

Report to	Policy and Resources Committee
Date	19 September 2017
By	Performance and Projects Manager
Title of Report	Project Evaluation Report

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to

- 1) Receive the project evaluation at Appendix 1**
- 2) Agree if it wishes to make recommendations to officers as a result of the learning from the evaluation**
- 3) Agree that the learning from the evaluation be added to the improvement plan as set out in Appendix 2**

1. Summary and Background

- 1.1 This report presents one project evaluation for consideration by the Policy and Resources Committee. The Committee is asked to consider the evaluation report and identify any recommendations it may wish to make as a result of the learning points and themes highlighted. The Committee is also asked to agree the corporate learning to be added to the improvement plan. This report contains 1 evaluation report.

2. The Secrets of the High Woods

- 2.1 This project involved using ground penetrating radar (LiDAR) to provide data on the archaeological history of a heavily wooded part of the South Downs, from the River Arun to the A3. Over 3 years more than 200 volunteers worked on ground-truthing various locations of interest revealed by the LiDAR data.
- 2.2 The total project cost was projected to be £935,756. This included a grant from HLF for £640,698, which represents 71% of the total project cost; funding from SDNPA of £119,745 and match funding and in-kind support to the value of £145,475. The final project cost was £905,918. The project was therefore underspent by £30,723, most of this was unspent contingency or capital expenditure.
- 2.3 The Secrets of the High Woods (SoHW) was a Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) funded project led by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in partnership with Chichester District Council and Historic England that ran for three years between 2014 and 2017.
- 2.4 The project uncovered the archaeology and history of a heavily wooded part of the South Downs that runs from the river Arun to the A3 road. Archaeological sites that were difficult to see were revealed using LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) – a method that uses a laser to scan the landscape from an aircraft flying overhead. LiDAR is capable of providing data that when processed removes trees and foliage to reveal the ground beneath.
- 2.5 More than 200 volunteers worked on the project either; ground truthing various locations of interest identified by the LiDAR survey – verifying and classifying landscape features; a undertaking archival research – examining historical maps and documents to help inform the interpretation of key sites; and collecting oral histories – meeting with local residents to record their stories about how the SoHW landscape had changed during their life time. The end of project summative evaluation report is at **Appendix 1**.

2.6 The detailed activities of the project are set out on pages 12-26 of the evaluation report. Detailed information about the successes are in pages 28-36. Project challenges and recommendations are in pages 37-55.

3. Corporate learning

3.1 The corporate learning from evaluations is pulled together and added to the improvement plan as appropriate. There are 21 recommendations from this report which have been collated and grouped in the management response. Where recommendation a have been accepted they are marked green, where they have been partially accepted they have been marked amber, and where they have not been accepted they have been marked red. The detail is set out in **Appendix 2**. The Committee is asked to agree the additional improvement activity – items marked green and amber, for inclusion in the improvement plan.

4. Policy and Programme Committee considerations

4.1 The project was approved in [June 2012](#) at the then Resources and Performance Committee and reported to the Governance Committee as part of regular project reporting, the last time this happened was in [February 2017](#). It was also reported to Policy and Programme Committee as part of annual project reporting in [May 2017](#) and [appendix](#).

5. Other Implications

Implication	Yes*/No
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority?	No
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	Not in itself although the value for money of the projects themselves are reported as part of the evaluations.
How does the proposal represent Value for Money?	Each project is assessed separately for value for money. Overall the project evaluated did represent either appropriate or good value for money.
Are there any Social Value implications arising from the proposal?	No
Has due regard has been taken of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	Any such considerations are taken into account in the developments of the projects themselves.
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy: 1. Living within environmental limits 2. Ensuring a strong healthy and just society 3. Achieving a sustainable economy 4. Promoting good governance 5. Using sound science responsibly	Learning from projects contributes to sustainability principle 2 ensuring a strong healthy and just society – considering social cohesion and wellbeing; principle 3 achieving a sustainable economy – considering impacts on or contribution to a sustainable economy; and principle 4 Promoting good governance – considering how to encourage active participation.

6. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
That learning from projects is not fully captured	2	2	Well understood mechanisms are in place to capture information about the progress of projects and identifying learning through evaluation. Evaluation reports and case studies are routinely produced.
Learning from projects is not fed into future project development	3	2	Improvement planning is in place but there is potential to review and improve how this takes place. Project specific learning is followed up by themed programme boards which meet several times a year. Corporate learning is beginning to be captured and disseminated in a more comprehensive way via a revised improvement plan and in any revisions to guidance that might be deemed appropriate.

ANNE REHILL

Performance and Projects Manager South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: Anne Rehill – Performance and Projects Manager

Tel: 01730 819217

email: anne.rehill@southdowns.gov.uk

Appendices

1. Appendix 1 – Secrets of the High Woods evaluation
2. Appendix 2 – learning to be added to the corporate improvement plan

SDNPA Consultees: Chief Executive; Director of Strategy & Partnerships; Director of Planning; Director of Operations; Director of Corporate Services; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Legal Services, Governance and Support Services Manager

External Consultees: Report authors for the evaluations consulted SDNPA staff during the development of their evaluation reports.

Background Documents

Agenda Item XX Report XX/16 Appendix 2

Summary of corporate learning from evaluations

There were XX key learning points from the evaluation.

It is proposed that the following improvement activities are added to the improvement plan

Improvement action	Start date	End date	Owner
<i>From the Secrets of the High Woods</i>			