

Local Heritage Listing

Case Studies





Summary

These case studies are designed to show a range of different approaches to local heritage list projects, responding to the local context as well as the resources available.

The case studies were developed through conversations with Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and Civic Societies, during 2025. All of the local heritage lists featured have been developed or revised since 2020, some with funding received from the recent Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) local heritage listing campaign.

These case studies are part of a series of documents about local heritage lists:

Historic England 2026 Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage, Historic England Advice Note 7 (3rd edition)

Historic England 2026 Local Heritage Listing: Toolkit

Historic England 2025 Local Heritage Lists: The National Perspective, Historic England Research Report Series 38/2025

This document has been prepared by Caroline Kendall, with support from Amy Burnett and Zoe Shaw.

This edition published by Historic England May 2026.

All images © Historic England unless otherwise stated.

Please refer to this document as:

Historic England 2026 Local Heritage Listing: Case Studies

historicengland.org.uk/locallisting

Front cover: L Rodi Café, Walthamstow. Included on the London Borough of Waltham Forest's Local List. [Chris Redgrave © Historic England, DP528491]



Contents

Summary.....	i
Cambridgeshire.....	1
Enfield	5
Harlow	10
Peterborough.....	14
Somerset and Exmoor	17
South Yorkshire.....	21
Waltham Forest	24
Woking	29
Contact Historic England	32



Cambridgeshire

Case study developed with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council. This project was part of the MHCLG-funded local heritage list campaign (2020).

Why did you decide to develop a new local list?

Prior to the MHCLG-funded project, each of the District Councils had an existing acknowledgment of local listing, whether that was through an existing list that had not been updated, or a list of NDHAs included as part of a local plan or other document. However, as none of the District Councils had the resources to implement a more formal list independently, a group bid to the MHCLG campaign made the most sense.

Who was involved?

Cambridgeshire's revised local heritage list is a strong example of collaboration between multiple District Councils and the County Council. Overall, it is one coherent programme consisting of five lists. The programme, managed by Cambridgeshire County Council brings together lists reflecting the local heritage of Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire, and East Cambridgeshire. Each District Council holds the legal responsibility for their own list.

At Cambridgeshire County Council, the Historic Environment Record & Archives Manager took the lead with support from colleagues. For each of the five District Councils, team members included Conservation Officers, GIS Officers and other support staff. For example, at South Cambridgeshire District Council, a Planning Policy/GIS Technical Data Officer was involved in transferring the data from the shared project website (the local heritage list platform) to South Cambridgeshire's internal GIS mapping.

How was the list compiled?

At the start of the project, there were plenty of potential assets ready and waiting. In Cambridge City, for example, the existing local list (identified as part of the Local Plan) was incorporated directly, and in East Cambridgeshire sites were also identified in existing documents such as Conservation Area appraisals and Neighbourhood Plans. These assets were directly uploaded to the local heritage list platform, a piece of software developed for the MHCLG-funded projects, which LPAs could buy licences for.

The local list initiative became part of daily operations at Cambridgeshire County Council. When responding to consultations on Neighbourhood Plans, team members encouraged those developing plans to consider nominating assets identified within draft plans for the local list. As well as recognising NDHAs identified in existing documents, nominations were also made by volunteers who signed up to the project's one-to-one training sessions.



Members of the public could also nominate an asset for the local heritage list via the platform. Parish surveys were carried out by Conservation Officers to ensure consistent coverage. In East Cambridgeshire, the survey accounted for 95% of all new additions to the local list, proving it to be a worthy exercise.

The process of assessing nominations is ongoing. Following nomination, a letter is sent to the owner or occupier of the site, notifying them of the nomination and allowing them the opportunity to comment, provide more information, or object. In the case of objections, the District Council contacts the owner/occupier by letter to discuss a reassessment.

Every fortnight, a panel consisting of Conservation Officers from across the District Councils along with representatives from the County Council's Historic Environment Team, meet to assess nominations. Nominations are scored 1-3 against each of the criteria. If a nomination meets the criteria and scores 8 or higher, it will be put forward for adoption onto the local list.

How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

The project began in November 2021 and is ongoing. By July 2025, there were 2,145 nominations on the local heritage list platform. Of these, 927 are locally listed, 406 have been assessed and are ready to be incorporated into the lists whilst 491 are pending review from the panel members. A further 265 nominations require more information.

What criteria were used, and why?

The criteria were influenced by advice from Historic England Advice Note 7 (HEAN 7, 2021) and Civic Voice's Local Heritage Listing Toolkit (2018 – no longer available online), as well as the statutory listing criteria and discussions at the Cambridgeshire Conservation Officer's Forum (September 2021). Age and asset type are also recorded but not scored.

The criteria are:

- Archaeological Interest;
- Architectural and Artistic Interest;
- Group Value;
- Historic Interest;
- Rarity;
- Landmark Status (scored either 0 or 1).

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

Overall, the project has successfully raised the profile of non-designated heritage assets and the contribution they make to the historic environment of the Cambridgeshire area. Conservation Officers consider it to be a helpful tool, as it supports them to make transparent and defensible decisions with regards to planning.



For South Cambridgeshire, hiring a Project Officer was key to the volunteer engagement aspects of the project. Further, having a host Local Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council) helped to keep the project manageable and collaborative.

The approach of working together and pooling resources has enabled District Councils to 'even out' the coverage of their previous local lists (for those that had one). In East Cambridgeshire, for example, the previous local heritage list was incomplete and inconsistent, as there were only 90 entries, and 15 out of its 35 parishes were completely omitted. Now, there is complete, systematic coverage for East Cambridgeshire, and the local list is fairer, more consistent and fit for purpose.

What did you learn during the project?

The ongoing management of a local heritage list undeniably takes up a fair amount of resource. For Cambridgeshire, there is a two-hour, fortnightly panel meeting. Preparing for the panel takes a further two hours. As well as this, Conservation Officers need to assess pre-candidate nominations (new nominations which might not yet have all the requisite information required for a full assessment at the panel meeting). Officers also need to organise notification letters and respond to objections, as well as getting final sign off. Additionally, any photographs taken by volunteers need to be closely vetted, in case people or car registration plates appear in the background. HER Officers at the County Council keep records of and process the results of the assessment panels, enhancing or creating HER records for each nomination.

Some Conservation Officers do think a different methodological approach could help boost coverage. For example, in South Cambridgeshire, sites are not assessed in batches according to parish.

What are the next steps for your local list?

For the local lists to 'go live,' further resource is necessary; especially as more publicity and public consultation will be required. The lists are not 'finished' and East Cambridgeshire, for example, plans to do another sweep of the five remaining parishes. As such, the fortnightly assessment panels will continue until the lists have been formally adopted.

While it is not a statutory requirement at County Council level, the duty to support local listing is part of the Historic Environment related service level agreement between the County and District Authorities. To that effect, Cambridgeshire County Council is in the process of hiring a new Local List Engagement Officer, due to start in August 2025. This is a fixed term post for two years at 0.5 FTE. Having had a Local List Engagement Officer funded by MHCLG during the pilot, the team realised how effective this role could be. The postholder engaged local communities across the county, helped disseminate information about the local listing process and, importantly, promoted the community benefits. Having another person in post will help the Cambridgeshire Districts to adopt their lists and



ultimately become champions for local heritage. The work of the Officer will also maximise the evidence base for built heritage recorded in the Cambridgeshire County Council's HER.



Dullingham Village Sign, Dullingham, Newmarket. Included on East Cambridgeshire's Local Heritage List. © East Cambridgeshire District Council



Enfield

Case study developed with the London Borough of Enfield and The Enfield Society.

Why did you decide to update your local list?

Enfield's local heritage list was last refreshed in 2018 and included around 200 assets. It was in need of revision, not least as one building had been demolished and some others had been substantially altered. There were also one or two assets that needed reviewing to determine whether they should still be included. Some were also considered 'curtilage listed'. In addition, there were lots of buildings that people thought should be on the local list and weren't.

There was also a lack of coverage in the eastern part of the Borough, which tends to have different heritage types from the western part. This partly stems from the creation of the current London Borough in the 1960s, when the former boroughs of Enfield, Southgate and Edmonton merged. The western part of the borough is more residential, whereas the eastern part tends to be more industrial and experiences higher levels of deprivation.

A lot of the designated heritage in the Borough dates from 1850 or earlier. As the local demography has changed greatly since the 19th Century, neither the designated nor non-designated heritage assets in the area adequately reflected the different communities living and working in the borough. The local Civic Society (The Enfield Society) and the LPA's Heritage Team also felt that quite a lot of the Borough's important industrial heritage was being lost or was at risk of loss or damage. Military heritage was also under-represented.

The Borough's heritage strategy (2019) stated that the Local Heritage List would be reviewed on an annual basis, however this was considered to be too onerous an undertaking as it would leave limited resource for other heritage projects. Instead, the LPA felt that once during the period of the strategy would be sufficient. The strategy was developed in collaboration with local civic societies and groups and so it felt important to honour this objective.

In addition, everyone involved in the project knew that an expanded Local Heritage List would be a useful tool for development management, providing clarity on NDHAs at an early stage.

Who was involved?

From the start, the Heritage Team knew that they would need to get political buy-in for the process, through the Leader of the Council. They were fortunate to have a Leader who is interested and engaged in heritage, and the project received cross-party support. As an important tool for development management, ensuring planning colleagues were bought-in



was also vital so that they could understand the process and recognise the value of the final list.

Because of the local authority's governance process, many different internal teams were consulted on the potential impact of the local list on their work. This gave the project visibility and buy-in from other teams. In addition, the Heritage Team used the expertise of their colleagues in Comms and IT to promote the consultation and produce and share the final list.

The Heritage Team worked collaboratively with The Enfield Society, whose work tries to reach across the borough's east-west divide. The Society acted as conduit to engage with other local groups, such as the Southgate Society. The Enfield Society had been involved in previous iterations of the Local Heritage List, and brought considerable knowledge, experience and people power to the project.

How was the list compiled?

Working with The Enfield Society, the LPA trained volunteers to survey the borough, looking at existing entries on the 2018 list as well as potential new candidates. The training focused on how to assess assets against the different heritage values identified in the criteria.

Some 50 volunteers were recruited, although by the end around 35-40 were still active in the project. The volunteers divided up the 25 wards and systematically surveyed them, looking for potential candidates. Volunteers ranged from those with professional heritage experience to keen and interested locals without a heritage background. When the surveying teams found a candidate heritage asset, they completed a form and took photographs. For those assets already included on the Local Heritage List, they checked the description was still accurate and verified factual details such as the address.

Once the forms were complete, they were passed to a Heritage Officer at the LPA to review. Officers checked the quality of the submission and created datasets, including mapping the extents on GiS. They were also fortunate to be able to use the Senior Heritage Officer's photography expertise to upskill colleagues within the Team and then set about capturing high resolution photographs where these hadn't been provided by volunteers.

Once the draft list was compiled it went through a process of internal governance before it was presented to the Leader of the Council to approve the draft. Public consultation took place after this. As part of the consultation, the Heritage Team wrote to owners and used social media to engage members of the public, asking people to identify factual errors. Where something didn't have a clear 'owner' (such as the New River) the LPA put up posters in the area to let the community know that the asset was being considered. The main aim of public consultation was to ensure the document was accurate and provide an



opportunity for members of the community to share additional knowledge. Assets proposed for inclusion would only be omitted if it could be demonstrated they were not of heritage value.

The final list, together with a summary of all consultation responses (positive and negative), were presented to the Leader of the Council for final approval.

How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

Discussions about refreshing the list began in early 2022, with the aim of adopting a refreshed list around 12 months later. However, the project was put on hold for almost a year due to staffing changes. In the end, the list was adopted in December 2024.

This delay gave the team longer to create the final document, which was originally intended to be a digital-first output. Through consultation, the Heritage Team found that people were keen on a printable version, and so a PDF format was developed. Originally the team had planned to consult only on new nominations, but the extended timescale allowed them to consult on the full final document too, asking people to identify any factual errors.

What criteria were used, and why?

The criteria were developed as part of a previous iteration of the local list, with guidance from external consultants. It was felt that the existing criteria could still adequately represent the types of heritage that the Heritage Team wanted to see added to the list, and they also felt that if they changed it, they would have to reassess older entries against the new criteria.

The criteria are:

- Historic value: Age, Archaeological Interest, Rarity, Historic Association;
- Townscape value: Architectural Quality, Landmark Status, Group Value, Urban Design Quality, Designed Landscape Merit;
- Cultural value: Social or Communal Value, Aesthetic Merit, Literary or Creative Association.

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

Within the local authority, the project to refresh the local list has enriched relationships with other teams. Colleagues in development management have a greater understanding of the significance of assets on the list and how they have been identified, and the Heritage Team feel that the new local list is given greater weight. Printed copies are now held in the LPA's offices for easy reference. Spending time creating an aesthetically pleasing document with high quality photography has elevated the perceived status of the document and the non-designated heritage assets within it.



By mapping the assets on GiS, colleagues working in validation also know to consult the Heritage Team when an application comes in that could affect an asset on the local list. In addition, the team are seeing NDHAs shaping development proposals in a positive way, with developers looking to incorporate them into new schemes.

Knowledge and awareness about Enfield's heritage has been increased through the positive publicity the project has received, for instance through an article in the local paper. Consulting publicly and working with volunteers to develop the list means that it has buy-in from local communities. The final list is also a valuable research tool for the public, including homeowners who can now find out more about the history of their home. It is also a useful advocacy tool with which to promote the borough's heritage.

The newly created dataset, including polygons, has been passed to the local HER, contributing valuable information about the borough's historic environment. The dataset will also be beneficial in meeting MHCLG's digital planning standards.

What did you learn during the project?

Collaborating with The Enfield Society and involving volunteers worked well and allowed a comprehensive approach, covering the whole borough. The value of the final product as a high-quality, PDF document really sells the borough and its heritage. This wasn't in the original scope of the project, but the Heritage Team feel that the professional presentation has reinforced the value of the local list. The list also provides a vital snapshot of the borough's heritage in 2024, and printed copies will be deposited at local libraries and archives.

Updating the mapping data for the existing local list (replacing point data with polygons) has also been also beneficial for planning colleagues, homeowners and developers. Taking high-quality photographs of each asset has had the additional benefit of providing an archive of images of the borough's heritage. These images have been used to update the heritage pages of the website but also provide an important record that can be used by heritage and planning colleagues in the future.

Having an appendix at the back of the document for small changes (i.e. date errors) means the document can be updated easily without going through the consultation process, whilst also providing transparency about any changes made. This also helps to future-proof the document before the next review.

Managing the scope in advance also worked well. For instance, the LPA decided not to add any new any heritage assets in Conservation Areas, as these are already subject to controls. This also reduced the size of the survey areas. It was also important to accept from the start that the project wasn't about capturing every historic building in the borough but about filling the gaps in the existing local list and having important representative



examples. For instance, selecting the most interesting or unique examples of common asset types, such as board schools and churches.

In future, the Heritage Team would make the process easier by digitising the assessment forms and using a database to capture information.

What are the next steps for your local list?

The Enfield Society are creating a supplementary record of street furniture in the borough, including small items such as ancient weight limits. Some of the volunteers who supported with surveying for the local list are now using those skills to undertake this project.

The Heritage Team feel that that it would be possible to increase the number of assets next time the local list is reviewed, as the project has been well supported and there is a better understanding of what local listing means in practice. The team also maintain a spreadsheet of potential assets identified after the deadline, including through the development management process. This list is available to planning colleagues and helps to underline the fact that local heritage lists are not an exhaustive record of every NDHA in an area but living documents subject to new additions. As part of a review of the Heritage Strategy, the team will consider milestones for future reviews of the local list.



Lock Cottage, Government Row, Enfield. Included on the London Borough of Enfield's Local Heritage List. © Enfield Council



Harlow

Case study developed with Harlow Council.

Why did you decide to update your local list?

Harlow's previous local list dated from 2013 and only included buildings. The Planning Team were keen to extend the types of heritage assets that could be included, and to ensure the local list was up to date and compliant with national planning policy. Opening the local list to different types of assets was particularly important in Harlow, as a town with a significant and valuable collection of public art and sculpture. In addition, the project lead and colleagues were keen to involve the local community, as the 2013 local list had been developed as a desk-based exercise, without community input.

Who was involved?

Harlow is a small LPA, without a Conservation Team. The LPA would usually consult with Place Services at Essex County Council for heritage matters. Therefore, the Planning Policy Team took the lead, with the relevant Portfolio Holder signing off on the different stages of consultation. The LPA used existing resource and tools available to them, without needing to use external consultants.

How was the list compiled?

Nominations were collected through a form on the council's website, using the same platform used for other functions such as submitting applications for an allotment or registering a community event. This had the benefits of being a format that was already familiar to many residents. The LPA also had hard copies of the forms available for anyone who requested them, available in key locations.

To encourage nominations and engagement with the process, the LPA contacted members of the public on their existing planning consultation database as well as statutory bodies, the Harlow Arts Trust and Harlow Civic Society. Both the Arts Trust and Civic Society promoted the consultation through their own channels, and the LPA also wrote to local secondary schools to ask if they could promote it through their newsletters or other channels.

The form was open for two months, and during that period 99 nominations were made, by 21 different people. Although not a huge number, Harlow is a small local authority area (around 93,000 residents), so this level of engagement was considered positive given that this is a specific topic and the budget did not allow for extensive publicising or advertising. Internal colleagues also made a few nominations based on their experience of work in the district.



Once all the nominations were received, the project lead and colleagues reviewed them to ensure they were all eligible – quite a number were already on the NHLE, so these were removed. The team also undertook background research and carried out a site visit for each nominated asset, taking photographs where these hadn't been submitted with the nomination form. Where extra information was submitted by individuals and organisations, such as the Harlow Arts Trust, this was verified and included in the details of nominated assets.

The 70 eligible assets were then assessed by the panel according to a scoring matrix, and of those, 60 were added to the shortlist. The panel included the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Development Management team colleagues and representatives from the Civic Society and Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (a multi-local authority regeneration and growth partnership). The Harlow Arts Society were not represented on the panel as they had submitted several of the nominations.

The LPA also considered the suitability of adding nominated assets that formed part of planned regeneration schemes, weighing up the benefits of including such nominations versus the benefits of bringing forward development proposals and regeneration improvements.

The project lead created a custom Microsoft Access database for the project, which holds photographs and information about the assets, as well as the scores assigned to each asset. The database can generate a PDF summary document for each asset, which was then uploaded to the website for the consultation.

Once the shortlist was finalised, the next stage involved a month-long public consultation on the shortlist, as well as targeted consultations with owners of potential assets, along with input from the panel. This led to a few changes to the scores and the identification of a small number of additional assets.

As a result of the nomination and consultation process, 58 new assets were added to the local list in this update, the majority of which were public artworks or sculptures, including works by well-known artists such as William Mitchell and Nicola Burrell. All the assets from the 2013 local list were carried forward and in total the new list includes 136 assets.

How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

The project began in early 2023, with the development of the criteria and a scoring system. Nominations opened in early May 2023 and closed in late June. Over the summer, nominated sites were visited and scored, and a shortlist was developed, for consultation in the autumn of 2023.

The new local list was adopted in February 2024 by Cabinet, with the whole process taking around 14 months.



What criteria were used, and why?

The criteria were influenced by the guidance provided in Historic England Advice Note 7 (HEAN 7, 2021). The project lead selected five criteria that best met the local context and devised a series of sub questions to sit below each of the criteria.

The criteria are:

- Architectural interest;
- Aesthetic interest;
- Archaeological interest;
- Landmark interest;
- Historical, cultural and social interest.

The threshold for shortlisting was 20 points, out of a total of 92. This was a low threshold but was specifically designed to exclude any unsuitable nominations to ensure they did not get shortlisted. The project lead carefully tested the scoring in advance to ensure it didn't penalise those buildings or structures without clear architectural or aesthetic significance, weighting the scoring in favour of historical, cultural and social interest.

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

Updating the local list has improved recognition of local heritage. While Harlow is a former New Town, there are pockets of older buildings, and the heritage of the New Town itself is also significant. More recent examples which were added to the list include a strikingly futuristic water tower and the Coppice Hatch mosaic, which features scenes from Harlow, created through workshops with local primary schools.

In addition, having the opportunity for the public to engage with heritage and planning has been positive, and something the LPA can continue to build on. Now that there is a solid framework in place (for instance the criteria and scoring matrix) the LPA will be able to update the local list more easily in the future.

What did you learn during the project?

One key piece of learning was the importance of creating and testing the scoring framework to ensure it wasn't weighted against smaller, more commonplace buildings and structures, important in the context of a 'newer' area. Having the panel to check the scoring was also helpful as panel members brought different perspectives to the process. Using Access to create a database also worked well, as it was a piece of software the council already had access to and didn't require any additional costs for software licences.

Although the nomination form asked nominators to check that the asset wasn't already on the NHLE, quite a number of the nominations were. This took time to sift out, despite sharing a link to the Harlow search results on the NHLE.



In future, if budget allows, it would be useful to advertise and publicise the local list update process more widely, potentially using external consultants.

What are the next steps for your local list?

The nomination form is still live. In a year or two, the team plan to conduct a review and update the list again, unless they receive several nominations in the meantime, in which case they might update it sooner. If NDHAs not included on the local list are identified sooner (for instance through the development management process) and it is considered that they should be urgently added to the list, they may be added on an ad-hoc basis through the relevant Portfolio Holder's approval.



Water Garden and Pisces Sculpture by Jesse Watkins, Harlow Town Park, Essex. Included on Harlow's Local Heritage List. Patricia Payne. © Historic England Archive DP247774



Peterborough

Case study developed with Peterborough City Council. This project was part of the MHCLG-funded local heritage list campaign (2020).

Why did you decide to update your local list?

A smaller-scale local listing project was undertaken in 2010, driven by the local Civic Society and focusing predominantly on the inner-city area. Work was also done at the time to include heritage assets identified in Conservation Area appraisals and those assets subject to heritage-based Article 4 Directions.

There was an ambition to expand the local list, and the opportunity to bid for funding as part of MHCLG's local heritage list campaign allowed the local authority to take a systematic approach across the whole area, as opposed to a piecemeal approach over several years. It also offered an opportunity to revisit the local listing criteria and update it to include more than just buildings and structures.

Who was involved?

The project was led by a Senior Conservation Officer at the LPA, with support from another Conservation Officer and an Archaeology Officer. Peterborough Civic Society also supported by sitting on the assessment panel alongside the LPA.

How was the list compiled?

Nominations for the refreshed list were made from across the local community, as well as including assets from the existing list of the inner-city area. Submissions were made through an anonymous online nomination form.

External consultants supported the compilation of the list by writing descriptions for the assets, using the LPA's updated criteria. Alongside a photograph and description, the entries for each asset also include information on which criteria the asset meets, and a short summary of why the asset was nominated for inclusion.

Nominations were then assessed by a panel, followed by a full public consultation on the proposed list. Conservation Officers also wrote to the owners of proposed assets which were considered to meet the criteria. This consultation was very broad and some of the resulting issues took some time to resolve, which delayed the project and publication of the list.

Whilst the LPA reached out widely, they lacked a colleague dedicated to engagement, and so responses to the consultation were limited outside of groups that already had a connection with the LPA.



How long did it take to refresh the local list?

The MHCLG funding was available for a 12-month period, although some additional time was taken to complete the consultation. The main body of the project (with the exception of formal adoption) was completed within the 12-month period.

What criteria were used, and why?

There were existing local list criteria, however these focused on buildings, and new criteria were needed for parks and archaeology. The criteria were amended to reflect additional asset types and made more relevant to the local context, based on Conservation Officer experience.

The criteria largely followed the criteria for statutory listing, with other criteria adapted from those suggested in Historic England Advice Note 7 (HEAN 7, 2021), amended to be more applicable at the local level, such as looking at new town parks. Below each criteria is a series of sub questions, such as 'Is it a communal piece of art which contributes to the setting of Peterborough?'.

The criteria are:

- Age & rarity;
- Historic and Social Interest;
- Architectural Interest;
- Street Furniture and Other Structures;
- Archaeological Interest;
- Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces.

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

The local list brought improvements to the Neighbourhood Plan process and encouraged some villages to approach the LPA with potential additions to the local list which were identified through their Neighbourhood Plan. The LPA has also encouraged communities to come up with their own criteria and have their own policies for NDHAs in their Neighbourhood Plans.

Conservation Officers are now consulted on assets outside of Conservation Areas, raising the profile of the local list. It has also been useful in raising awareness of the wider historic environment i.e. local forests that are managed as a historic landscape. There has also been a change in attitude towards the recording of archaeology, moving away from simply digging and recording unscheduled areas.

What did you learn during the project?

If the team were to undertake the process again, they felt it would have been good to emphasise more of the social and communal aspects of the criteria, having it as its own



category instead of as a sub-set of historical significance. For instance, Edwardian or Victorian pubs which have less significance architecturally but have strong communal value. The team felt that it would be a positive shift to be comfortable with adding assets purely for communal/local cultural value.

The biggest learning was the importance of having a clear process from the beginning on how to adopt the local list. The public nomination process also meant it wasn't systematic, for instance one house might be nominated but the one next door wasn't. It was also a challenge to make sure every ward/parish had some nominations which required a lot of time and effort on the part of Conservation Officers.

What are the next steps for your local list?

The LPA are currently going through the process of adopting the list under delegated powers and notifying the planning committee.

Every year, the LPA will periodically review and add new nominations to ensure it is a continual process. The list is being set up to be a live and ongoing document and currently the LPA have a batch of around 50 potential nominations to be added to the list, in further phases.



Pillbox at Thorney Golf Club. Included on Peterborough's Local Heritage List. © Peterborough City Council



Somerset and Exmoor

Case study developed with South West Heritage Trust. This project was part of the MHCLG-funded local heritage list campaign (2020).

Why did you decide to develop a new local list?

Before the local listing project launched, team members were concerned that the significance of locally important heritage assets was not being fully recognised within the planning process. In Somerset, the HER was flourishing for archaeological sites, but built heritage was not represented quite as strongly.

In October 2020, MHCLG launched their local heritage list campaign, which offered funding for the preservation of “locally important historic buildings and other heritage assets”. The South West Heritage Trust discussed a bid as one way to address concerns that some important local assets might be slipping through the net. Although local listing would not provide additional legal protections, it would help to influence planning decisions in a way that could conserve and enhance local character.

The bid, which outlined a joint heritage list for the local planning authorities in Somerset and Exmoor, was successful, and they joined over 20 other projects as part of the campaign.

Who was involved?

As the project covered the considerable areas of Somerset and Exmoor, it required a large team. A Senior Conservation Officer at the Trust led the project. His team set up the technical specifications and were supported by three new colleagues who were hired using the MHCLG funding. They also collaborated with the Historic Environment Team at Exmoor, and the Planning Teams supporting each LPA. This process became simplified when Somerset County Council was merged with the district and councils to become a unitary authority, Somerset Council.

Three partial posts were created: one for general project management (such as organising the meetings and ensuring timescales were adhered to) and developing the list, one for the HER data entry, and one for digital engagement. The latter included setting up social media accounts on Facebook, Twitter (now X) and Instagram, and creating proactive posts, as well as reacting to comments.

How was the list compiled?

The first part of the project involved developing technical documents such as criteria, guidance and a detailed technical guide which covers aspects such as the assessment process, what local listing means for homeowners and more. The Technical Guide was



adopted after a period of public consultation. Many of these technical documents are held in the public domain and are accessible [here](#).

As the team had a dedicated staff member for digital engagement, a lot of publicity to encourage nominations and engagement was done online. As well as building up a social media network, they emailed all the parish councils and town councils to further encourage nominations. They also did some offline marketing, including advertising in the local press, and putting up posters. All marketing pointed towards the Know Your Place platform, where individuals and groups could make a nomination. The team also hosted a webinar series to support nominations; these were recorded and are now stored on the Local Heritage List project website.

Nominations were reviewed by a panel. The panels for Somerset and Exmoor met separately to review the list and the new nominations. However, representatives from the respective partner organisation were invited, to encourage consistency in decision making. During panel meetings, public nominations were reviewed, as well as existing assessments of potential heritage assets, such as Conservation Area appraisals, Neighbourhood Plans, the Buildings of Britain series, and other trusted resources to source potential 'legacy assessments'.

In Somerset, the panel is hosted by the SWHT. Once a list of approved candidates has been made, it is sent on to Somerset Council. The Council produces a report and ratifies it from their end, after which the candidate assets are officially added to the local list.

How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

The pilot ran for 18 months; the first year or so being spent on setting up the technical aspects of the process.

What criteria were used, and why?

Nominations had to be a permanent building, structure, object, monument, item of street furniture or artwork, site, place, area, garden, or landscape. Whether archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic, there had to be a demonstrable heritage interest.

The criteria are:

- Age;
- Rarity;
- Distinctive design;
- Historical association;
- Evidential value;
- Social and communal value;
- Group value;
- Collective value.



Each criteria contributed to the overall score of a nomination, which was helpful as the team could then point to particular reasons as to why a nomination was, or was not, included on the local list.

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

The panels (for both Somerset and Exmoor) meet two or three times a year to review the list and its applications. Both panels have reviewed heritage assets that have been assessed for inclusion on the National Heritage List for England (the NHLE) but not designated. Some listing advice reports point to an asset having local rather than national importance, something which the LPA considered as providing rationale for inclusion on the local list. As a result, the local list has a direct connection with the NHLE, providing alternative options for the protection and recognition of heritage, commensurate with significance.

Already, there have been several examples of a site being saved from demolition as a result of its inclusion on the local list. Even when a site has not been saved, it has provided the rationale for detailed drawings of the site to be produced and kept for posterity.

The local list is seen as a tool for heritage bodies and the public to get their voice heard about what matters in their local area. The local list is fully integrated with the separate HERs for Somerset and Exmoor and is published online, as part of an evolving resource for heritage management. It has provided a far stronger representation of built heritage on the HER, enhancing the HER as a whole.

It also provided an opportunity to host a placement student in their second year at university. They looked at a particular settlement and provided an overview of all the individual structures there, which then allowed for some structures to be considered for local listing. The student spent four weeks on the project, and learned more about specific asset types, the planning system, and how heritage can be managed in various ways. As a real-world, concise project, it was the perfect task for a placement student (or indeed a volunteer) to perform.

What are the next steps for your local list?

The local list is an ongoing project, and the panels continue to meet to assess both individual nominations, and legacy nominations. The framework developed during the pilot project continues to be used to expand and enhance the lists.



Glastonbury Tor, Glastonbury, Somerset. Included on Somerset's Local Heritage List. By John Gay, 1958. © Historic England Archive



South Yorkshire

Case study developed with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS). This project was part of the MHCLG-funded local heritage list campaign (2020).

Why did you decide to develop a new local list?

The drive came from the planning departments across the four LPAs that make up South Yorkshire. There was an understanding that a local list was wanted and needed, but LPAs lacked the resources and mechanisms to manage the process in a robust way. Therefore, when funding was made available to bid for as part of the MHCLG campaign, SYAS were approached to manage the bid and the process of creating a local heritage list across South Yorkshire. SYAS are embedded within Sheffield's LPA.

Who was involved?

South Yorkshire HER took the lead on the project and continue to facilitate the formal assessment of additions to the local heritage list. The Heads of Planning for each LPA also meet regularly and the initiative is supported by Conservation Officers and Planners across all four LPAs.

How was the list compiled?

The project funded a dedicated Project Officer to work across LPAs and conduct the initial outreach to local interest groups and the wider public. This was done through direct correspondence, canvassing at local events and posting adverts in local buildings such as libraries. A number of workshops (both in-person and virtual) were run with support from colleagues in the partner LPAs, to support people with putting together nominations and describing them against the criteria for inclusion. Nominations were submitted through the web portal and then reviewed, amended where necessary and then sent out to public consultation with organisations that had indicated an interest, in addition to the nominee themselves and any other interested parties.

Once the consultation was complete, an assessment panel comprised of Conservation Officers and key stakeholders met to discuss and ratify which nominations met the local list criteria. This formed a recommendation that went to the relevant Local Authority's Conservation Officer. The Local Authority then undertook a second consultation with the owner.

If there were any substantive objections the nomination would go back to the panel. If not, then the recommendation went to the Head of Planning in that Local Authority to be added onto the local list. The whole process, from acceptance of a nomination to consideration by the Head of Planning for formal adoption, took around 6 months

How long did it take to develop the local list?



The project had funding secured for a 12-month period, although the local heritage list is now a live document and is regularly revised and refreshed with new nominations.

What criteria were used, and why?

The criteria used largely matches the statutory framework for assessing special interest, although when developing the criteria local context was closely considered and so some subcategories are unique to South Yorkshire, for example 'Emerging Municipal Identity'. Any asset considered for the local heritage list needs to meet 5 of the 7 criteria:

- Age;
- Rarity;
- Architectural & Artistic Interest;
- Group Value;
- Archaeological Interest;
- Historic Interest;
- Landmark Status.

What has been the impact of developing the local list?

Internally there has been better awareness of NDHAs, with planning officers contacting SYAS proactively to determine if buildings affected by planning applications are eligible for local listing. It has been beneficial for heritage organisations who have wanted to highlight the value of an asset to pursue funding or bring attention to something they believe to be at risk.

What did you learn during the project?

If SYAS were to undertake the process again, they would consider expanding the criteria to reflect more specific local context (such as buildings related to the non-conformist movements), as a category of significance.

What are the next steps for your local list?

SYAS have an ambition to look at other existing lists of NDHAs and how these can work more effectively together, in particular NDHAs included in Neighbourhood Plans. These were developed with a different evidence base and criteria than the local heritage list, and so it would be a positive thing for cohesion across the region to rationalise how NDHAs are recognised.

There is also an ambition to do further work to reach under-engaged groups, for example working with Sheffield University who have an initiative called Roots and Futures - a place-based heritage project with underserved communities, which could help support less-engaged groups to investigate and celebrate their local heritage.



258 Eldon Street, Barnsley, South Yorkshire. Included on the South Yorkshire Local Heritage List. Alan Bull
© Historic England Archive DP486478



Waltham Forest

Case study developed with the London Borough of Waltham Forest.

Why did you decide to update your local list?

The catalyst for revising the local list stemmed from dissatisfaction with the existing list, adopted in 2012. Descriptions in the list were very limited, with no pictures, and organised by street name rather than by name or area. The ambition of the team was to be more resident focused in the new list, making it clearer, more accessible, and visually engaging to raise its profile.

Who was involved?

One of the Borough's Conservation Officers, and the Design and Conservation Lead, took the lead on the project with input from colleagues in the wider Place and Design team. This allowed for the upskilling of colleagues with less heritage experience (for instance Policy Planning Colleagues) This also allowed for leveraging the digital design skills of more experienced colleagues, who supported the production and presentation of the revised list, giving it a professional and distinctive appearance that complements other documents produced by the team.

How was the list compiled?

A public consultation was launched in December 2023 which ran for around eight weeks using the 'Let's Talk' engagement platform, which is used across the Council for other consultations and is both familiar and easy-to-use. This was also promoted in the local press and in the council's own communications, including regular social media posts. The revision of the local list also coincided with a borough-wide 'Summer of Design' festival in 2024, which enabled the local list consultation to be cross-promoted through communications about the other events and projects. This allowed for good awareness of the project throughout the duration of the consultation period and led to more than 70 nominations from the public, with a good spread across the Borough.

Colleagues at the LPA also held informal consultation sessions with the Waltham Forest Civic Society and the Higham's Park Planning Group, who were also invited to make nominations. Details of the consultation were also sent to the Waltham Forest Heritage Network, an umbrella body that brings together many local groups within the borough. Some Statutory Amenity Societies were also contacted as part of the process, and The Twentieth Century Society had previously reached out with potential nominations to the list, which were included.

The project lead and his colleagues also had an internal list of possible buildings which had been identified in previous years, through planning applications or through knowledge



of the local area. With the addition of the public nominations, the team had a total list of 142 new nominations, of which 93 were considered suitable to be added to the revised list. In addition, the team also conducted a light touch review of the buildings already included on the 2012 version of the local list, removing anything that had been demolished or added to the National Heritage List for England (NHLE).

The nominations were first reviewed by the Conservation Officer, before being presented to a panel of LPA colleagues (from Development Management, Regeneration and Place & Design) to get a more objective review and for a final decision on whether to include or reject them.

How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

The process took around 18 months however some preparation work had been done previously to review the contents of the existing list.

What criteria were used, and why?

The 2012 list lacked detail in how it was developed and so it was decided to develop new criteria to try and broaden the types of heritage represented. The criteria were informed by both the Historic England Advice Note 7 (HEAN 7, 2021), as well as the statutory listing criteria.

The criteria are:

- Architectural Significance;
- Historical Significance;
- Cultural Significance.

The three criteria are presented as overlapping and complementary rather than exclusive. Including 'Cultural Significance' was key in broadening the types of building included on the local list and making it more relevant to and representative of the diverse population of the borough, where 47% of residents are from a minority ethnic background.

Another change in the development of the revised local list was the inclusion of very high-quality contemporary buildings by notable architects such as Levitt Bernstein, which reflect the borough's Exemplar Design approach to development. The idea to promote good quality design in this way came from the wider Place & Design Team, an example of the integrated approach to design, planning and conservation taken in the borough.

What has been the impact of updating the local list?

Between 2018 and 2022 the LPA received around seven public nominations for buildings to be added to the local list, likely owing to its low profile and lack of clarity on what would be considered and how to make a nomination. By comparison, as part of the process of revising it, 78 public nominations were received during the eight-week consultation period.



Even within the LPA, the profile of the local list and heritage in general has increased as a result of the project.

The project was also a positive opportunity for newer colleagues in the department, and those without detailed knowledge of the borough, to get out and about and engage with its heritage by photographing the nominated buildings. In addition, having a local list has helped to provide clarity on NDHAs in the borough, which is beneficial for development management colleagues.

As well as a launch event to promote the new local list (attended by around 80 people), the LPA also ran an exhibition for several months, highlighting the list and the new additions. Feedback received has included letters from residents whose properties had been added to the local list, including the owner of an Art Deco house who had lovingly restored his property and was proud of the recognition that local listing status had provided.

What did you learn during the project?

The ability to do the design work in-house saved money and time, a benefit of having conservation staff integrated into a wider team including colleagues with design software skills. It also allowed for upskilling of Conservation Officers in design software, with officers now able to support wider workstreams including production of design led SPDs.

One of the things lacking in the previous list was the lack of photography. The team managed to photograph every building on the revised list by getting out and about on foot or bike, taking images using phone cameras and doing some basic post-production using photoshop or app-based photo editing tools where required. The team were able to get good photographs with blue sky and sunshine because this part of the process coincided with the summer months. Photographing everything on the list also means there is now a record of existing building conditions, which may be useful for future use.

Some of the buildings nominated for the local list received some pushback internally, owing to concerns about 'restrictions' on future use and changes. The solution here was to ensure that the publicity focused on the local list as a tool for celebration and community engagement, rather than one which aims to restrict development. Clarity on 'Making changes to locally listed buildings' was also provided within the document itself and is available on the LPA's website.

Some nominations were received which LPA colleagues wouldn't have initially considered to merit inclusion, but the open nomination process meant that they were able to better understand the values that these buildings hold for local communities.

One building that was nominated had previously been assessed and turned down for statutory listing by Historic England. The LPA considered that the building wouldn't meet the criteria for the local list either, but as a compromise a piece of public art attached to the



building was included. Taking a flexible approach and being responsive to local opinion is one of the benefits of local listing.

What are the next steps for your local list?

Currently the local list is displayed as pins on a google map, which is useful for the public as it is a familiar and user-friendly interface. However, as a follow-up the team would like to prepare detailed polygon data for GiS mapping, which could eventually feed into MHCLG's digital planning platform.

As part of ongoing work to update the borough's Conservation Area appraisals, future appraisals will make much clearer reference to the Local List. The team are planning for an annual light touch review and update, ensuring the task remains manageable.



Sutherland Road affordable housing scheme by Levitt Bernstein, Waltham Forest, London. Included on the London Borough of Waltham Forest's Local List. Chris Redgrave © Historic England Archive DP528483



Kali Amman Hindu Temple, Forest Road, Walthamstow, London. Included on the London Borough of Waltham Forest's Local List. Chris Redgrave © Historic England Archive DP528485



Woking

Case study developed with Woking Council. This project was part of the MHCLG-funded local heritage list campaign (2020).

Why did you decide to update your local list?

Woking's existing list was quite old (dating from 1992), and it was unclear from the descriptions what exactly was identified as being part of the NDHA. The list of assets was originally divided into two categories; architecture and townscape merit, which didn't adequately explain the heritage significance.

There has been an effort in recent years to digitise the original list, and the LPA also have a policy on locally listed buildings, but the list needed more detailed descriptions to support the planning process and explain the quality and merit of each asset. Woking's revised local list was part of Surrey County Council's bid to the MHCLG-funded campaign.

Who was involved?

The team consisted of a dedicated Project Officer and a HER Officer. The project was also supported by a Policy Planner at Woking Council. Throughout the nomination and compilation process the Development Management Team were regularly consulted.

How was the list compiled?

Nominations were invited from the public and overseen by Surrey County Council, who developed an interactive map and online system for the community to access. There was extensive dissemination of information about the new local list through social media, to encourage nominations. Organisations with established links and interest in heritage (such as Surrey Gardens Trust) made lots of nominations.

Officers at Surrey initially assessed the nominations and made recommendations for additions or alterations to the list. Surrey then consulted with individual Policy Planners across the boroughs involved, and came to a consensus on what was to be included.

Woking carried out a consultation on the draft list, where owners were notified directly by letter if their building was being considered. The consultation involved an online form for responses and was supported by an interactive map, displaying the spatial extent of each asset. People were also able to respond via email or letter.

The initial process generated around 80 nominations and subsequently there were a lot of extra nominations from the draft list consultation; around 50-60 extra suggestions. The new local lists were then adopted by individual boroughs, including Woking.



How long did it take to develop/refresh the local list?

Woking began working on a new list independently in 2019, but the funded project started in 2021. It took about 2 years to get final recommendations. Formatting the nominations was the most time-consuming part of the project.

What criteria were used, and why?

Surrey Council developed the central criteria and the boroughs adopted it. Woking engaged with the Surrey panel to verify the criteria. It was in-line with the criteria in Historic England Advice Note 7 (HEAN 7, 2021) although there was an emphasis on rarity as a criteria. For instance, the county has limited modernist architecture and so examples of this type of asset would be significant. There was a distinct emphasis on social and communal value, intangible heritage and connection with specific periods e.g. Basingstoke Canal's links to the Industrial Revolution, and methodist churches linked with the Wesleyan movement. Archaeology was largely excluded as Surrey has a comprehensive and up-to-date existing archaeological mapping resource.

The criteria are:

- Rarity;
- Group Value;
- Architectural or Artistic Value;
- Archaeological Value;
- Historic Association;
- Landmark Status;
- Social and Cultural Value.

What has been the impact of developing or updating the local list?

There has been a noticeable improvement in engagement with Planning Officers and there was a good deal of informal use by the Development Management Team before the list was formally adopted. The list has also been useful for understanding heritage significance and providing greater clarity, e.g. explicitly detailing significant gardens attached to houses, and standardising the way in which assets are described.

What did you learn during the project?

The nomination and consultation processes were really positive and a good way for people to get involved with the heritage of their local area and to feel like they are making a difference. This process was made easier through the use of digital tools although they would have liked to increase the functionality of the online nomination form, for example there was limited ability to upload supporting information or pictures.

What are the next steps for your local list?



Going forward, Woking want to make the list a living document and periodically assess new nominations. The LPA would also like to do some thinking about how people can make new nominations. They would also be open to exceptional additions through the planning process. The new local list was adopted in December 2025.



Well Lane, Horsell, Woking, Surrey. Included on Woking's Local Heritage List. Derek Kendall © Historic England Archive DP370191



Contact Historic England

East of England

Brooklands
24 Brooklands Avenue
Cambridge CB2 8BU
Tel: 01223 582749
Email:
eastofengland@historicengland.org.uk

Fort Cumberland

Fort Cumberland Road
Eastney
Portsmouth PO4 9LD
Tel: 023 9285 6704
Email:
fort.cumberland@historicengland.org.uk

London and South East

4th Floor, Cannon Bridge House
25 Dowgate Hill
London EC4R 2YA
Tel: 0207 973 3700
Email:
londonseast@historicengland.org.uk

Midlands

The Foundry
82 Granville Street
Birmingham B1 2LH
Tel: 0121 625 6888
Email:
midlands@historicengland.org.uk

North East and Yorkshire

Bessie Surtees House
41-44 Sandhill
Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 3JF
Tel: 0191 269 1255
Email:
northeast@historicengland.org.uk

37 Tanner Row
York YO1 6WP
Tel: 01904 601948
Email:
yorkshire@historicengland.org.uk

North West

3rd Floor, Canada House
3 Chepstow Street
Manchester M1 5FW
Tel: 0161 242 1416
Email:
northwest@historicengland.org.uk

South West

Fermentation North (1st Floor)
Finzels Reach, Hawkins Lane
Bristol BS1 6JQ
Tel: 0117 975 1308
Email:
southwest@historicengland.org.uk

Swindon

The Engine House
Fire Fly Avenue
Swindon SN2 2EH
Tel: 01793 445050
Email:
swindon@historicengland.org.uk



Historic England is a public organisation that protects and brings new life to the heritage that matters to us all, so it lives on and is loved for longer.

Please contact [**guidance@historicengland.org.uk**](mailto:guidance@historicengland.org.uk) with any questions about this document.

[**historicengland.org.uk**](https://www.historicengland.org.uk)

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact our customer services department on:

Tel: 0370 333 0607

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

All information and weblinks accurate at the time of publication.

Please consider the environment before printing this document.

Publication date: May 2026

© Historic England
