

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Ironbridge Gorge

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

371

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

1986

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

| Name              | Coordinates (longitude / latitude) | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Total (ha) | Inscription year |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| Ironbridge Gorge  | 52.626 / -2.473                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 1986             |
| <b>Total (ha)</b> |                                    |               | <b>0</b>         |            |                  |

### 1.4 - Map(s)

| Title   | Date       | Link to source  |
|---|------------|---|
| Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site, scale 1:13000 | 11/02/2002 |  |

### 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 SW1 2BQ +44 (0) 20 7211 6117  
Francesca.conlon@culture.gsi.gov.uk

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

- Vanessa Harbar  
Telford and Wrekin Council  
World Heritage Officer
- Rachel Taylor  
  
World Heritage Officer

#### Comment

Vanessa Harbar is no longer with Telford & Wrekin Council. The management of the World Heritage Site is delivered by Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust on behalf of Telford & Wrekin Council and World Heritage Site Steering Group partners: Anna Brennand Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust Ltd, Coach Road, Coalbrookdale, Shropshire, TF8 7DQ Telephone: +44 (0) 1952 435900; Email: anna.brennand@ironbridge.org.uk Rachel Taylor remains as a key contact.

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

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
- [Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site \(Borough of Telford & Wrekin\)](#)
- [Ironbridge Gorge Museums \(Ironbridge Gorge Museums Trust\)](#)
- [A Virtual Tour of the Ironbridge Gorge \(Virtual Shropshire\)](#)
- [The Ironbridge Institute \(University of Birmingham\)](#)

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

#### Comment

The Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site is a designated Conservation Area under Local Authority supervision. Many of the key assets are scheduled ancient monuments or listed buildings.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Statement of Significance

The Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage property covers an area of 5.5 km<sup>2</sup> (550ha) and is located in Telford, Shropshire, approximately 50km north-west of Birmingham. The Industrial Revolution had its 18th century roots in the Ironbridge Gorge before spreading across the world, bringing with it some of the most far-reaching changes in human history.

The site incorporates a 5km length of the steep-sided, mineral-rich Severn Valley from a point immediately west of Ironbridge downstream to Coalport, together with two smaller river valleys extending northwards to Coalbrookdale and Madeley.

The Ironbridge Gorge offers a powerful insight into the origins of the Industrial Revolution and also contains extensive evidence and remains of that period when the area was the focus of international attention from artists, engineers, and writers. The site contains substantial remains of mines, foundries, factories, workshops, warehouses, ironmasters' and workers' housing, public buildings, infrastructure, and transport systems, together with traditional landscape and forests of the Severn Gorge. In addition, there also remain extensive collections of artefacts and archives relating to the individuals, processes and products that made the area so important.

Today, the site is a living, working community with a population of approximately 4000 people. It is also a historic landscape that is interpreted and made accessible through the work of a number of organisations, in particular, the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust (established in 1967 to preserve and interpret the remains of the Industrial Revolution within the Ironbridge Gorge) and the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust (established in 1991 to manage the woodland and grassland in the Gorge).

Within the site, five features are highlighted as of particular interest:

- Coalbrookdale: It was here in 1709 that the Quaker Abraham Darby I developed the coke iron production technique which began the great 18th century iron revolution. There still remains a high concentration of 18th and 19th

century dwellings, warehouses and public buildings in Coalbrookdale.

2. Ironbridge: The community draws its name from the famous Iron Bridge erected in 1779 by Abraham Darby III. At the eastern end of Ironbridge stand the remains of two 18th century blast furnaces, the Bedlam Furnaces, built in 1757.

3. Hay Brook Valley: South of Madeley lies a large open-air museum which incorporates the remains of the former Blists Hill blast furnaces and Blists Hill brick and tile works. Also of importance is the spectacular Hay Inclined Plane which connected the Shropshire Canal to the Coalport Canal, which in turn linked with the River Severn.

4. Jackfield: This small community on the south bank of the River Severn was important for navigation, coal mining, clay production, and the manufacture of decorative tiles.

5. Coalport: Located at the eastern end of the site and on the north bank of the River Severn, industrialisation came to Coalport in the late 18th century and the area is remembered principally for the Coalport China Works.

Criterion (i): The Coalbrookdale blast furnace perpetuates in situ the creative effort of Abraham Darby I who discovered coke iron in 1709. It is a masterpiece of man's creative genius in the same way as the Iron Bridge, which is the first known metal bridge. It was built in 1779 by Abraham Darby III from the drawings of the architect Thomas Farnolls Pritchard.

Criterion (ii): The Coalbrookdale blast furnace and the Iron Bridge exerted great influence on the development of techniques and architecture.

Criterion (iv): Ironbridge Gorge provides a fascinating summary of the development of an industrial region in modern times. Mining centres, transformation industries, manufacturing plants, workers' quarters, and transport networks are sufficiently well preserved to make up a coherent ensemble whose educational potential is considerable.

Criterion (vi): Ironbridge Gorge, which opens its doors to in excess of 600,000 visitors yearly, is a world renowned symbol of the 18th century Industrial Revolution.

#### **Comment**

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the World Heritage Committee in June 2013

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

(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)

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

#### **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>   |   |   |
| 3.1.5         | Interpretative and visitation facilities   |       |   |
| <b>3.2</b>    | <b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>   |   |   |
| 3.2.1         | Ground transport infrastructure  |      |   |
| <b>3.3</b>    | <b>Services Infrastructures</b>  |   |   |
| 3.3.3         | Non-renewable energy facilities  |       |   |
| <b>3.4</b>    | <b>Pollution</b>   |   |   |
| 3.4.2         | Ground water pollution   |       |   |
| 3.4.3         | Surface water pollution  |      |   |
| <b>3.5</b>    | <b>Biological resource use/modification</b>  |   |   |
| 3.5.10        | Forestry /wood production  |      |   |
| <b>3.7</b>    | <b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>  |   |   |
| 3.7.1         | Wind   |      |   |
| 3.7.6         | Water (rain/water table)   |      |   |
| <b>3.8</b>    | <b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>  |   |   |
| 3.8.1         | Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses  |       |   |
| 3.8.2         | Society's valuing of heritage  |       |   |
| <b>3.10</b>   | <b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>  |   |   |
| 3.10.2        | Flooding   |      |   |
| <b>3.11</b>   | <b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>  |   |   |
| 3.11.4        | Avalanche/ landslide   |       |   |
| 3.11.5        | Erosion and siltation/ deposition  |       |   |
| <b>3.12</b>   | <b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>                                      |   |   |
| 3.12.1        | Translocated species   |       |   |
| 3.12.2        | Invasive/alien terrestrial species   |      |   |
| 3.12.3        | Invasive / alien freshwater species  |      |   |
| <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>3.10</b>   | <b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>         |                |                          |                     |                 |            |
| <b>3.10.2</b> | <b>Flooding</b>   | extensive      | frequent                 | minor               | medium capacity | increasing |
| <b>3.11</b>   | <b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>           |                |                          |                     |                 |            |
| <b>3.11.5</b> | <b>Erosion and siltation/ deposition</b>                | restricted     | intermittent or sporadic | insignificant       | medium capacity | static     |
| <b>3.12</b>   | <b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b> |                |                          |                     |                 |            |
| <b>3.12.2</b> | <b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>               | restricted     | intermittent or sporadic | insignificant       | medium capacity | static     |

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

The impact and risks of flooding on the World Heritage Site is well understood and recent developments, including the creation of flood defences in the centre of Ironbridge has significantly reduced the negative impact. However, localised flooding elsewhere in the Gorge (e.g. Coalbrookdale) is an on-going issue.

### 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

The current boundaries of the World Heritage Site and the potential need for a Buffer Zone will be considered as part of the Management Planning process.

#### 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The boundaries of the designated area are coterminous with those of the Severn Gorge Conservation Area, which was formally designated in 1980. The Area contains 7 Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and 285 listed buildings.

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

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

Severn Gorge Conservation Area

250+ Listed Buildings

7 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

2 Sites of Special Scientific Interest

Article 4 Direction

It would be useful to review the effectiveness of the current protection arrangements for the World Heritage Site in order to identify areas where protection could usefully be increased or changed.

##### 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?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

##### 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

#### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

##### 4.3.1 - Management System

Management plan in place.

Steering group: set up in January 1995, formally established with the involvement, agreement and support of the partner organizations. Site manager on full-time basis. Consensual management: the Ironbridge Gorge.

WHS has numerous land owners and stakeholders, many having their own management responsibilities for particular aspects or areas of the WHS (Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust, Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Borough of Telford & Wrekin, English Heritage, the Environment Agency, Shropshire County Council and Bridgnorth District Council). In addition, there are other organisations, individual landowners

and interest groups each with its own responsibilities. The WHS strategy group provides a forum for the principal landowners and stakeholders. Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national and regional (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Countryside Agency, English Heritage, Environment Agency, ICOMOS UK); local (Borough of Telford & Wrekin, Bridgnorth District Council, Shropshire County Council, The Gorge Parish Council, Madeley Parish Council, Broseley Town Council).

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

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


Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

- **Question 5.02**  
Stering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site
- **Question 5.03**  
**Set up date:** 1995  
**Function:**
  1. To discuss and set the strategy for the management of the WHS
  2. To commission and oversee the preparation of the Ironbridge Gorge WHS Management Plan and its subsequent implementation, monitoring and review
  3. To provide a forum for key stakeholders in the WHS to ensure the co-ordinated and effective management of the Site
  4. To lobby external agencies and organisations on behalf of the Ironbridge Gorge WHS**Mandate:** Established with the involvement, agreement and support of the partner organisations  
**Constituted:** formal
- **Question 5.05**  
Overall management system of the site
  - Consensual management
  - Other effective management system

The Ironbridge Gorge WHS has a wide range of land owners and stakeholders, many having their own management responsibilities for particular aspects or areas of the WHS.

Principal landowners are Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust, Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. Other key stakeholders with management responsibilities within the WHS include English Heritage, the Environment Agency, Shropshire County Council and Bridgnorth District Council. In addition, there are other organisations, individual landowners and interest groups each with its own responsibilities and interests within the WHS. The WHS Strategy Group provides a forum within which the principal landowners and stakeholders can work together in order to achieve the co-ordinated and effective management and protection of the WHS.

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

| Title  | Status | Available | Date       | Link to source  |
|--|--------|-----------|------------|---|
| Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site Management Plan | N/A    | Available | 01/01/2002 |  |

**Comment**

The Management Plan is under revision

**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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

**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 **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 | Good |
| Indigenous peoples            | Good |
| 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**

**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)                                      | 30% |
| In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)                        | 40% |
| Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)  | 30% |
| 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**

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

**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**

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

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Full-time | 100% |
| Part-time | 0%   |

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

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Permanent | 100% |
| Seasonal  | 0%   |

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

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Paid      | 100% |
| Volunteer | 0%   |

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

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** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

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

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

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

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

There is insufficient space to provide details of publications here

**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 **many locations 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 | Excellent      |
| Local Indigenous peoples   | Not applicable |
| Local landowners   | Excellent      |
| Visitors   | Average        |
| Tourism industry   | Excellent      |
| 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 and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

**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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

**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            | Excellent |
| Site museum               | Excellent |
| Information booths        | Adequate  |
| Guided tours              | Adequate  |
| Trails / routes           | Adequate  |
| Information materials     | Excellent |
| Transportation facilities | Adequate  |
| Other                     | Adequate  |

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

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

|                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Last year       | Static         |
| Two years ago   | Minor Increase |
| Three years ago | Minor Increase |
| Four years ago  | Minor Increase |
| Five years ago  | Minor Increase |

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

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| Entry tickets and registries |
| Accommodation establishments |
| Transportation services      |
| Tourism industry             |
| Visitor surveys              |
| Other                        |

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Visitor management policy is detailed within the World Heritage Site Management Plan

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

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

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

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

**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>3.10</b>   | <b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>         |   |  |  |                                   |   |      |
| <b>3.10.2</b> | <b>Flooding</b>   | The criteria most immediately affected by flooding is 1) The Iron Bridge itself and 2) The collective physical remains of early 18th century to mid 19th century industrial structures, buildings and archaeological sites. | The flood defences brought in by Telford & Wrekin Council in 2007 have made a significant impact. The impact of more localised flooding around the Gorge, including at Coalbrookdale, needs to be monitored with mitigation solutions developed. | Telford & Wrekin Council, the Environment Agency and key partners within the World Heritage Site lead on the monitoring. | On-going issue.                   | Telford & Wrekin Council, Environment Agency and other partners including the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust. | None |
| <b>3.11</b>   | <b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>           |   |  |  |                                   |   |      |
| <b>3.11.5</b> | <b>Erosion and siltation/deposition</b>                 | Erosion of the banks of the River Severn is an on-going issue.  | Monitoring and localised improvement work led by the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust, Environment Agency and Shropshire Wildlife Trust.   | Monitoring is on-going.  | Issue is on-going.                | Environment Agency supported by Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and other partners.  | None |
| <b>3.12</b>   | <b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b> |   |  |  |                                   |   |      |
| <b>3.12.2</b> | <b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>               | Visual appearance of the Gorge through invasive Japanese knotweed now and potential for further visual impact if the woodland is affected in the future by Ash Dieback  | Eradication of Japanese knotweed Monitoring of woodland to identify Ash Dieback if it occurs   | Surveys by Severn Gorge Countryside Trust  | Ongoing                           | Severn Gorge Countryside Trust; Ironbridge Gorge Museums Trust  | None |

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

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

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

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

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

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

**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**

**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 | Very positive |
| Recognition  | Very positive |
| Education  | Very positive |
| Infrastructure development                                   | Very positive |
| Funding for the property                                     | Very positive |
| International cooperation                                    | Very positive |
| Political support for conservation                           | Very positive |
| Legal / Policy framework                                     | Very positive |
| Lobbying   | Very positive |
| Institutional coordination                                   | Very positive |
| Security   | Very positive |
| Other (please specify)                                       | Very positive |

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

The overall partnerships within the Gorge are strengthened significantly by the WHS status.

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

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

|                 |
|-----------------|
| Advisory bodies |
|-----------------|

**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 | Very good |
| Advisory Body              | Very good |

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

All 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   | Satisfactory |
| 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: The retrospective 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**