

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Tower of London

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

#### State(s) Party(ies)

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

488


#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Tower of London	51.508 / -0.076	0	0	0	1988
<b>Total (ha)</b>			0		

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Tower of London, scale 1:2,500	21/12/1987	

### 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

DCMS contact is now Francesca Conlon, DCMS, 4th Floor, 100 Parliament St, London SW1A 2BQ 00 44 (0) 20 7211 6117 Francesca.conlom@culture.gsi.gov.uk

### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Tracy Simmons  
Historic Royal Palaces  
Coordinator - Conservation and Learning  
Department  
Conservation and Learning Dept

### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Patrimonium-mundi.org](http://Patrimonium-mundi.org) : visit this site in [panophotographies - immersive and interactive spherical images](#)
2. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
3. [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
4. [Tower of London \(Historic Royal Palaces\)](#)

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

#### Comment

The World Heritage property is wholly protected by designation as a scheduled ancient monument with many listed buildings, and is within a conservation area.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Statement of Significance

The Tower of London, founded by William the Conqueror in 1066 has Outstanding Universal Value for the following cultural qualities:

Its landmark siting, for both protection and control of the City of London: As the gateway to the capital, the Tower was in effect the gateway to the new Norman kingdom. Sited strategically at a bend in the River Thames, it has been a crucial demarcation point between the power of the developing City of London, and the power of the monarchy. It had the dual role of providing protection for the City through its defensive structure and the provision of a garrison, and of also controlling the citizens by the same means. The Tower literally 'towered' over its surroundings until the 19th century.

As a symbol of Norman power: The Tower of London was built as a demonstration of Norman power. The Tower represents more than any other structure the far-reaching significance of the mid 11th-century Norman Conquest of England, for the impact it had on fostering closer ties with Europe, on English language and culture and in creating one of the most powerful monarchies in Europe. The Tower has an iconic role as reflecting the last military conquest of England.

As an outstanding example of late 11th-century innovative Norman military architecture: As the most complete survival of an 11th-century fortress palace remaining in Europe, the White Tower, and its later 13th and 14th century additions, belong to a series of edifices which were at the cutting edge of military building technology internationally. They represent the apogee of a type of sophisticated castle design, which originated in Normandy and spread through Norman lands to England and Wales.

As a model example of a Medieval fortress palace which evolved from the 11th to 16th centuries: The additions of Henry III and Edward I, and particularly the highly innovative development of the palace within the fortress, made the Tower into one of the most innovative and influential castle sites in Europe in the 13th and early 14th centuries, and much of their work survives. Palace buildings were added to the royal complex right up until the 16th century, although few now stand above ground. The survival of palace buildings at the Tower allows a rare glimpse into the life of a medieval monarch within their fortress walls. The Tower of London is a rare survival of a continuously developing ensemble of royal buildings, evolving from the 11th to the 16th centuries, and as such has great significance nationally and internationally.

For its association with State institutions: The continuous use of the Tower by successive monarchs fostered the development of several major State Institutions. These incorporated such fundamental roles as the nation's defence, its records, and its coinage. From the late 13th century, the Tower was a major repository for official documents, and precious goods owned by the Crown. The presence of the Crown Jewels, kept at the Tower since the 17th century, are a reminder of the fortress's role as a repository for the Royal Wardrobe.

As the setting for key historical events in European history: The Tower has been the setting for some of the most momentous events in European and British History. Its role as a stage upon which history is enacted is one of the key elements which have contributed towards the Tower's status as an iconic structure. Arguably the most important building of the Norman Conquest, the White Tower symbolised the might and longevity of the new order. The imprisonments in the Tower, of Edward V and his younger brother in the 15th century, and then in the 16th century of four English queens, three of them executed on Tower Green – Anne Boleyn, Catherine Howard and Jane Grey – with only Elizabeth I escaping, shaped English history. The Tower also helped shape the Reformation in England, as both Catholic and Protestant prisoners (those that survived) recorded their experiences and helped define the Tower as a place of torture and execution.

Criterion (ii): A monument symbolic of royal power since the time of William the Conqueror, the Tower of London served as an outstanding model throughout the kingdom from the end of the 11th century. Like it, many keeps were built in stone: e.g. Colchester, Rochester, Hedingham, Norwich, or Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight.

Criterion (iv): The White Tower is the example par excellence of the royal Norman castle in the late 11th century. The ensemble of the Tower of London is a major reference for the history of medieval military architecture.

**Comment**

A revised 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**

(ii)(iv)

**2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion**

Attributes are currently being developed (they will be included in the Revised Management Plan).

**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**

**3. Factors Affecting the Property**

**3.14. Other factor(s)**

**3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>		
3.1.1	Housing		
3.1.2	Commercial development		
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure		
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities		
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure		
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>		
3.7.2	Relative humidity		
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>		
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system		
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation		
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>		
3.10.2	Flooding		
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>		
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities		
3.13.3	Management activities		
<b>Legend</b>	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	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.1	Housing	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity	increasing
3.1.2	Commercial development	extensive	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	high capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

Historic Royal Palaces management response does not result in political action against the continuing extensive development

## 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**, and it is not needed

#### 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 are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 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

A buffer zone is not needed because it would be ineffective in the dense urban context.

### 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The site is scheduled as an ancient monument; in addition, most buildings and structures within it are included in the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest, and the whole site lies within a conservation area. Any physical works to a scheduled monument require the consent of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, who in making such decisions is advised by English Heritage. This requirement takes precedence over the other forms of statutory protection of the heritage, except for those parts occupied as dwelling houses, which are subject to listed

building controls. The relevant local authorities have policies in place which should protect the setting of the Tower.

#### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, November 25, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

The site is scheduled as an Ancient Monument; in addition, most buildings and structures within it are included in the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest, and the whole site lies within a conservation area. Any physical works to a scheduled monument require the consent of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, who in making such decisions is advised by English Heritage. This requirement takes precedence over the other forms of statutory protection of the heritage, except for those parts occupied as dwelling houses, which are subject to listed building controls. The relevant local authorities have policies in place which should protect the setting of the Tower.

#### 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?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

#### 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 **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

4.2.2.3 - The legal framework for the maintenance of the OUV of the WH property provides an adequate or better basis for effective management and protection within the boundary of the property itself. 4.2.5.4 - There is excellent capacity/resources to enforce legislation in the WH property that is, within the boundary. 4.2.4.3 The legal framework exists, but there is a lack of political will at all levels to use it to prevent harmful development.

### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

#### 4.3.1 - Management System

Planning policy and development management are both managed by the Mayor and the Boroughs. Within the context of national policy the Mayor sets out the strategic policy framework in which the Boroughs develop their own policy and decision making. The Tower is situated in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and Westminster in the City of Westminster. Due to spatial arrangement of the Boroughs and the location of the two World Heritage properties, the settings of the properties are managed by adjoining Boroughs, in particular the City of London, Southwark, Lambeth and Wandsworth. All local planning authorities have policies in their local plans to protect the World Heritage properties and their settings. The Mayor's and Boroughs' development plans and their policies relating to the protection of World Heritage properties and their settings have been updated since the 2006 mission.

#### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

- **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: A steering group was originally established to administer the consultation process for the draft Management Plan. Many of this group are still involved in work connected with the Plan but a new membership will be established once the current exercises have been completed. The site is in single ownership and therefore it is easier for HRP to drive but we do consult on any proposals.
- **Question 5.05** Overall management system of the site
  - Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party

#### Comment

The adjoining boroughs to the Tower of London also include Tower Hamlets

#### 4.3.2 - Management Documents

##### Comment

A Management Plan for the Tower was formally adopted in 2007. This is currently being reviewed and updated.

#### 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 only **partially 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 **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

#### 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	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Good

#### 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 **regular contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone and **substantial co-operation** on management

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

Planning policies in place to protect the setting are often not being applied/interpreted effectively by the relevant Planning Authority

#### 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

### 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)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	35%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	65%
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**

Historic Royal Palaces does not receive any International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

**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 a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

**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**

HRP is a registered charity and receives no Government income. All our activities and conservation work is funded by visitor admissions, commercial events and private donations. The way in which HRP is financially structured is that income from all five of our sites is divided where it is needed and that not all income generated at the Tower is spent on conservation at the Tower alone. The figure of 65% for visitor charges also includes commercial operator payments.

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

Full-time	76%
Part-time	24%

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

Permanent	91%
Seasonal	9%

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

Paid	78%
Volunteer	22%

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

**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	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

**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**

**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**

**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**

The Crown Jewels (guidebook), (Historic Royal Palaces, London 2010) The White Tower. Edited by E Impey (Yale University Press 2008) The Byward Tower Tiled Pavement, J. Spooner, I. Betts and T. Cromwell

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

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

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

In **one location and 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	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

**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 planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

**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	Excellent
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

Our planned education programme delivers a wide range activities and information across a wide audience in both a formal and informal capacity

**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	Static
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**

**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 **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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

There is **excellent 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**

**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** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

**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	Excellent
Local communities	Excellent
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Implementation is planned, but has **not yet begun**

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

The local planning authorities are unable to agree on a process (methodology) for addressing World Heritage Committee's concerns about the increasing impact of tall buildings on the setting of the WHS

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

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements 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	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>						
<b>3.1.1</b>	<b>Housing</b>	The Towers setting is most affected, Criterion (ii) - monument of symbolic power and Criterion (iv) The White Tower. Draft attributes include location and setting, the perceived physical dominance of the Tower and its silhouette against the skyline.	HRP continuously engages with both the local planning authorities and developers to seek to ensure that development proposals preserve or enhance the WHS.	Development proposals are reported to the Tower of London WHS Steering Committee which meets every 6-12 months	Ongoing	HRP and EH are the key agencies involved that actively engage with the surrounding local authorities	The major management concerns are the continuing development applications that have the potential to affect the setting of the OUV of the WHS site.
<b>3.1.2</b>	<b>Commercial development</b>	The Towers setting is most affected, Criterion (ii) - monument of symbolic power and Criterion (iv) The White Tower. Draft attributes including, location & setting, form & design and spirit & feeling are affected by small and large scale development	HRP continuously engages with both the local planning authorities and developers to seek to ensure that development proposals preserve or enhance the WHS.	Development proposals are reported to the Tower of London WHS Steering Committee which meets every 6-12 months	Ongoing	HRP and EH are the key agencies involved that actively engage with the surrounding local authorities	The major management concerns are the continuing development applications that have the potential to affect the setting of the OUV of the WHS site.
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	People's ability to appreciate Criterion (iv), particularly the landmark siting of the Tower, is particularly affected by the major roads bounding the site to the north and east, which also have a generally negative impact on the local environment of the Tower.	HRP engages with Transport for London with regard to the road transport infrastructure to try to moderate its impacts. Pedestrian at grade crossings have been improved	Continuous	Ongoing	Historic Royal Palaces and Transport for London	Good transport links are an essential part of the Tower's success in bringing large numbers of visitors to the WHS. The surrounding road infrastructure negatively affects the setting of the Tower, but since it forms part of the principal road network of London, major change remains a long term objective.

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.8 Monitoring</b>					
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>4.8.4</b>	<b>Implementation of Committee recommendations is planned, but has not yet begun</b>	Following the Committee recommendations the Tower of London Steering Committee is due to meet in the Autumn to discuss and also review the proposed updates on the Tower WH Management Plan	Ongoing	HRP, EH and Local Planning Authorities	No comment

**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 **compromised** by factors described in this report

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

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

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **seriously impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation can be addressed, or is currently being addressed through 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**

5.3.1.4 Authenticity - compromised by impact of development within the setting

**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	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Not applicable
Political support for conservation	Positive
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**

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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
External experts

**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**

**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	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**

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Excellent
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

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

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
Reason for update: A revised Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the World Heritage Committee in June 2013

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