

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites

Comment

The steering groups for the property are considering whether to propose a name change

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

373bis

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986



1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Stonehenge and Associated Monuments , Wiltshire , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela	51.179 / -1.825	2608.2	?	2608.2	1986
Avebury and Associated Monuments , Wiltshire , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela	51.429 / -1.854	2377.2	?	2377.2	1986
Total (ha)		4985.4	0	4985.4	

Comment

This does not reflect minor boundary review of 2008. Decision 32COM 8B.71 Total value for Avebury should be Property (ha) 2546 and Total (ha) 2546 The total for both parts of WHS is 5154 ha If figures should be rounded to the nearest ha then Stonehenge should read 2608 ha.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Stonehenge and associated monuments, scale 1:25000	24/12/1985	
Avebury and associated sites, scale 1:50000	27/02/2009	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Christopher Young
English Heritage
Head of World International Advice
- Paul Blaker
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
Head of World Heritage

Comment

ASSUME EH WORLD HERITAGE TEAM WILL CORRECT THIS SECTION FOR ALL SITES? English Heritage Christopher Young Correct job title - "Head of International Advice" DCMS Francesca Conlon, 4th Floor, 100 Parliament St, London SW1A 2QB + 44 (0) 20 7211 6117 Francesca.Conlon@Culture.gsi.gov.uk

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Sarah Simmonds
Wiltshire Council
Avebury World Heritage Site Coordinator
- Amanda Chadburn
English Heritage
Lead Adviser, Stonehenge
- Beth Thomas
Stonehenge Administration Office

Comment

Sarah Simmonds Job title "Avebury World Heritage Site Officer" email is: sarah.simmonds@wiltshire.gov.uk ie omit 2 in email address Amanda Chadburn Job role "Lead Adviser, Stonehenge" no longer exists. Please delete contact. Beth Thomas Job role "Stonehenge World Heritage Site Coordinator" is missing

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Stonehenge \(English Heritage\)](#)
3. [Avebury \(National Trust\)](#)
4. [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
5. [Avebury World Heritage Site Avebury World Heritage Site Avebury World Heritage Site](#)

Comment

Please add as number 2. Stonehenge and Avebury WHS website www.stonehengeandaveburywhs.org and reorder the remaining website addresses. 1. - 4. details are correct 5. Please update website address to the following http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/artshheritageandlibraries/museumhi storyheritage/worldheritagesite.htm 6. Please add the following address: Stonehenge (National Trust) http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/stonehenge-landscape/

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Avebury WHS is part of the North Wessex Downs AONB. SSSI in both Stonehenge and Avebury National Nature Reserve (Fyfield Down) Scheduled Monuments in both parts of the site.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

The Stonehenge, Avebury, and Associated Sites World Heritage property is internationally important for its complexes of outstanding prehistoric monuments. It comprises two areas of chalkland in Southern Britain within which complexes of Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial and

funerary monuments and associated sites were built. Each area contains a focal stone circle and henge and many other major monuments. At Stonehenge these include the Avenue, the Cursuses, Durrington Walls, Woodhenge, and the densest concentration of burial mounds in Britain. At Avebury, they include Windmill Hill, the West Kennet Long Barrow, the Sanctuary, Silbury Hill, the West Kennet and Beckhampton Avenues, the West Kennet Palisaded Enclosures, and important barrows.

The World Heritage property is of Outstanding Universal Value for the following qualities:

Stonehenge is one of the most impressive prehistoric megalithic monuments in the world on account of the sheer size of its megaliths, the sophistication of its concentric plan and architectural design, the shaping of the stones, uniquely using both Wiltshire Sarsen sandstone and Pembroke Bluestone, and the precision with which it was built.

At Avebury, the massive Henge, containing the largest prehistoric stone circle in the world, and Silbury Hill, the largest prehistoric mound in Europe, demonstrate the outstanding engineering skills which were used to create masterpieces of earthen and megalithic architecture.

There is an exceptional survival of prehistoric monuments and sites within the World Heritage site including settlements, burial grounds, and large constructions of earth and stone.

Today, together with their settings, they form landscapes without parallel. These complexes would have been of major significance to those who created them, as is apparent by the huge investment of time and effort they represent. They provide an insight into the mortuary and ceremonial practices of the period, and are evidence of prehistoric technology, architecture, and astronomy. The careful siting of monuments in relation to the landscape helps us to further understand the Neolithic and Bronze Age.

Criterion (i): The monuments of the Stonehenge, Avebury, and Associated Sites World Heritage Site demonstrate outstanding creative and technological achievements in prehistoric times.

Stonehenge is the most architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world. It is unrivalled in its design and unique engineering, featuring huge horizontal stone lintels capping the outer circle and the trilithons, locked together by carefully shaped joints. It is distinguished by the unique use of two different kinds of stones (Bluestones and Sarsens), their size (the largest weighing over 40t), and the distance they were transported (up to 240km). The sheer scale of some of the surrounding monuments is also remarkable: the Stonehenge Cursus and the Avenue are both about 3km long, while Durrington Walls is the largest known henge in Britain, around 500m in diameter, demonstrating the ability of prehistoric peoples to conceive, design and construct features of great size and complexity.

Avebury prehistoric stone circle is the largest in the world. The encircling henge consists of a huge bank and ditch 1.3km in circumference, within which 180 local, unshaped standing stones formed the large outer and two smaller inner circles. Leading from two of its four entrances, the West Kennet and Beckhampton Avenues of parallel standing stones still connect it with other monuments in the landscape. Another outstanding monument, Silbury Hill, is the largest prehistoric mound in Europe. Built around 2400 BC, it stands 39.5m high and comprises half a million tonnes of chalk. The purpose of this imposing, skilfully engineered monument remains obscure.

Criterion (ii): The World Heritage Site provides an outstanding illustration of the evolution of monument construction and of the continual use and shaping of the landscape over more than 2000 years, from the early Neolithic to the Bronze Age. The monuments and landscape have had an unwavering influence on architects, artists, historians, and archaeologists, and still retain a huge potential for future research.

The megalithic and earthen monuments of the World Heritage Site demonstrate the shaping of the landscape through monument building for around 2000 years from c 3700 BC, reflecting the importance and wide influence of both areas.

Since the 12th century when Stonehenge was considered one of the wonders of the world by the chroniclers Henry de Huntington and Geoffrey de Monmouth, the Stonehenge and Avebury sites have excited curiosity and been the subject of study and speculation. Since early investigations by John Aubrey, Inigo Jones, and William Stukeley, they have had an unwavering influence on architects, archaeologists, artists, and historians. The two parts of the World Heritage Site provide an excellent opportunity for further research.

Today, the Site has spiritual associations for some.

Criterion (iii): The complexes of monuments at Stonehenge and Avebury provide an exceptional insight into the funerary and ceremonial practices in Britain in the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Together with their settings and associated sites, they form landscapes without parallel.

The design, position, and inter-relationship of the monuments and sites are evidence of a wealthy and highly organised prehistoric society able to impose its concepts on the environment. An outstanding example is the alignment of the Stonehenge Avenue (probably a processional route) and Stonehenge stone circle on the axis of the midsummer sunrise and midwinter sunset, indicating their ceremonial and astronomical character. At Avebury the length and size of some of the features such as the West Kennet Avenue, which connects the Henge to the Sanctuary over 2km away, are further evidence of this.

A profound insight into the changing mortuary culture of the periods is provided by the use of Stonehenge as a cremation cemetery, by the West Kennet Long Barrow, the largest known Neolithic stone-chambered collective tomb in southern England, and by the hundreds of other burial sites illustrating evolving funerary rites.

The State Party also proposes the revision of the brief description as follows:

The Stonehenge, Avebury, and Associated Sites World Heritage Site is internationally important for its complexes of outstanding prehistoric monuments. Stonehenge is the most architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world, while Avebury is the largest in the world. Together with inter-related monuments and their associated landscapes, they help us to understand Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial and mortuary practices. They demonstrate around 2000 years of continuous use and monument building between c. 3700 and 1600 BC. As such they represent a unique embodiment of our collective heritage.

Comment

This is the Statement of Significance but a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the World Heritage Committee in June 2013

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(i)(ii)(iii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

1. Stonehenge itself as a globally famous and iconic monument. (Criterion i) 2. The physical remains of the Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and associated sites. (Criterion iii) 3. The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the landscape. (Criterion iii) 4. The design of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial

sites and monuments in relation to the skies and astronomy. (Criterion iii) 5. The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to each other. (Criterion iii) 6. The disposition, physical remains and settings of the key Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary, ceremonial and other monuments and sites of the period, which together form a landscape without parallel. (Criterion iii) 7. The influence of the remains of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and their landscape settings on architects, artists, historians, archaeologists and others. (Criterion ii)

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The current short description on the UNESCO website is inaccurate. Please can this be removed so that only the SOUV when approved is reflected in the website.

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

Burrowing Animals - damage to archaeological monuments from badgers, moles and rabbits and has increased dramatically due to warmer winters and other factors which has led to an increase in population and damage to monuments.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin	
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing						
3.1.3	Industrial areas						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities						
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure						
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities						
3.3.4	Localised utilities						
3.3.5	Major linear utilities						
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.6	Input of excess energy						
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.3	Land conversion						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals						
3.5.5	Crop production						
3.5.8	Commercial hunting						
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production						
3.6	Physical resource extraction						
3.6.4	Water (extraction)						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.1	Illegal activities						
3.9.3	Military training						
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts						
3.13	Management and institutional factors						
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities						
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside	

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.3	Industrial areas	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	localised	on-going	significant	high capacity	static
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	extensive	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	extensive	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.6	Input of excess energy	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	extensive	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.5.5	Crop production	extensive	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.5.8	Commercial hunting	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.4	Water (extraction)	localised	frequent	minor	low capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts	extensive	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

innappropriate devt:produce setting study & SPD & review of Article 4 Directions cultivation:better incentives for grass reversion wetter climate:more resources for maintenance of footpaths etc required burrowing animals strategy improved visitor centre & interpretation at Stonehenge opening late 2013 interpretation plan required for Avebury WHS impact of roads:A344 closing 2013 and solutions required A303 & A4/A3461/B4003 whs transport/traffic scheme required engage local interest groups

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, but there is a need for one

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Whilst a buffer zone is not thought to be the most effective approach, it is intended to develop a setting study to help planners and developers further understand how any future development will affect the WHS and its OUV. An indicative line on the map may be necessary to alert planners to the need to consult curators.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

Specific local planning policies to protect against adverse development: (Salisbury Local Plan, Kennet Local Plan 2004, HH3). The Stonehenge WHS management plan was adopted as supplementary planning guidance. Statutory designations for conservation of the historic environment, nature conservation and landscape: scheduled monuments, listed buildings and other designations

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, November 14, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

Specific local planning policies to protect against adverse development: "Development that would adversely affect the archaeological landscape of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site, or the fabric or setting of its monuments, will not be permitted" (Salisbury Local Plan) ; "Proposals which would harm the historic landscape, archaeological features or visual setting of that part of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site within the district will not be permitted" (Kennet Local Plan 2004, HH3). The Stonehenge WHS Management Plan was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Statutory designations for conservation of the historic environment, nature conservation and landscape: scheduled monuments, listed buildings and other designations (for details, see the maps in the Stonehenge and Avebury Management Plans).

Comment

Saved local planning policies above will be replaced by Policy 59 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy which states that "The OUV of the WHS will be protected & sustained by i) giving precedence to the protection of the WHS and its setting ii) development not adversely affecting the WHS and its attributes of OUV this includes the physical fabric, character and appearance, setting of views into or out of the WHS" The full policy within Wiltshire Core Strategy is likely to be adopted by late 2013.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the

Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

Statutory protection is not given for WH status. Recent National Planning Framework issued in 2012 recognises WH as designated assets of the highest significance to which "substantial harm" should be wholly exceptional. However, the Framework also includes a presumption in favour of development. There is a need to develop a SPD or equivalent planning guidance & Setting Study to articulate the implications of enhancing the WHS, its setting, its attributes of OUV & maintaining their significance.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A management plan for the property is in place. Steering group formally set up: There are two steering groups, one for the Stonehenge part of the World Heritage site and one for the Avebury part. Stonehenge and Avebury are 40 km apart and have different stakeholders. Steering Groups set up as follows: STONEHENGE - November 1998, AVEBURY - 1989. Their role is to oversee the preparation, implementation and review of the WHS management plan. Site manager on full-time basis. Management by the State Party; management under protective legislation; management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party; consensual management.

Dept.for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (defra) grants to farmers for grass restoration; National Trust looks after Avebury on behalf of State Party; ownership by the National Trust of large parts of the WHS, including some inalienable land.

Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national; local.

Other levels: English Heritage, National Trust, Highways Agency, Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, English Nature, RSPB, Ministry of Defence Wiltshire County Council, Salisbury District Council and Kennet District Council (planning authorities) and the parish councils.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, November 14, 2005

• **Question 5.02**

Steering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

• **Question 5.03**

Set up date: 1998

Function: There are two steering groups, one for the Stonehenge part of the World Heritage Site and one for the Avebury part. Stonehenge and Avebury are 40 km

apart and have different stakeholders. Steering Groups set up as follows: STONEHENGE - November 1998 AVEBURY - 1989

Mandate: To oversee the preparation, implementation and review of the WHS Management Plan

Constituted: formal

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party
- Consensual management
- Other effective management system

Dept.for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (defra) grants to farmers for grass restoration.

National Trust looks after Avebury on behalf of State Party.

Ownership by the National Trust of large parts of the WHS, including some inalienable land.

Comment

Much of the above detail is correct. However, both steering groups are currently reviewing the management structure of the WHS and looking at a more coordinated management system for the WHS as a whole. Currently there is one coordinator for each half of the WHS. Wiltshire County Council, Salisbury District, Kennet District replaced by unitary authority, Wiltshire Council.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/1998	
Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2000	
Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan. August 2005	N/A	Available	01/01/2005	
Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan 2009	In Force	Available	13/02/2009	

Comment

Avebury Management Plan 2005 is still in use but is currently in process of being revised and updated. The Stonehenge and Avebury Management Plan can be pulled together into one main Management Plan with local action plans for Stonehenge and Avebury by 2015.

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Fair

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

The WHS Coordinators work with farmers, Natural England & English Heritage to farm the area around the monuments in an appropriate manner which protects OUV. Farmers are also represented on both Steering Groups. There may be opportunities to expand cooperation with other industries in the area. Representatives of local parishes are members of both Steering Groups and contribute to the development of both management plans & meet regularly with WHS Coordinators informally.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 Wiltshire Core Strategy WHS governance review currently underway.

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	0%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	77%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	5%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	18%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

No funds have been received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

Further work on financial security required for the coordination unit of the WHS. A resource to bid for external funding in order to deliver WHS projects would further enhance the work of the WHS coordinators and facilitate the implementation of outstanding actions.

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Good
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

The current economic situation means that resources potentially at risk. Management is at local level with regional and national support. Two members of staff (4.4.9/11) are dedicated to delivering the management plans. Other staff & volunteers are employed in managing the properties by National Trust and English Heritage as owners/managers of

the properties that make up the WHS. These staff are also involved in assisting the work of the WHS but not dedicated to it. 4.4.15 not directly relevant

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Research Framework is being updated Not all work is published in a timely fashion.
<http://www.wessexarch.co.uk/projects/wiltshire/stonehenge-avebury-rrf>

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

Not all work is published. Dissemination to the wider public could be improved. Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Research Framework is being updated
<http://www.wessexarch.co.uk/projects/wiltshire/stonehenge-avebury-rrf> The need for a central repository for research and information has been recognised. Avebury has a research group already exists and options to include Stonehenge are being explored.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **many locations, but not easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average

Local businesses and industries	Average
---------------------------------	---------

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Not needed
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

Interpretation & Learning Strategy for Stonehenge 2011. Stonehenge visitor centre (late 2013) will improve facilities on site with exhibitions & landscape scheme to better inform visitors. Avebury has museum and information panels on site. More work to be done to develop an interpretaton & learning plan for Avebury covering the whole site in line with Stonehenge Strategy. Improve walks/trails

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Both Avebury & Stonehenge Management Plans provide policy framework on visitor management. Both English Heritage and National Trust have business plans for their respective properties but these are not public documents.

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed **but improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

English Heritage charges entry fee at Stonehenge. National Trust charge entry to museum and car parking fee is payable. This money is used to conserve the WHS and other properties owned and managed by NT and EH. The majority of both sites is open access and free of charge 365 days per year. There is some cooperation with tourist industry.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined **but monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

The A303/A344 junction at Stonehenge was closed in June 2013. The A344 will have a Traffic Regulation Order in place from Winter 2013. This will prevent all but authorised vehicles from travelling along it. The section closest to the monument will be removed. This will allow the Avenue to be joined to the Monument once more. A new visitor centre planned for late 2013. Further integrate monitoring

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

Condition Survey of monuments within WHS completed 2011. Woodland Strategy 2011-13. Burrowing Animal Survey 2011-12. Programme of pedestrian counters installed in Stonehenge Landscape 2011-13. Counters needed in Avebury. More proactive & holistic management strategy needs to be developed in the light of these.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 management needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing	Some attributes within WHS are affected by inappropriate housing development within the WHS boundary and its setting. In particular, the relationship of attributes to the landscape and each other.	Comments are submitted by English Heritage and WHS Coordinators. A strong policy within the Wiltshire Core Strategy. A setting study of the WHS. A Supplementary Planning Document is planned. Training of planning officers is ongoing.	Number of applications for housing development. Where applications are approved despite objections from curators.	Ongoing. Supplementary Planning Document and Setting Study by 2018.	Wiltshire Council English Heritage	no further comments
3.1.3	Industrial areas	Setting of WHS and its attributes from industrial parks on the perimeter of WHS. Large grain stores and other agricultural buildings within WHS and its setting have limited impact on some attributes of the WHS	Wiltshire Core Strategy approved by end of 2013. Setting Study & Supplementary Planning Document by 2018. See 3.1.1 above.	see 3.1.1 above	see 3.1.1 above	Wiltshire Council English Heritage	no further comments
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	Roads within WHS impact considerably on the integrity of the WHS and inter-relationship between attributes in the landscape. Diminish the ability of visitors to understand and enjoy the attributes of the WHS.	A344 closing June 2013. Avebury WHS Traffic Strategy 2013 - 14 Continuing dialogue with Highways Agency and Wiltshire Council Highways Department.	Speed and traffic counts where appropriate Review of perception of visitors of the impact of roads within the WHS and their ability to enjoy and access the attributes within the WHS.	Within the next reporting period.	Wiltshire Council Highways Agency English Heritage	no further comments
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	Damage to monuments by traffic on roads eg W Kennet Avenue Damage to monuments by traffic on byways open to all traffic eg Ridgeway National Trail Impact of parking on setting of attributes eg byway 12 Stonehenge. Reduces visitor access & movement	Consider traffic regulation order for byways open to all traffic eg Ridgeway National Trail. Clear signage. Survey of the impact of traffic on visitors' ability to understand & explore the WHS. Encourage sustainable transport links in and around WHS.	surveys of speed and traffic flows within WHS surveys of visitor experience within WHS	Within next Periodic Reporting time period	Wiltshire Council Highways Agency English Heritage National Trust National Trails North Wessex Downs AONB	Attempt to introduce traffic regulation orders on certain byways within the Stonehenge WHS failed in 2011 after public inquiry.
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.3	Land conversion	Land conversion to arable has a significant negative affect on attributes of OUV. Land conversion to grassland has a significant positive affect on attributes of OUV. Grassland improves setting and presentation. Ploughing damages buried archaeology.	Work with Natural England to design appropriate agri-environment schemes. Encourage local farmers to protect the attributes of OUV through up-take of schemes.	By Natural England statistics related to agri-environment schemes Condition Survey	Ongoing	Natural England English Heritage National Trust Wiltshire Council Landowners & farmers	Current agri-environment schemes under review awaiting outcome of review of European Common Agricultural Policy Funding is likely to be reduced.

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.5.5	Crop production	See 3.5.3 above	See 3.5.3 above	see 3.5.3 above	Ongoing	Natural England English Heritage National Trust Wiltshire Council Landowners & farmers	see 3.5.3 above Global grain price fluctuations affect the willingness of farmers to enter into grass reversion schemes. Evolving farming practices increases demand for larger industrial grain stores and barns etc.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Please select your top management needs in question 4.9 before filling in the summary table.

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

The active management of the two steering committees, their coordinators and Management Plans has meant that issues are addressed effectively within the resources and constraints available. The excellent progress on the development of a new interim visitor facility at Stonehenge and the closure of the A344 to traffic is a major step forward in improving the presentation of Stonehenge & WHS.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

Closing A344 and opening of new visitor facility at end of 2013 is a major step forward in presentation of OUV with limited -ve

impact. National investment in agri-environment schemes are essential for protection of the WHS. Management Plans & Coordinators have been fundamental to the successful management of the WHS. Partners & local communities work closely together to ensure the preservation of OUV. It is imperative that the current level of resources are maintained and if possible increased.

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Non Governmental Organization
Local community

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

some of the questions are difficult to interpret and apply to individual circumstances due to the choice of words

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Very good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Name of World Heritage Property**
Reason for update: The steering groups for the property are considering whether to propose a name change
- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**
Reason for update: This is the Statement of Significance but a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the World Heritage Committee in June 2013
- **Geographic Information Table**
Reason for update: This does not reflect minor

boundary review of 2008. Decision 32COM 8B.71
Total value for Avebury should be Property (ha) 2546
and Total (ha) 2546 The total for both parts of WHS
is 5154 ha If figures should be rounded to the
nearest ha then Stonehenge should read 2608 ha.

**6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations
related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting
exercise**

This report is a combination of the work within the two parts of
the Stonehenge & Avebury WHS serial site. It may not
therefore fully reflect the specific details of each part of the
site.