

Towards a Strategy for the Future of the National Heritage List for England

Listing: A View From The Amenity Sector – Synopsis

1 November 2019

By Matthew Saunders

Contents

About this report	1
In brief	2
1. The importance of Listing	4
2. The problems	5
3. The Repercussions	9
4. The problem is well understood	10
5. The problem tackled	12
6. Manpower and resources.	13
7. Recommendations.	14
8. Glossary	20

About this report

Historic England commissioned Matthew Saunders MBE to consult with the voluntary conservation movement, collate views and report on the present state of, and future strategy for, Listing in England. The overarching purpose of the commission is to advise Historic England on how it might better deliver the delegated legislative function of compiling and maintaining the National Heritage List for England.

This is the synopsis of the principal findings and recommendations. The full report and appendices will be published in due course, together with a statement of response from Historic England.

Matthew Saunders was awarded this commission due to his extensive knowledge of England's architectural history and of the heritage protection system, gained principally (but not exclusively) during his 42-year tenure as Secretary of the Ancient Monuments Society.

Disclaimer: The views, information and opinions expressed herein are those of the author and of the individuals who engaged with the commission; they do not necessarily reflect the views of Historic England.

In brief

This report is premised on the belief that Historic England's highest purpose is the protection of the historic buildings and monuments which do as much to define this country as its democracy and language.

It has two principal messages:

1. There must be a drive to increase the number of buildings afforded the protection of statutory listing.
2. There needs to be a revisiting, in parallel, of the several hundred thousand earlier "minimalist" listings to bring them up to current standards.

Without both actions, buildings of significance, quality and beauty will be lost or mutilated.

It argues that these deficits should be tackled ideally through a geographical resurvey and that the results should be manifested through concentrated and illustrated Listing descriptions. Such a survey could, and should, be given further scholarly backbone by harvesting the panoply of knowledge already to hand within Historic England, specialist societies and interest groups and by selective commissioning of additional thematic studies. It is very conscious of political and financial realities and elaborates on the potential which these suggested campaigns offer for a degree of citizen engagement unseen since the heroic days of the "accelerated resurvey" of Michael Heseltine.

However, it is also well aware that both initiatives would be heavily dependent on Government commitment, both political and financial.

The full report and appendices offer further substantiation of the arguments and examination of other issues, such as the Listing Grades, Listing for Historic Interest and complementary jurisdictions, such as Local Listing, which have been omitted from this digest.

The Recommendations at the end are comprehensive so that this summary of the four principal ones can be placed in context.

Matthew Saunders

October 20th 2019

1. The importance of Listing

After some six months of intense absorption with the present Lists, I emerge full of admiration at how sophisticated the system has become in the seven decades or so since it was introduced, as part of the post-war settlement, in 1947.

The vital role of Listing in protecting this country's architectural heritage is established. In the 40-year period since 1978 there have been applications to demolish 8,700 listed buildings – buildings that might have come down or been maltreated but for the protection of Listing. The British system is without equal in the world and it has deservedly earned a positive international reputation.

Outside Planning, Listing is intrinsic to the decision-making of those offering both grants and relief from obligations, whether taxation or Building Regulations.

It is effective – the number of List Entries has passed the 400,000 mark and yet the tally of applications to demolish now bumps along at a handful a year. In 1979 applications were lodged to demolish 693 listed buildings in their entirety; in 2018 it was a very small fraction of this.

The total of Listings has risen in inverse proportion to the applications to demolish, a hugely gratifying ratio. All this is in the context of a mathematical decrease in the proportion of buildings that are listed as the number of new listings, even if increased, will be vastly outpaced by the number of new-builds.

Without contradiction, the National Heritage List now represents the greatest concentration of applied and pure facts on the physical architectural heritage of England available anywhere. Applied – because its principal task is to protect – pure because, at its best, a listing description compiled, to present standards, can easily prove the single most useful concentration of facts on the asset concerned, as good as an (un-illustrated) guide book. This should be a source of pride for the Government and for Historic England.

I have also emerged with a profound appreciation for the professionalism behind it. HE spends impressive amounts of time in considering listing cases. The Advice Reports will often run to 8 or 10 pages with scholarly apparatus of a standard one would expect in an academic journal. Many of the thematic surveys extend the frontiers of collated knowledge.

2. The problems

The achievements are clear. Yet, my research has identified a number of problems that inhibit the effectiveness of the heritage protection system.

i) Minimalist or Deficient Lists

As an almost universal rule, the great majority of existing Listings, particularly those compiled in the 20th century, are poorly explained and described.

The sense of dissatisfaction with the state of the “minimalist” Lists is in some measure because the more meticulous standards exhibited in the listings of the last two decades have not been revisited on the several hundred thousand early listings which are now seriously showing their age and inadequacy when silhouetted against current practice.

Listing descriptions are non-statutory and famously for identification only. The original brevity assumed that the principal user would be informed by a Conservation Officer, who needed minimal instruction. Yet, more recently, the number of Conservation Officers has declined significantly, whereas the number of users has expanded hugely among the general lay public – hence the four million annual “hits” on the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) online portal.

“Minimalist” descriptions are generally characterised by clipped descriptions, mostly describing the front elevation only with the absence of any explanation of the reason for either the listing itself or defence of the grading chosen. The total is impossible for Historic England to calculate accurately, short of a systematic trawl, but if “minimalist” entries are taken to be co-terminous with the first date of major improvement (2,000, with marked advances after that in 2005 and 2011) HE’s calculation is that we could be dealing with some 366,000 entries. Some descriptions were inaccurate at the time of designation, mostly owing to delays between fieldwork and designation and others have become so through alteration, authorised or not.

Every single correspondent has decried the quality of the Minimalist entries, although appreciative of why a brief schedule was regarded as a price worth paying in order to speed up a process where the priority was designation rather than description.

Examples of the deficiencies are legion (please refer to the Appendix).

ii) Listable buildings are unlisted

The other principal finding is that an appreciable number of potentially listable buildings (judged by the Principles of Selection, as revised November 2018) are not on the statutory lists, thus laying many of them open to destruction or damage.

It is only the present modest pace of additions that has denied them listing, not any intrinsic demerits. At the current rate of accretion, the Lists will have some 10,000 additions (comprising roofed structures) in thirty years’ time. This report argues that those buildings deserve the protection of statutory listing as soon as practicable, both for their protection and

to counter the present damaging imbalance between those listed in the 20th century and those included since.

The “salons des refuses” come in recognisable batches:

- the omission by mistake
- buildings with early cores shielded by later additions (e.g. concealed medieval timber frames or undercrofts)
- significant Victorian and Edwardian buildings
- important buildings from between the Wars
- industrial buildings, structures and complexes
- agricultural buildings
- important buildings identified by scholarship.

With some listable buildings already over the line and others that clearly deserve to be so, there are issues of fairness and consistency. The sense of good governance depends on citizens being treated equally and that perception is undermined where very similar structures are treated differently, with one listed, the other not.

It must be a matter of real concern that the coverage of many major historic settlements begins with a baseline survey, many of them nearly half a century old, which has never since been systematically re-visited. Subsequent expansion and improvement has only been through the essentially interim device of myriad (spot or) reactive listings reinforced by thematic studies which are necessarily limited in their scope, with a few “reviews” and “Defined Area Surveys”. Major historic settlements are still obliged to work with supposedly comprehensive resurveys that are now decades out of date – Cambridge was last systematically covered in 1972 (with 198 additions/changes since), Chelmsford (1978, with 190 additions), Colchester (1971 with a staggering 1,098 added to the original 511), Exeter (1974 where the figure of extras is 1,007), Whitby (1972, where 35 additions only since then bringing the total to 476, is clearly an inadequate response to its significance and vulnerability) and Winchester (1974, clearly so inadequate the other way with its 617 entries that it has undergone 1,653 additions and amendments since). And there are geographical inconsistencies – all the “systematic” Lists in the North East postdate 1985 and those in the North West, 1983.



Examples of minimalist listings

Above left: The 1977 description of the listing of the Hotel de Paris, Cromer, 1895, by George Skipper describes nothing of the interior.

Above right: S S Teulon’s Elvetham Hall House, Hart, Hampshire (1859–62, Grade II* 1973, 109232) has a description of a mere 10 lines.

Left: Tonbridge School Chapel, Kent – the description still refers to the building as being the creation of W Campbell-Jones, 1902, despite its effective destruction by fire in 1988. And despite the fact that under the Thirty Year Rule the “new” chapel by Donald Buttress, shown here, remains eligible for re-listing in its own right.



Examples of listable, unlisted buildings

Above left: The former Black Cat Building (Carreras Factory) 180 Hampstead Road, Camden was one of the most spectacular examples of the interwar Egyptian Revival (1928). All this was stripped off in 1961 but was reinstated in the 1990s. It yet remains unlisted. © Historic England.

Above right: St Mark's Horsham – demolished 1989, except for tower and steeple (which remain unlisted), after a refusal to list. These are now enveloped by an office block. The design of 1870 by Habershon and Brock had been compared by Ian Nairn in the first Pevsner to Burges.

Left: In a case that is emblematic of the “antiquarian prejudice” that pervaded the early lists, Milestone House at Yoxford, Suffolk (given 7 sentences in the 2015 Pevsner) is unlisted whereas the diminutive contemporary milestone, from which it takes its name, is on the Lists. © James Darwin.

3. The Repercussions

The disadvantages of the lack of listing are obvious – important historic buildings are both at risk of insensitive alteration, damaging their significance, or of being lost completely. Yet, the listings with inadequate descriptions are also a matter of huge concern. At best, minimalist listings undermine confidence in the List and pose a reputational risk to Historic England and the DCMS. But of far greater significance is that minimalist descriptions are also leading to losses.

Anecdotal evidence from Conservation Officers is legion that the List Entries are simply ignored on the assumption that at their most clipped they won't offer any useful enlightenment. They feed the old canard that if it is not in the description it is neither significant nor covered, and the lack of mention of an historically significant item can mean that it ends up in a skip with no recourse to enforcement action. There is also clear evidence that clipped descriptions are going hand in hand with lack of applications for listed building consent and can frustrate enforcement action.

Leaving aside many 20th-century structures, it is a truism that the more indisputably historic the building, the more likely it is to have been picked up in an early round of Listing. That means that it is more than likely to be labouring with an inadequate description; an historical accident but a potentially damaging one.

4. The problem is well understood

Historic England is well aware of the importance of the regular review as a general principle. Its own guidance on Local Heritage Listing suggests that such Local Lists should be revisited. "Lists that have not been reviewed for a period of years are more open to challenge, for example at a planning appeal". Martin Robertson, one of the key figures in the accelerated programme of forty years ago, envisaged a re-survey every twenty years. The reality is that some of the List entries have not been re-assessed for seventy.

The 1996 English Heritage guidance note "Conservation Area Character Appraisals" states "where asked to make a direction under Section 76 of the Act (allowing LPAs to carry out urgent works to preserve an unlisted building in a CA) the Secretary of State is more likely to do so where the area's special interest has been clearly defined and published". The equivalent of an Appraisal with a listed building is surely an adequate description.

Of equal significance, Government planning policy (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework) puts great stress on decision-making within the Historic Environment being "evidence-based".

Historic England is unable to fulfil the advice given to others to update and review their lists. This is entirely down to lack of resources rather than will.

The only argument advanced in favour of a minimal description is that such a comparative tabula rasa allows a suitably qualified professional to assert their own take on "interest" and "significance". Where such a person is in possession of the full facts and the full range of sensibilities, that might be an incidental advantage, but it can only apply in a minority of cases. All listed buildings in the 30 per cent of LPAs that are without any access to a Conservation Officer and those owners who are not using a conservation-accredited professional are at an immediate disadvantage.

Moreover, it is normal practice in many LPAs for the "minor" listed building consent application to be determined by a Development Management (DM) Officer without reference to the Conservation Officer. The DM Officer is more than likely to be relying on a description that is practically useless for his or her purposes. The silent page can licence the genuinely or wilfully ignorant to run amok. And this is against the onus placed on the citizen to be conversant with all legal obligations placed on him/her – "Ignorance is no Defence".

In addition, there is rarely anything on the relative significance of elements of a building and that is leading to hyper-caution by some Development Management Officers who rather than being permissive are going to the other extreme by refusing any alteration – the most effective way of bringing the whole system into disrepute.

The reality of many under-staffed planning offices today is an increasing number of desk-bound decisions – without site visits. The author was told that the chief items of evidence adduced internally, to place against the evidence of the applicant, can be a combination of a minimalist List Entry and Google Street View, especially in those lbc cases which do not trigger consultations with Historic England or the National Amenity Societies. And if that is combined with the principal source of advice to owners being their builder you can have an unholy marriage between minimal fact-finding and self-interested advice.

By the same token lack of mention allows estate agents to wilfully mislead over the extent of listing.

Perhaps counter-intuitively , the more important the building, the less the need for a new assessment by Historic England itself. The great cathedrals, country houses, properties owned by bodies such as The National Trust and The Landmark Trust have, since the initial listing, nearly all been subject to comprehensive in-house studies. The Conservation Management Plan (CP/CMP) is but the most supreme example of that.

It is argued by some that the deficiencies can be compensated for given the obligation on applicants to accompany listed building consent applications with Design and Access Statements (and Heritage Statements) that need to describe the interest and significance of the asset concerned. "Citizen conservation" instead of Government decree; but the asset might be misunderstood, especially where there is no Conservation Officer able to critique let alone refute.

Moreover, Design and Access Statements have to be prepared only when a building is the subject of an application for listed building consent – the many that are not, will not have benefitted. This puts any potential new owner, who merely wants the building without alteration, at an immediate disadvantage.

5. The problem tackled

There are three main methods in which the two principal problems can be tackled – spot or reactive listing, and/or the systematic survey, which broadly-speaking, boils down either to the horizontal (geographical) or the vertical (thematic).

Spot or reactive Listing

Reactive listing remains vital and it should always be treated as the priority. The concerned citizen or civic society is much more likely to be the originator in reactive listing than any other listing media and HE/DCMS will be perceived in high profile in how it is seen to react.

Geographical resurvey

Of the survey options, geographical and thematic, the most satisfying has to be the geographical. Taking an overview of a complete district holds the promise of universal coverage and that must be the safest guarantee of fairness, consistency and maximum protection.

Everything short of that feels interim. The first surveys had all the challenge of tackling the tabula rasa but the sort of geographical survey advocated here, sometimes seventy years into the listing process, will be more of an exercise in collation and infilling, pulling the threads together to emerge with the ultimate Big Picture.

The author expects there to be a ranking of priorities, depending on the importance of the settlement and the date of the last synoptic overview; and that such a programme can be phased.

The logic would be for existing listings to be re-examined where descriptions are deficient at the same time as an examination afresh of the plausible candidates for addition.

Thematic surveys

It is suggested that, parallel to the geographical overview, there should be a modest revival in the thematic programme. Revisits of more “traditional” building types which have not so far been analysed in depth are suggested – for example, almshouses, assembly rooms, dovecotes, masonic halls, public schools and windmills.

6. Manpower and resources

It is perceptibly the case that the problems outlined above exist primarily due to a lack of resources. By its very nature, the process of identifying, surveying, assessing and understanding the historic and architectural significance of any building or structure is a time-consuming exercise, requiring exemplary specialist knowledge, analytical skills and judgement.

Notwithstanding this, in terms of implementation, I have suggested some possible approaches which would not be mutually exclusive – an internal campaign by HE, utilising the almost limitless “grey literature” on its files, maybe with external financial support and maybe buying in the help of external partners (a precedent being the Cadw condition surveys of 2012); support from LPAs, likely to be in kind rather than cash; building on the potential for substantial voluntary effort, of which there are a number of precedents orchestrated by Civic Voice, the possibilities presented in the Localism Act and new tools such as the “Know your Place” website; established sources of expertise in specialist societies and the help of sympathetic owners and architects. All of this would take full advantage of the digital revolution which has transformed access to textual and photographic information both on the part of Government and its potential partners in Society.

In the list of priorities, expanding the lists is more important than deepening understanding of those already protected although the two need not be, and should not be, mutually exclusive. The suggestion for a new round of geographical surveys would embrace both.

7. Recommendations

Four Principal Recommendations

1. There are blatant and serious omissions from the Lists, using the present Selection Criteria, and this must be addressed as a priority. Significant buildings identified by scholarship remain unprotected as do many 19th- and early 20th-century designs and industrial and agricultural structures. Among virtually identical structures there is marked discrepancy with some listed, some not. The situation is being redressed only in small part by reactive listing and these serious omissions need to be redressed much more systematically.
2. The “minimalist” list descriptions, which may be as many as 90 or 95% of the present total of 400,000 listings, fully deserve the adjective and the problem must be addressed, other than through the ongoing practice of the occasional updating on request. There are damaging practical and reputational consequences from descriptions which are inadequate and out-of-date and which do not address “significance”, whether overarching or comparative, nor spell out the reasons for the listing and at the grade chosen. This is a major issue but should be tackled, if the choice has to be made, as a second priority to Recommendation 1.
3. Those omissions should be rectified by reactive listings but also by geographical and thematic (re)surveys.
4. Both tasks, at 1 and 2, but especially 2, should be tackled using a mixed economy of multiple partners but with Historic England in the lead. This should engage with LPAs, owners, architects and other professional advisers and, where possible, trained volunteers – both for its own sake but also because of the potential for engaging with the public in a significant new community initiative. Depending on circumstances such volunteers should be identified from among the many who have proved themselves expert in given fields of knowledge. This would build on contacts already made by Listing Team with “informed” communities.

Other Recommendations

5. **The National Heritage Lists should never be closed. They are, and must remain, dynamic – never free of the need for amendment, addition and refinement.** As now, the ability to re-list structures that have been de-listed should persist whilst, again as now, de-listing should be a conscious act and not an automatic consequence of any listed building consent to demolish (such consents are of course permissive and not mandatory and need not be executed). Neither should delisting be assumed in any resurvey by simply dropping the structure from the new Lists – it should always be explicit not implicit.

The present working DCMS policy of not entertaining repeat applications within 5 years should not apply to updates in existing listings – although applicants should be encouraged not to come in for piecemeal revisits

6. **Powers to list in the face of live planning and development proposals must continue as should the present policy that precludes consideration of condition or commercial potential at the time of Listing.** These considerations must, as now, be reserved for any subsequent listed building consent processes. This is because Listing is to identify interest alone and passes no judgment on whether the asset concerned can be saved. That in any case will be a matter in flux, changed by market flows, the availability or not of grant aid and whether there is a party willing to take on the conservation challenge as a “labour of love”.
7. **The return of the “watershed” to 1850 (from 1840) is welcome but there should be further “smart” watersheds,** with differing cut-off dates, particular to given settlements or building types.
8. **The regime for updating present listing descriptions, to make them more user-friendly and accurate, should be regarded as an improvement in Governance, a service to the public, and the consultation procedure should be streamlined accordingly.**
9. **The power, whether founded in policy or statute, not to press for entry to the interior of an already-listed building should be withdrawn,** in light of the inability to deny access to an unlisted equivalent.
10. There should always be a freedom in the compilation of listing descriptions but there should be examination of the potential for further codification. **ALL listing descriptions should have mastheads clarifying how they are to be interpreted especially those which are likely to remain “minimalist” until their revision can be undertaken.** Such mastheads would confirm, inter alia, that Listing covers the exterior and interior, structures that abut or lie in the curtilage and that descriptions cannot be presumed to be definitive.
11. **There should be greater use of illustrations and photos in listing descriptions.**
12. **The criteria for listing primarily on the grounds of historic interest should be revised and amplified.** The decision to prepare a Selection Guide on that topic, prepared and published by Historic England, is welcome.
13. **The filters or triggers to allow buildings to be considered for Listing should include sale or vacancy.** Both can constitute a latent threat and each might offer the practical occasion for thorough internal examination.
14. **The present three grades in listing should be retained.** Building on presently observed best practice, upgrading (and downgrading) should always be accompanied by a detailed and updated description of the exterior, interior and subsidiary features and a clear explanation of the change in grade. With downgrading, reference to features lost and changes in understanding since the initial listing is likely to assist the subsequent exercise of Development Control.

15. **There should be a further drive to encourage the more extensive use of Enriching the List (ETL)** but this should be subservient to, and run parallel with, Recommendations 1 and 2.
16. **Textual submissions under ETL should, where possible, be verified for accuracy and relevance to the listing before permanent uploading; photos should be dated and evidence of wrong-doing should be directed to LPA not ETL.**
17. **The Thirty Year Rule should persist.**
18. **The National Heritage List Online is an outstanding innovation but it is not as user-friendly as it should be and it should be improved.**
19. NHLE online includes listed buildings, scheduled sites, protected wrecks, registered parks and gardens, battlefields, World Heritage Sites, Certificates of Immunity, and BPNs (it excludes Conservation Areas – for the very good reason that these are designated by LPAs not Historic England). Nevertheless, **the sense of NHLE online as the One Stop Shop would be rounded were there to be a hyperlink connection say to the Heritage Gateway website, or others which might be regarded as appropriate.**
20. Many LPA websites and Historic Environment Records offer direct access to designated sites in their area. In case of technical or human error, or late updating of information. **LPAs should be asked, maybe through the Local Government Association, always to make clear, and to do so prominently, that the master list is NHLE online.**
21. I am told that DCMS delete the supporting files relating to listing cases after 15 years. **The deletion of files should only take place in the context of an Archives Policy and there should be a presumption in favour of permanent digital access to significant cases and/or photographs.** An example could be set by uploading such items onto “ETL”. It is particularly vital that all the research papers drawn up as part of the Heritage Protection Reform (HPR) initiative are preserved in perpetuity against the day when that concept might be revisited. I understand that all such papers are presently curated by Historic England.
22. **Historic England/DCMS should consider introducing a time limit for reaching a decision whether to list or not to list.** I have no strong views on the timing for that.
23. **The digital equivalent of the annual Designation Year Books are much appreciated and should continue.**
24. **Interim Protection should be introduced in England, as it has been recently in Wales.** It was a provision of the 2008 HPR Bill and DCMS had “promised to introduce it at the earliest opportunity”.
25. **The Listing of churchyards and their monuments is confusing and needs to be addressed.**
26. **The Church Buildings Council (which is charged with preparing reports on Anglican churches being considered for closure) should be invited to share all the Pastoral Measure Redundancy Reports with Historic**

England, especially where Listing of an unlisted church is recommended. This was the normal practice of its predecessor body, the Council for the Care of Churches

27. **Certificates of Immunity from Listing (COI) are only granted at present after a site visit and that practice should continue.** Consultations with the National Amenity Societies on these and de-listing applications should include photos wherever these have been supplied by the applicant, and where these are readily available to Historic England. Notification of the decision taken is greatly valued by the Societies.
28. **The present practice of having to renew COI's should continue.**
29. Section 1(5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 can be useful in excluding discrete areas of a building, especially
 - where freestanding or abutting – or clearly identifiable (“late 20th century lifts”) as modern, transitory or damaging. However great caution should be exercised in granting such express exemption to any element which has walls that are load-bearing or where there is an element of the cuckoo in the nest – the “modern kitchen” may be just that in terms of its fitting out and white goods but may have been slotted into a reused historic space. **Section 1(5A) exemptions should be granted where unequivocally justified but not where historic interest to that part of the shell is evident, concealed, or suspected.** It should always be emphasized to owner and LPA alike that listed building consent is still required even in “excluded” areas.
30. **Listing should never be granted by implication – on the back of the listing of a curtilage structure or a neighbour that may share fabric.** If deserved, it should be expressly granted.
31. **To prevent ignorance of Listing (genuine ignorance or a Nelson Eye) the following are suggested:**
 - **placing “QR” codeboxes, discreetly, on the building concerned.**
 - contacting the Law Society to seek an extension in the scope of the Solicitors Search – LLCI will tell you if your property is listed or in a CA (and has a TPO) but not if it is on the Local Lists. **Scope of Solicitors’ searched should be extended to include Local Listings.**
 - **Further guidance be provided where LPAs are not feeding through change of addresses.**
 - **Contacting the Land Registries to verify that statutory listing is always tagged.**
 - **notification of listing should go to each new owner on sale and maybe also change of lessors on full repairing leases.**
 - **Encouragement be made to inclusion of the fact that you are in a Conservation Area on street signs**, as at Hinckley, LB of Morden and several other English towns.
 - **The feasibility of an App explaining listing that new owners can download should be explored.**

- **Architects receiving Lbc should, as under Smc, be required to inform all involved with the work that the site is Listed.**

I have no strong views on who should pursue the above ideas, whether DCMS, Historic England or LPAs, but clearly the apportionment of tasks needs to be understood and agreed.

32. “Taking Stock” is a strategic thematic assessment by Historic England of Roman Catholic churches, carried out on a diocese by diocese basis in agreement with the Roman Catholic Church (the results made available, with laudable openness at www.takingstock.org.uk) . **The nationwide “Taking Stock” survey should be completed** and candidates identified as worthy of the Lists added to an agreed timetable.
33. **Reinstate National Case Conferences between staff.** These helped to create common standards. Listing staff already have to hand Historic England’s exemplary online and hardcopy archive but might there be a regularly updated compendium of non-HE websites ?
34. Buildings moved from their original location to re-emerge as exhibits in an open air museum were not listable – yet Fig 3 of the Selection Guide to “Agricultural Buildings” suggests otherwise. This should be clarified especially as an historic building in such a museum must be in safe hands and should be one less historic building for the LPA to worry about. In fact the picture is uneven – there are several listings at Avoncroft Museum of Buildings and Cogges (Manor Farm, Oxon) but none at Singleton or Chiltern Open Air Museums, despite the latter having received a barn from Northolt, Ealing of 1595 that had been listed in its original location in Kensington Road. I would recommend that in most circumstances **Historic England should regard structures transposed to museums as chattels and therefore not listable.**

Complementary Jurisdictions

35. **There is limited scope for circumspect and heavily chaperoned revisiting of some presently listed buildings in Conservation Areas where the interest is wholly or substantially external (therefore only postdating a thorough internal examination).** That should be done on request only through the present de-listing processes and should not be systematic. It should also only post-date a concentrated consultation on how the Conservation Area and Listing regimes interact. A principal participant in the latter should be IHBC, as well as the National Amenity Societies. Such revisiting should never apply within Conservation Areas that lack Article 4s (or have had them withdrawn) and those identified as being “at risk”. Such non-listings should be re-examined if the CA is de-designated or otherwise judged to be ineffective or failing.
36. **There should be a national Register of Conservation Areas,** the agency to compile and maintain such a Register being chosen by Historic England. This should include dated conservation area management plans and appraisals, where available.

37. **Building Preservation Notices should continue to be encouraged and the ability to seek compensation, where these are not confirmed, should be withdrawn.**
38. **Expansion in the number and coverage of Local Lists should continue to be actively encouraged as should their effectiveness in preventing demolition and loss.**
39. Local Lists should not be given statutory force per se. However, **Historic England should examine Local Lists that have been prepared or published with a view to granting statutory status to entries on such Lists**, where that is justified by the exercise of the national criteria. This should particularly apply to buildings owned by LPAs.
40. **There should be a re-examination of the case for a Registered Garden Consent and guidance on how Listing might apply to the organic in areas where there is a clear overlap.**
41. **The existence of Assets of Community Value, particularly as a means of safeguarding the traditional use of an historic building, should be further publicised.**
42. **Where Listing and Scheduling are co-terminous (as opposed to parallel and complementary) the present policy of de-scheduling or de-listing, whichever is appropriate, should continue.** However this should be decided on a case-by-case basis and there need not be a systematic drive. Why primacy or exclusivity is being granted to scheduling or Listing should be explained in the relevant description.

8. Glossary

- COI** Certificates of Immunity from Listing – issued by the Secretary of State and, following an assessment, give a legal commitment not to designate for a period of five years.
- ETL** “Enriching the List” – the informal, unregulated, addition of facts and photos by the public to the formal record of the Listing
- HPR** The Heritage Protection Review (2007) which proposed the merger of all designation regimes
- IHBC** Institute of Historic Building Conservation, recognised as the professional body for building conservation practitioners in Britain.
- Lbc** Listed Building Consent – the permission required from LPA to carry out works of demolition, alteration or extension at a listed building
- LPA** Local Planning Authority
- National Amenity Societies** The 6 voluntary organisations which have to be informed of all applications for lbc, where there is any element of demolition.
- NHLE** The National Heritage Lists available online through HE website
- Reactive Listing** new name for “Spotlisting” – the result of an ad hoc application to list