

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1084


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	51.482 / -0.294	132	350	482	2003
Total (ha)		132	350	482	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
The Site Boundary and Buffer Zone	17/01/2002	

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

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- David Holroyd
Royal Botanic Gardens
Head of Estates
- Keith Garner

Comment

Dave Holroyd Telephone: +44 (0) 20 8332 5858 Keith Garner
Consultant Telephone: +44 (0) 20 7585 0421 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7801 9591

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- Patrimonium-mundi.org : visit this site in [panophotographies - immersive and interactive spherical images](#)
- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew](#)
- [Site description in Estonian](#)

Comment

i) Can Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew be at the top of the list? ii) Suggest remove site description in Estonian.

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

Comment

Royal Botanic Gardens Kew works with DEFRA to manage the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and holds various relevant plant collections. Buildings in the Gardens are protected by appropriate designations and the whole property is within a Conservation Area

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

Set amongst a series of parks and estates along the River Thames' south-western reaches, this historic landscape garden includes work by internationally renowned landscape architects Bridgeman, Kent, Chambers, Capability Brown and Nesfield illustrating significant periods in garden design from the 18th to the 20th centuries. The gardens house extensive botanic collections (conserved plants, living plants and documents) that have been considerably enriched through the centuries. Since their creation in 1759, the gardens have made a significant and uninterrupted contribution to the study of plant diversity, plant systematics and economic botany. The landscape design of Kew Botanic Gardens, their buildings and plant collections combine to form a unique testimony to developments in garden art and botanical science that were subsequently diffused around the world. The 18th century English landscape garden concept was adopted in Europe and Kew's influence in horticulture, plant classification and economic botany spread internationally from the time of Joseph Banks' directorship in the 1770s. As the focus of a growing level of botanic activity, the mid 19th century garden, which overlays earlier royal landscape gardens is centred on two large iron framed glasshouses - the Palm House and the Temperate House that became models for conservatories around the world. Elements of the 18th and 19th century layers including the Orangery, Queen Charlotte's Cottage; the folly temples; Rhododendron Dell, boundary ha-ha; garden vistas to William Chambers' pagoda and Syon Park House; iron framed glasshouses; ornamental lakes and ponds; herbarium and plant collections convey the history of the Gardens' development from royal retreat and pleasure garden to national botanical and horticultural garden before becoming a modern institution of conservation ecology in the 20th century.

Criterion (ii): Since the 18th century, the Botanic Gardens of Kew have been closely associated with scientific and economic exchanges established throughout the world in the field of botany, and this is reflected in the richness of its collections. The landscape and architectural features of the Gardens reflect considerable artistic influences both with regard to the European continent and to more distant regions; Criterion (iii): Kew Gardens have largely contributed to advances in many scientific disciplines, particularly botany and ecology; Criterion (iv): The landscape gardens and the edifices created by celebrated artists such as Charles Bridgeman, William Kent, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and William Chambers

reflect the beginning of movements which were to have international influence;

Integrity (2009)

The boundary of the property contains the elements that bear witness to the history of the development of the landscape gardens and Kew Gardens' uninterrupted role as national botanic garden and centre of plant research. These elements, which express the Outstanding Universal Value, remain intact. The Buffer Zone contains the focus of one of the garden vistas on the opposite bank of the Thames River - Syon Park House - together with other parts of the adjacent cultural landscape (Old Deer Park - a royal estate south of Kew Gardens, Syon Park on the opposite bank of the Thames, the river from Isleworth Ferry Gate to Kew Bridge, the historic centre of Kew Green with the adjacent buildings and the church, and then to the east, the built-up sectors of 19th and 20th century houses). Development outside this Buffer Zone may threaten the setting of the property.

Authenticity (2009)

Since their creation in the 18th century Kew Gardens have remained faithful to their initial purpose with botanists continuing to collect specimens and exchange expertise internationally. The collections of living and stored material are used by scholars all over the world.

The 44 listed buildings are monuments of the past, and reflect the stylistic expressions of various periods. They retain their authenticity in terms of design, materials and functions. Only a few buildings are being used for a purpose different from that originally intended (the Orangery now houses a restaurant). Unlike the works of architecture, in each of the landscaped garden areas, the past, present and future are so closely interwoven (except in the case of vestigial gardens created by significant artists, such as the vistas), that it is sometimes difficult to separate the artistic achievements of the past in terms of the landscape design of the different periods. Recent projects such as recutting Nessfield's beds behind the Palm House have started to interpret and draw attention to the earlier landscapes created by Capability Brown and Nessfield. Other projects are proposed in the overall landscape management plan subject to resourcing. Protection and management requirements (2009)

The property includes the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew, Kew Palace and Queen Charlotte's Cottage, which are the hereditary property of Queen Elizabeth II and are managed for conservation purposes by the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew and Historic Royal Palaces.

The property is included in a conservation area designated by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. Part of the Buffer Zone is protected by a conservation area in the London Borough of Hounslow. Forty four buildings and structures situated on the site have been listed under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as buildings of special architectural and historical interest. The whole site is Grade I on the English Heritage Register of Park and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England Permission to carry out works or change functions is subject to the approval of the local authorities, who consult English Heritage in the case of listed buildings and conservation areas.

Protection of the property and the Buffer Zone is provided by development plans in the planning systems of the London Boroughs of Richmond upon Thames and Hounslow and by the London Plan (the Regional Spatial Strategy) and by designation.

Kew Gardens' conservation work has continued at an international level, notably for the cataloguing of species, supporting conservation projects around the world, the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES, 1975) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992).

The property has a World Heritage Site Management Plan, a Property Conservation Plan, and a Master Plan.

Implementation of the Management Plan is coordinated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. The World Heritage Site Management Plan is currently being revised alongside a specific landscape master plan.

At the time of inscription the World Heritage Committee encouraged the State Party to include on the staff of the Royal Botanic Gardens a landscape architect or other specialist qualified in the history of art and history in general, so that architectural conservation activities can be coordinated on-site. Landscape architects with experience of working in historic landscapes have been appointed to provide this advice.

Comment

- Historical background could be developed, in particular to refer to the two royal gardens. - Integrity compromised as parts of the designed landscape, covered by criteria ii) and iv), are outside the WHS. - Similarly, Chambers' Observatory and the "Great Conservatory" at Syon are outside the WHS. - Inappropriate development outside buffer zone causing harm to WHS. - Errors in description of ownership. - Some amendments and rephrasing to the section on site protection desirable.

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

(ii)(iii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Attributes are set out in section 3.8 of the WHS Management Plan, 2011 under five categories: - a rich and diverse historic cultural landscape providing a palimpsest of landscape design. - an iconic architectural legacy. - globally important preserved and living plant collections. - a horticultural heritage of keynote species and collections. - key contributions to developments in plant science and plant taxonomy. NB: attributes are not set out "per criterion" in the WHS Management Plan.

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

See suggested revisions in answer to question 2.1 above, relating to: - desirability of fuller description of the site's history. - lack of integrity, with important parts of the designed landscape and key buildings outside the WHS. - development outside buffer zone in Brentford causing harm to the OUV. - errors in description of ownership. - the desirability of including a fuller description of the protection and management regime.

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

It is appreciated that Kew's SOUV will not be changed in the foreseeable future. It is however desirable to express the significance of Kew as well and fully as possible. This is particularly important given other values - such as economic regeneration - which are currently seen as antithetical to the protection of OUV. A new synthesis is required, protecting OUV whilst allowing the economy of the surrounding area to flourish. A fuller SOUV could contribute to this process.

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
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing						
3.1.2	Commercial development						
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						
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.2	Ground water pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution						
3.4.6	Input of excess energy						
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.5	Crop production						
3.5.6	Commercial wild plant collection						
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production						
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.2	Relative humidity						
3.7.3	Temperature						
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)						
3.7.7	Pests						
3.7.8	Micro-organisms						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.1	Illegal activities						
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.1	Storms						
3.10.2	Flooding						
3.10.3	Drought						
3.10.6	Temperature change						
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts						
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)						
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.1	Translocated species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
3.13	Management and institutional factors						
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.3	Management 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	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.2 Commercial development	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	extensive	frequent	significant	low capacity	static
3.4 Pollution					
3.4.4 Air pollution	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.4.6 Input of excess energy	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2 Relative humidity	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity	static
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static
3.10 Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1 Storms	extensive	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species	extensive	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

3.1.1, 3.1.2 & 3.4.6 - New buildings (and "light outspill") affecting WHS and setting 3.1.5 - Need for new visitor and interpretation facilities 3.2.1 - Intrusive car park on river 3.2.4 - Aircraft noise beneath final approach to Heathrow. 3.4.4 - Film of aviation fuel on thatched roof of Queen Charlotte's cottage 3.7.2 - Rapid deterioration of glasshouses 3.8.6 - Localised concentrations of visitors 3.10.1- Loss of trees in 1987 storm 3.12.2. Ash Dieback

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

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?

Inadequacies in the buffer zones of the World Heritage property make it difficult to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

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 buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

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

Shortcomings of the boundaries of the WHS and buffer zone are problematic for maintaining OUV. Policy 2a of the WHS Management Plan envisages extending the buffer zone further into Brentford, where it is narrow with development sites outside. However a greater benefit might be achieved if the WHS itself could be extended to take in Syon Park in Hounslow.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The property, which includes the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew, Kew Palace and Queen Charlotte's Cottage, are the hereditary property of Her Majesty the Queen Elizabeth II. The extent of the property follows the current administrative delimitation of the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew (except for Little Kew Green) and also includes Kew Palace and Queen Charlotte's Cottage, which are placed under the protection of Historic Royal Palaces. The whole of the property proposed for inscription is included in a conservation zone designated by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. Another part of the buffer zone territory is protected by the conservation zone of the London Borough of Hounslow. The permits needed to carry out works or change functions are subject to the approval of these local authorities, which in the case of historic buildings and zones, consult English Heritage. 44 buildings and structures situated on the site have been listed as buildings of special architectural and historical interest by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. All listed buildings are protected by the 1990 Listed Buildings and Conservation Zones Act. This law provides statutory protection to the building, its characteristics and its environment. The whole of the property proposed for inscription is Level 1 listed on the English Heritage register of parks and gardens, because of its exceptional historic interest. English Heritage and the Garden History Society must be consulted when a permit application is made concerning an intervention on the listed gardens and their environment. Kew Gardens are also protected by Richmond upon Thames from the viewpoint of nature conservation. Protection of the buffer zone (Old Deer Park, a royal estate south of Kew Gardens, Sion Park on the opposite bank of the Thames, the river from Isleworth Ferry Gate to Kew Bridge, the historic centre of Kew Green with the adjacent buildings and the church, and then to the east, the built-up sectors of 19th and 20th century houses) is granted at various levels by the individual development plans of the two boroughs mentioned above.

Comment

Suggest first sentence is rephrased to read: "The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew is the property of The Crown Estate, managed by the Trustees of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Kew Palace and Queen Charlotte's Cottage are owned by HM Queen Elizabeth on behalf of the nation and are managed by Historic Royal Palaces". The paragraph would benefit generally from rephrasing and updating to take account of legislative changes.

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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

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?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone is **inadequate** to ensure 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

The Royal Botanic Gardens has adequate protective measures in place. However new development carried out within the buffer zone (and beyond) since inscription has harmed OUV. The Mayor of London has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2012) on the protection of the settings of World Heritage Sites in London. However the boroughs of Richmond and Hounslow have still to incorporate relevant policies of the 2011 WHS Management Plan within their Local Development Frameworks.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The property has two separate management units which work together for the conservation and management of the site. The Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew (board of directors and director) manage the whole site except for Kew Palace and Queen Charlotte's Cottage, which are managed by Historic Royal Palaces (board of directors and chief executive). Kew Gardens are placed under the responsibility of the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and Historic Royal Palaces is appointed by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen. The property management plan was adopted by the Secretariat of State for Culture, Media and Sport in November 2002. The Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew is in charge of its implementation. At the same time, the authorities have drawn up a Property Conservation Plan (November 2002), which is a flexible management tool. It thus reinforces the management plan to ensure that the values of the site are conserved. These two documents are in line with the Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention as regards management issues. Resources: The Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs provides most of the funds necessary for the functioning of Kew Gardens, whose annual budget is around 27 million pounds sterling. The other sources of financing are the sale of products and services, donations and fund-raising. The financing sources of Historic Royal Palaces are visitors' entrance fees, sales of products, etc.

Comment

i) Line 6. "Secretariat" should be "Secretary". ii) Line 8. "Property" should be "Site". iii) Line 10. After "Rural Affairs" insert abbreviation "DEFRA" in brackets. iv) Line 12. Delete

Section II-Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

reference to annual budget. v) Line 12. Insert "entrance fees" before "sale of products". Delete "services".

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

The principal management documents are: i) Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. World Heritage Site Management Plan, 2011. Gross. Max. Landscape Architects. ii) Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Landscape Master Plan. November 2010. Gross. Max. Landscape Architects. iii) Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Site Conservation Plan. November 2002. Chris Blandford Associates.

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 being **fully** implemented and monitored

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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in 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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

Royal Botanic Gardens Kew has wide contacts with companies, universities and governments worldwide concerning its central mission of plant conservation. This is not necessarily related to the management of the WHS. There is little traditional industry surviving in the area surrounding the WHS, other than some boat repair yards at Brentford Dock, with which there is little contact at the present time.

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

The Management Plan drawn up in 2002 prior to inscription is now superseded by the Management Plan drawn up in 2011. Changes to the English planning system since 2010 are set out at section 4.2 of the WHS Management Plan 2011.

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)	40%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	40%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	10%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

None

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

Section II-Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

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

Fundraising is in progress for the conservation of the Grade 1 listed Temperate House, including a bid to the national lottery and approaches to private benefactors and supporters. The fundraising is progressing well. Further major projects identified in the WHS Management Plan, such as new visitor facilities at Victoria Gate and "Breathing Planet" walk, may present greater challenges if current economic conditions persist.

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

Full-time	85%
Part-time	15%

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

Permanent	95%
Seasonal	5%

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

Paid	53%
Volunteer	47%

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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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

The Royal Botanic Gardens is greatly assisted in its work by volunteers drawn from the local community.

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 **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

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

Scientific papers are published by Kew's research staff on specific topics. Kew Magazine publishes articles on all aspects of the management and presentation of the World Heritage Site and scientific research projects in progress.

Section II-Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

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	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 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 **not adequately** presented and interpreted

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	Poor
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Adequate

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

The World Heritage Site emblem is displayed in the Nash Conservatory near the Main Gates, unveiled by HM Queen Elizabeth in 2006, and in the foyer of the administration building. The emblem is not currently displayed at the four public entrances: the Main Gates, Brentford Gate, Victoria Gate or Lion Gate. It is planned to add the emblem to the Donor Wall at Victoria Gate.

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	Decreasing
Three years ago	Decreasing
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	N/A

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

Entry tickets and registries
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor Management and education issues are discussed at Section 10 of the WHS Management Plan. There are no specific 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 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

The strategy for visitor management is set out in policies 4a-j of the WHS Management Plan. In particular policy 4e refers to enhancement of the visitor experience, including the proposed redevelopment of the Victoria Gate to improve facilities for interpretation and orientation, and the new Breathing Planet Garden Walk which will "manifest Kew's mission in relation to worldwide plant conservation". Question 4.7.2.6 refers to visits to Kew's web site to assess visitor trends.

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	Average
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
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 **underway**

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

The SOUV notes that, at the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee encouraged the inclusion on the staff at Kew a landscape architect or other specialist in art history to coordinate conservation activities. In the event, this service has been provided by consultants rather than by in-house staff.

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

The principal means of monitoring is the meetings of the WHS Steering Group, which take place twice a year in May and November. The meetings are attended by representatives of the Royal Botanic Gardens, English Heritage, DCMS, DEFRA, London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow and others as required.

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
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing	Criterion iv Attributes contributing to Kew's rich and diverse landscape: - Relationship with the Thames and wider Arcadian landscape. - Victorian layout by Nesfield and Burton. - Remaining landscapes by Brown and Chambers. - Key vistas.	WHS Management Plan Aim 1: Management Plan to be endorsed. Policy 1b: London Plan and LDF policies. Policy 1c: Management Plan policies incorporated into LDFs. Policy 1d: Development adversely impacting WHS should not be permitted.	- Prospective developments impacting on OUV of WHS discussed at six monthly WHS Steering Group meetings. - RBGK consultants monitor development proposals and advise on appropriate responses.	5 years and ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens in collaboration with Historic Royal Palaces, English Heritage, London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow and the Greater London Authority.	New residential development in Brentford is ongoing cause for concern. 25 storey tower at Wallis House site, Brentford approved in 2005, currently under construction, will appear in backdrop of Kew Palace. Other proposals coming forward.
3.1.2	Commercial development	Criterion iv Attributes contributing to Kew's rich and diverse landscape: - Relationship with the Thames and wider Arcadian landscape. - Victorian layout by Nesfield and Burton. - Remaining landscapes by Brown and Chambers. - Key vistas.	WHS Management Plan Aim 1: Management Plan to be endorsed. Policy 1b: London Plan and LDF policies. Policy 1c: Management Plan policies incorporated into LDFs. Policy 1d: Development adversely impacting WHS should not be permitted.	- Prospective developments impacting on OUV of WHS discussed at six monthly WHS Steering Group meetings. - RBGK consultants monitor development proposals and advise on appropriate responses.	5 years and ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens in collaboration with Historic Royal Palaces, English Heritage, London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow and the Greater London Authority.	Similar issue to 3.1.1 concerning new commercial development in Brentford. Also recent case of consent granted for illuminated advertisements on Haverfield estate towers. Consent subsequently quashed following legal action by RBGK.
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	No inscription criteria or attributes contributing to OUV affected as such. However other values, such as educational, social and artistic values, are affected.	Kew responds as required to government consultations on capacity of Heathrow Airport. For example response to the consultation on a proposed variation to hours of usage of existing runways at Heathrow in 2008.	Not applicable	Ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew in collaboration with London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow as the local authorities affected by aircraft noise. Also Greater London Authority and Department for Transport.	Relates to planes passing over Kew at low altitude at approximately 1 minute intervals on the final approach to Heathrow Airport.
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.6	Input of excess energy	Criterion iv Attributes contributing to Kew's rich and diverse landscape: - The relationship with the River Thames and wider Arcadian landscape beyond.	WHS Management Plan Aim 1: Management Plan to be endorsed Policy 1d: Development adversely impacting WHS should not be permitted. Aim 3: Conserve and enhance OUV Policy 3h: improve visual integrity of WHS by screening inappropriate structures.	- Prospective developments impacting on OUV of WHS discussed at six monthly WHS Steering Group meetings. - RBGK employs consultants to monitor development proposals and to advise on appropriate responses.	5 years and ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Similar to 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. Relates to "light outspill" consequential on the construction of new residential and commercial buildings in Brentford. Also inappropriate advertising.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.10.1	Storms	Criterion ii Attributes contributing to Kew's horticultural heritage of keynote species and collections. - Collection of heritage trees	WHS Management Plan Aim 3: Conserve and enhance OUV Policy 3f: The overall nature conservation value of the WHS should be maintained and enhanced.	Periodic review	Ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Significant loss of trees in relatively recent past; eg 1000 trees in 1987 storm.
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species							
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Criterion ii Attributes contributing to Kew's horticultural heritage of keynote species and collections. - Collection of heritage trees	WHS Management Plan Aim 3: Conserve and enhance OUV Policy 3i: Risk management strategies should be kept under review.	As required	Ongoing	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Relates to current concerns over the impact of "Ash Dieback" disease" at Kew. Information on the disease and how Kew is responding is described by Tony Kirkham, Head of Kew's Arboretum, here: http://www.kew.org/news/chalara-dieback-of-ash.htm

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	WHS Management Plan Aim 2: The boundary should ensure integrity of the WHS is maintained. Policy 2b: Review whether WHS boundary and buffer zone are sufficient. Policy 2c: Review the status of protection of significant sightlines and vistas.	- Policy 2b: long term - Policy 2c: 5 years	- Policy 2b: Royal Botanic Gardens, London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow, English Heritage, DCMS. - Policy 2c: Royal Botanic Gardens, English Heritage.	Question as to whether timeframe for implementation of policy 2b should be brought forward, given ongoing pressure of development in Brentford on OUV.		
4.2 Protective Measures							
4.2.4	Inadequate legal framework	WHS Management Plan Aim 1: The Management Plan should be endorsed by those bodies responsible for its implementation. Policy 1c: Relevant policies should be incorporated within LDF's. Policy 1d: Adverse development should not be permitted.	5 years	Royal Botanic Gardens, London Borough of Richmond, London Borough of Hounslow, English Heritage, DCMS.	Perceived economic benefits of redevelopment are given greater priority by London Borough of Hounslow than protection of OUV of Kew. Extending the WHS to include Syon Park in Hounslow would give a sense of "ownership" of the WHS.		

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 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 **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

In the period since inscription, the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew has been enhanced a series of well-received new buildings and structures, including : the Davies Alpine House; the Shirley Sherwood Gallery for Botanic Art; the Xtrata Treetop Walkway, and the Sackler Crossing. The Royal Botanic Gardens received the RIBA/Arts Council "Client of the Year" award in 2006.

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	No impact
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	No impact

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

Despite continued success and national and international fame, the World Heritage Site is not celebrated at a local level to the degree that might be expected. This may in part be due to a failure of presentation on the part of Kew.

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

The available text, at 500 characters, is insufficient to give a complete answer to the question or comment requested, eg comments on SOUV at 2.1. There should be more opportunity to enter text, rather than clicking radio buttons, to allow a more nuanced discussion of issues affecting the WHS. Slightly negative emphasis to the questionnaire, dealing predominantly with "threats". No particular opportunity to report on the "positives" that have taken place at the WHS since 2003.

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

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	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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: - Historical background could be developed, in particular to refer to the two royal gardens. - Integrity compromised as parts of the designed landscape, covered by criteria ii) and iv),

are outside the WHS. - Similarly, Chambers' Observatory and the "Great Conservatory" at Syon are outside the WHS. - Inappropriate development outside buffer zone causing harm to WHS. - Errors in description of ownership. - Some amendments and rephrasing to the section on site protection desirable.

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