

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church

#### Comment

The name of the property was changed to Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including St Margaret's Church at the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2013

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

426bis


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

1987

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

51.4997222200-0.1286111110 10.2600

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map showing the boundary of the property as modified in 2008	04/02/2008	

### 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

Please update the DCMS representative details to be the following Francesca Conlon Head of Heritage Policy  
Department of Culture, Media and Sport 4th Floor, 100  
Parliament Street, London SW1A 2BQ  
francesca.conlon@culture.gsi.gov.uk telephone 00 44 (0) 20  
7211 6117

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

- Sue Cole  
  
Site Manager
- Rob Ayton  
Westminster City Council  
Head of Design and Conservation

#### Comment

Please update the City of Westminster details as follows; Jane Hamilton Principal Design and Conservation Officer City Planning Westminster City Council 11th Floor, City Hall 64 Victoria Street London SW1E 6QP Direct Line: 020 7641 8019 Fax: 020 7641 2338 jhamilton@westminster.gov.uk

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

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
- [Westminster Abbey Website](#)

#### Comment

Please add the url for the Houses of Parliament <http://www.parliament.uk/> and the url for the Jewel Tower <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/daysout/properties/jewel-tower/> and <http://www.westminster.gov.uk/services/environment/planning/conservationlistedbuildings/world-heritage-site/>

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

#### Comment

Documents in the archives are on the Memory of the World Register. The property is protected under national heritage legislation and the principal buildings are either scheduled as ancient monuments or listed as historic buildings. The Abbey is a Royal Peculiar. The property lies within a conservation area and the River Thames is a key part of the Blue Ribbon network. Parliament Square and the gardens next to the palace are on the Parks and gardens register

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Statement of Significance

Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey, and St Margaret's Church together encapsulate the history of one of the most ancient of parliamentary monarchies of present times and the growth of parliamentary and constitutional institutions. In tangible form Westminster Abbey is a striking succession of the successive phases of English Gothic art and the inspiration of the work of Barry and Pugin on the Palace of Westminster.

The Palace of Westminster illustrates in colossal form the grandeur of constitutional monarchy and the principle of the bicameral parliamentary system, as envisaged in the 19th century, constructed by English architectural reference to show the national character of the monument.

The Palace is one of the most significant monuments of neo-Gothic architecture, as an outstanding, coherent and complete example of neo-Gothic style.

Westminster Hall is a key monument of the Perpendicular style and its admirable oak roof is one of the greatest achievements of medieval construction in wood.

Westminster is a place in which great historical events have taken place which have shaped the English and British nation. The church of St Margaret, a charming perpendicular style construction, continues to be the parish church of the House of Commons and is an integral part of the complex. Criterion (i): Westminster Abbey is a unique artistic construction representing a striking sequence of the successive phases of English Gothic art.

Criterion (ii): Other than its influence on English architecture during the Middle Ages, the Abbey has played another leading role by influencing the work of Charles Barry and Augustus Welby Pugin in Westminster Palace, in the "Gothic Revival" of the 19th century.

Criterion (iv): The Abbey, the Palace, and St Margaret's illustrate in a concrete way the specificities of parliamentary monarchy over a period of time as long as nine centuries. Whether one looks at the royal tombs of the Chapterhouse, the remarkable vastness of Westminster Hall, of the House of Lords, or of the House of Commons, art is everywhere present and harmonious, making a veritable museum of the history of the United Kingdom.

**Comment**

Please replace this version with the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which was agreed by the World Heritage Committee at their 37th meeting in 2013

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

(i)(ii)(iv)

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

The attributes are under discussion by the Steering Group for the Property.

**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)**

The property is owned by the Abbey, Parliament & school all with their own activities, aims & objectives. The Steering Group includes Local & Regional Government, transport and national heritage organisations. It does not always agree on what are the priorities or what activities should take place . The property has a key role in British history particularly ceremonial & social history & as a place of legal protest. There is a need for increased political support at all levels for WH.

### 3.15. Factors Summary Table

#### 3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.2.5	Underground transport infrastructure							
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>							
3.4.4	Air pollution							
<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							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>							
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage							
3.9.5	Terrorism							
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>							
3.10.2	Flooding							
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts							
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

### 3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

#### 3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
<b>3.1.2</b>	<b>Commercial development</b>	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.1</b>	<b>Ground transport infrastructure</b>	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>Air pollution</b>	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
<b>3.8.2</b>	<b>Society's valuing of heritage</b>	localised	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
<b>3.8.6</b>	<b>Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation</b>	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

The main factors are approved mixed use tall buildings outside the boundary which impact on the visual integrity -discussions are ongoing about how best to protect the property; the significant volume of traffic using the road through the property & Parliament Square which results in air and noise pollution and an inability to properly appreciate the buildings; terrorism & security issues; lack of resources & coordinator to implement & revise the Management Plan; competing SG aims & priorities

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

#### 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 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 the management authority but **are not known by 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

Discussions are taking place regarding the need for a buffer zone. Policies protecting the wider setting are included in relevant regional & local plans but have not prevented consent for large schemes A medium term objective of the 2007 Management Plan was to examine if the boundaries should be extended to include Parliament Square & this will be undertaken in the next Management Plan review

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

National legislation to protect archaeological sites and historic buildings and conservation areas. Specific policies in regional and local plans. The Abbey is protected by its own legislation.

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

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

National legislation to protect archaeological sites and historic buildings and conservation areas. Specific policies in Regional and Local Plans. The Abbey is protected by its own legislation.

### 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?

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**

### 4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

### 4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

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

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

There is **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

Policies are in place at a national, regional and local level to protect the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the property. Discussions are ongoing with the SG stakeholders to resolve the concerns expressed by UNESCO regarding wider protection with some stakeholders calling for specific legal protection for the setting of the WHS to prevent granting of planning permissions that adversely affect World Heritage Sites.

### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

#### 4.3.1 - Management System

Steering group formally established on 01 January 2003 to oversee and publish the management plan and then to hand on to a successor body. No site manager but one is needed. Management by the State Party; management under protective legislation. Other: the Palace of Westminster, Westminster School, Westminster Abbey and English Heritage are responsible for the management of their own buildings and often co-ordinate with each other. Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national (DCMS); regional; local (owners and managers of the various parts of the site, including the Parliamentary authorities, the Dean and Chapter of Westminster and Westminster School).

#### 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:** 2003

**Function:** To coordinate production of a Management Plan.

**Mandate:** To oversee and publish the management plan and then to hand on to a successor body

**Constituted:** formal

- **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Other effective management system

The Palace of Westminster, Westminster School, Westminster Abbey and English Heritage are responsible for the management of their own buildings and often co-ordinate with each other.

#### Comment

The Westminster World Heritage Site Steering Liaison Group was set up in 2010 and is run by Westminster City Council. The Group is responsible for implementing and reviewing the management plan. The Abbey and Parliament have their own conservation plans and programmes in place to direct repair, interpretation, education and visitor management. There is no coordinator to facilitate cross referencing and cross pollination between Steering Group stakeholders but ad hoc collaboration takes place.

#### 4.3.2 - Management Documents

##### Comment

The Westminster World Heritage Site Management Plan was published in 2007. Westminster Abbey and the Palace of Westminster have Conservation Plans that put in place a comprehensive conservation maintenance regime based on regular inspection programmes. Westminster City Council has a conservation area audit.. Key views are identified for protection in the Mayor of London's View Management Framework.

#### 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 **only partially** being implemented

#### 4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists but **few of the activities** are being implemented

#### 4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Not applicable
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

#### 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 **little or no contact** 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

There is no industry or agricultural activity within the property or its immediate surroundings. The property is used for religious, governmental and educational purposes and only a handful of people live there.



**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 regional authority has published a new Regional Plan (2011) incorporating increased protection for World Heritage and a revised Views Framework together with guidance in relation to assessing the setting of World Heritage Sites although no increased legal protection has been put in place. Changes to English spatial planning system include the publication of Circular 07/09 Protection of World Heritage and changes to call in legislation; further changes are proposed in 2013

**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)	50%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	5%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	5%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	28%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	12%
Other grants	0%

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

**Comment**

No 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**

Individual parts of the property are well resourced. The Abbey - a living, working church - uses its money derived from a mixture of sources for religious & charitable uses but adequate funding is spent on conservation, visitor management and education. Parliament - a working building - is funded by national Government and has teams to look after the building and its contents. Westminster School is a fee paying school and has adequate resources for conservation. No WH funding is available

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

Full-time	85%
Part-time	15%

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

Permanent	95%
Seasonal	5%

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

Paid	90%
Volunteer	10%

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

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

Expertise in all of the areas is present/available at Abbey, School and the Houses of Parliament either in the employed staff or consultants all of whom will be external as few people live in the property. However there is no coordinator in place to develop programmes relating to World Heritage status. The Abbey has a number of volunteers who are actively involved with liturgy, visitor management and stewarding, bell ringing and museum guides.

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

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

Research results are shared 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 are numerous books and articles published each year regarding various aspects of the property.

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

Research projects take place to inform understanding and conservation but are not targeted towards OUV.

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

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

Not displayed at all

**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	Not applicable
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Poor
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Poor

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

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only partly meets the needs and could be improved

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

World Heritage status has not influenced education, information or 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 not presented or 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	Adequate
Site museum	Not needed
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Excellent
Other	Adequate

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

There is very good interpretation and education in both the Abbey and Parliament but these are not linked and do not always feature world heritage. A coordinated education, information and awareness building strategy involving all stakeholders that informs about the OUV would help improve the visitor experience and enrich the understanding of those who work or attend school in the property.

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Major Increase (100%+)
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
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Both the Abbey and Houses of Parliament have visitor management plans as does English Heritage who manage the adjacent medieval Jewel Tower. There is collaboration between the stakeholders.

**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 **some 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**

Visitor entrance fees for the Abbey, Houses of Parliament & Jewel Tower are collected into general funds & not ring fenced. There is no public access to the School. Collaboration takes place with the tourism industry & Steering Group stakeholders over coach parking, guided tours and their content, administrative details but tourist operators could do more to explain about World Heritage & OUV. The 2011 royal wedding and 2012 Diamond Jubilee significantly boosted visitor numbers

**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 considerable monitoring but it is **not directed towards 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 to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

**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	Not applicable
Researchers	Not applicable
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

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

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

Discussion is under way as how best to protect the visual integrity of the property but no agreement has been reached.

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

The physical fabric of the buildings and contents and the hard and soft landscaping are well managed and rigorously monitored but these programmes are not related to OUV.

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2



## 5. Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

#### 5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>						
<b>3.1.2</b>	<b>Commercial development</b>	ii Prominence of the buildings in their surroundings and against and open sky and ability to appreciate the high quality materials and ornate and lavish detailing and decoration	Development of protected key view corridors & regional and local planning policies in all boroughs that require proposals to demonstrate no adverse impact in terms of bulk/massing/ use of materials or other elements.	Applications are monitored by English Heritage, Westminster City Council and others and applicants are encouraged to discuss proposals at an early stage to identify and mitigate impact on OUV	On going	Greater London Authority, English Heritage, Westminster City Council, London Boroughs of Lambeth, Southwark and Wandsworth	Differing views exist in the Steering Group as to the best way of ensuring appropriate protection especially of the setting & discussions are ongoing at a local, regional & national level. Developments affecting the visual integrity were approved.
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
<b>3.2.1</b>	<b>Ground transport infrastructure</b>	ii and iv Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey buildings, sound of Big Ben	The emissions, noise and number and speed of vehicles significantly adversely impacts on the visitor experience. Proposals to pedestrianise part of Parliament Square have been put on hold so emphasis now is on localised traffic management.	Monitoring of traffic is undertaken on a regular basis. Westminster City Council and Transport for London are responsible for hard landscaping and ensuring visitor safety	On going	Transport for London and Westminster City Council	Proposals have been made to reduce the volume of traffic by closing the road between the Abbey and Parliament Square but these are on hold. Roads are sometimes shut on a Sunday to allow visitors to appreciate the area
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	ii and iv The emissions, noise, volume and speed of traffic make it difficult to appreciate the OUV of the Property. Access for visitors can be difficult and dangerous	Review noise levels and assess ways of reducing noise. Develop a strategy that allows visitors to better use the surrounding area	Air quality is monitored as is decibel level	On going	DEFRA, London Universities, GLA, Westminster City Council, Transport for London	Reducing vehicle numbers will improve appreciation of OUV but is a major challenge
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>						
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>Air pollution</b>	ii	A low emission zone has been introduced across London as well as low emission buses. Westminster City Council action plan 2013-8 sets out an action plan	There is on going monitoring of air quality	5 years	Transport for London, City of Westminster, Universities, DEFRA	This issue is being tackled on a London wide basis
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
<b>3.8.2</b>	<b>Society's valuing of heritage</b>	ii & iv Abbey and Houses of Parliament, Big Ben	Repair, cleaning and restoration of the Abbey and Parliament was undertaken in preparation for the 2011 Royal wedding and 2012 Jubilee and Olympics and results seen worldwide . As seat of government Parliament attracts protesters.	Visitor surveys, media	On going	Westminster Abbey, Houses of Parliament, Visit Britain, Mayor of London	The recent royal events and successful Olympics seen on TV across the world have increased awareness of the importance of the property and its central role in the development of a modern democracy.

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	ii and iv Abbey and Houses of Parliament	The necessary security measures installed at Parliament combined with large number of visitors mean crowded pavements next to very busy roads. The property copes well with large numbers eg by using timed tickets and guided tours	The stakeholders monitor the impacts of visitors but no key indicators have been defined	on going	Parliamentary estates and the Abbey	Visitors seldom visit St Margaret's church. It is difficult to appreciate the OUV of the buildings because of the busy roads and limited pavement space & long terms plans to close the road between the Abbey and Parliament Square will assist matters

## 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	Discussions are underway regarding the need for an immediate buffer zone and the wider setting but no agreement has been reached	On going	Steering Group Stakeholders (GLA, City of Westminster, English Heritage, London Boroughs of Southwark, Lambeth, Wandsworth, Abbey, Parliament, Government	A medium term objective of the Management Plan is to examine the need to extend the boundary to include Parliament Square.		
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	None	None	None	None		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.6	Few of the work plan activities implemented	Discussions have mainly centred on buffer zone issues. Few of the Property wide objectives have been implemented but actions down to individual parts of the property have been undertaken. A coordinator could help here.	on going	Steering Group	The Management Plan will need to be reviewed in the near future and this issue will be looked at then.		
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management						
4.4 Financial and Human Resources							
4.4.15	No capacity development plan or programme is in place						
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building							
4.6.1	World Heritage emblem not displayed	None	None	None	None		
4.6.4	World Heritage status has not influenced education, information or awareness building activities						
4.6.5	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not presented or interpreted	The SOUV was approved in 2013 and the Steering Group can now encourage its use more widely	On going	Steering Group members	Employment of a coordinator would encourage a more holistic approach		

4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.2	<b>Key indicators have not been defined</b>	key indicators exist for monitoring historic fabric, visitor numbers but need to be developed with regards to education, well being, understanding of OUV	Next Management Plan review	Steering Group	This should be done as part of the management plan review
4.8.4	<b>Implementation of Committee recommendations is planned, but has not yet begun</b>	Discussions are underway regarding how to effectively protect the immediate setting of the Property and its wider setting but no agreement has been reached	On going	GLA, English Heritage, City of Westminster, London Boroughs of Lambeth, Wandsworth and Southwark and other Steering Group members	Some developments within the wider setting of the Property have been recently granted as set out in 2013 State of Conservation report and correspondence. Consensus is being sought but has not yet been achieved.

### 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

The fabric of the Property and its intangible values are intact and widely appreciated though developments in the setting may impact on the ability of onlookers to appreciate the OUV.

### 6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

#### 6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

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

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

The Abbey and Parliament are iconic working buildings and were important long before inscription. More needs to be done by UNESCO to demonstrate the benefits of WH inscription for such properties and to make it easier for similar properties world wide to develop linkages.

#### 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
Others

#### 6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

no

#### 6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

Many of the questions are ambiguous, inflexible and open to interpretation and there are some glitches. The character limit is frustrating. The technical support from staff at UNESCO is excellent. It is not possible to include comment on potential impacts on the site. The link between 4.9 and 5.2 is very temperamental and loses data.

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

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very poor

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

**Not all** of the required information was accessible

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

The concept of 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	Not Applicable

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

- Name of World Heritage Property**  
 Reason for update: The name of the property was changed to Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including St Margaret's Church at the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2013
- Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
 Reason for update: Please replace this version with the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which was agreed by the World Heritage Committee at their 37th meeting in 2013

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

We would like to see further work by UNESCO on  
demonstrating the benefits of inscription