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ICOMOS

World Heritage Convention 1972
for the protection of World’s Cultural & Natural Heritage

The WH Convention recognises properties of ‘outstanding universal value’.

• The notion of OUV is substantiated by applying the criteria set out in the Operational Guidelines
• Conditions of Integrity & Authenticity have to be met by the attributes of the properties conveying OUV
• An adequate protection and management system must be in place
OUV & Attributes

The World Heritage Convention a property-based convention,

therefore

• It is sites or properties that are inscribed on the List (and not values or ideas)
• Those properties need to express OUV, and
• It is **attributes** that convey OUV

**Attributes are physical elements, and tangible or intangible aspects or processes of the property that make manifest OUV**

Value-based management (VBM)

• in the heritage realm VBM refers to processes in which the values of a property and related attributes are identified, made explicit, and clearly put at the basis of conservation and management activity.

• Values-based approaches require that identified values be ‘codified’ in a declaration - the ‘statement of significance’
  – in which attributes in conveying the significance of the property need to be indentified and their role clarified
  – The Statement of Significance becomes the reference for any future action.
Value-based management in the WH context

A clear and shared understanding of what OUV is for WH properties and how properties make OUV evident/manifest/understandable is essential

→Today when World Heritage Committee inscribes a property on the list, a Statement of OUV (SoOUV) is approved

SoOUV encapsulates why the property is considered to be of OUV:
- How it satisfies criteria
- What are the attributes that make manifest OUV
- How/to what extent attributes convey OUV (conditions of authenticity – integrity)
- Which are the needs/arrangements for protection and management to sustain OUV

Authenticity in the WH Context

Authenticity is looked at two levels:

• ‘Authentication process’ (at the time of nomination)
  →attributes of the property should credibly and truthfully reflect the proposed OUV (SP proposal and ABs assessment)

• Declination of the character/specificity of the property in relation to its OUV (selected criteria) as expressed by its attributes, result of the history/evolution of the property (useful for management)
Authenticity in the WH context: current Op Guidelines

“The ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depends on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful.” (OG, 2012)

- Authenticity thus relates to how credibly and truthfully attributes reflect OUV

“The statement of authenticity should assess the degree to which authenticity is present in, or expressed by, each of these significant attributes.” (OG, 2012)

It needs to say briefly whether the attributes that carry OUV convey their message credibly and truthfully.

Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Points for World Heritage
16 - 19 September 2013, Florence, Italy

Integrity in the WH context: Current Op Guidelines

For properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi), the physical fabric of the property and/or its significant features:

- should be in good condition (intactness)
- and the impact of deterioration processes controlled (absence of threats)
- A significant proportion of the elements necessary to convey the totality of the value conveyed by the property should be included (wholeness)
- Relationships and dynamic functions present in cultural landscapes, historic towns or other living properties essential to their distinctive character should also be maintained (functional/structural/visual integrity)

(para. 89)
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Case studies

• 1 EEA funded Research Project on
  "Improvement of the existing protection and management systems for sites inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. Preparation of statements of outstanding universal values and monitoring indicators, based on Norwegian and Polish experiences"

Selected examples: 1 WH historic city (Historic Centre of Kraków) and 1 industrial property and its associated landscape (Røros Mining Town and the Circumference)

• 3 World Heritage properties:
  • Transboundary: The Curonian Spit (Lithuania, Russian Federation), 2000, C (v)
  • Cultural Landscape: Loire Valley,
  • Archaeological Site: Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites

Historic Centre of Kraków (Poland), 1978

Criterion: (iv)

Statement of OUV

The historic layout of Cracow, with Wawel and Kazimierz, is one of the most outstanding examples of European urban planning, characterised by the harmonious development and accumulation of elements representing all architectural styles from the early Romanesque phase up to Modernism. The importance of the city is evident in the urban layout, numerous churches and monasteries, monumental secular public buildings, the remains of medieval city walls, as well as urban palaces and town houses designed and built by high-class architects and craftsmen. The value of the ensemble is determined by the extraordinary accumulation of monuments from various periods, preserved in their original form, with authentic fittings, which combine to create a uniform urban ensemble in which the tangible and intangible heritage is preserved and nurtured to the present day.

The dominant point of the urban ensemble, Wawel Hill, is the symbol of the crown, a necropolis documenting the dynastic and political links of medieval and modern Europe. Cracow, one of the largest administrative and commercial centres in Central Europe, was a centre of arts and crafts; a place where Eastern and Western culture and art met. The importance of Cracow as a cultural centre of European significance is reinforced by the existence of one of the oldest universities of international renown, the Jagiellonian University. The picture of the city’s cultural richness is supplemented by Jewish monuments of Cracow’s Kazimierz.
Historic Centre of Kraków (Poland), 1978

**Criterion (iv):** Cracow is an urban architectural ensemble of outstanding quality, in terms of both its *townscape* and its individual *monuments*. The historic centre of the town admirably illustrates the process of continuous urban growth from the Middle Ages to the present day.

---

Issues / threats / factors affecting the property (from Periodic Reporting Exercise):

- Development pressure, environmental pressure, natural disasters, visitor/tourism pressure
- A tendency of buildings proposed to be erected on the few available plots to exceed the size of existing Old Town buildings
- Unfinished transport investment projects and lack of strategically located car parks which would allow to remove all vehicle traffic from the inscribed area
- Sporadic possibility of flooding development of tourist infrastructure (hotels)
- Transport related natural environment pollution
**Historic Centre of Kraków**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Category</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Attribute characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban planning layout: the sum of the settlement ensembles</td>
<td>Inscription includes 3 settlement ensembles with their adjoining properties. Wawel, Kraków within the walls, Kazimierz with Stradom. The sum of the ensembles determines the uniqueness of the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban planning layout, in each settlement ensemble</td>
<td>Clarity of the urban planning layout separately in each ensemble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borders: tangible and intangible</td>
<td>Clarity of the historic city borders and the settlement ensembles co-creating the World Heritage site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network of streets and squares</td>
<td>Historical layout of the location with clear pre-location enclaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network of cadastral lots</td>
<td>Historical layout of the ownership areas determining the development layout. Restructured as a result of merges and divisions in the course of the centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Layout of development blocks</td>
<td>Historical development layout, usually filled with a new building substance. Dependent on the network of lots, but not explicitly. Layering of the elements from various periods visible in the.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectural scale (monuments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Category</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Attribute characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-phase monumental development</td>
<td>Layering of the elements from various periods engraved in the location spatial scheme determines the value of the ensemble. A full review of the European artistic styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-functionality of the development</td>
<td>Multi-functional development from various historic periods. Churches, synagogues, residences, tenement houses, public buildings, fortifications, etc. show the full development of the historic city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of the development</td>
<td>The height and extent of the development, shaped through the centuries, due to the regulations and economic conditions, characteristic for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decorations of the façade</td>
<td>Derived from the multi-phases of the development. Determines the expression of the urban interiors and the historic values accepted from the outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings, movable objects</td>
<td>Furnishings of the social, public use and private use interiors. Invaluable collection of works of art, artistic crafts of a historic value. Partially inaccessible, collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Monitoring of the Property in Relation to the Individual Attributes, i.e. the Essence of OLV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Who conducts the research / Or who do we ask?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban planning layout: the sum of the settlement ensembles</td>
<td>Maintaining the differences of the individual (3) integral elements of the ensemble</td>
<td>Stability of the spatial layout of the World Heritage site comprised of three historic units, clarity of their borders, spaces, functional differentiation. The highest value determining the essence of the ensemble is the authenticity of the ensemble layout maintained in their authentic form.</td>
<td>Satellite photogaphs, Map basis, Periodic comparisons</td>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>Poznan Regional and Cartography Documentation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban layout, branch settlement ensemble</td>
<td>Maintenance of the layout of the streets, development, development proportions, occupation of the space</td>
<td>Stability and clarity of the borders of the location components, as well as the urban values of the ensemble. Macro-scale</td>
<td>Satellite photogaphs, Map basis, Periodic comparisons</td>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>Poznan Regional and Cartography Documentation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorations of the facade</td>
<td>Maintaining historical decorations of the facade</td>
<td>Factor has been shaped throughout the ages, determining the perception of individual urban interfaces. Derivative of the multi-dimensions of the development. Especially sensitive to the lack of conservator’s care and negligence on the part of the users of the facilities.</td>
<td>Analysis of the conservator and building permits issued, as well as intervention of the building supervision authority for a given area</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Monitoring institution with the cooperation of the Voivodeship and Municipal Monument Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Points for World Heritage
16 - 19 September 2013, Florence, Italy

Historic Centre of Kraków

- Photo 1: Differentiation of low as a factor of quality
- Photo 2: Modern interference may be significant for changes in Authenticity of the site

- Positive and negative changes require noting and assessment

Historic Centre of Kraków

- Photo 1: Planty, one of the key elements of the city urban fabric
- Photo 2: Trees around the Market Square

- Diversity of the solutions and a minute amount of heritage substance
- Purposeful preservation of a catalogue of terms and noting changes for surveillance and management
Røros Mining Town and the Circumference (Norway), 1980, 2010 (extension)

Criteria: (iii), (iv), (v)

**Røros Mining Town and the Circumference** are linked to the copper mines, established in the 17th century and exploited for 333 years until 1977. The site comprises the Town and its industrial-rural cultural landscapes; Femundshytta, a smelter with its associated area; and the Winter Transport Route. [...] Røros contains about 2000 wooden one-and two-storey houses and a smelting house. [...] Surrounded by a buffer zone, coincident with the area of privileges (the Circumference) granted to the mining enterprise by the Danish-Norwegian Crown (1646), the property illustrates the establishment and flourishing of a lasting culture based on copper mining in a remote region with a harsh climate.

**Criterion (iii):** From the time copper ore was found in the mountains at Røros in 1644 until the copper works went bankrupt in 1977, with German mining technology as a starting point, employing German, Danish, Swedish immigrants, and Norwegian nationals, a unique culture developed to extract the valuable copper in a remote and sparsely inhabited area. Today there is no mining in the area, but **Røros Mining Town and the traces of mining, smelters, transport, and water management systems** bear unique witness to the adaptation of technology to the requirements of the natural environment and the remoteness of the situation.
Røros Mining Town and the Circumference (Norway),
1980, 2010 (extension)

Criterion (iv): Røros townscape and its related industrial and rural landscapes, with their interlinked industrial activity and domestic and agricultural accommodation within an urban environment, illustrate in an outstanding manner how people adapted to the extreme circumstances in which they had to live and how they used the available indigenous resources to provide shelter, produce food for their sustenance, and contribute to the national wealth of the country. Technologically, their buildings and installations evolved through the use of available indigenous materials to functionally satisfy the combined approach of mining and agrarian practices whilst at the same time accommodating the consequences of dealing with extreme climatic conditions.

Criterion (v): Røros Mining Town and the Circumference constitute a totality that is an outstanding example of traditional settlement and land-use. The various activities that have been carried out in the area constitute a coherent and interdependent unit. These activities have shaped a cultural landscape that provides a unique picture of how the mines and the mining town functioned as a complex and at times vulnerable system that verged on the limits of what was possible in an inhospitable environment with a harsh climate.
**Røros Mining Town and the Circumference (Norway), 1980, 2010 (extension)**

**Issues/ threats / factors affecting the property (from I Periodic Reporting Exercise)**

- Development pressure, environmental pressure, agricultural/forestry regimes
- Deposits from the processing of copper ore are a source of poisonous leakage, especially to water.
- The cultural landscape is dramatically changing as the vegetation is spreading (farming abandoned).

---

**Table 1: List of Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1: Reflects particular kind of industrial planning introduced by the Danish kings of Norway in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2: Characteristic example of this type of technological and industrial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3: Regular urban pattern adapted to the mountain terrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4: An outstanding survivor of a traditional kind of human settlement built in traditional methods of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5: Totality of the urban complex and its individual constituent parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6: Industrial buildings and the slag heaps created over the years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7: Numerous surviving buildings represent the Norwegian tradition of wooden construction that flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8: Building ensembles reflect the dual occupations of the inhabitants, mining and farming, with domestic groups being arranged as compact farmyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.9: Clear urban division and typology of the building ensembles of the social classes constituting the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.10: Individual buildings as well as their representativeness in comprising all the different (social) types represented in the community and incorporating the subsistence farming needs, winter stocking of fodder and the need to stabilise both migrant transport animals and domestic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.11: Urban agricultural landscape (including the circumference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.12: Industrial cultural landscapes (including the circumference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.13: Natural environment: mountain plateaux, cold climate, copper ore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.14: Network of lakes and rivers functioning as transport routes and mitigating the long distances to harbours and large towns, as well as for supplying food and other essential amenities to the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Røros Mining Town and the Circumference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Reflects particular kind of industrial planning introduced by the Danish kings of Norway in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Røros is a characteristic example of this type of technological and industrial development. ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Regular urban pattern adapted to the mountain terrain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 An outstanding survivor of a traditional kind of human settlement, built in traditional methods of construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A5 Totality of the urban complex and its individual constituent parts | 2.1 Landscape  
2.2 Røros Mining Town  
2.3 The Smelting House and the Malmgassen Square  
2.4 Stagheaps  
2.5 The Church |
| A6 Industrial buildings and the stagheaps created over the years |  |

---

### Røros Mining Town and the Circumference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Feature/ Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A6 Totality of the urban complex constituent parts | C1 - 21 Landscape  
C2 - 22 Røros Mining town  
C3 - 23 The Smelting House and the Malmgassen Square  
C4 - 24 Stagheaps  
C5 - 25 The Church  
C6 Randerborg  
C7 Assergården form | C2.F1 - 23 Town plan of 1771  
C2.F2 - 23a Bergmannsgata street  
C2.F3 - 23.1 and it still functions as a centre of activity and as a meeting-place  
C1.F.4 - 24.1 into major features of the landscape. They appear almost as they did during the time when the copper works were in operation  
C4.C5.F6 - 2.6, with 2.4 together they dominate the townscape  
C5.F6 Impressive edifice, with lime-washed masonry walls in Kristiania style. Visible from the entire town  
C7.Randerborg, more organic structure, lower classes  
F6 Outbuildings and the farm Assergården  
**The second number indicates the provenance chapter of the component.** |
| A6 Industrial buildings, stagheaps | C1 Stagheaps | A.6.C.6.C.5.F6 - 2.6, with 2.4 together they dominate the townscape |
| A7 Buildings represent the Norwegian wooden construction | C1 485 outbuildings were registered  
C2 200 of these have been restored | F1 Dual occupations of the inhabitants: mining and farming, and arranged as compact farmyards  
F2 Demonstrate with exceptional quality how miners and other employees had to exploit all available natural resources in addition to their wages from the copper works in order to survive  
F3 No other mining town with its cultural landscape on the World Heritage List demonstrates such complete exploitation of scanty resources  
F.2 Traditional wooden construction techniques |
The Curonian Spit landscape is a unique vulnerable sandy wooded cultural landscape of the coastal spit with small Curonian lagoon settlements formed and still being formed by the sea, wind and human activity. Rich with abundance of unique natural and cultural properties, it has retained its social and cultural importance. The Curonian Spit cultural landscape reflects changes in the natural environment and local community, and the need to choose and implement the appropriate actions over time in order to survive in the changing environment. The most valuable elements and qualities of the Curonian Spit cultural landscape are the unique size and general spatial structure [...] expressing harmonious coexistence between humans and nature [...] characteristic powerful panoramas and silhouette from the Curonian Lagoon; cultural formations [...] the remains of postal tracks, trade villages of 10–11th centuries, historic fishermen villages and other archaeological heritage covered by sand; the spatial-planned structure and architecture of ancient fishermen villages turned into resort settlements: ancient wooden fishermen houses, professionally-designed buildings of the 19th century: lighthouses, piers, churches, schools, villas; elements of marine cultural heritage. Natural and man-made formations include the distinctive Great Dune Ridge and individual dunes, relics of ancient parabolic dunes; man-made protective coastal dune ridge; relics of moraine islands, seacoast and littoral forests, littoral capes; ancient forests, mountain pine forests and other unique sand flora and fauna, bird migration path; Social-cultural traditions, spirituality, social perception of the area [...] are of high importance.
Issues/ factors affecting the property (from SOC reports):

- potential pollution from the oil exploitation of the D-6 oil field in the Baltic Sea by the Russian Federation;
- Lack of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation including joint assessment of environmental impact of the D-6 project;
- Impacts of sewage spill accident which took place at Klaipeda Water Treatment Station (Lithuania);
- New and possibly illegal constructions;
- Sand dunes erosion;
- Possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad (programmes cancelled - ?)
The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes (France), 2000

**Criterion (i):** The Loire Valley is noteworthy for the quality of its architectural heritage, in its historic towns such as Blois, Chinon, Orléans, Saumur, and Tours, but in particular in its world-famous castles, such as the Château de Chambord.

**Criterion (ii):** The Loire Valley is an outstanding cultural landscape along a major river which bears witness to an interchange of human values and to a harmonious development of interactions between human beings and their environment over two millennia.

**Criterion (iv):** The landscape of the Loire Valley, and more particularly its many cultural monuments, illustrate to an exceptional degree the ideals of the Renaissance and the Age of the Enlightenment on western European thought and design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Echelle</th>
<th>Motifs paysagers</th>
<th>Menaces et risques d’impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Le Val de Loire, une composition d’ensemble, du littoral de la Loire aux océans | Attaque aux structures paysagères fondamentales : | - étalement urbain  
- voies de grande dimensions  
- ouvrages de franchissement  
- canaux (création, extension, réaménagement)  
- lignes à haute tension  
- lignes et installations ferroviaires  |
| [Échelle approximative de 1 à 10 km] | Construction d’aménagements hors de proportions, écrasant le paysage, par une rupture d’échelles | - en hauteur : immeubles de grande hauteur  
- en volume : centres commerciaux et zones d’activité  
- routes et réseaux | - suppression de points de vue  
- construction d’aménagements : lotissements, zones d’activités, parkings  
- suppression d’aménagements  
- destruction de sites historiques  
- destruction de sites archéologiques  |
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**The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes (France), 2000**

#### inventory threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Echelle</th>
<th>Motifs paysages</th>
<th>Menaces et risques d’impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Echelle du grand paysage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atteinte aux structures paysagères fondamentales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- en hauteur:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- immeubles de grande hauteur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- en volume:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- centres commerciaux et complexes avec des immeubles de grande hauteur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction d’aménagements hors de proportions, exaltant le paysage par une rupture d’échelle:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- loisir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- immeubles de grande hauteur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- en volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- centres commerciaux et établissements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues/ factors (as identified in the MP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menaces et risques d’impact</th>
<th>Thématiques</th>
<th>Moyens d’intervention</th>
<th>Objectif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Echelle du grand paysage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atteinte aux structures paysagères fondamentales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- en hauteur</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCOT, FLU</td>
<td>Etablir l’aménagement urbain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- immeubles de grande hauteur</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCOT, FLU</td>
<td>Réduire l’ensemble des nouveaux équipements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- en volume</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCOT, FLU</td>
<td>Intégrer l’intégration des nouveaux équipements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes (France), 2000

1. Structure of the Management Plan
   - The Outstanding Universal Value of the property
   - Loire Valley: a model of spatial organisation shaped along centuries
   - Landscapes shaped by economic activities
   - Natural character of the river and its beauty

2. Threats and vulnerabilities
   - Landscape an public policies
   - Loire Valley landscape patterns and components
   - Analytical grid
   - Inventory of threats
   - Themes and areas of intervention

3. Guidelines for a shared management

4. Specific Actions by the State
   - Protect the emblematic spaces of the property
   - Integrate the landscape issues/ challenges in the public planning policies
   - Integrate the landscape issues/ challenges in the management of the river domain
   - Promote the elaboration of the landscape plan
   - Ensure the monitoring of the MP
3. Guidelines for a shared management

- Preserve and valorise remarkable heritage and spaces
- Maintain the open landscapes and the views of the Loire Valley
- Master the human settlement
- Organise the urban development
- Integrate new equipment in the setting
- Valorise the entrances and discovery axes of the property
- Organise a sustainable tourism
- Favour the understanding of the OUV by local actors
- Accompany decision makers through the council and the permanent participation

To know more check at http://www.valdeloire.org/Actions/Grands-projets/Plan-de-gestion-du-site-inscrit/Plan-de-gestion-des-orientations-communes-pour-agir
The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes (France), 2000

les techniques d'entretien et de valorisation des berges

Michel Bacchi, Hydrobiologist, Professeur associé à l'Université de Tours.

Les travaux d'entretien des berges de Loire concernent principalement:
- La consolidation de pieds de levées à partir de techniques du génie végétal.
- La restauration de cheminement public.
- L'ouverture de vues sur le fleuve et d'accès aux berges par l'élagage de la végétation spontanée (les fenêtres végétales).

RECOMMANDATIONS
La consolidation des pieds de levées:
- une intervention lors des périodes d'étéage du fleuve,
- un coût identique ou inférieur aux interventions de génie civil (enrochements),
- un intérêt écologique avec une incidence faible sur le milieu (consolidation naturelle et augmentation de la biodiversité - supports, abris, nourritures),
- une souplesse et une résistance accrues du levées.

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom), 1986

Criteria: (i), (ii), (iii)

Statement of OUV – Brief Description
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.
Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom), 1986

Criterion (i): The monuments of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites 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 [...] and the distance they were transported [...]. The sheer scale of some of the surrounding monuments is also remarkable:

- the Stonehenge Cursus and the Avenue are both about 3 km long, while Durrington Walls is the largest known henge in Britain, [...] 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 1.3 km 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 39.5 m high and comprises half a million tonnes of chalk. The purpose of this imposing, skilfully engineered monument remains obscure.

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 (1626-1697), Inigo Jones (1573-1652), and William Stukeley (1687-1765), they have had an unwavering influence on architects, archaeologists, artists and historians. The two parts of the World Heritage property provide an excellent opportunity for further research. Today, the property has spiritual associations for some.
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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 interrelationship 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 […] 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 2 km 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.

Issues/ factors affecting the property (SOC reports):

• closure of route A344 running close to the property not accomplished (promised since inscription)
• lack of adequate visitor facilities
• threats to buried archaeological remains caused by ploughing - reversion of arable land to chalk grassland (addressed)
• localised conservation problems to archaeological remains due to subsidence (addressed)
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Structure of the Management Plan

1. Description of the WHS, assessment of its Outstanding Universal Value, policy and management context, assessment of the 2000 Plan
2. Key management issues affecting the WHS and monitoring indicators
3. Vision, long-term aims, short and medium-term policies

Attributes (follows in-depth description of each)

1. Stonehenge itself as a globally famous and iconic monument.
2. The physical remains of the Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and associated sites.
3. The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the landscape.
4. The design of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the skies and astronomy.
5. The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to each other.
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.
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.
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Excerpt from the 2009 Management Plan

Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Points for World Heritage
16 - 19 September 2013, Florence, Italy
Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom), 1986

The Vision for the Stonehenge World Heritage Site

The Stonehenge WHS is globally important not just for Stonehenge, but for its unique and dense concentration of outstanding prehistoric monuments and sites, which together form a landscape without parallel. We will care for and safeguard this special area and its archaeology and will provide a more tranquil, biodiverse and rural setting for it, allowing present and future generations to enjoy it and the landscape more fully. We will also ensure that its special qualities are presented, interpreted and enhanced where necessary, so that visitors can better understand the extraordinary achievements of the prehistoric peoples who left us this rich legacy.
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Priorities for 2009-2015

The primary purpose of this Management Plan is to guide all interested parties on the care of this World Heritage Site by sustaining its Outstanding Universal Value. This will ensure the effective protection, conservation, and presentation of the World Heritage Site for present and future generations. It will also ensure that all decisions affecting the World Heritage Site move towards the achievement of the Vision.
Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom), 1986

- maintain and extend permanent grassland to protect buried archaeology from ploughing and to provide an appropriate setting for upstanding monuments;
- remove the woodland and scrub cover from key monuments;
- remove or screen inappropriate structures or roads, in particular the A344, and keep the A303 improvements under review;
- enhance the visitor experience by 2012 by providing improved interim facilities;
- improve the interpretation of the WHS and increase access to selected monuments;
- continue to encourage sustainable archaeological research and education to improve and transmit our understanding of the WHS;
- encourage the sustainable management of the WHS, balancing its needs with those of farming, nature conservation, access, landowners and the local community.

Aim 1: The Management Plan should be endorsed by those bodies and individuals responsible for its implementation as the framework for long-term detailed decision-making on the conservation and enhancement of the WHS and the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and its aims and policies should be incorporated into relevant planning guidance and policies (All issues).

Policy 1a – Government departments, agencies and other statutory bodies responsible for making and implementing national policies and for undertaking activities that may impact on the WHS and its environs should recognise the importance of the WHS as a whole and its need for special treatment and a unified approach (issue 1).

Policy 1b – The Regional Spatial Strategy and the Local Development Framework and other statutory plans such as Community Strategies should contain policies to ensure that the importance of the protection of the WHS and its setting and the maintenance of its OUV are fully taken into account in determining planning applications and Road Orders (issue 2).

Policy 1c – The relevant policies of the Management Plan should where appropriate, be incorporated within the Local Development Framework, and consideration be given to the potential need to adopt the Management Plan as a Supplementary Planning Document or Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Policy 1d – Development which would impact adversely on the WHS, its OUV or its setting should not be permitted. (issue 2)
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**Aim 5:** To reduce the impacts of roads and traffic on the OUV of the WHS and to improve sustainable access to the Site (issues 34-37).

- **Policy 3a:** Measures should be identified and implemented to reduce the impacts of roads and traffic on the WHS and to improve road safety (issues 34-36).
- **Policy 3b:** Proposals should be developed, assessed and implemented, if practical, for the closure of the A203/ A244 junction, of the A344 between the junction and the current visitor centre site, and for restricted access on some or all of the remainder of the A344 up to Airman’s Corner, depending on the location of new visitor facilities (issues 34 and 35).
- **Policy 3c:** Vehicular access to Boways within the World Heritage Site should be restricted apart from access for emergency, operational and farm vehicles (issue 36).
- **Policy 3d:** Measures should be taken through on an exemplary Green Travel Plan to encourage access to the Site other than by car (issues 36, 39).
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