

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

City of Bath

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

428

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

1987

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
City of Bath	51.381 / -2.359	2900	0	2900	1987
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>2900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2900</b>	

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
City of Bath World Heritage Site Boundary	11/12/2003	

### 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

Paul Blaker should be replaced by Francesca Conlon.  
Francesca.conlon@culture.gsi.gov.uk, tel +44 (0) 20 7211 6117, 4th Floor, 100 Parliament St, London SW1A 2BQ

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

- Tony Crouch  
Bath and North East Somerset Council  
World Heritage Manager

#### Comment

Change of address: World Heritage Manager Abbey Chambers Kingston Buildings York Street Bath BA1 1LT Great Britain

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

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
- [City of Bath \(Bath & Northeast Somerset Planning Services\)](#)
- [Bath Assembly Rooms \(The National Trust\)](#)
- [www.bptlearning.org.uk](http://www.bptlearning.org.uk)

#### Comment

- web link should be: [www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage)

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

#### Comment

Two thirds of the site is covered by the City of Bath Conservation Area. Some surrounding land in the setting is covered by the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and by Green Belt designations. There are many listed buildings, designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Statement of Significance

The Roman remains, especially the Temple of Sulis Minerva and the baths complex (based around the hot springs at the heart of the Roman city of Aquae Sulis, which have remained at the heart of the City's development ever since) are amongst the most famous and important Roman remains north of the Alps, and marked the beginning of Bath's history as a spa town.

The Georgian city reflects the ambitions of John Wood Senior, Ralph Allen and Richard 'Beau' Nash to make Bath into one of the most beautiful cities in Europe, with architecture and landscape combined harmoniously for the enjoyment of the spa town's cure takers.

The Neo-classical style of the public buildings (such as the Assembly Rooms and the Pump Room) harmonises with the grandiose proportions of the monumental ensembles (such as Queen Square, Circus, and Royal Crescent) and collectively reflects the ambitions, particularly social, of the spa city in the 18th century.

The individual Georgian buildings reflect the profound influence of Palladio, and their collective scale, style, and the organisation of the spaces between buildings epitomises the success of architects such as the John Woods, Robert Adam, Thomas Baldwin, and John Palmer in transposing Palladio's ideas to the scale of a complete city, situated in a hollow in the hills and built to a Picturesque landscape aestheticism creating a strong garden city feel, more akin to the 19th century garden cities than the 17th century Renaissance cities.

Criterion (i): Bath's grandiose Neo-classical Palladian crescents, terraces, and squares spread out over the surrounding hills and set in its green valley are a demonstration par excellence of the integration of architecture, urban design, and landscape setting, and the deliberate creation of a beautiful city. Not only are individual buildings such as the Assembly Rooms and Pump Room of great distinction, they are part of the larger overall city landscape that evolved over a century in a harmonious and logical way, drawing together public and private buildings and spaces in a way that reflects the precepts of Palladio tempered with picturesque aestheticism.

Bath's quality of architecture and urban design, its visual homogeneity and its beauty is largely testament to the skill and creativity of the architects and visionaries of the 18th and 19th centuries who applied and developed Palladianism in response to the specific opportunities offered by the spa town and its physical environment and natural resources (in particular the hot springs and the local Bath Oolitic limestone). Three men – architect John Wood Senior, entrepreneur and quarry owner Ralph Allen, and celebrated social shaper and Master of Ceremonies Richard "Beau" Nash – together provided the impetus to start this social, economic, and

physical rebirth, resulting in a city that played host to the social, political, and cultural leaders of the day. That the architects who followed were working over the course of a century, with no master plan or single patron, did not prevent them from contriving to relate each individual development to those around it and to the wider landscape, creating a city that is harmonious and logical, in concord with its natural environment and extremely beautiful.

Criterion (ii): Bath exemplifies the 18th century move away from the inward-looking uniform street layouts of Renaissance cities that dominated through the 15th–17th centuries, towards the idea of planting buildings and cities in the landscape to achieve picturesque views and forms, which could be seen echoed around Europe, particularly in the 19th century. This unifying of nature and city, seen throughout Bath, is perhaps best demonstrated in the Royal Crescent (John Wood Younger) and Lansdown Crescent (John Palmer). Bath's urban and landscape spaces are created by the buildings that enclose them, providing a series of interlinked spaces that flow organically, and that visually (and at times physically) draw in the green surrounding countryside to create a distinctive garden city feel, looking forward to the principles of garden cities developed by the 19th century town planners.

Criterion (iv): Bath reflects two great eras in human history: Roman and Georgian. The Roman Baths and temple complex, together with the remains of the city of Aquae Sulis that grew up around them, make a significant contribution to the understanding and appreciation of Roman social and religious society. The 18th century redevelopment is a unique combination of outstanding urban architecture, spatial arrangement, and social history. Bath exemplifies the main themes of the 18th century neoclassical city; the monumentalisation of ordinary houses, the integration of landscape and town, and the creation and interlinking of urban spaces, designed and developed as a response to the growing popularity of Bath as a society and spa destination and to provide an appropriate picturesque setting and facilities for the cure takers and social visitors. Although Bath gained greatest importance in Roman and Georgian times, the city nevertheless reflects continuous development over two millennia with the spectacular medieval Abbey Church sat beside the Roman temple and baths, in the heart of the 18th century and modern city.

#### Comment

a revised Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at its 37th session, June 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

Attributes can be summarised as: 1. Roman Archaeology 2. The hot springs 3. Georgian town planning. 4. Georgian architecture. 5. The green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills. 6. Georgian architecture reflecting 18th century social ambitions. Full attributes for the City of Bath can be viewed at [www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage)

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

The 1987 inscription encompasses tangible features of buildings and archaeology, but does not recognise intangible elements. Bath embraces a wider range of values than those

currently recognised. The fashionable spa played a leading role in the development of a polite society, of manners, medicine, and an emerging leisure industry. A legacy of literature, appreciation of arts, sciences and landscape was created. Bath is working with leading European Spas to have these values recognised.

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

The wider range of values identified in 2.4 are not covered in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value agreed by the World Heritage Committee in 2013

### 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>		
3.1.1	Housing		
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		
<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>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>		
3.6.2	Quarrying		
3.6.3	Oil and gas		
<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		
<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>3.1.1</b>	<b>Housing</b>	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	localised	on-going	minor	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>Air pollution</b>	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

Several urban housing developments under consideration on site fringes. Impact may be moderately harmful, but fully assessed in decision making, & harm balanced against needs of the city-wide site. Central area air quality poor due to vehicle emissions. Principally an human health issue, but also potentially damaging to building stonework. Air Quality Management Areas widened in 2012 to address this. Bath Rugby Club proposing a new city centre stadium. Full plans & impact as yet unknown.

## 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 extensive site has planning policy in place addressing development which may affect the setting. In November 2012, a Supplementary Planning Document was approved identifying the setting, and factors which may affect it. In addition, the site boundary is wide and surrounded by further restrictive designations including the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Green Belt

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

Specific policy protecting the World Heritage site in the local development plan. Conservation Area; listed historic buildings; scheduled monuments; much of immediate surrounding designated as Green Belt; Cotswold Area of outstanding natural beauty; specific buildings and monuments protected by designation.

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

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

Submitted on Tuesday, October 25, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

There is a policy protecting the World Heritage Site in the local development plan. Two thirds of the Site is covered by a Conservation Area. 5000 of the historic buildings are listed, and there are 13 sites are Scheduled Monuments. Much of the countryside immediately surrounding the city is designated as Green Belt (a proposal to change the boundary of the Green Belt is currently under debate) and the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Specific buildings and monuments are protected by designation.

### 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 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

### 4.2.4 - 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**

A management plan for the property is in place. Steering group set up in 2000. Consensual management Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national; local.

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

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

Submitted on Tuesday, October 25, 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:** 2000

**Function:** To prepare and implement the Management Plan

**Mandate:** Set up by the Local Authority, who are the stewards of the Site, with the approval of local key stakeholders. It oversees the strategic direction of implementation of the Management Plan, approving projects.

**Constituted:** formal

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Consensual management

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Pla	N/A	Available	01/01/2003	

**Comment**

The 2003 Management Plan has been replaced by the 2010 Management Plan. The link to source should be: [www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/worldheritage)

**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	Fair
Visitors	Fair
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 **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?**

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

**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**

In accordance with recommendations of the 2008 UNESCO/ICOMOS Mission, a revised management plan was produced and adopted locally in December 2010. Plan implementation is well underway, and overseen by a Steering Group comprising of representatives from a wide variety of stakeholders. The Steering Group meets regularly, with an independent Chairman, thus ensuring consultative management with the local community.

**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**

Site management has been strengthened Since the last periodic report. An independent Chairman has been appointed to lead the Steering Group. This is designed to ensure greater communication with local communities. A new site manager has also been appointed (in 2008), at a higher level than his predecessor and better able to influence strategic decision makers in the city.

**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)	80%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	20%
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**

No funding 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 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	

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	

**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	Fair
Education	Fair
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)	Medium

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

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

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

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

There are a high number of student dissertations relating to the site, plus many recent books (including the 'Bath History' series) and published research findings including the British Museum's investigation of the Beau Street Hoard (of Roman Coins) [www.romanbaths.co.uk](http://www.romanbaths.co.uk).

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

There are two universities within Bath providing research and training on heritage issues, plus a technical college providing craft training on subjects such as stone masonry.

**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	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
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 **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 **partially influenced** 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 **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	Poor
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Poor

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

Despite having no visitor centre, the site has many high quality independent museums. These include the Roman Baths Museum interpreting Roman values, and 1 Royal Crescent interpreting Georgian values. The Mayor's Honorary Guides provide free walking tours for over 30,000 visitors each year. World Heritage emblem visibility has been significantly enhanced by display on directional signposts.

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Static
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

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Bath Tourism Plus are the company who manage tourism in Bath. Visitor Management Documents: Destination Management Plan 2007 Destination Marketing Strategy for Bath & North East Somerset 2012 - 2014

**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 **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**

With regard to collection of fees, an entrance fee is collected for visiting individual attractions which interpret the Outstanding Universal Value. The site itself comprises of an entire city, and no entrance fee is charged.

**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 and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

**4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups**

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Non-existent
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Poor
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**

2008 Mission recommendation implementation continues. Setting (& views) is addressed through new planning guidance, & a Building Heights Study completed. A replacement Management Plan is written. The Bath Western Riverside development first phase nears completion. An award winning contemporary building (Holburne Museum) is

complete. Greater use of WH symbol secured & flood risk work strengthened

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

Across the city wide site a great deal of monitoring work is undertaken, and drawn upon as necessary for site management. Implementation of management plan actions is undertaken annually.

**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>3.1.1</b>	<b>Housing</b>	Housing development is likely to impact upon the setting of the site.	Decisions on suitable housing sites are being taken in full consideration of the likely impact on the site.	This is a potential risk, and monitoring is not yet relevant.	Site decisions are likely in Spring 2013, with planning applications to follow. No final implementation dates are yet known.	The local authority is responsible for town planning and is lead authority. English Heritage are fully involved in decision making.	The site covers a city of 85,000 people, and the impact of new housing needs to be balanced against the benefits to the local economy and people of this provision.
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	Excessive vehicular traffic affects living standards, interpretation, presentation & site enjoyment. Vehicular emissions are detrimental to building fabric. Railway electrification is proposed by 2017 which will impact upon protected structures.	The Local Authority is developing a revised Transport Strategy, and has instigated closure of roads and introduction of low emission public buses. Local authority working with rail operator to mitigate electrification impacts.	Traffic levels and emissions are monitored.	Some actions are already underway, with a Transport Strategy expected to be complete by 2014. Rail electrification by 2017.	The local authority is leading on this, in consultation with local communities and with central government funding. Network Rail are the rail operator.	None.
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>						
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>Air pollution</b>	Vehicle emissions create poor air quality in some areas of the site. This is principally a human health issue, but can accelerate decay of stone buildings.	Air Quality Management Areas have been introduced, with associated action plans.	Air quality is monitored.	Actions are on-going.	The Local Authority is the lead agency, working in consultation with affected communities.	None.

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

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

Very positive impact upon civic pride & status is widely referred to in business marketing.

**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
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**

The 500 character word limit is very restrictive for many descriptions.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

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

All required information was accessible

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

Monitoring and reporting
--------------------------

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

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
Reason for update: a revised Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at its 37th session, June 2013

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