



Historic England

---

# Biennial Report on the Care of the Government Historic Estate 2017-19

---



Compiled by the Government Historic Estates Unit

Frogmore Mausoleum, Windsor, Berkshire. The Mausoleum in Windsor Great Park, built for Victoria and Albert, is undergoing repair to solve problems of water ingress.  
© Historic England Archive



Cover image: In 2019 a new bridge re-united the two parts of Tintagel Castle, Cornwall, an English Heritage property.  
© Historic England / English Heritage Trust

# Contents

---

Introduction .....	5
Why conserve the government historic estate? .....	7
Major change in the historic estate. ....	9
How they are doing.....	11
The Questions.....	12
The Answers .....	14
Conclusions and lessons.....	22
Annex.....	25
<i>Heritage at Risk on the Government Historic Estate 2017-19 .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Government departments and others, contributing to this Report.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Government historic estates – the evolution of the Reports .....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>How the Protocol came into use.....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Government policy on disposals .....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Agreements as a way to secure better management of heritage assets ..</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Conservation Plans, Conservation Management Plans,     Conservation Statements – and others.....</i>	<i>53</i>



Richmond House, Greater London. Standing directly behind the Cenotaph, Richmond House (Grade II\*) recently passed into the Parliamentary Estate. © Historic England Archive

# Introduction

---

**This two-year period** has seen a continuing emphasis on the rationalisation of the Government Estate. A major programme of disposals, for which Homes England will be the main facilitator, is under way. In Whitehall, the Government Property Agency is getting into its stride as the holder and decision-taker for significant amounts of property, and attention is beginning to turn to how the essential and central buildings can remain relevant and workable. Not connected with this last initiative, but surely subject to the same forces, will be the project to renovate the Palace of Westminster, the Act for which has recently received the Royal Assent.

Every two years since 1997, what is now the Government Historic Estates Unit of Historic England has produced a report into the care of the historic assets owned or cared for by government departments, agencies and similar bodies. The [report covering 2015-2017](https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/biennial-report-care-of-government-historic-estate-2015-17/) (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/biennial-report-care-of-government-historic-estate-2015-17/) shifted the emphasis towards an assessment of actual performance in those years: this report takes that further, and publishes an analysis of that performance as reflected in the answers to the questions asked. As before, **the estates are very different** in size, character, and purpose and these factors play a part in the way the estates have been assessed.

This shift towards a more focused report was discussed with the contributors in the period of preparation before the end of the biennium. Major contributors were consulted on the publication of the figures and gave their assent, but the analysis is entirely Historic England's own. We are, as ever, very grateful to all those who have contributed. We try always to make contact with those who actually do the work. In accordance with this principle, this Report for the first time draws on returns submitted directly by Network Rail and Highways England, two of the most active satellites of the Department of Transport.



Old Admiralty Buildings, Greater London. The sea-horses or hippocampi on the Adam Screen (1760) have been cleaned and repaired. © Carlile Associates

# Why conserve the government historic estate?

---

The **government and its agencies** control a large amount of property and much of this is listed or scheduled, i.e. it carries some form of protection under the law because of its archaeological, historic, architectural or design interest. Some of this property is simply of special interest, but a good deal of it is outstanding, and a few of these sites are of international importance. It is a dozen years since these sites mostly ceased to be exempt from the planning laws (although they remain exempt from **scheduled monument consent legislation** (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/guidance-crown-bodies-scheduled-monument-clearance/>)). Their owners and users must obey the usual rules relating to what can be done with protected sites.

In addition, successive governments since 1991 have recognised that they cannot ask the rest of the property-owning public to conserve the historic environment unless they **set a good example**. The short document setting out how government departments will ensure that the right standards are maintained is called **the Protocol** (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/protocol-for-the-care-of-the-government-historic-estate/>). The greater part of this report examines how the contributing bodies have performed in relation to each of the recommendations in the Protocol.



India Buildings, Liverpool (Grade II\*). The interior being converted into a Government Hub for HMRC and other bodies. © HMRC



# Major change in the historic estate

---

**This period** has seen the Government's broad strategy on its estate proceeding along the lines established after 2010 – rationalising the estate as a whole, and modernising the use of the remaining buildings. **The overall estate has shrunk** by a third since 2010 ([https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/863283/State-of-the-Estate-in-2018-19.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/863283/State-of-the-Estate-in-2018-19.pdf)). The Government Property Agency has moved into higher gear and is assuming direction of property from a number of departments. The dependence on rented property has been reduced and the move to concentrate the central civil service ('Whitehall') in a small number of buildings is well under way. Consequently the drive to dispose of property continues, making the role of Homes England more important than ever. The holder at any time of a significant number of listed structures and other designations, it is recruiting fast to double its workforce and **release land for housing**.

The challenges of disposal for Historic England remain fairly constant, above all to make sure the significance of the asset survives that evolution. Sites which are poorly understood (either by the seller or the buyer) will sell more slowly and be less productive. This matters when departments need to divest in order to realise funds for the maintenance of their remaining properties, as is usually the case today. Historic England has services which can **assist government bodies to assess significance** fully ahead of disposal, so as to 'de-risk' each site.



Sandhurst Block, Bourn Barracks, Catterick. This fine barrack block of 1938 has been renovated as offices with work to all the windows. © Crown Copyright

# How they are doing

---

We asked a series of questions under 11 headings. Each heading is drawn from the Protocol and the questions reflect the content of that section.

As in the last Report there follows some general analysis by theme, with the full set of results published in Fig 6. It is important to stress that this analysis cannot give a complete picture of the Government's historic estate, as change is constant and not all the information received can be moderated.

Given the pressures on spend, the general standard achieved remains high. We estimate that the contributing bodies overall average **74%** in their fulfilment of the Protocol requirements. This is a very good result, which shows that the essential message continues to get through: the heritage is irreplaceable, and Government and its satellites can play their part in conserving it.

No body that we have examined fails to meet a significant number of the requirements. Caution is needed in interpreting any scores which seem to indicate failure, as despite our best efforts some misunderstanding may still be reflected rather than the reality. However, there are some grounds for concern.

In particular, the maintenance of heritage property continues to be difficult for departments or agencies with large historic estates. Although most heritage property performs well over time, it has specialist requirements which can fall outside normal budget assumptions. There is an avowed backlog of repairs in some cases. Where properties are at risk, and disuse is either a cause or a consequence, relatively few bodies are equipped to consider or execute measures to alleviate these cases.

These issues of scale are important, since the **contributing bodies** vary so much. Active use of a small estate presents fewer problems, and supervision is obviously simpler. These physical issues have been taken into account in the assessment, but the Protocol rightly makes no exception for sheer size.

# The Questions

---

**Q1. Nominate a heritage officer**

Are you the nominated heritage officer?

- a) If yes, what contact do you have with the property managers in your organisation on these issues?
- b) If no, how is heritage information disseminated?

**Q2. Ensure that professional advisers and contractors have appropriate expertise**

- a) Who is responsible for ensuring that professional consultants and contractors have appropriate expertise?
- b) How is this checked?

**Q3. Ensure that the significance of any heritage asset is taken into account when planning change or development**

- a) Where change has been proposed, has the significance of any heritage asset affected been factored in?
- b) Does your practice on disposals include an assessment of the impact?
- c) Are heritage impact assessments standard?
- d) Do you have current CMPs for your heritage sites?

**Q4. Commission regular condition surveys**

Do you have regular condition surveys?

- a) If yes, with what regularity? (3/4/5 years)? Are these up to date?
- b) If no, how do you 'identify and prioritise repair and major maintenance requirements'?

**Q5. Implement a planned programme of repairs and maintenance**

- a) Does your asset management plan build on condition survey recommendations?
- b) What period(s) are covered by forward work plans?

**Q6. Secure heritage at risk**

Do you have any heritage at risk assets?

If so, do you have an agreed strategy for each HAR site, arrived at in discussion with the local authority or Historic England?

**Q7. Safeguard heritage assets that are unused or in course of disposal**

Do you have any heritage assets that are unused or in course of disposal?

- a) If so, do you follow published guidance?
- b) What is the regular inspection period?

**Q8. Comply with the statutory procedures that regulate works to heritage assets**

- a) How many designated heritage assets do you count as within your estate, broken down by category?
- b) How many listed building consent applications has your organisation made in the period 2017-2019?
- c) How many scheduled monument clearances were made (or how many standing clearance agreements are in operation)?

**Q9. Ensure that the design quality of any new work enhances the historic environment**

Do you have any examples of new works that have enhanced your heritage assets or the area around them?

(Are you willing to share them as exemplars or case studies which we can publish?)<sup>1</sup>

**Q10. Prepare biennial conservation reports**

Do you prepare a biennial conservation report for your senior management or for internal information?

- a) If yes, please provide it to us
- b) If no, how do you track the condition and issues affecting your heritage assets?

**Q11. Records and archives**

- a) How are your records held and archived?
- b) Does your organisation send material to the National Archives (or another repository) when no longer required?

<sup>1</sup> This question is not scored

# The Answers

---

In this edition, we have asked questions under a series of headings, usually more than one question, with the headings corresponding exactly with the paragraphs of the Protocol. The larger number of questions has proved to be necessary because simple questions tended to elicit answers which did not cover all the ground. Nonetheless we have tried to keep the questionnaire as simple to answer as possible. The scoring reflects the whole set of answers and any subsequent clarification, supplemented by what we may already know.

We have taken on board the reactions to the questions asked in the Biennial round 2015-7, and modified the questions accordingly. Thus the question about **Conservation Management Plans**, which caused some confusion, is now merged into the group under heading 3 where it best applies, and the scoring on the contributing body's own biennial report (or equivalent) is comparatively light to reflect the fact that we no longer promote this format as the way of communicating the information directly to us.

All questions are scored out of 10 except for those on enhancing the historic environment and on biennial reporting which are scored out of 5; the pass mark for compliance (on the full questions) is half the possible mark, i.e. a pass scores 6 or above. The two less significant questions (9 and 10) are not noted as being passed or failed. Many questions have more than one part, the answers to all the parts contributing to the mark.

This kind of enquiry is not an exact science. A numerical presentation risks, of course, giving the impression of certainty. However on this many questions we can be reasonably sure that the picture of each organisation, and of the issues behind the questions, is broadly fair.

## The Golden Thread (1, 2, 3)

We asked each body a cluster of questions designed to address the first three sections of the Protocol. These ask in effect: do you have a ‘responsible person’ who gathers the information and should be able to understand it – because that person (the Heritage Officer) should ideally be in charge of ensuring standards; do you make sure that your contractors have the right understanding and qualifications; and does the special interest of the assets therefore work through into what is done to them, so we can be sure it is being preserved? The last question introduces what has been called the ‘golden thread’, the linking of what is special to what work is undertaken and how it is carried out.

Question	% engaging	Number of fails	Average mark
1	100	0	8.00
2	100	1	8.15
3	100	3	7.25

Fig 1

All respondents answered these questions, and the response on the first two was good (an average score of around 8). This is especially important because today most work to government or agency buildings is undertaken by private contractors, usually including the direction of the work. There is always a danger that the understanding of a site will dissipate, or even that contractors will not have the ability to translate the aspirations into an appropriate end product. The third question is harder to answer, and here the response was less uniform, averaging **7.25**. Three contributors are assessed as failing this question. We will be discussing the less assured answers with the contributors.

One of this cluster of questions (under 3) asks about Conservation Management Plans. **CMPs** are not mandatory under the Protocol, but have proved their worth over the years because the process of discovery about a site creates a greater sense of investment in it, and deepens the appreciation on which successful conservation depends. Plans certainly do not exist for all the buildings which could benefit by them, and we would be happy to advise on this.

## The Facts (8, 11)

Two related questions occur later in the Protocol, which ask about the numbers and type of heritage assets; the numbers of applications made for them; and how the records of work are kept and accessed. Taken together, these tend to indicate whether an organisation has the apparatus to understand its resource and what is happening to it.

Question	% engaging	Number of fails	Average mark
8	100	2	7.65
11	100	3	7.45

Fig 2

The strike rate here falls a little (to averages of **7.6** and **7.4**). The marks reflect knowledge of the stock, and knowledge of the number of applications – not the absolute totals. Many organisations have delegated responsibility for making applications; we recognise this does not necessarily mean that those cases have escaped from effective oversight. A failure to answer either of the questions under 8 is cause for concern. On a more fundamental level, reckoning up the number of heritage assets affected by its operations can present problems for the extensive estates, and especially those with a linear pattern of operation which may be at a tangent to the sites and affect them only marginally. But without a list there can be no proper understanding of the historic holding of the organisation or its overall condition.

It is too easy to forget that good records need to be kept and be accessible, so that an understanding of condition is based on knowing how the fabric has fared over time and what interventions have been made. After twenty years, significant material should be deposited in the **National Archives**, which has advice on this (<https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/manage-information/digital-records-transfer/>). The advice has been updated to take account of electronic data.



## Condition (4, 5)

The assessment of condition has been a mainstay of understanding how government was performing since the early reactions to the White Paper, *Our Common Inheritance*, of 1990. We asked two questions specifically about this: whether the buildings or features are inspected regularly, and what maintenance cycle or regime follows from that.

Question	% engaging	Number of fails	Average mark
4	100	0	8.85
5	100	5	7.50

Fig 3

The average score on Question 4 was the highest of any, which shows that there is a general understanding that condition needs to be monitored on a regular basis. But the connection to work programmes (Question 5) is less secure (with a full quarter of organisations assessed as failing), and this appears to reflect the reality of organisations which cannot undertake to address all of their property in a timely fashion. Indeed in 2017 this was an argument for the rationalisation of Ministry of Justice property<sup>2</sup>:

*An inherited estate of too many, inflexible courts and tribunals has a further hidden cost. For decades, maintenance spending on our buildings has been spread too thinly. Funding has had to be focused almost exclusively on reactive responses to problems; and we have not been able to put in place a programme of planned preventative maintenance.*

<sup>2</sup> 'Fit for the future: transforming the Court and Tribunal estate' (Consultation document), January 2018

## Risk and Redundancy (6, 7)

The public estate is substantially represented on the Heritage at Risk Register of Historic England (see below, Annex). The Protocol is clear that there should be a positive strategy on **each** building at risk, not simply an overall strategy. This requirement of the Protocol is often overlooked, and is perhaps seen as having significant resource implications especially on the larger estates. Similarly the requirement for buildings or sites marked for disposal to be maintained adequately in any waiting period may be the victim of the uncertainty around them or of the need to prioritise operational buildings. Government property policy states that it is still in the public interest for such sites to be maintained so that they can be a going proposition for future users and sustain their special interest.

Question	% engaging	Number of fails	Average mark
6	50	5	5.90
7	50	2	7.30

Fig 4

Question 6 concerns the approach being taken to heritage at risk, and the marks reflect the existence of this problem and strength or weakness of responses to it. The returns from those organisations with identified heritage at risk was variable, with an average score of only **5.9**. Half of the respondents could not be marked as having complied, and this was the worst result for any question. Question 7, on the related issue of the upkeep of redundant sites, showed a rather better result at an average of **7.3**. As with Question 6, here the marking recognised a particular effort being made to confront the vulnerability of empty property. Often this reflects the fact that it is easier to keep a redundant building in an automatic cycle of inspection than it is to think creatively about its future. It is also true, now, that the rate of vacancy in government buildings is well below that in the private sector<sup>3</sup>. But relatively few organisations inspect as frequently as vacancy can require – see Historic England advice: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/vacanthistoricbuildings/heag183-vacant-historic-buildings/>

<sup>3</sup> 'The State of the Estate in 2018-19', Cabinet Office 2020, p 26

## Enhancement and Oversight (9, 10)

The questions which are more lightly scored (out of 5) concern positive work to enhance the historic environment, and whether organisations render a regular account of their historic estate.

Question	% engaging	Number of fails	Average mark (out of 5)
9	70	N/A	2.70
10	100	N/A	2.05

Fig 5

The first question is intended to be distinct from those about repair, but few organisations are in a position today to undertake the essentially civic improvements about which this section was originally concerned. Nonetheless there have been works which can be commended for their elegance and attention to detail, such as the new bridge at Tintagel for the English Heritage Trust.

Because a fully-answered set of questions will give us the information we need, relatively few organisations intend to persist with biennial reporting (or any other periodic report) – which is regrettable chiefly because knowledge within their own organisation needs to be spread either by the Heritage Officer (see Question 1) or others; reports of this kind are valuable, especially when responsibility for property is diffused.

## How the contributing bodies fared in 2017-2019

Fig 6

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	% Total
<b>Out of</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	10	3	6	10	10	N/A	N/A	10	N/A	0	10	59	79
Cabinet Office	7	10	6	10	4	N/A	10	10	5	0	10	72	80
Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	8	8	6	10	10	N/A	N/A	10	2	0	6	60	75
Department for Transport	6	6	3	6	10	4	6	10	0	2	10	63	63
Environment Agency	10	10	9	6	7	4	N/A	6	3	2	7	64	71
English Heritage Trust	10	10	10	10	10	10	N/A	6	5	3	10	84	93
Forestry Commission	10	8	9	8	6	6	10	7	0	5	8	77	77
Foreign and Commonwealth Office	8	10	9	10	10	N/A	N/A	10	2	5	7	71	89
Government Offices, Great George Street	7	6	10	10	8	N/A	N/A	6	N/A	5	7	59	79
Historic England	7	10	7	6	5	7	N/A	6	N/A	0	10	58	68
Highways England	6	10	6	6	6	N/A	N/A	0	3	3	0	40	50

All questions are scored out of 10 except for those on enhancing the historic environment and on biennial reporting which are scored out of 5; the pass mark for compliance (on the full questions) is half the possible mark, i.e. a pass scores 6 or above. The two less significant questions (9 and 10) are not noted as being passed or failed. Many questions have more than one part, the answers to all the parts contributing to the mark.

## How the contributing bodies fared in 2017-2019 (continued)

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	% Total
<b>Out of</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs	8	7	2	10	5	N/A	2	10	3	1	0	48	53
Homes England	8	10	9	10	0	9	10	10	N/A	3	10	79	83
Ministry of Defence	8	7	4	7	5	5	6	6	5	3	8	64	64
Ministry of Justice, Courts and Tribunals Service	7	6	6	8	8	N/A	6	6	N/A	0	4	51	60
Ministry of Justice Prisons and Probation Service	6	6	9	10	6	4	5	6	0	1	6	59	59
Network Rail	10	10	8	10	10	4	8	4	3	2	10	79	79
Royal Botanic Gardens Kew	10	10	10	10	10	N/A	10	10	5	1	10	86	96
The Royal Parks	8	10	10	10	10	6	N/A	10	2	2	10	78	87
UK Supreme Court	6	6	6	10	10	N/A	N/A	10	N/A	3	6	57	76
<b>Average</b>	8.00	8.15	7.25	8.85	7.50	5.90	7.30	7.65	2.71	1.65	7.45		74.05
<b>Responded</b>	all	all	all	all	all	10	10	all	14	all	all		

All questions are scored out of 10 except for those on enhancing the historic environment and on biennial reporting which are scored out of 5; the pass mark for compliance (on the full questions) is half the possible mark, i.e. a pass scores 6 or above. The two less significant questions (9 and 10) are not noted as being passed or failed. Many questions have more than one part, the answers to all the parts contributing to the mark.

# Conclusions and lessons

---

**This report builds on the previous one** to give a picture of the challenges faced on the Government Historic Estate. It has a somewhat finer grain than the 2015-2017 Report, exemplified in the consolidated Table, Fig 6. This gives the contributing organisations in alphabetical order with the scores against all the applicable questions<sup>4</sup>.

It is clear from the returns that no organisation which has contributed has truly neglected its responsibilities. However, some have scores which are certainly disappointing, and among these there are instances of apparent or definite failure to comply with a Protocol requirement (these, and the outstanding successes, are picked out in corresponding colours in the Table). The circumstances behind this will be taken up with the organisation concerned.

The previous, experimental version of the questions in the 2015-2017 Report brought up the possibility that the larger estates might prove to be less successful than the small ones. It is certainly true that larger estates struggle in a few cases to know even the exact statistics of their historic estates, and may have imperfect coverage also when it comes to repair or supervision. But the presence of larger bodies in the upper echelon shows that this is not an iron law. If there is a conservation culture in an organisation, or if its structures have been designed to accommodate the needs of heritage work, even a highly elaborate organisation, which does not have the conservation of historic sites as its core purpose, can serve the heritage well – and thus fulfil the government’s commitment to sustaining the environment.

<sup>4</sup> **The list of contributors** also includes the The Royal Palaces, The Royal Household and the Parliamentary Estate, which made submissions, but these organisations are not required to comply with the *Protocol* and have not been scored.



The new bridge at Tintagel Castle, Cornwall, is purposely designed to interfere as little as possible with the fabric and views.  
© Historic England / English Heritage Trust



Home Farm, Denny Lodge, Hampshire. The earthwork is at risk from the track which cuts across it (top). Excavation trenches to establish the profile of the original earthwork (bottom). © Forestry Commission



# Annex

---

## Heritage at Risk

Heritage assets on the Government Historic Estate continue to be, in some cases, under threat. Work goes on to reduce their number, or to ameliorate their condition. Sites which have lost their historic function are always vulnerable – this time Hanger 2 at RAF Scampton has been taken off the register, but Hanger 3 remains at risk, a risk which past experience suggests must now be increased by the announcement of the forthcoming closure of the base.

Dogged work to improve the physical condition of ancient monuments has shortened the list held by the Forestry Commission, and reduced the risk category both there and on the Defence estate – especially in Wiltshire, where badgers and rabbits wage their own war on the human past.

The total number of items in the Biennial Report Annex for 2015-2017 was **112**, and the number in this Report is **100**.

## Heritage at Risk on the Government Historic Estate 2017-19

---

The annexed list of heritage assets at risk has been put together in conjunction with most of the bodies represented. It is unlikely to be exhaustive. There is a considerable overlap between this list and the Historic England HAR Register, and most of the descriptions have been drawn from the main register<sup>5</sup>. However it also contains some Grade II sites, which are mostly not recorded (outside London) on the national database. The standing buildings, whether listed or scheduled, have ‘priority categories’ in accordance with the Heritage at Risk methodology:

- A.** Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; no solution agreed
- B.** Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; solution agreed but not yet implemented
- C.** Slow decay; no solution agreed
- D.** Slow decay; solution agreed but not yet implemented
- E.** Under repair or in fair to good repair, but no user identified; or under threat of vacancy with no obvious new user (applicable only to buildings capable of beneficial use)
- F.** Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; or functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented

Other ways of categorising risk and condition apply to other types of site, as detailed in <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/key-to-terms-and-abbreviations/>.

Some of the scheduled sites, especially linear monuments, may be in several parts and their ownership split, with a consequent variation in the risk assessment. Efforts have been made to list only those where the part at risk is in the ownership of a relevant body.

<sup>5</sup> These entries are shaded in the ‘Listing’ column.



Shrewsbury Flaxmill Maltings, Shropshire. Historic England has repaired the Main Mill to create 28,000 square feet of commercial space. © Historic England Archive

You will see by the relevant section of the main text (p28-45) that the Protocol requires a strategy for each building at risk. This is a stringent requirement which few organisations find easy to meet, but it exists because these structures or features are easy to miss out of any survey system and they are, often, deteriorating. Where there is a strategy for a site we endeavour to record it below.

You can find the list for each body by clicking on the links below:

[The Department for Transport](#)

[English Heritage](#)

[The Environment Agency](#)

[The Forestry Commission](#)

[Historic England](#)

[Homes England](#)

[The Ministry of Defence](#)

[The Ministry of Justice](#)

[The Royal Household](#)

## Department for Transport

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Devon</b>					
Officers' quarters, Agaton Fort, Devon.	1002613	Scheduled monument	C	18/11/1997	One of the ring of C19 land forts built to defend Plymouth. Overlooks River Tamar. Irregular pentagonal plan, with deep ditch on four sides protected by caponiers and a counterscarp gallery. Internally the officer's quarters, cookhouse and barracks, seven of twenty open gun positions, one Haxo casement, five expense magazines and two of previous six mortar batteries survive. Ceased military use in 1958 but was used as Heavy Goods Vehicle testing centre (partly in a modern building) until 2015. Vacancy is concerning and there are significant problems with dry rot and vegetation management. A condition survey is to be undertaken.

## English Heritage

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Durham</b>					
Derwentcote steel cementation furnace, iron finery forge and drift coal mine.	1015522	Scheduled Monument. Listed Grade I	D	14/08/2008	A large and difficult site which is now improving through local engagement and National Lottery (NHLF) funding. English Heritage is working with local partners The Land of Oak & Iron and the Tyne & Wear Building Preservation Trust to improve the condition of the site as well as broadening access and interpretation.
<b>Greater Manchester</b>					
Baguley Hall, Hall Lane, Manchester.	1291962	Listed Building. Listed Grade I	E	25/02/1997	Medieval hall managed by English Heritage on behalf of the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. A full market and options appraisal has now been completed to obtain a fully costed schedule of repairs and viability for future use. English Heritage and Historic England are engaged with local partners to agree next steps.

## Kent

The north entrance, north-centre bastion and adjoining detached bastion on the Western Heights, Dover.	1020298	Scheduled Monument	C	26/11/1997	A multi-phase, post-medieval fortification, with extant structures largely dating from the Royal Commission period of military construction. Site is at risk in part due to lack of joined-up management leading to lapsed maintenance, but also issues with funding. On this part of the site (another part is owned by Ministry of Justice) a feasibility study is under way to develop a major project which could bring the most significant elements into a sustainable condition. Subject to costs and consents, work may progress in 2020 / 2021.
--	---------	--------------------	---	------------	--

## Environment Agency

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Gloucestershire</b>					
Lydney Harbour and Docks, Gloucestershire.	1002079	Scheduled monument	C	18/11/1997	The docks and harbour date from c1810 to 1821 and were once the main commercial port serving industry in the district. There have been individual localised repairs carried out, with Scheduled Monument Consent focusing on retaining the harbour's flood risk management role rather than on improving its overall condition. The Inner Basin is still in poor condition and needs extensive repairs. Work has also been on-going to clear and control vegetation on the site.

# Forestry Commission

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Cheshire</b>					
Glassworking remains in Glazier's Hollow, 330 metres south of Kingswood Cottage.	1020705	Scheduled Monument	B	14/08/2008	The monument includes the earthworks and buried remains of a late medieval glassworking site in Delamere Forest. No current activity.
<b>Cumbria</b>					
Prehistoric enclosure, field system and cairnfield, and medieval and early post-medieval settlements and field systems 600m SSW of Blacklyne House.	1016089	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	Although a management plan has been prepared by the Forestry Commission, severe bracken infestation will have damaged the site.
<b>Devon</b>					
Post-medieval deer park, medieval fishpond, and a C19 lead mine, ore works and smelt mill at Boringdon Park.	1020565	Scheduled Monument	D	14/08/2008	The site is at risk as walls are under threat of collapse due to tree growth. Removal of trees from these and mining structures have left some in urgent need of repair, some of which is now being undertaken.
Thorn Barrow 520 metres south east of Coop, in Higher Moor Plantations.	1017144	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	The site is at risk as walls are under threat of collapse due to tree growth. Removal of trees from these and mining structures have left some in urgent need of repair, some of which is now being undertaken.
<b>Dorset</b>					
Bowl barrow 610 metres east of Bere Heath Farm.	1015365	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	Occupied by badgers with extensive resulting damage. There is a management plan to protect the monument.
<b>Gloucestershire</b>					
Offa's Dyke: section in Caswell Wood, 280 metres west of Beeches Farm.	1020601	Scheduled Monument	B	14/08/2008	Medieval earthwork. There is significant erosion by visitors in places. A conservation management plan is now in place.
Offa's Dyke: section in Passage Grove, 660 metres west of Sheepcot.	1020603	Scheduled Monument	B	14/08/2008	The monument is at risk from two badger setts. It has also been affected by significant erosion in places due to the Offa's Dyke Long Distance Path. A conservation management plan is now in place.
Offa's Dyke: section in Worgan's Wood, 800 metres west of Chase Farm.	1020605	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	There are some active badger setts in the side of the bank. A conservation management plan is now in place.

Hampshire					
Castle Hill, Chilworth.		Scheduled Monument	B	2009	Prehistoric enclosure. This site is at risk from scrub and sapling growth and also from anti-social activity such as vandalism and fires. There is on-going discussion with the Forestry Commission regarding future management.
Hillfort 400m south of Home Farm, Denny Lodge, New Forest.	1017019	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	The fort is at risk from bracken growth and badger activity, which is being monitored, and needs the diversion of a track which is now being pursued.
Isle of Wight					
Bouldnor Battery, Shalfleet, Isle of Wight.	1010011	Scheduled Monument	C		Battery built in 1938 situated on west coast of the Isle of Wight to help protect the Solent. Buried components no longer accessible but survive. Mainly constructed from reinforced concrete. Historic England has grant aided temporary propping and waterproofing of the roofs. Negotiations proceed towards a long term plan for the conservation and possible use of the monument.
Northumberland					
Cross dyke, south of Campville, Harbottle.	1011396	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	This cross dyke is at risk from bracken growth and selfset trees.
Two cairn cemeteries west of Willie Law.	1006451	Scheduled Monument	B	14/08/2008	The monument is at risk from tree growth.
North Yorkshire					
Broxa Forest: The Thieves' Dikes: prehistoric linear boundaries and associated features.	1019627	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	This is a complex monument which is protected in four constraint areas, covering different management regimes and ownership. At risk from arable clipping. An agreed management plan should help deal with many of these issues. There are signs of illegal access by motorcyclists which the Forestry Commission will address.
Mount Misery Farmhouse, Estell Lane.	1168024	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	F	1999	Late 17th Century farmhouse. The building has been re-roofed but further works are required and it is not occupied.
Round barrow on Grimston Moor 350m north east of Black Gill Plantation.	1013444	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	At risk from bracken growth. Although a management plan is in place, the site will remain at risk until the bracken is dealt with.

Somerset					
Ruborough Camp large univallate hillfort.	1007670	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	A large univallate hillfort on a triangular promontory. The fort is rectilinear with rounded corners. The main entrance is to the East where a hollow way runs up the spine of the hill. Long under forestry, the site is now under a Section 17 Agreement and undergoing positive improvements.
South Yorkshire					
Iron Age and Roman quern workings on Wharncliffe Rocks.	1004802	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Although a management plan is in place and showing good progress, the monument is still at risk from bracken growth. A revised management plan should help to mitigate this.

Historic England					
Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
Hampshire					
Fort Cumberland, Eastney, Portsmouth.	1015700	Scheduled Monument. Listed Grade II	C	20/11/1996	Coastal fort of 1746-1812 with later buildings and features. The Guardhouse has been repaired and is now partly in use. The casemates are suffering from water ingress and associated decay. In addition there is localised deterioration of the Fort's defences, particularly the curtain and counterscarp, with areas of falling material, loose bricks and masonry and exacerbated by vegetation growth. A programme of works to address some of the most urgent issues has started, whilst options for the sustainable re-use of the vacant parts of the site are being considered.
Shropshire					
Shrewsbury Flax Mill Maltings.		Listed Building. (Various Grades)			This is a complex site with 5 individual entries all being managed as a single project. A revised bid was submitted to the HLF in October 2016 and approved in January 2017. This Stage 2 scheme focuses upon the Grade 1 Main (Spinning) Mill and attached Grade 2 Kiln. These should be fully restored by summer 2021. The ground floor will house a larger interpretation and learning area along with catering facilities, whilst the upper four floors will be available for commercial tenants. The Kiln will provide access to the upper floors and a reception space.



Spinning Mill.	458193	Listed Building. Listed Grade I	E	24/02/1997	Former flax mill with five storeys, built in 1797 as the first iron framed building in the world. Converted to maltings in 1897. Outline planning approval was secured for the whole site in 2010. Funding has been secured for the first phase of works and the building is now being repaired. The scaffolding has been removed and the fitting out will begin soon.
Flax Warehouse.		Listed Building. Listed Grade I	B	26/04/2005	Built c1810 as part of the mill's expansion; the cast iron frame represents the rapid development of the use of this material in the first decade of the C19. Outline planning approval was secured for the whole site in 2010.
Apprentice House.	458195	Listed building. Listed Grade II*	D	26/04/2005	Former apprentice house for the Flax Mill c1812, now mothballed. Historic England is working in partnership with the local authority. Outline planning approval was secured for the whole site in 2010.
Stove House and Dye House.	458194	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	B	26/04/2005	Former drying stove house and dye house of the flax mill. Outline planning approval was secured for the whole site in 2010, and this will form the basis of the masterplan and future redevelopment proposals. This building has been repaired to allow for a small Historic England office. The main space has been cleared of later interventions to allow it be used for events, but the roof is still in need of major repair.
Cross building.	458196	Listed Building. Listed Grade I	B	24/02/1997	Flax dressing building circa 1803, rebuilt after fire in 1812. Last used as maltings, but vacant since 1987. English Heritage is working in partnership with the Local Authority and Homes England. A masterplan for the site now has Planning Permission. A Heritage Lottery Fund development grant has been awarded to take forward the first phase of repair.

## Homes England

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Durham</b>					
Medieval farmstead and irregular open field system at High Burntoft Farm.	1015207	Scheduled Monument	B	14/08/2008	At risk from extensive vehicle damage and erosion. A heritage condition assessment has been carried out and a management plan has been agreed as part of a new agricultural tenancy to ensure harm to the asset is avoided. Historic England has discussed the terms under which the monument can be preserved, and negotiations will follow on the development of the surrounding land and its effect on the setting.

## Lancashire

Church of St John in Grounds of Whittingham Hospital, Whittingham Lane.	1165188	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C		Built in 1875, this served as the church for a very large mental hospital. It has been unused since the hospital closed in 1995. The church was severely damaged as a result of neglect, theft and vandalism prior to its transfer to Homes England in 2005. Agreement has been reached for development to start on part of the site but this heritage asset remains in Homes England ownership at the current time. A new masterplan has been prepared (2018) and a building survey was carried out in June 2019 to assess condition. The survey recommended some urgent works to maintain the building in a watertight state.
---	---------	-------------------------------------	---	--	---

## Nottinghamshire

Regional Seat of Government, Government Buildings, Chalfont Drive.	1390526	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C		An early 1950s War Room, extended c1963 in the grounds of the former Land Registry office site, which is in the course of disposal. The bunker is in poor condition with no operable mains electricity. Access is limited because of the presence of asbestos throughout. A list of defects and recommendations was prepared in 2013. An asbestos inspection has followed and Homes England intends to begin work shortly to remove this, before marketing of the building.
--	---------	-------------------------------------	---	--	---

## Ministry of Defence

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Berkshire</b>					
Former Infirmary Stables, Arborfield Garrison, Arborfield.	1006949	Scheduled Monument	E	19/02/1998	A specialised 'horse hospital' built 1911-12. The building is redundant by virtue of changes in army practices (reduced cavalry activity). A sustainable future needs to be found and repairs undertaken. Planning Permission has been granted for the development of Arborfield Garrison and this will include a requirement to repair the stables. Works to clear asbestos from the site began in early 2017 and re-roofing of the stables with matching cement diamond tiles were carried out in 2017 and have been completed. An end use for the building is being considered and long term management/maintenance agreed.

## Buckinghamshire

Halton House landscape, RAF Halton.	1000601	Registered Park/Garden. Listed Grade II	D	1999	One of the original seven Rothschild country houses in the Aylesbury Vale with late C19 formal gardens and park with woodland rides. Sold to the Royal Air Force in 1918 Halton House is now the Officers' Mess to RAF Halton. Bisected by the Grand Union Canal the park has been extensively curtailed by development of Halton camp with the historic fabric of the ornamental features of the garden in poor condition affecting its values. The Forestry Commission manages the woodland rides and a Conservation Management Plan has been written to guide future proposals.
Garden Summerhouse at Halton House, RAF Halton.	1000601	Registered Park/Garden. Curtilage listed structure	A	1999	This is the focal point of an Italian garden in the grounds of Halton House. The structure is in very poor condition. An options study was prepared in 2010 but there has been no progress since then.

## Cornwall

Scraesdon Fort, Antony Training Area.	1140707	Scheduled Monument. Listed Grade II	C	05/04/1999	Built 1868, used for military training purposes. Vegetation is being kept under reasonable control. Works have been undertaken to stop water ingress and repairs to metalwork throughout site. Drawbridge and main gate repairs were completed in 2014. The ditch was cleared in 2015.
Tregantle Fort, Antony Training Area.	1159255	Scheduled Monument. Listed Grade II	C	18/11/1997	Fort, built 1858-1865. The fort is vacant, with no end use identified. The interior of the keep is in poor condition, notably the wooden floors. New external doors and windows have been fitted. Interior partitions are still awaiting re-installation. Elsewhere in the fort, the barracks accommodation is no longer used full time with interiors deteriorating in places due to moisture penetration. A section of the counterscarp wall has collapsed. Significant localised problems remain to be tackled elsewhere on the site. SMC has been granted for works to reinstate accommodation at the fort.

## Cumbria

Shieling 150 metres south of Tinkler Craggs, RAF Spadeadam.	1017731	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Medieval shieling. The turf roof has collapsed. Consent was given for consolidation of the partially collapsed north and west walls, which has now been carried out.
---	---------	--------------------	---	------------	--

## Devon

Fort Bovisand, (Joint Service Sub Aqua Diving Centre, JSSADC).	1002584	Scheduled Monument	D	2009	Major C19 fort complex forming part of the ring of defences around Plymouth. Most recently used as a base for training divers, it is now disused. A scheme for residential conversion with significant levels of public access and interpretation has been agreed and planning permission was granted in 2017. Enabling and recording have started and are progressing.
Watch House battery and ditch, Staddon Heights.	1002585	Scheduled Monument	A	2009	Constructed 1904 but utilising an 1860s ditch system, with First and Second World War additions. The site was leased to a private company until 2009, and since then has been vacant and subject to vandalism. Recording has been put in hand but no options for repair/reuse have been agreed.
HM Naval Base, Devonport, South Yard: South Saw Mills, South Yard, HM Naval Base, Plymouth.	1388413	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	E	1994	Sawmill built between 1856 and 1859. The saw mills ceased to be used as such in 1987 but the ground floor remained in light industrial use and for storage until 1997. An options report was issued in 2010, but the building remains vacant with no identifiable use. The roof was provided with a large net in 2017 to prevent dislodged roofing materials becoming projectiles.
HM Naval Base, Devonport, South Yard: South Smithery, South Yard, HM Naval Base, Plymouth.	1392692	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	A	1994	Dockyard smithery built 1771, modified in the C19 and reconstructed c1897. It remained in use until 1987 when structural faults were discovered. There is continued deterioration of the roof, masonry and interiors. An options report was issued in 2010, but a repair strategy has not yet been put in place. In 2017 a large net was installed on the roof to prevent dislodged roofing materials falling in high winds.

## Dorset

Bindon Hill camp, Lulworth Gunnery School.	1002705	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	At risk from coastal erosion.
Flower's Barrow: a small multivallate hillfort and associated outwork on Rings Hill.	1008141	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	At risk from coastal erosion.
Two barrows known as 'Water Barrows' 650 metres WNW of Whiteway Farm: part of a round barrow cemetery to the south east of East Lulworth.	1008144	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Very overgrown with several trees fallen across the mound; severely affected by badgers.

## Essex

Environmental Test Centre Foulness: The George and Dragon Public House.	1112635	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	1997	17th century former public house, now vacant. Re-opening as a public house is unlikely because of its location within a military area.
Environmental Test Centre Foulness: Ridgemarsh Farmhouse, Court End, Courtsend.	1112640	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	25/02/1997	Farmhouse of circa 1700. Derelict and on Ministry of Defence firing range (so unsuitable for permanent occupation). Roof repairs are still needed. The local MoD conservation group has recorded the farmhouse in detail and is looking at options for re-use.
Environmental Test Centre Foulness: Barn Approximately 60 metres south east of Ridgemarsh Farmhouse, Court end.	1308397	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	25/02/1997	Timber-framed barn c1700 adjacent to Ridgemarsh Farmhouse. Located on a Ministry of Defence firing range, the barn is unused because of its location within the range danger template.
Environmental Test Centre Foulness: Quay Farmhouse (or Monkton Barns), The Quay.	1112641	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	25/02/1997	Farmhouse of circa 1811. Derelict and vacant on Ministry of Defence firing range (so unsuitable for permanent occupation). There has been no progress since the last report.
Environmental Test Centre Foulness: Bakehouse/Brewhouse at Quay Farm, Monkton Barns.	1147739	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	25/02/1997	Bakehouse/Brewery of circa 1811 and associated with the site of Quay Farmhouse (Monkton Barns). The range is in poor condition and vacant. It is located on a Ministry of Defence firing range (so is unsuitable for permanent occupation).
Suttons Manor House, Suttons Road, South Shoebury.	1306855	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	A	05/04/1999	House, 1681. Currently vacant, last used as residential quarters. Re-use of the building is complicated by its location within a military site. A serious dry rot problem was treated 1998 to 2003 but has caused considerable damage to the interior. The building has been vacant for many years. Rigid application of three-year break clause in all long leases granted by Ministry of Defence has seriously worsened potential for reuse by charitable trusts. On-going water ingress due to defective rainwater goods.

## Greater London

Feltham House, Elmwood Avenue, Feltham.	1189466	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	A	1994	Built in the mid-C18 in stock brick and modelled on other Palladian villas, extended in the late C18 with the addition of side wings. The interior has been modernised but retains C18 decorations of interest, which may partly be attributable to James Wyatt who lived at Hanworth. The building has been unused for some years, and there is extensive rot damage in the principal storey and rainwater penetration. Some ceilings have collapsed and the building is now unsafe to enter. Discussions are underway to secure its repair and re-use.
The Keep (Armoury) to Hounslow Cavalry Barracks, Beavers Lane, Hounslow.	1240633	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C		Built in 1875, consisting of three storeys with four-storey staircase towers at each end and in the centre of the south west front. Many windows retain heavy cast iron shutters with firing loops and massive bolts to the interior. The building has been unused for some years and the top storeys are now inaccessible. This is as a result of rainwater penetration from the rooftop parapet and blockages in the flat roof drainage rainwater pipes. There are currently no plans for repairs but discussions have begun concerning the future of the wider site.
The Rotunda, Green Hill, Woolwich Common.	1078987	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	A	2005	24-sided single-storey building designed by John Nash. Concave conoid roof. First erected in the grounds of Carlton House in 1814 for (premature) celebration of Allied victory in the Napoleonic wars. The Rotunda housed the reserve collection of the 'Firepower' museum but is now vacant. The roof covering is leaking and there is considerable concern about the condition of internal timbers. Urgent works are needed and investigations into the roof structure are outstanding. Discussions regarding its potential re-use continue.

## Greater Manchester

Sundial Cottage Simons Farm, Redisher Lane.	1067229	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C		Stone-built Pennine vernacular cottage of c1700 with later extensions. The building is unoccupied. The site has been earmarked for disposal.
---	---------	-------------------------------------	---	--	--

## Hampshire

HM Naval Base Portsmouth: Former Royal Naval Academy (Buildings 1/14 and 1/116-9), HM Naval Base, Portsmouth.	1244573	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	A	25/05/2011	One of the oldest structures in the Dockyard, this building is a Georgian forerunner of the Britannia Royal Naval College at Dartmouth. This building has long been vacant. Natural ventilation and background heating has been introduced, reducing damp levels. Recent remedial works have reduced water ingress and the dry rot appears to be dying back. If the HMS Nelson Ward Room is relocated into the historic dockyard this building would be brought back into use for officer accommodation and facilities. This decision is awaited. Asbestos has been found in the roof.
HM Naval Base Portsmouth: 2-8, The Parade, HM Naval Base, Portsmouth.	1272307	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	A	28/04/2005	Terrace of dockyard officers' lodgings, 1715-19. Partially converted to office use c1995, but now empty. Prone to wet rot and some structural movement. Background heating has been introduced, reducing damp levels. However, problems persist between the main building and the rear extensions. There is extensive decay in panelling and some plaster ceilings have collapsed. Scaffolding has been erected to examine the condition of the building with a view to completing high level repairs to make the building watertight.
HM Naval Base Portsmouth: Iron and Brass Foundry, 1/140, Victoria Road, HM Naval Base, Portsmouth.	1272310	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	C	06/03/2001	Iron foundry and smithery built 1857-1861, by Col GT Greene RE and Andrew Murray, Chief Engineer; extended 1878, with later alterations. The main part of the building was converted to office use in 2003. The east wing (Building 1/136) remains unused and at risk. There are concerns over water ingress and drainage of ground water; these problems are being addressed.
HM Naval Base Portsmouth: No. 25 Store, Yard Services Manager's Office, 1/118, Jago Road, HM Naval Base, Portsmouth .	1244578	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	C	06/03/2001	Two storey storehouse of 1782, with internal courtyard. In poor condition and vacant. Some evidence of water ingress and pigeon infestation. Future use uncertain. If the HMS Nelson Ward Room is relocated into the historic dockyard this building could be converted for reuse. The decision to relocate the Ward Room is awaited. Some repairs to the structure planned over the next 18 months (making good after small area of demolition).
HM Naval Base Portsmouth: No.5 and No.6 Dock, Basin No.1, Portsmouth Dockyard.	1001852	Scheduled Monument	C	06/03/2001	Docks 5 and 6 are part of a complex of late C18 and early C19 ship building and repairing docks with associated quay walls and mooring fixtures. The docks have stepped sides with flights of steps and haulage slides; some retain later metal gates. Dock 6 is suffering from rotation, and mortar joints on the stonework treads on the north side have opened up; it is also vulnerable to water penetration action and the stonework is spalling. Dock 5 has recently been flooded due to failure of the gates and is vulnerable to algal growth and saturation of stonework with risk of accelerated decay.
Fort Elson, RNAD, Military Road, Gosport.	1001841	Scheduled Monument	A	1994	Polygonal artillery fort of 1853-60. Damaging vegetation has taken hold of the site. Programmes of vegetation removal are intermittent. A management plan has been drafted but not agreed or implemented. The building cannot be occupied because it lies within a munitions storage area.

Fort Grange, Military Road, Gosport.	1001807	Scheduled Monument		1994	A polygonal fort of c1860, part of the Gosport outer defence line, now located in HMS Sultan. Some parts of the fort are in poor condition, including the gun casemates and soldiers' quarters to the south of the central caponier, and the right flank gun casemates and officers' quarters. A condition survey is required.
Fort Rowner, Military Road, Gosport.	1233871	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	A	1994	A polygonal fort of c1860, part of the Gosport defence line, now located in HMS Sultan. Some parts of the fort are in poor condition, including the left flank gun casemates and officers' quarters. A condition survey is required.
Old Military Swimming Baths, Queens Avenue, Aldershot Garrison.	1272438	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	2009	Former military swimming baths of 1900 with minor later accretions; largely unused for many years. Most of the interior is inaccessible due to health and safety concerns. A scheme has been developed for conversion to a conference centre but has not been implemented. However the main building was re-roofed in 2018.
Main Block of Cambridge Military Hospital, Hospital Road, Aldershot Garrison.	1339693	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	2007	A large purpose-built military hospital dating from 1879 with extensive ranges of later wings and wards. The building has now been transferred to Grainger, the MOD's development partner, but remains in MOD freehold. The conversion of the main hospital buildings to residential use has been granted in outline. The building is in very poor condition and the presence of asbestos is a major issue.
The Orangery, Southwick House (Defence Police College), Defence Police College.	1096224	Curtilage Listed Structure. Listed Grade II	C	2009	Orangery, much altered in the 1990s. A curtilage building to Southwick House, overgrown and decaying.
Long barrow 400m south east of Moody's Down Farm.	1012515	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	The monument is at risk from annual cultivation by the tenant farmer.
Three disc barrows on Longmoor Common, 250m north west of the church.	1016843	Scheduled Monument	F	14/08/2008	At risk due to bracken coverage.



Kent					
Dymchurch Redoubt, Hythe Ranges.	1017352	Scheduled Monument	E	19/04/2000	The original fort of 1806 is a massive brick circular structure within a dry moat, and has C20 additions. Located on Ministry of Defence ranges, some parts have been brought back into use as a military training facility. There is brickwork deterioration to both the original fort and later additions. A Conservation Plan was prepared in 2005. Phased repairs are in progress.
The London, The Nore, Thames Estuary.	1000088	Protected wreck site	E	01/08/2008	The London was a Second Rate 'Large Ship' built in Chatham in 1654 during the Interregnum. She is known to have participated in the First Dutch War (1652-4) and later formed part of an English Squadron sent to collect Charles II from the Netherlands and restore him to the throne. The London blew-up on passage from Chatham in March 1665. A series of artefacts have been identified on the river bed and recovered to the surface.
Lincolnshire					
Hangar 3, RAF Scampton.	1391594	Listed Building. Listed Grade II.	E		One of four C-type hangars, built in an arc 1936-7 as part of a RAF bomber station. In 2012, the station Heritage Centre re-opened in the annex to hangar 2 following refurbishment by volunteers, cadets and trainees. Further work on the site must be in doubt given the closure announcement.
North Yorkshire					
Oran House and farmstead, Marne Barracks.	1301661	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	2009	Small manor house of c1830 with later additions and separately listed farmstead buildings, including barn, stables, cottages, outbuildings and a laundry. The three maisonettes within the manor house were last occupied c1998, and the outbuildings currently are unused. Weatherproofing works and basic maintenance works have allowed the house to dry out. Disposal may be possible following major road upgrades close to the barracks.

## Wiltshire

Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bell barrow 250 metres NNE of the sports ground: one of a group of round barrows north west of Idmiston Down.	1013971	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	Formerly at risk from arable clipping but returned to grassland in 2018.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bell barrow and bowl barrow 500 metres NNW of Long Orchard.	1013984	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monuments have suffered from extensive rabbit activity. Geophysical survey by Wessex Archaeology 2018. Protected with mesh.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bell barrow, three bowl barrows and gas testing trenches on Idmiston Down.	1014818	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	The monuments are suffering from extensive rabbit and badger activity, as well as severe scrub encroachment. However their position in the most restricted area makes mitigation largely impractical.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 250m south of Martin's Clump.	1013063	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from significant rabbit activity. Consent was granted in 2015 for works to address risk, and it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 260 metres SSE of the southern corner of Moll Harris's Clump: one of a group of round barrows on Porton Down.	1014096	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 440 metres SSW of the southern corner of Moll Harris's Clump: one of a group of round barrows on Porton Down.	1014094	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 530 metres SSW of the southern corner of Moll Harris's Clump: one of a group of round barrows on Porton Down.	1014092	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 535 metres SSW of the southern corner of Moll Harris's Clump: one of a group of round barrows on Porton Down.	1014093	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bowl barrow 750 metres NNE of Easton Down Farm.	1013986	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.

Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Bronze Age enclosure and two bowl barrows 520 metres north east of Moll Harris's Clump on Idmiston Down.	1014819	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	The larger bowl barrow has significant scrub covering and extensive rabbit activity. However its position in the most restricted area makes mitigation largely impractical.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Long barrow 140 metres WSW of the Battery Hill triangulation point.	1014089	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Saucer barrow 400 metres north east of the sports ground: one of a group of round barrows north west of Idmiston Down.	1013970	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	The monument is suffering from badger activity.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Two bowl barrows 265 metres south of the southern corner of Moll Harris's Clump: part of a group of round barrows on Porton Down.	1014095	Scheduled Monument	E	14/08/2008	The monument has suffered from extensive rabbit activity, but it has recently been meshed.
Defence Science & Technology Laboratory, Porton Down: Two disc barrows and two bowl barrows 900 metres north of Moll Harris's Clump on Idmiston Down.	1015557	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	The monument is at risk from extensive rabbit burrowing. However their position in the most restricted area makes mitigation largely impractical.
Horse barrow, Defence Nuclear Biological & Chemical Centre.	1005610	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Prehistoric round barrow. The monument is at risk from farming activity.
Defence Training Estate, Salisbury Plain: Enclosure and linear earthworks between Bishopstrow Down and South Down Sleight.	1010283	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Prehistoric enclosure. The monument is suffering extensive damage from tracked vehicles during military training.
Defence Training Estate, Salisbury Plain: Six bowl barrows and two disc barrows forming the majority of a round barrow cemetery 300 metres north west of Fargo Road ammunition compound.	1009124	Scheduled Monument	A	14/08/2008	Both established and new badger damage observed in 2015.

# Ministry of Justice

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Devon</b>					
Chapel and kitchen block, HM Prison Dartmoor, Princetown.	1326422	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	15/12/2000	The prison was built in the early C18 as a prisoner of war camp for the Napoleonic Wars. It was subsequently used to house American prisoners during the war of 1812, before conversion to a civil prison in the 1850s. The chapel and old kitchen block both date from the first phase of the prison's development and are now derelict.
<b>Durham</b>					
Durham Prison Officers' Club, ('The Tithe Barn'), Hallgarth Street, Durham.	1120616	Listed Building. Listed Grade II*	D	10/04/2001	C15 granary building, erroneously known as 'The Tithe Barn', forming part of an important group of medieval farm buildings. The building lies outside the secure perimeter of the adjoining prison and is used as part of the Prison Officers' Club. The roof, stonework and close-studded upper floor require attention. Repointing of the barn has been completed but further works are required, particularly to the granary.
Cottage adjacent to Judges' Lodgings, Plawsworth, Durham.		Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	17/04/2002	A self-contained cottage attached to the Judges' Lodgings. It requires extensive repairs but is subject to a full repairing lease held by a private tenant.
<b>Kent</b>					
The western outworks and moats, The Western Heights fortifications, Dover.	1020298	Scheduled Monument	C	26/11/1997	A multi-phase, post-medieval fortification, with extant structures largely dating from the Royal Commission period of military construction. Site is at risk in part due to lack of joined up management leading to lapsed maintenance, but also issues with funding. A masterplan has been agreed but actions arising from this are slow to be taken forward.
Chapel of the Good Shepherd at Maidstone Prison, Boxley Road.	1336159	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	26/11/1997	Maidstone Prison's Anglican chapel of 1910, built almost entirely of concrete blockwork imitating smooth ashlar and rock-faced ragstone. The tracery of the aisle windows is in urgent need of repair but has been stabilised for the present.
<b>Merseyside</b>					
Stables to Judges' Lodgings, Newsham House, Liverpool.	1293121	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	C	19/11/1997	Stable and coach house to west of Judges' Lodgings. Part used as garaging. Capable of being converted to form a self-contained residential unit.

## Worcestershire

Hewell Grange: Hewell Grange Park.	1000886	Registered Park and Garden. Grade II*	E		Multi-phase landscape, including work influenced by 'Capability' Brown and Humphry Repton. Another period of activity took place towards the end of C19 when the current house was built. Post-war development by the Prison Service has had a major impact on the legibility of the design. A management plan and partnership with the County Gardens Trust has led to renewed interest in and care for the designed landscape, including restoration of a bridge and the commissioning of a Statement of Significance for the earlier, ruined mansion at the heart of the landscape.
Hewell Grange: Ruins of Old Hewell Grange, Hewell Park.	1167984	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	A	14/02/1998	A classical building by Francis Smith of Warwick, 1712. The portico was added to the designs of Thomas Cundy 1815-16. It was reduced to a ruin by fire c1890 and now stands in the grounds of an open prison, managed by HM Prison Service. The structure was scaffolded a few years ago but parts at risk of collapse. The building makes a significant contribution to the RPG which is at risk.
Hewell Grange: Cast Iron Bridge north of the lake.	1436349	Listed Building. Listed Grade II	A	14/02/1998	Detailed reports have been produced and studies carried out to restore bridge and abutments to take pedestrian traffic. Funding provisionally secured at the beginning of 2015 has been frozen following cutbacks by HM Prison Service. The bridge has been shored with scaffolding.

## Royal Household

Site Name	UID	Listing	Category	Date Listed as HAR	Description
<b>Maidenhead</b>					
Royal Mausoleum, The Home Park, Windsor.	1117781	Listed Building. Listed Grade I	F	07/02/2006	Mausoleum of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, 1862-71. Damp problems placed external and internal historic fabric at risk, including the internal paintings. The original rainwater drainage was inadequate and poorly designed. Environmental monitoring carried out since 2009 confirms that the building is drying out at high level. The exterior is now weather-tight but it will be some years before the building has dried to enable conservation of the interior to begin.



The internal arcade of India Buildings, Liverpool, being renovated as a Government Hub. © Historic England Archive

## Government departments and others, contributing to this Report

Name	Type <sup>1</sup>	Number of Heritage Assets <sup>2</sup>
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	MD	1
Cabinet Office	MD	5
Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	MD	4
Department for Transport <sup>3</sup>	MD	1
Environment Agency	ENDPB	1798
English Heritage	Trust	420
Forestry Commission	NMD	909
Foreign & Commonwealth Office	MD	7
Government Offices Great George Street	MD	1
Highways England	Other	no information
Historic England	ENDPB	8
Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs	NMD	6
Homes England	ENDPB	121
Historic Royal Palaces*	PC	38
Ministry of Defence	MD	1364
Ministry of Justice	MD	243
Ministry of Justice	MD	91
Network Rail	Other	973 <sup>4</sup>
Parliamentary Estates*	Other	17
Royal Botanic Gardens Kew	ENDPB	58
Royal Household*	Other	77
Royal Parks	Charity <sup>5</sup>	198
UK Supreme Court	NMD	1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6341</b>

\* These bodies bear comparison with the Departments and Agencies but are not subject to the Protocol. They have submitted material voluntarily since 2001.

No return was received this time from the Department of Health and Social Care.

<sup>1</sup> MD = Ministerial Department; ENDPB = Executive Non-Departmental Public Body; NMD = Non-Ministerial Department; PC = Public Corporation; EA = Executive Agency. The full list of Departments, agencies and public bodies, with their affiliations, may be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations>

<sup>2</sup> Heritage assets of all kinds (conservation areas are not included except by Environment Agency). The figures come from the bodies themselves and have not been comprehensively checked. The Forestry Commission and Environment Agency control land on which parts of scheduled monuments (etc) may lie, and these have been counted in. Some World Heritage Sites coincide with these assets, notably at Kew and in Westminster.

<sup>3</sup> In this period DfT reported only on behalf of DVSA.

<sup>4</sup> Listed buildings within 20 metres of a station lease; lineside estate not yet fully mapped.

<sup>5</sup> The Royal Parks became a Charity in July 2017, having previously been an Executive Authority.

## Government historic estates – the evolution of the Reports

---

**Governments do not**, as a rule, acquire historic estates, or even heritage assets, simply because they are historic. Some assets were created by a branch of government, and have become historic by the sheer passing of time and increasing rarity; others have been acquired for some other reason long after they were made. None of the Reports written by the Conservation Unit of the Department of National Heritage or its successor bodies (now the Government Historic Estates Unit of Historic England) contains a definitive list, either of the heritage assets, or the organisations which hold them.

Concern over the way in which such assets might be treated in public hands goes back to the 1980s, when the lists of listed buildings were still in course of a major revision<sup>1</sup>. The assumption seems to have been that Departments would report on all the sites within their direct control, but from the 1995-7 Report ‘agencies’ were treated as equivalent in this respect<sup>2</sup>. The list of contributing bodies has changed regularly, as have their responsibilities, titles and holdings.

Thus the bodies represented in this report are either departments of government, agencies of those departments, or ‘arm’s-length bodies’ (the length of the arm is variable), mostly deriving income from government. A body which has a public purpose, but which is financially and managerially almost entirely separate from government (such as Trinity House, the ancient institution that maintains and runs the country’s lighthouse system), will generally not be included. Network Rail, though not an arm of government, receives considerable government funding and is consequently included in this report for the first time.

<sup>1</sup> The official process began with the White Paper, *This Common Inheritance*, in 1990.

<sup>2</sup> For example the Royal Parks Agency and the Historic Royal Palaces Agency, both dependencies of the Department of Culture, Media & Sport (which produced the Report), and the Benefits Agency, a dependency of the Department of Social Security.



## How the Protocol came into use

---

**The initiative to demonstrate best practice** on the government historic estate started with the White Paper *This Common Inheritance* in 1990. From this the following paragraph was quoted in the first Protocol (2003):

*The Government constantly aims for the highest standards of conservation and will ensure that those responsible for its historic buildings are aware of the importance of the heritage they hold in trust. All departments holding historic buildings are committed to this policy, which extends to all protected sites and property of cultural value in the government estate.*

To which the Department of the Environment responded with a ‘Plan of Action for the Care of Government Historic Buildings’ in 1991, endorsed by the Public Accounts Committee in 1992. The Plan was revised by the Department of National Heritage in 1996, and then superseded by the *Protocol* in 2003. The current **Protocol** was produced by Historic England in 2017, and is essentially an updated version of the same text.

Take-up appears to have been a matter for individual timetables: the 2003-2005 Biennial only says that ‘most’ of the relevant departments had adopted the Protocol (a full decade later) and not which they were; all are reported on equally. One exception was the Ministry of Defence, which seems to have publicly adopted the Protocol in its own publication of 2005, *The Strategic Statement on Heritage*; this is reported in the 2005-2007 Biennial Report. The Homes & Communities Agency, predecessor of Homes England, was praised for adopting the Protocol on its creation in 2008.

## Government policy on disposals

---

**Advice on the disposal of heritage assets** was issued first in 1995, and Historic England is in the course of revising its own guidance (previously issued by English Heritage).

However, the pace of change has intensified since 2010 as new imperatives to save have arisen and governments have sought increasingly to rationalise accommodation, starting with offices. **Land seen as surplus to requirements** was placed on a register and the default setting was to put it on the open market ([www.gov.uk/government/publications/disposal-of-surplus-public-sector-land-and-buildings-protocol-for-land-holding-departments](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disposal-of-surplus-public-sector-land-and-buildings-protocol-for-land-holding-departments) 2014). £1.4 billion was raised from the sale of surplus property between 2010 and 2014 and £600 million in running costs saved. The current **Government Estate Strategy (2018)** (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-estate-strategy-2018>) emphasises ‘a more proactive approach that considers property as a platform for the delivery of government’s wider objectives’.

Building on initiatives to encourage flexible working and free up space, government is pursuing a longer-term ambition to cluster functions in regional Hubs, to coalesce with local government in many cases through the ‘One Public Estate’ project, and to reduce Whitehall to a single campus of ‘no more than twenty core buildings’.

This general reconsideration of government property holdings needs to build in the heritage significance of the buildings and sites, either so that they can be used in ways which protect or enhance their significance in continued use, or so that their significance can be properly understood by all parties to the disposal process. **Guidance** on this is provided by the Cabinet Office ([https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/599778/Guide\\_for\\_the\\_Disposal\\_of\\_Surplus\\_Land.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/599778/Guide_for_the_Disposal_of_Surplus_Land.pdf)), in which Departments and other bodies are urged (at Annex 2) to consider how ‘land and property with historical, architectural, or archaeological interest... may be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance’. The Office of Government Property directs each department to compile a *Strategic Asset Management Plan* which should identify heritage assets, and to confirm that it has consulted Historic England on their future management. Summaries of these Plans are published each year on gov.uk.

Very much of the land which is disposed of is intended for housing, and this usually passes to Homes England as the facilitator of these sites. Homes England (a contributor to this Biennial Report) is committed to undertake 'early and meaningful market engagement' as one of its Land Disposal Policy Principles, and this includes consultation where appropriate with the bodies protecting the natural and historic environment.



The Small Mansion at Gunnersbury, Greater London (Grade II), is receiving grant from Highways England for surveys and repairs, because of its position near a trunk road (M4). © Historic England Archive

## Agreements as a way to secure better management of heritage assets

---

**In recent years** there has been a gradual increase in the use of Agreements to secure stable management of particular sites or classes of asset.

Historic England, in addition to its role in these statutory agreements, can offer specific advice to organisations and authorities, either across a range of sites (a Service Level Agreement) or when an application is in prospect (Enhanced Advisory Services). These extend the range of our **traditional advice on a cost-recovery basis** (<https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/enhanced-advisory-services/>).

A recent development is the Enterprise & Regulatory Reform Act (2013) which empowers owners to seek agreements with local authorities, or with Historic England. An agreement of this kind can take specified works out of the ordinary control system provided they remain within the prescribed range of solutions, agreed by the parties. The most popular of these is the **Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement**, suitable for a large single building or complex (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/setting-up-listed-building-hpa-advice-note-5/heag008-listed-building-hpa-an5/>). The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government can also make a **Listed Building Consent Order** covering a class of assets across the country, and one of these (for the Canal and River Trust) is in the later stages of preparation; these, it appears, will only be feasible with a limited range of structures and of works ([https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Listed\\_building\\_consent\\_order](https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Listed_building_consent_order)).

## Conservation Plans, Conservation Management Plans, Conservation Statements – and others

---

**There is no magic** in any of these words either singly or in combination, and their shifting use has occasioned much confusion.

The term ‘Conservation Plan’ came into use during the 1980s following the publication of *The Conservation Plan*, by James Semple Kerr (the New South Wales National Trust, 1982). Derived from practice in a country where different cultural traditions must be taken into account, this lucid and thoughtful guide sets out the essentials of a Plan for a site that needed to be defined in terms of its significance. It was several times reprinted and is still available today.

Conservation depends on both understanding and action. Kerr demonstrates how one should grow out of the other, linked by what has sometimes been called the ‘golden thread’. A **Conservation Plan** therefore must contain a full examination of the significance of the site or building, and only when this is complete should the author of the Plan go on to assess the vulnerability of the site’s significance to current or future pressures. The Plan then assesses the options for the site and proposes policies for its conservation. One of these will provide for the periodic revision of the Plan itself.

Not every site merits this full treatment, which will usually result in a document of some size. So there is a simpler version, the **Conservation Statement**, which contains a similar depth of historic analysis, and a similar assessment of the vulnerabilities, but will not typically contain policies.

In recent years the fuller phrase ‘**Conservation Management Plan**’ has been used, to emphasise the importance of the ‘back end’ of the Plan and to signal that this version includes the action plan and schedules. Policies of course imply a commitment by the organisation responsible for the site, and often the agreement or oversight of other bodies. These can take time to assemble, and they obsolesce quickly. Such a Plan requires regular revision with the consent of all parties.

It is unfortunate that this version of the name shares two words with the **Asset Management Plan** which is now the standard term for a government body's overall assessment of its holdings. The standard definition makes the priorities of this kind of plan clear: 'a *plan* developed for the *management* of one or more infrastructure *assets* that combines multi-disciplinary *management* techniques (including technical and financial) over the life cycle of the *asset* in the most cost effective manner' (from the *International Infrastructure Management Manual*). These Plans should contain assessments of heritage assets where appropriate, but will not descend to the level of detail which is characteristic of a full Conservation Plan. They are therefore not a substitute for Conservation Plans or Conservation Management Plans where these have been produced in the past.

There is a very readable introduction to the subject of Conservation Plans, and what they are not, by Kate Clark, at [http://ip51.icomos.org/~fleblanc/documents/management/doc\\_ConservationPlans-Questions.pdf](http://ip51.icomos.org/~fleblanc/documents/management/doc_ConservationPlans-Questions.pdf) (although the contact details no longer apply); and a fuller description from the National Lottery Heritage Fund which requires them as a pre-condition of some grants at <https://www.hlf.org.uk/conservation-plan-guidance>. The NLHF wisely concludes that 'there is no point in preparing a plan unless you are going to use it'.



Old Admiralty Buildings, Greater London. Repair work on the Adam Screen, now part of the Cabinet Office.  
© Carlile Associates

The report has been written by David Brock with contributions from colleagues in GHEU

Photographic credits

(all © Historic England Archive except where indicated below):

Cover & 23: English Heritage Trust

6 & 54: Carlile Associates

8: HMRC

10: Crown Copyright

24: Forestry Commission

Historic England

4th Floor

Cannon Bridge House

25 Dowgate Hill

London

EC4R 2YA

[www.HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://www.HistoricEngland.org.uk)

This report is available to download in pdf form from the Historic England website  
([www.HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://www.HistoricEngland.org.uk))

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact our Customer Services department:

Tel: 0370 333 0607

Email: [customers@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:customers@HistoricEngland.org.uk)

Any queries regarding the subject matter should be addressed to the Government Historic Estates Unit at the address above

Product code HE0024

February 2020



Historic England