access to the historic building data they are generating and an apparent appetite to address the issues with advice from digital data specialists. Cost was seen as the major barrier to deposition with professionals looking to their clients to pay this as part of the cost of development (Historic England, 2015). However, unlike below ground recording, clients with historic property are often already dealing with higher project expenditure due to the cost of more traditional materials and specialist conservation techniques and a ‘polluter pays’ strategy may just add to conservation deficit and undermine sustainable futures for built heritage.

There were more complex issues raised about open public access with intellectual property rights, clients’ privacy and security all seen as potential barriers. It is unclear from this research how providers of the professional indemnity insurance required by all practitioners would respond to their consultants’ work output being in the public realm although it should be noted that the public access planning portal already makes much of this information public during and following the application process.

Despite recommendations from Historic England regarding the digital archiving of data, dissemination and signposting in the re-issue of ‘Understanding Historic Buildings’ (Historic England, 2016) it would appear professionals are still referring more to the 2006 issue which defined the level of recording.

7.4. Public Access Planning Portal Systems

The submission of data online to support listed building consent applications and to satisfy conditions of consent has revolutionised public access to individual property data. However, it is clear that this does not facilitate thematic research and understanding of building types and periods as a whole. At present information can only be interrogated by location but wider analysis and interpretation of plan types or historic methods of construction are not searchable. Digital archiving of the data with building-specific
metadata would enhance this existing resource, to create an extensive, publicly accessible repository for non-commercial reuse in a large part funded by building owners who commission the work.

Of some concern are the perceptions of longevity and security of data submitted through the planning portal. It is clear from the responses to the local planning authority requests for information that this cannot be taken for granted.

It was beyond the scope of this project to research how the challenges of digital archiving of data on the built environment are being approached by other institutions but useful to acknowledge that there is global interest and emerging research in the subject. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology commissioned the FAÇADE project (Smith, 2009) on the preservation of digital architectural files on current design projects and the Royal Institute of British Architects held a conference in 2013 titled ‘Archiving the Digital’ (RIBA, 2013) followed up with a recent initiative to form a digital data forum. The Cyark initiative, a non-profit organisation based in Oakland, California has a global team of partners with the aim of creating a 3-D online library of the world’s cultural heritage sites (Cyark, 2014). The data is disseminated in a readily accessible format and free and open for all to access but is limited to 3D point clouds of laser surveys of monuments, and data is presented to facilitate wider understanding and education rather than to permit reuse.
8. Conclusions

The majority of buildings investigations are commissioned by the owner and undertaken as part of the planning process. Reports are generally produced in soft copy, but are often supplied to clients in hard copy. Whilst we found there was wide awareness of the value of Open Data and a broad perception that it would benefit professional practice, there is no evidence for any systematic approach to archiving, and in most cases there is no consideration to the long-term preservation of data and reports. Nonetheless, the more information that is made freely available would, it was widely agreed, greatly facilitate improvement in conservation knowledge and, thereby, skills in practice.

However, the majority of those working in the sector showed little or no awareness of ADS and OASIS, and few made any use of either resource. Many were keen to see more digital archiving taking place, and proposed the need for greater awareness, and for making the process obligatory through planning permission or funding requirements. However, issues of coordination, cost, validation of content, confidentiality, commercial interest and intellectual property rights were all raised as concerns.

The submission of data online to support listed building consent applications and to satisfy conditions of consent has revolutionised public access to individual property data. However, it is clear that this does not facilitate thematic research and understanding of building types and periods as a whole. At present information can only be interrogated by location but wider analysis and interpretation of plan types or historic methods of construction are not searchable. Digital archiving of the data with building specific metadata would enhance this existing resource, creating an extensive publicly accessible repository for non-commercial reuse, funded by building owners who commission the work.

It is clear, as a result of our survey, that there is an appetite for making reports available online, and for archiving both reports and survey data. However, there is also clearly a need for much more awareness-raising activity and liaison with the key professional groups to bring about a sea change in both policy and practice. Some of this work can be undertaken as part of the roll-out of the new OASIS Buildings form and ADS-Easy, but it will require significant investment in promotion and training.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 Historic Buildings: Preserving digital imagery, survey data and reports

Q1.1 Thank-you for agreeing to help us with our research. Our aim is to find out how historic building conservation professionals access and archive unpublished digital data and how this could be improved to assist your work. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes, you can use the back button to revise answers. If you need to come back to complete the survey at a later date your answers will be saved and can be accessed through the original invitation link. All answers including comments will be anonymised in reports and a summary of the research results will be available on the Archaeology Data Service website http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/.

Q1.2 What is your primary discipline or interest in historic buildings?
- Architect (1)
- Project Manager (2)
- Building Surveyor (3)
- Structural Engineer (4)
- Buildings Archaeologist (5)
- Architectural Historian (6)
- Heritage Consultant (7)
- Town Planner (8)
- Conservation Officer (9)
- Owner (10)
- Facilities Manager (11)
- Contractor (12)
- Other (please specify) (13) ____________________

Q1.3 What professional affiliations do you currently have? Please tick all that apply.
- RIBA (1)
- AABC (2)
- RICS (3)
- ICE/IStructE (4)
- CARE (5)
- CIIfA (6)
- IHBC (7)
- RTPI (8)
- CIAT (9)
- CIOB (10)
- BFIM (11)
- Other (please specify) (12) ____________________
Q1.4 Please select the description that best describes the organisation you work for.

- Sole practitioner (1)
- Small local consultancy (2)
- Medium regional consultancy (3)
- Large multi-disciplinary consultancy (4)
- Specialist investigation provider (5)
- Not for profit organisation (6)
- Contractor (7)
- Owner or owner representative (8)
- Local government (9)
- Other (please specify) (10) ____________________

Q1.5 Please identify the regions where your projects have been located in the last two years. Please tick all that apply.

- London (1)
- East Midlands (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland) (2)
- East of England (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk) (3)
- North East (County Durham, Northumberland, Tees Valley, Tyne and Wear) (4)
- North West (Cheshire, Cumbria, Greater Manchester, Lancashire, Merseyside) (5)
- South East (Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, East Sussex, Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Kent, Oxfordshire, Surrey, West Sussex) (6)
- South West (Bristol, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Somerset, Wiltshire) (7)
- West Midlands (Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, West Midlands, Worcestershire) (8)
- Yorkshire (East Riding of Yorkshire, North Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire) (9)
- Scotland (10)
- Wales (11)
Q2.1 Thank-you for telling us a little about yourself, the next few questions will ask questions about your work with historic buildings.

Q2.2 What sort of historic buildings data or information do you generate as part of your professional role? Please tick all that apply.
- Desk Based Assessment (14)
- Assessment of Significance/Statement of Significance (13)
- Measured Survey (2)
- Condition Surveys/Periodic Inspections/Property Reports (3)
- Structural Survey (15)
- Photographic Survey (4)
- Rectified Photography (5)
- Laser Scanning (6)
- Photogrammetric Survey (7)
- Specialist Materials Analysis eg Dendrochronology or Paint Analysis (8)
- Heritage Statement/Heritage Impact Assessment (1)
- Conservation Management Plan (9)
- Schedule of Work/Specifications/Drawings for repair or adaptation (10)
- As-Built/Estates or Facilities Management Records (11)
- Other (please specify) (12) ____________________

Answer If What sort of historic buildings data or information do you generate as part of your professional... Specialist Materials Analysis eg Dendrochronological Survey or Paint Analysis Is Selected

Q2.3 What range of specialist materials analysis do you carry out or record? Please tick all that apply.
- Dendrochronology (1)
- Paint (2)
- Mortar (3)
- Other (please specify) (4) ____________________
Q2.4 Who most frequently commissions or instructs the work?
- **Client/Building Owner (1)**
- **Local Authority Planning or Conservation Officers (2)**
- **Amenity Society e.g. SPAB, the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, 20th Century Society (3)**
- **Funding Body e.g. Heritage Lottery Fund, Historic England (4)**
- **Researcher for academic or personal interest (5)**
- **Another member of the conservation project team e.g. architect, surveyor, project manager (6)**
- **Other (please specify) (7) ____________________**

Q2.5 Who writes the briefs, scopes of work, written schemes of investigation or defines the level of investigation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usually (1)</th>
<th>Sometimes (2)</th>
<th>Rarely (3)</th>
<th>Never (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client/Building Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning or Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. SPAB, the Georgian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, the Victorian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society, 20th Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. HLF, Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for academic or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal interest (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another member of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team e.g. architect,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveyor, project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) ____________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 For whom, or for what purpose, is the data and/or reports you produce used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequently (1)</th>
<th>Occasionally (2)</th>
<th>Never (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building Consent or Planning Application submission (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform conservation decisions by the owners/occupiers/developers (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assist other work by the conservation team e.g. Architects, Engineers, Planners (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help with funding applications (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.1 Where is the data or report you generate kept after issue? Please tick all that apply.
- Hard-copy with the building owner/client (1)
- Digitally with the building owner/client (2)
- Historic Environment Record (3)
- Academic Institution (4)
- Hard-copy with an archive or County Records Office (5)
- Other (please specify) (6) ____________________
- It is not archived to my knowledge (7)

Q3.2 Where will your data be available in ten years' time?

Q3.3 Local Authorities are working to make information about the historic environment accessible to everyone.

Q3.4 Please describe briefly if you have experience of initiatives that have enabled better public understanding of historic buildings through your work.

Q3.5 In respect to your professional role, what information or resources about historic buildings would you like to be able to access in the future?

Q3.6 To what extent do you think free and open access to historic building information could impact on your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Agree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would reduce costs (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would improve the quality of our work (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would enable us to respond to our clients' needs more quickly (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3.7 Do you see any of the following as barriers to you making your historic building reports and data freely available online? Please click and drag to indicate the level of importance.

______ I do not think my client would agree to information being made available online (1)
______ I would be worried about tackling intellectual property rights with my client (3)
______ I would not have skills necessary to prepare data for deposition (4)
______ I do not think I can convince my client to cover the cost of archiving (NB data only, reports are free). (5)
______ I would not have time/capacity to prepare data for deposition (6)
______ My competitors could access reports and data (7)
______ Other (please specify) (19)
______ Other (please specify) (20)

Q3.8 Do you have any comments regarding depositing your reports or data online?

Q3.9 Can you identify how important the following benefits would be to you in making your historic building reports and data available online with the Archaeology Data Service? Please click and drag to indicate the level of importance.

______ I would be able to gain commercial advantage through demonstration of my professional work (1)
______ I would be able to demonstrate good practice in terms of making a contribution to the historic buildings community (2)
______ I would have a secure, long term and future proof archive of my work (7)
______ I would be providing accessibility to the information for my clients, project team and the public (4)
______ Other (please specify) (5)
______ Other (please specify) (6)

Q4.1 Thank-you for telling us about your professional work and archiving practice. Finally we would like to find out more about whether you’re familiar with our systems and resources.

Q4.2 Have you used the Archaeology Data Service website to access information online about built heritage?
   - Never (1)
   - Sometimes (2)
   - Often (3)

Q4.3 If you were told that there are over 3000 reports in the Library of Unpublished Fieldwork Reports relating to historic buildings and structures on the Archaeology Data Service website http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/greylit/, would you be surprised?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)
Q4.4 What other online sources of historic buildings information do you use in your professional role? Please tick all that apply
- [ ] Historic England (1)
- [ ] Historic Environment Record (2)
- [ ] Heritage Gateway (3)
- [ ] PastScape (4)
- [ ] Church Heritage Record (5)
- [ ] British History On-line (6)
- [ ] British Listed Buildings (7)
- [ ] National Heritage List for England (8)
- [ ] Images of England (9)
- [ ] Other (please specify) (10) ____________________

Q4.5 Can you tell us what you understand about OASIS?
- [ ] I am familiar with it and use it regularly (1)
- [ ] I am aware of OASIS and have used it occasionally (2)
- [ ] I am aware of OASIS but have never used it (3)
- [ ] I have never heard of it (4)

Answer If: Can you tell us what you understand about OASIS? I am familiar with it and use it regularly Is Selected Or Can you tell us what you understand about OASIS? I am aware of OASIS and have used it occasionally Is Selected

Q4.6 Can you tell us briefly what your experience of using OASIS has been?

Answer If: Can you tell us what you understand about OASIS? I am aware of OASIS but have never used it Is Selected Or Can you tell us what you understand about OASIS? I have never heard of it Is Selected

Q4.7 If you have not heard of or ever used OASIS http://oasis.ac.uk, would you be willing to help us test our new training material? If so please give us your contact information.

- Contact Name (1)
- Organisation (2)
- Telephone Number (3)
- Email (4)

Q4.8 Have you had experience of depositing information or data to a trusted, standards compliant digital archive?
- [ ] Yes (1)
- [ ] No (2)

Answer If: Have you uploaded any data to a digital archive? Yes Is Selected

Q4.9 Would you tell us which digital archives you’ve deposited data with in the past?
- [ ] Archaeology Data Service through ADS-easy (1)
- [ ] Archaeology Data Service through traditional deposition (e.g. CD, USB) (5)
- [ ] A report or images attached to an OASIS report (2)
- [ ] Other (please specify) (3) ____________________
- [ ] Other (please specify) (4) ____________________
Q4.10 What has been your experience of using ADS-easy?

Q4.11 What has been your experience of attaching reports and images to an OASIS record?

Q4.12 The Archaeology Data Service has been enabling the archaeological community to share data for reuse for 20 years. There are significant economic and research benefits for commercial and non-commercial practitioners alike, and we would like to see this benefit realised for the historic buildings community. What do you think would need to happen for this to come about?

Q4.13 If you have any questions about this survey or require any further information about the Archaeology Data Service please contact us at research@archaeologydataservice.ac.uk

Q4.14 Thank-you for your contribution to this research on the work and archiving practice of conservation professionals. If you are aware of any events where we could present further information or offer training, please complete the form below.

   Contact Name (1)
   Organisation (2)
   Telephone number (3)
   Email (4)
   Comments (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1_6_ Q3.1 Where is the data or report you generate kept after issue? List of ‘Other (please specify)’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digital copy with tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy of written documents with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself; LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our archives store the data confidentially for 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard and digital file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In house office archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own file storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our own records, for twelve years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE records and files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On file in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTAC records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in our office and church surveys are kept by the DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our our own archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own office archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital on company archive server and posted onto on line library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digitally with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitally in our office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic by LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our own company project files for upto 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our own digital project archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digitally in our archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On file in practice archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitally on our own archive server and often hard copy in our files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our own archive/filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On our server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally with the HER but only if requested in a brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On own hard drive archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company archives (digital)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3.4 Please describe briefly if you have experience of initiatives that have enabled better public understanding of historic buildings through your work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLF Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public open days on projects always seem to be popular. Normally these are trade based, ie carpenters or masons, but now and again the designers, architects, engineers explain the design process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work has sometimes facilitated HLF funded projects which have an important objective of increasing understanding of historic buildings. It has also informed decision making concerning proposals affecting heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work through public consultations and work on projects designed to articulate the history of a building or place; such as museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of the planning portal has been very interesting. We are now getting enquiries from people who search the council databases and find our details on line. Effectively the Portal is acting as a window into our working practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopefully most of my work enables better understanding of historic buildings. Of late I have been involved in a number of community archaeology projects with the Archaeological Practise of Newcastle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my experience is related to interpretive projects: re-interpretation of the visitor experience - the way in which public move through historic buildings and structures, and how they understand their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through HLF projects where heritage skills have been shared through training days and seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our work in EH and HLF-funded grant projects invariably expands the information available on buildings and facilitates its availability - usually as a condition of grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://map.cornwall.gov.uk/website/ccmap/?zoomlevel=10&amp;xcoord=165516&amp;ycoord=27575&amp;maptype=basemap&amp;wsName=ccmap&amp;layerName=Listed%20buildings">http://map.cornwall.gov.uk/website/ccmap/?zoomlevel=10&amp;xcoord=165516&amp;ycoord=27575&amp;maptype=basemap&amp;wsName=ccmap&amp;layerName=Listed%20buildings</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council Interactive mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have prepared boards for public display on the structural aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly all Listing Descriptions are by architects or surveyors. Engineers can often understand the development over time when carrying out an inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have set up databases that are publicly available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience working as a commercial buildings archaeologist usually means that time and resource are limited especially relating to built heritage. Everybody still thinks archaeology means below ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England’s own conservation/building projects usually have information boards on display during the works as well as their permanent information boards when the works are completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though reports can be written to better understand buildings, frequently this is not what the client or architect wants as they are often only concerned with degrading the monument and expect a report to be written to justify their plans. The report should be independent and thus the process becomes very abrasive. When plans are passed there is not always a standard and what is done is often a process of distroying the heritage asset. I believe that architects and building contractors should be passed to be on a list to work on historic buildings as many of them do not know what they are doing and couldn't really care.

Principle author of www.understandingconservation.org, co-author of Vol 5 of technologies of architecture, History, Performance and Conservation. Taylor and Francis 2008. Author of various articles etc. Co-author with Professor P. F. G. Banfill and Ingval Maxwell of paper on the use of the website understandingconservation.org as an educational facility. Various analytical studies of professional accreditation schemes; contributor to the Edinburgh Group, etc etc. Member of the CIAT conservation panel.

HLF work with Pershore Abbey for a visitor user interface that was recorded digitally. HLF at Hereford Cathedral with roof level visitor access to view the works and see bryophytes being conserved.

Much HLF funding for repairs and alterations to historic buildings is dependent on the inclusion of elements to improve the public understanding of that building.

We have advised Clients on measures to improve access and interpretation of historic buildings. We have designed glazed lobbies for church buildings that allow the public to gain a view of the interior when the church is not open.

Digitisation of historic environment records but then hampered if restricted to non-commercial uses.

I have carried out detailed research into the architectural history of a local country house where I am a tour guide, and I feed some of this information into my tours and the public interpretation.

HLF project where research was presented for public consultation.

Archaeology Data Service.

I can’t think of any, I find that there is generally a low level of knowledge about historic buildings, even amongst their owners.

No I am not aware of any.

we have been asked to produce information used to explain projects to the general public.

Each HLF project includes an element of interpretation as part of the proposals. However this does not extend to holding records.

I assist the buildings team in depositing their records and reports with museums etc

N/A

One project we worked on set up a website where all the project data was made available for viewing.

Information provided for display along side working sites to keep the public informed. Articles etc. about completed projects.

Yes continually both through my work and the work of others.

Not as part of a Local Authority project, only as part of a Client / HLF project.

We have produced Listed Building Management Guidelines documents for local authorities and institutional clients, which have been subject to wide consultation and thereafter adopted as SPD’s.

We have held public open days when preparing Conservation management plans, these have had varying degrees of success.

I have recently written a condition survey and outline schedule of works for a WWII Pill Box. Part of the Local Authorities conditions were for the Pill Box to be more accessible to the public. I recommended the provision of an informative notice board about the Pill Box be installed utilising the information I had.
provided on the history of the Pill Box. A bat box had already been installed within the pill box making access internally not feasible.

National Trust and similar bodies public engagement initiatives.
None

Bristol City Council Know Your Place database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided on the history of the Pill Box. A bat box had already been installed within the pill box making access internally not feasible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Trust and similar bodies public engagement initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol City Council Know Your Place database.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLF funded church projects where research disseminated to local community &amp; parish.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLF funded projects frequently have this aspiration, delivery is facilitated by our work but others (interpretation, display and exhibition consultants as well as the building owner/operator) have more responsibility for this aspect of the project outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally, particularly with museums or HLF funded church or park projects (if client interested or funder requires it).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My work with Archaeologists has included the preparation of formal reports that are typically published. In the past and as part of a project where archaeological investigation has been undertaken I have specified the inclusion of a published report of the findings. This has only ever been delivered where the grant aid funding stream has allowed for it. The cost of repair of historic fabric has always been prioritised over the public reporting of findings. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As part of HLF funding for churches, for example, we are required to carry out participation projects to involve and engage the wider public. These take the form of hard hat tours, talks, and schools projects and they raise awareness of the issues involved in conserving and maintaining an historic building.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much of our work is HLF or other public funding body and therefore include public participation, interpretation, activities and engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER is used by some building owners. Occasional talks to interested groups or school parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultations and consultations with amenity groups / interested individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity plans as part of HLF funding to provide greater public access and experience of buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement with large HLF funded project where public engagement was an integral part of the project, though not sure how much of it rubbed off.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes - frequently buildings in the ownership of local authorities, churches, or private ownership fall into disrepair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The only way to get things moving is to identify a sustainable use, prepare a conservation plan, and apply for grants from organisations like the HLF or LPOW roof repair fund.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication of survey drawings and assessments on Glastonbury Abbey website and on ADS data base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digitising of quinquennial survey reports on parish churches.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in this context, though often elements of my work might be used to produce a leaflet or other 'advert' for a group who are fundraising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See <a href="http://www.cyark.org">www.cyark.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Management Plans are made accessible to the public. All information submitted in support of Planning and Listed Building Consent applications are accessible to the public through online planning search websites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much work is Heritage Lottery Funded where interpretation is normally a key aspect of project funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had little or no experience of this initiative in the areas I work. The information I often see prepared by other architects/draftsmen/surveyors is often woefully inadequate to determine historical significance and yet the lpa's appear to have little power to require applicant's to prepare proper information. Equally, I know of certain authorities who treat listed building applications as a means of using the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
applicant’s money to produce ‘vanity documents’ in the form of irrelevant archaeological reports and building investigations, well beyond what is appropriate. Surely there should be a happy medium between these two positions?

Often access online planning portals for past applications which may include design and access/heritage statements

Information boards up on site hoarding.

Interpretation board for visitors to finished project.

Website for project

We are constantly writing heritage statements and commissioning specialist reports on elements of buildings. These are then locally made available to the PCC representatives.

I have worked with Historic England on projects looking at defining the heritage interest of police stations, fire stations, ambulance stations, and water management assets where the ultimate outcome of the report is to increase knowledge and feed into publically available documents.

We produced an interpretation window/board on a listed building.

No initiatives with that specific intent, but my reports linked to Planning Applications become available on the Heritage Gateway and I hope increase the understanding of specific buildings. I have written guided tours of historic towns and, as a by-product of assisting the conversion of one Listed building to a celebrity restaurant, I have voluntarily written a short guide for the interest of customers! I have also given public talks on schemes and buildings which widen their appreciation.

Q3.5 In respect to your professional role, what information or resources about historic buildings would you like to be able to access in the future?

More co-ordinated mapping systems both for current and historic mapping. OS partners are generally chaotic in their approach - all different and not always easy to get information. Historic mapping needs a central resource to identify all mapping available.

Better access to national archive records, rather than just references to records held in regional archive sources - this will happen as more records are digitised.

Known archaeological surveys, known historical analysis reports publicly available.

Technologies and fashions of the time and a catalogue of projects carried out by the original design teams that may help with understanding the fabric you may be dealing with especially if opening up is difficult.

online access to public records and heritage statements

Digital plans, scans and models

Any relevant archives or research relating to historic buildings, including work done in relation to the planning system.

There is a national database of EPC ratings (energy assessments) for domestic properties which operates quite well https://www.epcregister.com/. I’d be interested to see if this system can be adapted for Heritage Statements, Statements of Significance, and possibly even Heritage Asset Condition reports - I think this would bring the existing body of work prepared in planning applications and listed building consents to a much wider audience (of property owners and non-academic researchers).

Anything that records previous intervention, copies of consents and working drawings, environmental reports and conservation officer comments would be most helpful.

More interlinked historic resources - from national and local archives; i.e. if researching a building in one archive it would be useful to know of other archives information is also based with links through to that resource.

Historic data

Previous planning listed building consent and B regs applications and other reports held by the LA but
often archived.

Too broad a question to answer in a few lines! Any previously-produced accounts of buildings/ historical sources etc etc

Easier public access to heritage statements and CMPs. And - on a separate matter - I would like to see these become the depository in which energy strategies are planned for long-term enhancement of performance, so reference can be made back to stage improvements.

Drawings, records of previous work, specifications and photographs would all be extremely useful to access digitally.

Repair history

? Historic records - plans, title deeds, photographic records, previous reports

Records office documents

Getting hold of even Royal Commission inspections can be difficult.

Guidance documents, technical information.

Historical archives in photographs, drawings, authorisation documents

We search record office and other archives for mapping and occupancy details. With travel and time constraints these searches are fraught with various levels of response from record offices etc. I would like to see more mapping, aerial photographs and other documentary resources available on-line. If not on-line, then a better understanding from record office staff of the pressures we face

The general history of a building, including its uses, any famous or important occupants, any alterations and extensions, any hidden archaeology, or any specific historic/important features. The planning history would also be helpful.

The equivalent of a 'log book' type of resource (lodged with the local authority perhaps?) which collates the available records and continues the record.

Many and various but, primarily, internet based.

The original digital survey record as well as the as built digital drawings produced from them, the scheme drawings would be a nice to have too. Record photographs and contract meeting minutes would also be good as well as a record of educational gains made through visitor interaction during the project.

'As built' record plans, specifications & photographs of work which has previously been carried out to the building.

Archaeological records; statements of significance; historical records of building alterations or changes

It is helpful if Diocesan archives are available to view. We have not ourselves accessed these, but sometimes our Clients have.

One concern about making information widely available is that it can be used as a directory for the theft of historic artefacts. Perhaps there should be a risk assessment for each location.

A simpler HERs search with less complication.

Openly accessible digital historic map data, Ordnance Survey and earlier. More HER digital images online.

I would like more archival information to be available on-line as this will cut my costs. There have been occasions where relevant material has turned up in places some distance away, often where it is not possible for me to travel there. To pay an archivist to conduct a search is not the same as looking at the material yourself.

All record information, photos, listing statements etc.

More collaborative action by heritage groups to enable easier access to historic records

I advise clients that a measured survey of a building is a very useful tool for planning and managing the care of a building, but doubt that they will take care of the information. They often find hard copies easier to look after, and I am concerned that Cad files, which are most useful, may easily become inaccessible as technology changes. We try to be helpful in passing information on to other professionals but have had
bad experiences, when it has been misused.

What would be really helpful would be a database on the lines of the British Geological Survey's borehole record, which is very good.

A single point of access for a property - for example a simple search engine where you input the address and it gives the status (listed, in a conservation area etc) and then allow access to previous studies or local history articles, archives, planning records and building control records. At present this information is scattered.

It would be helpful if one were able to access reports, specifications and drawings of works carried out to buildings in the past which one was working on. O and M Manuals should be available but often are not. Log books for churches are encouraged but are often only very general and are not specific.

It would be very useful to access the details of any building recording which whilst is asked for as part of the planning approval is not stored with this information.

Full on line library of reprots

HER and HMR on-line

Statements of significance and historical backgrounds

The whole issue of works to listed buildings needs to be revamped in terms of keeping them in good condition. It is too bureaucratic as well as subjective when considering the needs of repairing them. If it was made simpler so that any works of replacement and/or repair could be deemed allowed with the proviso that full photographic evidence was supplied to the local authority and that only traditional materials and methods were used then this would free up time to actually get on with the work. This is how it once was achieved when conservation professionals actually had some knowledge of the building works involved. Of course, there needs to be more effort put into training the professionals of tomorrow as a whole raft of individuals who understand the complexities of these buildings will soon all have finished their professional lives.

Any previous drawings or reports. As much information as possible.

I am very concerned about the digital age and the possibility of loss of material that relates to historic buildings and would welcome a more centralised archiving system available online.

Having experience of working with Archaeologists and Archivists and finding it very useful and in many cases essential, it would be brilliant to have the same standard and amount of resources for all projects.

List entries; photographic records; contemporary published accounts

Evidence of previous reports, drawings etc to save time and money for the Clients if the original records can be used and updated.

The history of the building; details of repairs, maintenance and alterations carried out; any photographic records; copies of any detailed reports carried out or measured surveys.

photos, reports, newspaper/web articles

Records of all historic buildings, developments and changes over the years.

Historic condition reports and surveys of building fabric.

Drawings and specification documents from previous phases of repair.

Archaeological and historic reports.

A database recording sources of information, articles, dissertations, published and unpublished material would be useful. Often knowing what is available and/or where to look is critical to access and timing of research.

HER records should be fully digitised and available online.
Pre app notes and report memos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All historic and archive information. Map regression. Needs to be accessible and indexed/keyworded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have worked as a consultant for Historic England (English Heritage) who have the ability to provide detailed packages of drawing and data on each asset. The package can include details of past works and investigations. I am aware of the broad information that is held by Historic England. Much of the findings of past works is transferred into technical notes. A directory of centralised records for all historic buildings would be ideal although I expect it would be fanciful.

Specific information that would be helpful:

- Technical details on material types, source, performance, typical defects, repair methods...

- Records of repairs to listed buildings including churches and cathedrals.

- Archaeological records and reports

- Measured / digital survey data (ownership, stewardship and commercial issues will always serve as an obstacle to this)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawings and photographic records, particularly of repair projects. In assessing problems with buildings, one of the main issues is the lack of good records of works carried out in the past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All our work relies heavily on Conservation Planning principles, and we would always want to ensure that such research remains available and kept up to date.

Secondarily, the importance of as-constructed records and specifications of past interventions are of great value.

Consistent QIR reports are always useful.

Data on M&E installations are vital.

Knowledge of previous archaeological interventions and/or research is often of great value.

Previous repair information

Performance information / embodied carbon information to balance against shortfalls perceived in historic buildings in terms of performance.

3D mapping, historic maps/plans, CMPs

Information on the extent and nature of repairs carried out previously (eg copies of specifications and photographic records)

Things like tithe maps, though the trend seems to be towards allowing private companies to digitise public information and charge for access (Tithe maps are a good example). This is notwithstanding the excellent work of some local authorities in cataloguing their archives, e.g. Surrey and Bedfordshire. That said, I tend to go to primary sources as (a) digital copies have their limitations and (b) it is often surprising how much gets changed in the transfer.

A potted history of every listed building in the country would be very useful - the official listing descriptions are of limited use, and very cumbersome to read.

The above sources fed into by others.

It would be particularly useful to be able to access plans of buildings readily and with no charge. Churchplansonline used to be a wonderful resource, and saved churches much money in getting new surveys drawn up, but the website has recently been taken down and does not seem to be going to come
back which is a great pity.

Historic photos are also especially useful.

Written work is less useful from my perspective, though still interesting.

A complete survey and building manual/job record analogous to a Car Service Manual and Owners Handbook

See http://www.mwnb.nl/home?taal=en-GB

Full documented history of the buildings and drawings showing the development of the buildings.

Used to use the 'Church Plans Online' website frequently but now offline. I've had to personally access Diocesan archives and Local Records Offices for information, but having access to information online aids/speeds research. I've also used online resources for old Ordnance Survey maps, aerial photography (Britain from Above) and general photographs (picturethepast.org.uk) to aid research.

Photographic records of listed buildings/monuments (like those at imagesofengland.co.uk). More regularly updated listing documents, possibly including source material upon which the assumptions have been made. Most listing text would not meet even basic criteria for scientific referencing. Opinions have thier place but I find the assumptions are often wrong. Where factual evidence is available it should be clearly expressed to save future historians time in researching matters already covered formerly.

Earlier drawings or adaption schemes

All information needs to be site/building specific and should be sectioned into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of the site/building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent works and proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning application history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports

Historic research

Digital survey information

As built information after project completed

Services information

Accurate digital measured surveys are always useful. Access to original archive documents rather than digital scans is often more revealing.

We frequently see the English Heritage have survey targets on their buildings but are unable to produce digital or hard copy drawings where surveys are known to have been carried out.

As much information as possible and copies of all past reports.

A range of free on-line OS maps of good quality ie. 1:500 and 1:2500 scales and on-line versions of VCH for every county

Photographs, measured surveys, reports on repairs.

Historic building recording reports; select photographs; searchable database with details of period/architecture/architect/builder/location/function
Types of construction and date in timber framed buildings

As built or surveyed engineering drawing records and details of material and any modifications made

If I do my job well it will not be visible. That can be a problem for a future engineer who sees a bulging wall and assumes it has not been repaired in the past. Access to good records of what has been done in the past is invaluable. I have long advocated that records of all work on listed buildings should be held in an independent archive from which we can archive it.

On many occasions client's CDM records are lost making matters worse.

The access to digital archives is improving all the time. I would prefer to have more direct access to the Historic England archives and to those HER County Archives which are still only accessible through the County Archaeologists at a fee! And there is still a huge need to have a country-wide data base of student theses and dissertations etc, which can often hold useful material. I have been pressing for that since the 1970's, at Kings Manor, but it still seems a long way off!

Q 3.2 Where will your data be available in ten years' time?

Own IT system

On our electronic database, and hard copy archive.
digital copy with tpa
Clients records only.
Projects where an archaeologist is appointed details are archived with County Records Office.
All our data is digitally archived on our servers.
Historic England archive
HER, LPA

In some cases where we store the data for contracts signed as deeds (rather than under hand) or for attachment to leases, this will be available for up to 12 years, subject to our terms of contract. Public interest disclosure would be possible, as would disclosure with the client's consent (which I think could not be unreasonably with-held). We encourage clients to make a HER deposit of data which we believe may enhance the public's enjoyment and understand of historic environments, but many items have to be reedited and this has caused issues (redaction can be a costly and risky undertaking for which there is little appetite amongst practitioners, clients or archivists). Moreover, the formats and resources for making HER deposits are neither uniform nor user-friendly, so materials are seldom deposited. Finally, the practice of charging for HER consults causes some disapproval amongst clients, who wonder why data which has been acquired for free, in the public interest, should be charged-for during normal enquiries - clients who have been charged for HER searches tend to then resist making deposits. Most people we encounter are sympathetic to the resourcing issue but find the business case poorly thought-through, and the management of records to be inconsistent. I'd suggest a much better-resourced digital-only central archive, with sift of deposit materials by voluntary groups, and revenue funding by HLF to act as a national historic environment learning and outreach centre. Oh, and please not in the South again ...

Back up storage and hard file copy.

Stored in company archive both electronically and in hard copy
In house office digital archive (only guarantee we can provide)

Potentially - client archive, local authority archive

Hard copies probably destroyed unless Clients retain. A digital copy is likely to be kept

By law we have to keep records of all of our report. We store data as hard copies and in digital format. The digital format is usually images and this is out biggest concern as data on archive discs even gold disks is subject to corruption over time.

Some on OASIS
With clients

with personal archive

Quite possibly in our own archive, but not guaranteed.
With the client and also our files.

HE records and files

Where will any of us be in 10 years....... 

Some probably available via this office, some held by Church PCC on their log book system and similarly at the DAC.

The Local Authority digitize some of the information and make available on line so some may remain accessible via this route?

don't know

Building owner and / or our archives

Stored as pdf on the office system

Similar database.

In our office archive, on disk

I do not know.

digitally by us

Our own digital archive; cannot speak for the other interested parties.

Historic Environment Record or Oasis

From COTAC archives

External USB drives and HiDrive in the cloud

Office & building’s owner.

In my digital files and copies on client files

Church surveys and details for grant of faculty will be retained by the DAC or other diocesan archive. We will keep information for 20 years. Or client’s archiving practices vary.

With building owner/client and/or architect and/or other professional advisors if retained after six year liability period.

With the building owners, clients, local authorities and other architectural professionals with whom I have worked. I have also used some of my data to help university students. Then of course I retain copies of everything myself.

Probably only with the building owner, we are not likely to be practising in ten years time. In recent years we have once submitted a copy of a report to the County Records office, this happened when the office had been helpful in providing archive photographs free of charge.

My own digital archive

I would like to say yes but with changing formats of CAD etc it may not be the case. We have projects 15 years old for which we no longer can read the electronic data.

As a 60 year old practice with a large archive we would expect to hold current data electronically. We check regularly we can open earlier electronic data

hopefully all the above places

Office records

I presume local authorities will retain in digitally. As for us, we are likely to be retired but old photographs as well as digital ones will be kept and retained for as long as possible.

Within our office archive and if kept by the clients within theirs

With my practice
Within Archives

With the commissioning client and in our own servers

Records are held for 6 years in both digital and hard copy, after that date it depends on the storage space we have.

Within my companies records

Digital record copies taken and kept in the office

Generally a concern.

In storage if contract carried under deed

Own archive

archived on hard drives

Digitally in my records.

Digitally with the Client.

Digitally with the Local Authority where Planning/ Listed Building applications have been made

Client & HER databases, Church Heritage Record, own database, Planning & LBC database of LPA.

Yes - all data preserved electronically as part of my own records

With owner/client and my own records

Council Archives and owners personal records.

Varies. With Faculty/church records, archived by LPA (perhaps), archived by client (perhaps), sometimes by County Records Office/Archives, possibly by client, particularly if church or Museums Service.

We keep an electronic copy, in original file format (typically Pages for Mac) and as pdf.

In theory of building works in CDM file for building, which should be retained with the building (but often is not).

If our appointment requires we will hold an archive copy for 12 years. This will most probably be off site. After this time it is usually disposed of.

with the building owner in their Health and Safety File

We archive on project closure; using pdfA format. Digital Scans (cloudpoints) are generally retained by the survey company; however we don’t currently require them to hold this data (and curate it to ensure it remains legible to future software versions) for any period of time

Some hard copies or digital files with building owners

digitally in our archive and paper archive

Historic Environment Record and with the Building Owner

If past experience is anything to go by, forgotten. Clients have short memories (including those who know better) and I cannot see archives and records being much of a priority in the public sector, certainly not a local level where cuts and closures are rife.

I don't know

most will still be available in initial form/place

Cynically, on a scratched out of date CD in the back of a cupboard in a probably damp vestry.

More optimistically, on a hard drive kept by the PCC or DAC with church records.

Hopefully on a hard drive kept by myself with my own body of work on it. It remains to be seen whether the programmes will be available to view the files though - already it is hard to open an autocad 2004 file unless you have the right programme to do it with.

With current and on-going developments in IT technologies, who knows?

uncertain
My own hard drives and in the form of planning/listed building applications, either on the planning portal or with local authority records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perhaps in the bin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In company archive and with owners and within Local Planning Authority records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On file in practice archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From our archive and, I would hope, with the then building owner. In the long term I would expect to deposit significant records with either the Diocesan or County archive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>can be retrieved from out archive, consent applications, schedules, drawings and as built records available from English Heritage/Historic England and Client bodies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who knows. We cannot operate as the County Archive. In all probability the PCC will not have the data anymore!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-line planning applications (historical) and my archive. A small number of reports are lodged with HER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were recording work is undertake it is always archived with OASIS, the local records office and HER. Assessment work may in some instances be archived with the HER or on OASIS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local archives or museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoping that the owner will keep a copy safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We keep our own archives of all projects indefinitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assuming the company is still in existence and paying for archive storage, the files will be held in the company archive which covers all the jobs the company has done over the last 35-40 years. Our firm does not dispose of records after the standard 12 year liability period like some other companies do to save money.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most of my reports are submitted to the Local Planning Authority, who I know forward any important material to the County Record Office - not sure whether digital (as mostly produced now) or hard copy. However, I am concerned that some Heritage Statements, which contain important new research but within reports primarily aimed at supporting Planning Applications and therefore looking like advocacy documents, may not be archived. Any reports etc which I consider to be particularly important I send as hard copies to local libraries / record offices direct periodically, as they accumulate, editing them if necessary to just keep the factual content.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Q3.7 Other comments on barriers to data deposition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of fee could be affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>large file sizes and rates of upload / time taken.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If data is more freely available non trained people will tghink that they can construct a heritage based report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security implications of releasing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unable to click and drag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of deposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not sure what the costs would be if everything is electronic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation / Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability disclaimers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>confidentiality of commercial work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of available site for storage and access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keeping data files in accessible formats un-corrupted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed and ease of upload - websites have a tendency to be fantastically cumbersome in this respect copyright matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans and layouts of building could be useful to criminals and security is a big issue if all data is free to access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern over misuse of data attributed to ourselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>costs of clearing copyright to use historic images and time involved when deadlines are often very tight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For public buildings there are issues of security / public safety which would mean this is not a sensible thing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely many clients will pay my time even if pay archive fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/ Commercial sensitivities of client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information going out of date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Comments on data and reports online

**Do you have any comments regarding depositing your reports or data online?**

| information in reports is paid for and therefore valuable and in a competitive market will not be freely given. |
| reliance on past reports will lead to lazy analysis by others and errors in original analysis will be perpetuated as if fact. |
| No real problem with this. the only thing we would not like to see would be an increase of queries regarding the project. We simply wouldn’t have the time to deal with an increase in volume especially if it were just interested parties rather than working design teams. |
| No |
| Building Survey Reports are confidential to the Client. |
| This is a good idea generally. |
| (from experience of OASIS) can be long-winded, too many irrelevant boxes to tick |
| I have concerns about the time involved in the additional administrative processes. |
| Difficult to know which archive will take what and when. In a competitive working environment there is little time to 'ask around'. Few of my clients are likely to be prepared to pay for either archiving or my time to prepare and upload. |
| No |
| Professional copyright |
| no comment |
| It would need to be simple and easy to do. |
| A new deposition should only be made when the relevant building or structure has been completed, otherwise commercial competition could be a major problem for consultants as well as clients/developers. |
| Oasis not you. |
| There would be a significant amount of information that is made freely available would, in my opinion, greatly facilitate improvement in conservation knowledge and, thereby, skills in practice. |
| Copyright would be the main issue |
| Surveying, researching & working on historic buildings produces vast quantities of information. Filtering which elements of this can be released for archiving which would be available to the public would be a very time consuming process and would require the approval of the client, a number of different professional consultants, and the contractor who carried out the work (all who have different concerns). The majority of clients who are responsible for the upkeep of historic buildings and sites work to very tight margins and often struggle to maintain their properties without grant aid. While there are significant benefits to the public archiving of 'curated' information it is difficult to see who would bare the cost of an additional burden. |
| No |
| I would be happy to do so if a means of such were available, most of the information becomes public when given to the client |
| Historic buildings clients vary widely in their attitudes. |
| None |
| Reports and surveys are the products of our profession and ought to be protected by intellectual property rights. I always write to seek permission to use archive material from the author. Putting material on line is useful in order to save repeat work but I am struggling with the paradox of allowing information to be
available whilst respecting the work that has been done. Is there a potential to devalue the hard work by others by offering it for free? Licenses would be impossible to monitor on line. Therefore a generic access system is flawed. I also see the commercial disadvantage for professionals who rely on compiling reports from many sources as their key income stream. To avoid having the work taken for free perhaps a body of work can carry a charge or licence before it is published. It needs commercial evaluation because unlike the academic world - these are professionals. The proposal needs to be assessed by non-academic personnel to assess how this could work.

I would not be comfortable although I can see the benefits to historic fabric as a whole. Building owners should keep information in the form of O and M Manuals which subsequent architects would be able to use.

I would welcome it, however a permanent record should not be ruled out.

Please allow the facility to record the parish. It is very difficult for most people to search by grid reference or county, most simply want the parish level. Most building surveys are very heavy on photographic records. A simpler metadata requirement for these is necessary.

We already have to submit listed building applications when carrying out works. Our own archive of photographs will no doubt one day be important in tracing the history of the buildings we have worked on but our expertise and knowledge are intangible and thus will die out with us.

I would be happy to deposit reports but would be a little sceptical about technical specifications.

We regularly submit data to private archives, having this available as an uncontrolled online system would be unworkable for most clients. However, private archives are accessible to the public on request, and subject to the data being requested.

99% of work is confidential to the client... it MIGHT also have a wider public interest, but it is not specifically of public access. I think the confidentiality aspects and privacy issues will be too much to overcome.

I totally agree with the theory and I proposed a similar idea to English Heritage years ago... I take about 10,000 pictures each year. and I would be happy to make them publicly available. Imagine the volume scaled up across all the professionals.

Need to ensure that uploading or depositing data is as straightforward as possible. May be difficult to get clients to see benefits of additional costs associated with archiving material if not a grant or consent requirement.

It may affect how reports are written and referenced with regard to liability for inaccuracies. Professional Indemnity Insurers should be consulted on this point as it may be an addition to the scope of Architectural Services.

I prefer this to having to prepare and submit hard copy information.

Electronic should be easier to access. It needs to be on web and able to be found.

Commercial ownership is key. Risk can be managed with disclaimers and the status of the report for information not to be used without confirming its content.

Apart from the issues above no

Copyright issues. Security issues.

My greatest concern is that people will rely on reports and written records, rather than looking at the building.

I would be happy to make my research work freely available provided others in my position did the same.
Concerns over - Copyright; Commercial sensitivity; Security aspects; Liability issues; Clients' agreement to publish; No guarantee of retaining the commission for future work; Providing 'free' unpaid fee information to competitors; Future accuracy of information through unrecorded changes occurring; Inconsistencies in recording techniques and technologies

I have already been the victim of copyright theft/plagiarism by other architects and so this is a concern about the electronic distribution of information. Not worried about condition surveys and record information, but specifications and schedules of work more of a concern as it is specification information in particular that I was copyright information reused by other consultants for commercial benefit without consent.

Most of my reports and data form part of planning/listed building applications so they are online anyway at the planning portal. I have no issue with sharing such information more widely but controls should be put in place to make sure only professionals with the appropriate skills undertake this work.

Some data may have insurance implications and could be used to raise premiums or be restrictive. The online is a great idea it will save reinventing the wheel but access to the data needs to be strictly monitored and secure.

It will also drive up standards and clients will be more informed as to what to expect from their professionals.

It is less a matter of whether the client would pay for it but more the effect of including additional costs for archiving within competitive tenders. If other people aren't doing it then we are at a disadvantage as not all clients are willing to pay for such added value.

I think we need to be selective - particularly with respect to laser and photogrammetry data. But also in photos.

The data is prepared for CDM record so it should be simple to make it suitable for depositing in an archive. The quality of referencing is important.

While the information we hold in our archives is of public interest it is also commercially sensitive material. A lot of work on historic buildings is done on reduced fees to "help" clients access services that they cannot afford at full price - particularly work done to help clients access grant monies and to "get things going". For example church quinquennial surveys used to be carried out by architects at a discount on the loose understanding that the architect would get first refusal of any repair work which was subsequently done. More recent grant conditions/tendering arrangements mean that the architects cannot cross subsidise their work for clients in the same way and therefore professionals tend to have to charge full rate for piecemeal work, rather than being able to offer discounts for carrying out several small jobs. I'm not sure how this will fit in, but sharing technical material without charge during the lifetime of the job or professional practice is likely to have a negative effect on our clients. On the other hand sharing information or deposition of archives as a practice closes down would be much easier (assuming our clients agree as lots of them ask us to sign confidentiality agreements) and an excellent public service. At present we approach individual practices directly and tend to pay for access to their archives - eg Arup have an excellent archive service, but they charge for their information (which tends to be very high quality/valuable information) at about Â£50 per drawing plus Â£250 access fee.
### 3.8 Other possible benefits

- Personal satisfaction in knowing information is not 'lost'
- Cannot click and drag
- It could be used by others working on the site in the future
- It would enable future owners and trustees to access the information
- See above comments
- The archive becomes more valuable as time passes as a historical record
- I would be able to gain professional advantage by having free access to other companies archives which I would normally have to pay quite a lot to access!
- All the above raises serious concerns

### 4.8 Can you tell us briefly what your experience of using OASIS has been?

- A bit academic-led and not so user-friendly
- Sometimes frustrating but overall a good idea....
- My experience with OASIS is purely to enter data
- Fine although some of the fields are repetitive
- I personally have not used it but the office use it
- I find it useful for background researching. However, I feel it tends to place the role of conservation architects well below that of archaeologists in the heritage professional hierarchy. Possibly this is due to those who write the briefs and written schemes of investigation that require filing with Oasis. There are many conservation architects doing good work on heritage who will never file a report on Oasis. Hence, in my opinion, planning portal creates a better, more voluminous legacy of historic environment recording than Oasis.
- Training with historic england (very useful) and deposition of archaeological reports where requested in a brief or WSI. But it is time consuming and the information required is quite detailed when it is just a report being deposited. Difficult to justify the time spent as a sole practitioner with a heavy workload. Deposition with ADS even more difficult due to request that I caption every photo deposited rather than just direct readers to the photos with captions in the report.
- I upload reports and photographs for recording projects
- It’s OK but can be frustrating when further detail is embedded down data trees
- Used for building recording projects
The Archaeology Data Service has been enabling the archaeological community...

Discussions about what should and should not be in public domain - many buildings are people’s homes and personally I would not like my home to be digitally accessible to all and sundry. Also IP rights and liability issues if people rely on data in ways and timescales that it was never intended to be relied upon.

Establishment of a simple process for deposition of digital archives.

Incentives.

Broad acceptance of good practice for sharing of data.

Better inter-disciplinary working between the academic, archaeological, architectural and property management communities - there is currently a system of ‘gateways’ that building owners have to pass through to access each community, and the practitioners themselves are encouraged very strongly to ‘stick to what you know’ / ‘not exceed competency’, (with good reason!), but I have observed that the way data is collected and stored now (in other fields, such as flood data) tends to be less fussy about these distinctions and I suspect the generation of digital natives will, in future, wonder why we were so snobby. We must explore more fluid ways of working that support the lay person - whether building owner, agent or user, to engage with the data to extend intellectual access to our historic places.

I have no opinion on this matter.

The biggest problem that we have is that we all prepare reports for different reasons. I can record the same building in a dozen different ways depending on the end use of the data. Data would need to be sorted into categories so that future users can determine the level of trust that they can put in the data. Say category A = basic information suitable for quantitative appraisal, cat B = detailed information sufficient for accurate design work, cat C qualitative appraisal describing what you have in more detail, etc.

I do not understand the issues enough to make a useful comment, I am afraid.

A greater sense of openness on the part of private owners of listed buildings.

The requirement to be built into HLF and other funding grant bids. Also as a requirement through planning and other permissions processes.

An initiative of promotion in conjunction with Historic England and other nationally-orientated conservation bodies.

Would even HE be happy for their consultants to enter details in the public domain?

Greater awareness of this resource and the ability to use it.

Professional historic buildings consultants would perhaps need reassurance they wouldn't become undermined by unskilled people purporting to have a lot of knowledge and experience which has been ‘obtained’ by just a quick look online.

Easy access

There would need to be a massive outbreak of peace, love and understanding.

Money & Time

reduction of fee, I understand there is a Â£150.00 start up fee and an ongoing cost for depositing information in various forms. What incentive is there to deposit?

support from professional bodies and existing archive centres, but bear in mind the possible increased risk of theft of artefacts.

Is it not already accessible?

The service ought to be better publicised, more information needs to be made available and perhaps web links with historic building websites.

This is definitely something which would benefit historic building research and something I shall be looking to find out more about.

More awareness of the service

people not being worried about others using their information.

I hadn’t realised that they weren’t using it. I put up all the non confidential reports our branch of the company generates.
AS we are a tiny fish in this big sea, we have really no idea of commercial benefits.

More information sent out to practitioners; your survey is a good start

Write articles in the IHBC to promote and generally make the community more aware of the service.

Ease of uploading information and making people aware of the service.

You (in my case, an architect) would need to advertise in architectural conservation publications. As I do a significant amount of work with churches I would hear through the Diocesan Advisory Committees. Local planning authority conservation officers would also disseminate.

A change of policy... and people relaxing about privacy and confidentiality

Single custodian / funding stream to condition it as part of grant approval / planning and listed building consent requirement / simple standard for submission of information

Perhaps it could be done via AABC

A similar organization to be created.

Coordination with the RIBA Conservation Register and AABC for training and information

Publicity and Instructions on how to use it.

I consider that it could be extended to encompass historic buildings in its present form pretty well.

Major advertising!

I've been working for SPAB and in the conservation architecture sector for over 10 years and have never heard of either the ADS or OASIS and had absolutely no idea you had an archive. Archaeology does not generally 'associate' with the historic buildings sector, except in the form of writing heritage statements and undertaking watching briefs. That is obviously a generalization, and will not be true in high end 'expensive' project, but will be true for the average domestic extension or church repair project. Therefore, all these good things you have are completely underused and simply not known about by the majority of architects working in the sector.

Forgive me for saying so, but the survey approach is quite naive in its limited understanding of the commercial pressures of the pan-professional world and the pragmatic fee earning needs of the conservation-professional Architect, QS, Structural Engineer, M+E Engineer, Facilities Manager, Conservator; Restorer and the plethora of Skilled and Vocationally trained crafts - and how all contribute to the success (or otherwise) of architectural conservation projects and reporting needs across the historic building community.

There is a real danger that the complexity of what is involved will be glossed over through the simplistic manner in which the questions are phrased and answered.

No comment

More planning and listed building application data and drawings made public through ADS. That by definition would require all studies, drawings and reports carried out on protected structures to include the involvement of a registered conservation professional with the right skill set. That in turn would require a revamp of the planning system and I would strongly favour that.

Work with all the Quinquenial inspecting architects and their respective DAC offices to extract all relevant information and photographs showing the present state of the buildings and the works that have taken place under Faculty Planning (LBC) conditions to submit data

Information to LA conservation officers

Information to DACs for church records

Better information architects / surveyors / structural engineers etc. Conservation accredited.

Central funding. I think subscription use would be counter productive and become exclusive.

Vast databases need to be developed. I have file 8T errabytes in size for one church - a point cloud survey. This data is an invaluable record and there is no-one capable of handling it and looking after it for future generations. Church plans on line used to be the most valuable record which I use but this no longer available. The problem is huge and requires collaboration between all parties.

Significant reduction in costs involved as the fees to produce a heritage statement or buildings assessment etc are often in the region of Â£1000 so difficult to justify deposition costs of Â£200- Â£300 to clients.
Rationalization and simplification of the accompanying information required to deposit i.e. form filling!

Advertising and promotion through local authority planning departments.

Widespread adoption of the service would be essential. Close working with existing HERs/SMRs would be essential to ensure that the two services complement and strengthen one another.

Tell those in the sector that the service is available and make sure bodies curating the work require it.

There would have to be no cost associated with lodging or accessing the information (like the BGS borehole records).

Security risk for public buildings would have to be assessed.

It might be better for the data to be collected at the point where a company is to be dissolved or is disposing of records, to minimise problems with commercial value.

Professional Indemnity providers might resist publication of data within the 12 year liability period for architects/engineers.

It would be easy to gather information like surveys etc but we tend to make substantial alterations to historic buildings and therefore the initial survey is not terribly informative - the value of our work is in the drawings of the proposed alterations and it is this content which is more difficult to share and distribute for commercial/liability reasons. Not sure how you overcome that other than planning for long delays between preparation of information and deposition of plans?
Appendix 2 Local Planning Authority Request for Information

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am conducting a research project looking at how digital information relating to the historic environment is preserved in the long term. In order to do this I would like to request some information from your planning department / planning services.

1. How many Listed Building Consent applications for adaptation or demolition were validated in 2015?
2. Of these, how many times did the submission include a Heritage Statement or Heritage Impact Assessment?
3. How many times did a planning officer or specialist advisor (e.g. conservation officer, heritage officer, historic environment advisor) request supplementary information to inform consent such as a Historic Building Survey and Report in 2015?
4. How many times did Planning or Listed Building Consent include a condition for Historic Building Recording to be carried out in 2015?
5. How many times was a requirement to archive digital data included with a request for historic building or structure recording in 2015?
6. How do you ensure that historic building information submitted as part of the Planning or Listed Building Consent process is accessible to the public in the long term?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any queries please don’t hesitate to contact me via email or phone as noted below.

Yours faithfully,