

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Studley Royal Park including the Ruins of Fountains Abbey

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

372bis


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Studley Royal Park including the Ruins of Fountains Abbey , North Yorkshire , England	54.116 / -1.573	308.8	811	1119.8	1986
Component 2 , North Yorkshire , England	54.109 / -1.588	0.85	811	811.85	1986
Total (ha)		309.65	1622	1931.65	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Studley Royal Park including the Ruins of Fountains Abbey - Map of the World Heritage property	01/02/2012	

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

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Sarah Parkinson
Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal
Coordinator and Conservation Manager

Comment

Add 'National Trust' after Sarah Parkinson

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)

- [Fountains Abbey, Studley Royal, Garden, Historic Ruins, Yorkshire](#)
- [Map of the World Heritage site](#)

Comment

On link 1. to OUR PLACE - the site has not yet been officially documented by OUR PLACE photography team. Link 2. is correct. Link 3. takes you through to MAGIC and you then need to use the system to find the WHS map. Can you insert the map link used in Question 1.4?

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

Comment

The property is not protected by any other international designations/conventions. The protective designations such as listed buildings and scheduled monuments are set out in Question 4.2.1.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

Studley Royal Park, including the ruins of Fountains Abbey, combines into one harmonious whole buildings, gardens and landscapes constructed over a period of 800 years. All, important in their own right, have been integrated into a continuous landscape of exceptional merit and beauty. Its principal components are:

Studley Royal: one of the few great 18th Century 'green gardens' to survive substantially in its original form: arguably the most spectacular water garden in England. The landscape garden is an outstanding example of the development of the 'English' garden style throughout the 18th century, which influenced the rest of Europe. The garden contains canals and ponds, cascades, lawns and hedges, with elegant temples and statues used as eye-catchers. The layout of the gardens is determined by the form of the natural landscape, rather than a design that is imposed upon it. The Aislabies' design survives substantially in its original form.

Fountains Abbey ruins: a key element in the garden scheme, providing the spectacular culmination to the principal vista, but also of outstanding importance in its own right. It is one of the few Cistercian houses surviving from the 12th Century and provides an unrivalled picture of a great religious house in all its parts. Fountains Abbey, founded in 1132, soon became one of the largest and richest Cistercian abbeys in Britain, before being closed by Henry VIII in 1539 during the Dissolution of the Monasteries. It was partially demolished soon after.

Jacobean Fountains Hall: an outstanding example of a building of its period and partially built with stone from the Abbey. It has a distinctive Elizabethan facade and is enhanced by a formal garden with shaped hedges. The interior of the Hall has been adapted for successive uses, including a courthouse.

St. Mary's Church: an outstanding example of High Victorian Gothic architecture by one of its leading exponents, William Burges, in 1871, and considered to be one of his finest works. A building of importance in its own right, it has also been successfully integrated into the landscape of the Park. The church is one of a pair: its twin is Christ the Consoler at Skelton-on-Ure. They were both designed by Burges and built using the same craftsmen.

Criterion (i): Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey owes its originality and striking beauty to the fact that a humanised landscape was created around the largest medieval ruins in the United Kingdom. The use of these features, combined with the planning of the water garden itself, is a true masterpiece of human creative genius.

Criterion (iv): Combining the remains of the richest abbey in England, the Jacobean Fountains Hall, and Burgess's miniature neo-Gothic masterpiece of St Mary's, with the water gardens and deer park into one harmonious whole, Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey illustrates the power of medieval monasticism, and the taste and wealth of the European upper classes in the 18th century.

Comment

Full retrospective SOUV agreed by World Heritage Committee in June 2013

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

(i)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Attributes of OUV are the setting, views and vistas (criterion i), 18th century Water Garden (i & iv), the 12th Century Cistercian Abbey as garden feature and monastic ruin (i & iv), Fountains Hall (iv), St Mary's Church (iv), a humanised landscape designed around abbey ruins (i); combination of all features into a harmonious whole (iv), site illustrates taste and wealth of powered classes in C18 and the power of medieval monasticism (I & iv) and landscape of exceptional merit/beauty (i & iv).

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

No need for revision.

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

In 2011 the property produced a Draft Retrospective SOUV for the WHS. This will go to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for approval in Summer 2013. The attributes listed in Q2.3 are a summary of a fuller list of attributes.

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

None.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin		
3.1	Buildings and Development									
3.1.2	Commercial development									
3.1.3	Industrial areas									
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities									
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure									
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure									
3.3	Services Infrastructures									
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities									
3.3.4	Localised utilities									
3.4	Pollution									
3.4.3	Surface water pollution									
3.5	Biological resource use/modification									
3.5.3	Land conversion									
3.5.5	Crop production									
3.5.8	Commercial hunting									
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production									
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric									
3.7.1	Wind									
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									
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage									
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation									
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									
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events									
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition									
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species									
3.12.1	Translocated species									
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species									
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species									
3.13	Management and institutional factors									
3.13.1	Low 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					
3.1.3	Industrial areas	localised	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.5.5	Crop production	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.5.8	Commercial hunting	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.7.3	Temperature	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.7.7	Pests	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1	Storms	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.2	Flooding	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.3	Drought	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.1	Translocated species	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

The factor under 'Industrial Areas' is large scale agricultural buildings. There is a current and potential pressure for these developments in the area surrounding the site, now included within the buffer zone. The factor under 'Commercial Hunting' is the fact the freehold shooting rights on the estate are privately owned and exercised. This has a negative impact on visitor access (some areas of the estate are closed to visitors), conservation management and quality of the environment.

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?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are adequate** 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

Recent consultation on the buffer zone as part of the Harrogate Borough Council local plan process has raised awareness among surrounding landowners and the Ripon community about the boundaries of the WHS and the buffer zone.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The site is protected from intrusive development by several statutory and nonstatutory designations, by strict planning control from Harrogate Borough Council, and by the inalienable status of National Trust land. The National Trust was given the unique power to declare its land inalienable (cannot be sold or mortgaged) by Act of Parliament in 1907. A compulsory purchase is not possible without the consent of Parliament.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

The site is protected from intrusive development by several statutory and non-statutory designations, by strict planning control from Harrogate Borough Council, and by the inalienable status of National Trust land. The National Trust was given the unique power to declare its land inalienable by Act of Parliament in 1907. Inalienable land cannot be sold or mortgaged. A compulsory purchase is not possible without the consent of Parliament. Refer to section 7.5, Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal World Heritage Site Management Plan. Although the World Heritage Site boundary covers the core area of the designed landscape, some significant features lie outside. There is a need to review the boundary to ensure that it includes those areas that are essential to retain the site's outstanding universal value. There is also a need to develop a formal buffer zone (see section 03).

Comment

Remove sentence referring to section 7.5 of the WHSMP - this Plan has been superseded. Delete the last sentence and replace with 'A formal buffer zone to protect the immediate setting of the WHS and those areas currently outside the WHS but which contribute to the site's OUV was approved by the summer 2012 meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee.'

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 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?

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

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

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

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

The policies to protect the World Heritage Site, the buffer zone and the wider setting of the World Heritage Site are included in Harrogate Borough Council's Draft Sites and Policies Development Plan Document. This Plan is still to go through its final stage of consultation and public examination process before its formal adoption. Until the Plan is formally adopted there will be some deficiencies in implementation of policies to protect the World Heritage, buffer zone and wider setting.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Steering group (National Trust and English Heritage staff) formally set up on 01 January 1999 to supervise the production of the WHS management plan. The group now meets quarterly to review progress on conservation projects and discuss key management issues. Both the National Trust and English Heritage are involved in the management of the site. The National Trust owns the Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal estate and How Hill. St. Mary's Church is owned by the State. The High Stables, the Pheasantries and the freehold sporting rights are in private ownership. The ruins of the Abbey itself are in the guardianship of the Secretary of State whose responsibilities as guardian are exercised by English Heritage. The National Trust is responsible for the overall management of the estate (visitors, conservation of the designed landscape, garden buildings, Fountains Hall, maintenance of the infrastructure). English Heritage is responsible for the conservation of the abbey ruins, Fountains Abbey Mill, St. Mary's Church and the monastic artefacts in store at Helmsley. Both organisations have worked closely together at Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal since 1983. The National Trust has a planning framework based on a National Strategic Plan covering three years, cascading to regional and property levels. The current property strategic plan covers the period 2001-2004. The WHS management plan has a six year life span to fit within this framework. Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national (DCMS; English Nature; The Environment agency; English Heritage), regional, local (North Yorkshire County Council; Harrogate Borough 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**
Steering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site
- **Question 5.03**

Set up date: 1999

Function: A small group of National Trust and English Heritage staff was formed to supervise the production of the WHS management plan. The group now meets quarterly to review progress on conservation projects and discuss key management issues.

Mandate: The steering group's mandate was to agree the final version of the management plan taking into account the results of the consultation. A wider Consultative Group comprising statutory bodies, local organizations and individuals was consulted at each key stage. The role of the Consultative Group was to consider draft proposals for the WHS Management Plan during its preparation and advise the Steering Group. Since the production of the WHS Management Plan the National Trust and English Heritage have had a review of working arrangements and regular meetings to agree operational matters and implement subsequent actions.

Constituted: formal

- **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Other effective management system

Both the National Trust and English Heritage are involved in the management of the site. The National Trust owns the Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal estate and How Hill. St. Mary's Church is owned by the State. The High Stables, the Pheasantries and the freehold sporting rights are in private ownership. The ruins of the Abbey itself are in the guardianship of the Secretary of State whose responsibilities as guardian are exercised by English Heritage

The National Trust is responsible for the overall management of the estate (visitors, conservation of the designed landscape, garden buildings, Fountains Hall, maintenance of the infrastructure). English Heritage is responsible for the conservation of the abbey ruins, Fountains Abbey Mill, St. Mary's Church and the monastic artefacts in store at Helmsley. Both organisations have worked closely together at Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal since 1983.


The National Trust has a planning framework based on a National Strategic Plan covering three years, cascading to regional and property levels. The current Property Strategic Plan covers the period 2001-2004. The WHS management plan has a six year life span to fit within this framework.

Further information can be found in *Chapter 7, Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal World Heritage Site Management Plan, 2001*

Comment

Keep Q5.05. Update last sentence to refer to Chpt 4 of the 2009 Management Plan. Replace remainder with 'The World Heritage Site Management Plan was reviewed in 2009. A wide audience was involved in developing the Plan. The Plan is due for its next review in 2014. Delivery of the Plan is monitored by a Steering Group which includes the National Trust, English Heritage, ICOMOS UK & the Local Council. The Steering Group coordinates an annual stakeholder event involving a wide range of partners

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal World Heritage Site Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2001	

Comment

The 2001 Plan referred to above has been superseded by the Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal World Heritage Site Management Plan 2009-2014. Add link to Management Plan on National Trust website www.nationaltrust.org.uk/fountains-abbey/our-work/world-heritage-site/.

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

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

Local communities 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 the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property,

buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

The World Heritage Site Management Plan is due to be reviewed in 2014. The World Heritage Site Steering Group membership has recently been widened to include ICOMOS and the Local Council. The review of the Plan will provide opportunities for community engagement and partnership working. The site organises an annual stakeholder event and regular newsletters to keep partners, visitors and the local community updated on delivery of the Plan.

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 World Heritage Site now has buffer zone, approved by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at the summer meeting 2012. Since the last Periodic Report the site now has a World Heritage Site Coordinator and has broadened membership of the Steering Group to include ICOMOS UK and the Local Council.

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)	4%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	1%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	55%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	23%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	17%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

No international assistance has been received from the World Heritage Fund.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

All NT surplus income generated on the estate is retained for use on the property. Over 80% of operating income is from visitors (via admission fees, membership, catering, retail and donations) & annual income from endowment. EH funds maintenance of abbey ruins, St Mary's Church & part funds the WHS Coordinator. Grants from other public bodies include Natural England's Higher Level Stewardship Scheme for conservation in deer parks & council for historic building.

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

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

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

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

Question 4.4.15 - Most of the technical work on site is carried out by internal staff including a National Trust Building Team and Gardening Team. There is also a programme of internships and apprenticeships. Some technical work, particularly on the abbey, is carried out by external contractors. There is no formally documented capacity development plan for the site. 65 staff are employed to manage the site including a World Heritage Site Coordinator & have access to conservation specialists .

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 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

Range of research published about the World Heritage Site since 2006. Insert link. There is also a wide range of unpublished research produced by National Trust volunteers in the 'Fountains Articles' and by National Trust to inform conservation work. The recently completed Conservation Management Plan looks in great depth at all aspects of the site including historical analysis.

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

Q4.5.2 There is no formal research programme for the World Heritage Site although this is a priority in the WHSMP. There is a wide range of research carried out, mostly related to the management needs of the property including archaeological surveys and recording. The range of scientific studies includes soil, tree and water surveys. A book about the designed landscape is awaiting publication.

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	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

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

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

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

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

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

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is **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	Excellent
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Not needed
Other	Adequate

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

Site has learning centre & education programme emphasis on national curriculum, 13000 school visits/year. Initiatives with Higher Education bodies focus on garden design, conservation and World Heritage. Developing Education Programme with ICOMOS UK Rep. Interpret abbey in site museum and developing 18th century landscape interpretation. New guidebook produced. Tours and events programme.

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
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

The site receives around 500,000 visitors a year. Visitor facilities including car parks and catering facilities are located at the Visitor Centre to minimise the visual impact of cars on the historic areas of the estate. The National Trust carries out a Conservation for Access Toolkit which helps the staff determine the appropriate balance between access and conservation. However, there is no Visitor Management Plan for the site.

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 property works with Welcome to Yorkshire, the regional tourism board, to promote the site through their website and a World Heritage pocket guide for the Yorkshire sites. This year the property won the 'Best Large Visitor Attraction in Yorkshire' award. The National Trust also sits on local tourism networks in Ripon and Harrogate and works with visitor attractions and accommodation suppliers in the local area to ensure tourism at the WHS brings economic benefits to the local area.

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	Non-existent
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 need for a buffer zone was a recommendation arising from the 2006 Periodic Report and this has now been implemented. The recent UNESCO World Heritage Committee 2012 decision notice on the buffer zone recommended the boundaries of the WHS were reviewed and we propose to look

at the boundaries as part of the 2014 review of the World Heritage Site Management Plan.

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

Wide range of monitoring carried out on the property includes regular condition surveys of historic buildings, water features and the abbey. Volunteers monitor archaeology and wildlife. The landscape was surveyed as part of the Conservation Management Plan for the estate. The NT has an indicator for conservation measured twice a year. Potential to improve monitoring of water quality/silt

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
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	This particularly impacts on criteria (i) and the water features in the Studley Royal Water Garden.	Actions on site include constant clearing of ponds and canals to retain water quality and OUV of site. Future action to work with neighbouring landowners to reduce agricultural run off into the River Skell.	Water bodies surveyed in 2011. Plan to do telemmetry sampling 2013 to monitor solids and heavy metals in water.	1 to 3 years.	National Trust, Environment Agency, Natural England and surrounding landowners.	Caused by run off from farms and highways within the Skell catchment. Pollution results in eutrophication of water features and floating weed and can lead to anaerobic conditions.
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.8	Commercial hunting	(i) and (iv). Attributes particularly include the Water Garden and Abbey but impacts on whole site.	Management Plan in place and agreed with Shoot to manage the impact of the Shoot on WHS and agree conservation works and woodland management to maintain and enhance the WHS. National Trust seek to acquire the shooting rights if become available.	Monitor impact of Shoot through biosurveys every 10 years, monitoring of impact of Shoot activities on heritage features to be carried out 2013/14. Recent survey as part of Conservation Management Plan looked at impact on landscape features/trees.	Ongoing.	National Trust, Natural England, English Heritage, Harrogate Borough Council and Shoot Owners.	Studley Royal Shoot own freehold shooting rights and impose constraints on the management of the estate including conservation works and restrict public access to large areas of the 18th century landscape garden.
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.3	Temperature	(i) and (iv)	Programme of conservation/landscape works to address priorities set out in the Built Structures Condition Survey, Bridges and Tunnels Survey and Tree Survey. Reactive maintenance on abbey. Work started on a Climate Change Strategy for the WHS.	Impact of temperature/weather monitored through a range of surveys on site including tree survey, biosurvey and surveys of buildings and structures.	Ongoing works. Climate Change Strategy priority for next 3 years.	National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Environment Agency, Harrogate Borough Council.	Temperature changes and extremes are impacting on both the landscape of the garden including trees and other vegetation, water features and the built structures.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.2	Flooding	(i) and (iv)	Carried out hydrological modelling and developing engineered solutions. There are on site controls and project programme for repairs to flood damage. Ripon MOP partnership addressed some upstream issues. Developing a Climate Change Strategy.	Monitor occurrence and impacts of flood events. Engineering and hydrological survey of all water courses and features.	Ongoing	NT, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and Harrogate Borough Council	Flooding is one of the major threats to WHS. Work on the Climate Change Strategy will involve a wide range of partners and deal with management issues both within the site and the wider catchment.
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/deposition	(i) and 18th century Water Garden, particularly the water features includes canals, ponds and lakes/reservoirs.	Programme of works on site to dredge silt. The Ripon Multi-Objective Project aimed to reduce silt entering the site from the wider river catchment through grants for land management upstream. The scheme now ended. Looking at a future project.	There are plans to improve our monitoring of silt entering the site and develop the research already done analysing origins of silt entering the site.	Ongoing. We are seeking involvement in the Local Nature Partnership for the area to continue to reduce silt entering the site through land management measures in the catchment upstream from the WHS.	National Trust working in partnership with the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and Harrogate Borough Council.	This continues to be a key issue for the site and will be discussed as part of the review of the WHS Management Plan in 2014.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

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

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

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

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

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

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

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

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

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

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

5.4.1 - Comments

There are constant management and resource issues to retain the OUV of the property. The ongoing repairs to the water features and landscape caused by the frequent floods and dredging works to manage the ongoing deposition of silt is hugely resource intensive, both in staff time and financially.

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

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

None.

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
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Local community
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

We found it difficult to fit some of our situations in the list of options put forward. However, the comments boxes were useful to explain answers.

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

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

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	None

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: Full retrospective SOUV agreed by World Heritage Committee in June 2013

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

The main recommendation following the 2006 Periodic Reporting exercise were the implementation of a buffer zone and review of boundaries. The buffer zone was taken forward by the Site Manager, English Heritage/DCMS and the Local Council. The review of boundaries is still outstanding but will be considered as part of the 2014 review.