

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage property

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites

1.2 - World Heritage property details

1.3 - Geographic information table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Stonehenge and Associated Monuments	51.179 / -1.825	2608.2	0	2608.2	1986
Avebury and Associated Monuments	51.429 / -1.854	2377.2	0	2377.2	1986
Total (ha)		4985.4	0	4985.4	

Comment

Please can the property (ha) for the Avebury site be updated to 2546 and the Total to 5154.2. The current figure displayed for Avebury reflects the site before the minor boundary review of 2008 (Decision 32COM 8B.71) and was requested to be updated in the previous Periodic Report.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Stonehenge and associated monuments, scale 1:25000	1985	
Avebury and associated sites, scale 1:50000	2009	

Comment

The World Heritage Centre identified in December 2022 that they did not hold an up-to-date clear map which showed the delimitation of the property. We are in the process of producing the requested map in line with the World Heritage Centre's technical requirements, with support from Historic England. It will be submitted for the approval of the World Heritage Committee in advance of 46COM along with others from the UK State Party.

1.5 - Web and Social Media data of the property (if applicable)

1. [Avebury](#)
2. [Stonehenge & Avebury](#)
3. [Stonehenge \(National Trust\)](#)
4. [Avebury World Heritage Site](#)
5. [Please remove all links from list and update with the following in the following order: https://www.stonehengeandaveburywhs.org/ https://twitter.com/StoneAveWHS https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/stonehenge/ https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/visit/wiltshire/stonehenge-landscape https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/visit/wiltshire/avebury https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/avebury/](#)

2. Other Conventions/Programmes under which the World Heritage property is protected (if applicable)

2.1 - Records indicate that your World Heritage property (in whole or in part) is designated and/or protected under the Conventions/programmes shown in the prefilled table below. Please check and amend as necessary.

		The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme	The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is not</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme
2.1.1	International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection (1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.2	List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection (Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.3	The List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List) (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention))		✗

2.1.4	World Network of Biosphere Reserves Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme		×
2.1.5	Global Geoparks Network UNESCO Global Geoparks		×

2.2 - Please provide comments on 2.1 if necessary

2.3 - Do your national authorities intend to request the granting of Enhanced Protection (if relevant) under the Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict for the World Heritage property in the next three years?

No

2.4 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List), if relevant, in the next three years?

No

2.5 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property as a Man and Biosphere Reserve (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

2.6 - Do your national authorities intend to apply for whole or part of World Heritage property to be designated as a UNESCO Global Geopark (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

2.7 - Please indicate the level of cooperation at property level between designations under different Conventions/Programmes

2.7.1	1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	×
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	×
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	×
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	×
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.5	UNESCO Global Geoparks	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	×
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	

2.8 - Please add any further comments on cooperation with the other designation(s)/programme(s)

2.9 - Are you aware of any elements associated with the World Heritage property that have been inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage?

No

2.10 - Please list any elements associated with the World Heritage property inscribed under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of which you are aware

2.11 - Are you aware of any documentary heritage listed under the Memory of the World Programme associated with the World Heritage property?

No

2.12 - Please list any documentary heritage associated with the World Heritage property listed under the Memory of the World Programme of which you are aware.

3. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

The World Heritage property Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites is internationally important for its complexes of outstanding prehistoric monuments. Stonehenge is the most architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world, while Avebury is the largest. Together with inter-related monuments, and their associated landscapes, they demonstrate Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial and mortuary practices resulting from around 2000 years of continuous use and monument building between circa 3700 and 1600 BC. As such they represent a unique embodiment of our collective heritage.

The World Heritage property comprises two areas of Chalkland in southern Britain within which complexes of Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial and funerary monuments and associated sites were built. Each area contains a focal stone circle and henge and many other major monuments. At Stonehenge these include the Avenue, the Cursuses, Durrington Walls, Woodhenge, and the densest concentration of burial mounds in Britain. At Avebury they include Windmill Hill, the West Kennet Long Barrow, the Sanctuary, Silbury Hill, the West Kennet and Beckhampton Avenues, the West Kennet Palisaded Enclosures, and important barrows.

Stonehenge is one of the most impressive prehistoric megalithic monuments in the world on account of the sheer size of its megaliths, the sophistication of its concentric plan and architectural design, the shaping of the stones - uniquely using both Wiltshire Sarsen sandstone and Pembroke Bluestone - and the precision with which it was built.

At Avebury, the massive Henge, containing the largest prehistoric stone circle in the world, and Silbury Hill, the largest prehistoric mound in Europe, demonstrate the outstanding engineering skills which were used to create masterpieces of earthen and megalithic architecture.

There is an exceptional survival of prehistoric monuments and sites within the World Heritage property including settlements, burial grounds, and large constructions of earth and stone. Today, together with their settings, they form landscapes without parallel. These complexes would have been of major significance to those who created them, as is apparent by the huge investment of time and effort they represent. They provide an insight into the mortuary and ceremonial practices of the period, and are evidence of prehistoric technology, architecture and astronomy. The careful siting of monuments in relation to the landscape helps us to further understand the Neolithic and Bronze Age.

Criterion (i): The monuments of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites demonstrate outstanding creative and technological achievements in prehistoric times.

Stonehenge is the most architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world. It is unrivalled in its design and unique engineering, featuring huge horizontal stone lintels capping the outer circle and the trilithons, locked together by carefully shaped joints. It is distinguished by the unique use of two different kinds of stones (Bluestones and Sarsens), their size (the largest weighing over 40 t) and the distance they were transported (up to 240 km). The sheer scale of some of the surrounding monuments is also remarkable: the Stonehenge Cursus and the Avenue are both about 3 km long, while Durrington Walls is the largest known henge in Britain, around 500 m in diameter, demonstrating the ability of prehistoric peoples to conceive, design and construct features of great size and complexity.

Avebury prehistoric stone circle is the largest in the world. The encircling henge consists of a huge bank and ditch 1.3 km in circumference, within which 180 local, unshaped standing stones formed the large outer and two smaller inner circles. Leading from two of its four entrances, the West Kennet and Beckhampton Avenues of parallel standing stones still connect it with other monuments in the landscape. Another outstanding monument, Silbury Hill, is the largest prehistoric mound in Europe. Built around 2400 BC, it stands 39.5 m high and comprises half a million tonnes of chalk. The purpose of this imposing, skilfully engineered monument remains obscure.

Criterion (ii): The World Heritage property provides an outstanding illustration of the evolution of monument construction and of the continual use and shaping of the landscape over more than 2000 years, from the early Neolithic to the Bronze Age. The monuments and landscape have had an unwavering influence on architects, artists, historians and archaeologists, and still retain a huge potential for future research.

The megalithic and earthen monuments of the World Heritage property demonstrate the shaping of the landscape through monument building for around 2000 years from circa 3700 BC, reflecting the importance and wide influence of both areas.

Since the 12th century when Stonehenge was considered one of the wonders of the world by the chroniclers Henry de Huntington and Geoffrey de Monmouth, the Stonehenge and Avebury Sites have excited curiosity and been the subject of study and speculation. Since early investigations by John Aubrey (1626-1697), Inigo Jones (1573-1652), and William Stukeley (1687-1765), they have had an unwavering influence on architects, archaeologists, artists and historians. The two parts of the World Heritage property provide an excellent opportunity for further research.

Today, the property has spiritual associations for some.

Criterion (iii): The complexes of monuments at Stonehenge and Avebury provide an exceptional insight into the funerary and ceremonial practices in Britain in the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Together with their settings and associated sites, they form landscapes without parallel.

The design, position and interrelationship of the monuments and sites are evidence of a wealthy and highly organised prehistoric society able to impose its concepts on the environment. An outstanding example is the alignment of the Stonehenge Avenue (probably a processional route) and Stonehenge stone circle on the axis of the midsummer sunrise and midwinter sunset, indicating their ceremonial and astronomical character. At Avebury the length and size of some of the features such

as the West Kennet Avenue, which connects the Henge to the Sanctuary over 2 km away, are further evidence of this.

A profound insight into the changing mortuary culture of the periods is provided by the use of Stonehenge as a cremation cemetery, by the West Kennet Long Barrow, the largest known Neolithic stone-chambered collective tomb in southern England, and by the hundreds of other burial sites illustrating evolving funerary rites.

Integrity

The boundaries of the property capture the attributes that together convey Outstanding Universal Value at Stonehenge and Avebury. They contain the major Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments that exemplify the creative genius and technological skills for which the property is inscribed. The Avebury and Stonehenge landscapes are extensive, both being around 25 square kilometres, and capture the relationship between the monuments as well as their landscape setting.

At Avebury the boundary was extended in 2008 to include East Kennet Long Barrow and Fyfield Down with its extensive Bronze Age field system and naturally occurring Sarsen Stones. At Stonehenge the boundary will be reviewed to consider the possible inclusion of related, significant monuments nearby such as Robin Hood's Ball, a Neolithic causewayed enclosure.

The setting of some key monuments extends beyond the boundary. Provision of buffer zones or planning guidance based on a comprehensive setting study should be considered to protect the setting of both individual monuments and the overall setting of the property.

The survival of the Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments at both Stonehenge and Avebury is exceptional and remarkable given their age – they were built and used between around 3700 and 1600 BC. Stone and earth monuments retain their original design and materials. The timber structures have disappeared but postholes indicate their location. Monuments have been regularly maintained and repaired as necessary.

The presence of busy main roads going through the World Heritage property impacts adversely on its integrity. The roads sever the relationship between Stonehenge and its surrounding monuments, notably the A344 which separates the Stone Circle from the Avenue. At Avebury, roads cut through some key monuments including the Henge and the West Kennet Avenue. The A4 separates the Sanctuary from its barrow group at Overton Hill. Roads and vehicles also cause damage to the fabric of some monuments while traffic noise and visual intrusion have a negative impact on their settings. The incremental impact of highway-related clutter needs to be carefully managed.

Development pressures are present and require careful management. Impacts from existing intrusive development should be mitigated where possible.

Authenticity

Interventions have been limited mainly to excavations and the re-erection of some fallen or buried stones to their known positions in the early and mid-twentieth century in order to improve understanding. Ploughing, burrowing animals and early excavation have resulted in some losses but what remains is remarkable in its completeness and concentration. The materials and substance of the archaeology supported by the archaeological archives continue to provide an authentic testimony to prehistoric technological and creative achievement.

This survival and the huge potential of buried archaeology make the property an extremely important resource for archaeological research, which continues to uncover new evidence and expand our understanding of prehistory. Present day research has enormously improved our understanding of the property.

The known principal monuments largely remain in situ and many are still dominant features in the rural landscape. Their form and design are well-preserved and visitors are easily able to appreciate their location, setting and interrelationships which in combination represent landscapes without parallel.

At Stonehenge several monuments have retained their alignment on the Solstice sunrise and sunset, including the Stone Circle, the Avenue, Woodhenge, and the Durrington Walls Southern Circle and its Avenue.

Although the original ceremonial use of the monuments is not known, they retain spiritual significance for some people, and many still gather at both stone circles to celebrate the Solstice and other observations. Stonehenge is known and valued by many more as the most famous prehistoric monument in the world.

There is a need to strengthen understanding of the overall relationship between remains, both buried and standing, at Stonehenge and at Avebury.

Protection and management requirements

The UK Government protects World Heritage properties in England in two ways: firstly, individual buildings, monuments and landscapes are designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, and secondly through the UK Spatial Planning system under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Acts. The individual sites within the property are protected through the Government's designation of individual buildings, monuments, gardens and landscapes.

Government guidance on protecting the Historic Environment and World Heritage is set out in National Planning Policy Framework and Circular 07/09. Policies to protect, promote, conserve and enhance World Heritage properties, their settings and buffer zones are also found in statutory planning documents. The protection of the property and its setting from inappropriate development could be further strengthened through the adoption of a specific Supplementary Planning Document.

At a local level, the property is protected by the legal designation of all its principal monuments. There is a specific policy in the Local Development Framework to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property from inappropriate development, along with adequate references in relevant strategies and plans at all levels. The Wiltshire Core Strategy includes a specific World Heritage Property policy. This policy states that additional planning guidance will be produced to ensure its effective implementation and thereby the protection of the World Heritage property from inappropriate development. The policy also recognises the need to produce a setting study to enable this. Once the review of the Stonehenge boundary is completed, work on the setting study shall begin.

The Local Planning Authority is responsible for continued protection through policy development and its effective implementation in deciding planning applications with the management plans for Stonehenge and Avebury as a key material consideration. These plans also take into account the range of other values relevant to the site in addition to Outstanding Universal Value. Avebury lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a national statutory designation to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape.

About a third of the property at both Stonehenge and Avebury is owned and managed by conservation bodies: English Heritage, a non-departmental government body, and the National Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds which are both charities. Agri-environment schemes, an example of partnership working between private landowners and Natural England (a non-departmental government body), are very important for protecting and enhancing the setting of prehistoric monuments through measures such as grass restoration and scrub control. Much of the property can be accessed through public rights of way as well as permissive paths and open access provided by some agri-environment schemes. Managed open access is provided at Solstice. There are a significant number of private households within the property and local residents therefore have an important role in its stewardship.

The property has effective management plans, coordinators and steering groups at both Stonehenge and Avebury. There is a need for an overall integrated management system for the property which will be addressed by the establishment of a coordinating Stonehenge and Avebury Partnership Panel whilst retaining the Stonehenge and Avebury steering groups to enable specific local issues to be addressed and to maintain the meaningful engagement of the community. A single property management plan will replace the two separate management plans.

An overall visitor management and interpretation strategy, together with a landscape strategy needs to be put in place to optimise access to and understanding of the property. This should include improved interpretation for visitors and the local community both on site and in local museums, holding collections excavated from the property as well as through publications and the web. These objectives are being addressed at Stonehenge through the development of a visitor centre and the

Interpretation, Learning and Participation Strategy. The updated Management Plan will include a similar strategy for Avebury. Visitor management and sustainable tourism challenges and opportunities are addressed by specific objectives in both the Stonehenge and Avebury Management Plans.

An understanding of the overall relationship between buried and standing remains continues to be developed through research projects such as the "Between the Monuments" project and extensive geophysical surveys. Research Frameworks have been published for the Site and are regularly reviewed. These encourage further relevant research. The Woodland Strategy, an example of a landscape level management project, once complete, can be built on to include other elements of landscape scale planning.

It is important to maintain and enhance the improvements to monuments achieved through grass restoration and to avoid erosion of earthen monuments and buried archaeology through visitor pressure and burrowing animals.

At the time of inscription the State Party agreed to remove the A344 road to reunite Stonehenge and its Avenue and improve the setting of the Stone Circle. Work to deliver the closure of the A344 will be complete in 2013. The project also includes a new Stonehenge visitor centre. This will provide world class visitor facilities including interpretation of the wider World Heritage property landscape and the removal of modern clutter from the setting of the Stone Circle. Although substantial progress is being made, the impact of roads and traffic remains a major challenge in both parts of the World Heritage property. The A303 continues to have a negative impact on the setting of Stonehenge, the integrity of the property and visitor access to some parts of the wider landscape. A long-term solution remains to be found. At Avebury, a World Heritage Site Traffic Strategy will be developed to establish guidance and identify a holistic set of actions to address the negative impacts that the dominance of roads, traffic and related clutter has on integrity, the condition and setting of monuments and the ease and confidence with which visitors and the local community are able to explore the wider property.

3.2 - Please list the key attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of your property and give an assessment of their condition. As a guideline, it is suggested to focus on approximately five key attributes (no more than 15 overall).

	Brief identification of attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
3.2.1	Stonehenge itself as a globally famous and iconic monument.	✗			
3.2.2	The physical remains of the Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and associated sites.		✗		
3.2.3	The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the landscape.	✗			
3.2.4	The design of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the skies and astronomy.		✗		
3.2.5	The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to each other.		✗		
3.2.6	The disposition, physical remains and settings of the key Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary, ceremonial and other monuments and sites of the period, which together form a landscape without parallel.		✗		
3.2.7	The influence of the remains of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and their landscape settings on architects, artists, historians, archaeologists and others.	✗			
3.2.8					
3.2.9					
3.2.10					
3.2.11					
3.2.12					
3.2.13					
3.2.14					
3.2.15					

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

Attributes preserved or comprised in areas. Recognition & inspiration constant. Position to rivers/ridge lines fixed. Upstanding remains well preserved. Sites ploughed flat retain integrity through archaeology. Protection from scheduling/English Heritage/National Trust. Stonehenge solstitial alignment remains, A303/light pollution intrusion. Inter-visibility between sites remain, some now interrupted by road/woodland. Modern development: disposition of some sites/open space no longer visible.

4. Factors Affecting the Property

4.1. Buildings and Development

4.1.1 - Housing

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✗ Relevant				Not relevant			
Impact	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟡 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							

⊖ Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			↗
--------------	---	---	---	---	--	--	---

4.1.2 - Commercial development

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕	✕	✕		✕			↗

4.1.3 - Industrial areas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			↗

4.1.4 - Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.1.5 - Interpretative and visitation facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				↗
⊖ Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕			→	

4.1.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.1 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Development of housing, industrial areas & commercial areas within WHS setting monitored closely to mitigate further cumulative impact to OUV, particularly sightline disturbance & lighting eg Solstice Park. Stonehenge Article 4 Direction Area restricts certain development activities. Opening new Stonehenge visitor facilities/A344 closure brought significant positive impact to OUV conservation & interpretation. Visitor facilities monitored to manage adverse impact including footfall & lighting.

4.2. Transportation Infrastructure

4.2.1 - Ground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕	✕		✕	✕			↗

4.2.2 - Underground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕		✕	✕			➡	
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕			➡	

4.2.3 - Air transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			📈

4.2.4 - Marine transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

Relevant				✕ Not relevant			
----------	--	--	--	----------------	--	--	--

4.2.5 - Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕		✕	✕		➡	

4.2.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.2 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Management Plan Policies to reduce negative impacts of roads & traffic. Avebury WHS Transport Strategy 2015: balancing safeguarding WHS & retaining viable transport network, number of works implemented. 2013 closure of A344 a few meters from Stonehenge monument has enhanced integrity of site. Regarding A303 scheme, the current impact of A303 is reviewed in detail alongside potential impact/enhancements to OUV of proposed scheme in State of Conservation Reports by the State Party 2018/19/20/23.

4.3. Services Infrastructures

4.3.1 - Water infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕			➡	

4.3.2 - Renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing

Positive							
Negative							

4.3.3 - Non-renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	Not relevant
----------	--------------

4.3.4 - Localised utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	Decreasing	Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative							

4.3.5 - Major linear utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	Decreasing	Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative							

4.3.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.3 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

WHS reflects the national picture for renewable energy as residents & landowners look to be climate neutral. Access on site by utilities, sometimes in an emergency, is monitored for impact to OUV. Further definition of setting through Setting Study SPD will offer increase in protection for potential visual intrusion of localised utilities in the landscape.

4.4. Pollution

4.4.1 - Pollution of marine waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	Not relevant
----------	--------------

4.4.2 - Ground water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	Not relevant
----------	--------------

4.4.3 - Surface water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	Decreasing	Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative							

4.4.4 - Air pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.5 - Solid waste

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.6 - Input of excess energy

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
➕ Positive							
➖ Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			↗

4.4.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.4 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Light pollution needs to be carefully considered for development/highways as has potential to impact negatively on OUV of monument setting & solstitial alignments. For Avebury, planners/applicants advised to refer to guidance by North Wessex Downs AONB. Clear guidance required within WHS Setting Study SPD. Nitrate pollution to River Avon SAC. Increase in frequency/intensity of wet weather events increases spread of nitrates.

4.5. Biological resource use/modification

4.5.1 - Fishing/collecting aquatic resources

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.5.2 - Aquaculture

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.5.3 - Land conversion

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
➕ Positive ✕	✕		✕				↗
➖ Negative ✕	✕		✕		↘		

4.5.4 - Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------















	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
➕ Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
➖ Negative ✕	✕		✕			→	

4.5.5 - Crop production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.5.6 - Commercial wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.7 - Subsistence wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.8 - Commercial hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.9 - Subsistence hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant














Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.10 - Forestry/Wood production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.5.11 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.5 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Increase since 2020 of agri-environment schemes area. Stonehenge: 70%was40% /c500 historic features. Avebury: 70%/300 historic features. Stonehenge: chalk grassland reversion removed 60 sites/monuments from arable cultivation, 9 Scheduled Monuments removed on Heritage at Risk Register. Avebury: Farming in Protected Landscapes programme 2021-24 contribute to conservation as does Farmer Led Groups eg Marlborough Downs Nature Enhancement Partnership & Countryside Stewardship schemes across WHS.

4.6. Physical resource extraction

4.6.1 - Mining

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.2 - Quarrying

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.3 - Oil and gas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.4 - Water (extraction)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕			✕			↗

4.6.5 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.6 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric

4.7.1 - Wind

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕		✕			→	

4.7.2 - Relative humidity

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.3 - Temperature

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.4 - Radiation/Light

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.5 - Dust

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.6 - Water (rain/water table)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕		✕				↗

4.7.7 - Pests

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.7.8 - Micro-organisms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.7 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

A Condition Survey of all archaeological monuments within WHS currently ongoing, methodology includes use of volunteers as well as professional staff. WHS Burrowing Mammal Strategy (2020) seeks to address threats from burrowing animals to the physical remains that contribute to OUV. Includes a landscape scale strategy for use by land managers.

4.8. Social/Cultural uses of heritage

4.8.1 - Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕				
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.8.2 - Society's valuing of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕				
 Negative							

4.8.3 - Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.4 - Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):


- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.5 - Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			

⊖ Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			↗
--------------	---	---	---	---	--	--	---

4.8.6 - Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
⊖ Negative ✕	✕		✕				↗

4.8.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.8 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Managing visitor access to protect OUV: Chapter 9. Multi-agency & university research heritage & mental health: Human Henge & experience of heritage post-Covid: Places of Joy. Equinoxes & Solstices: English Heritage actively manages relationships with Pagan & Druid communities through Round Table discussion group with all authorities involved. Local population: army rebasing, changes in farming practices, residential area growth. WHS supports jobs & volunteer opportunities for local populations

4.9. Other human activities

4.9.1 - Illegal activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕	✕		✕				↗

4.9.2 - Deliberate destruction of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕	✕		✕				↗

4.9.3 - Military training

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
⊖ Negative ✕		✕	✕	✕		→	

4.9.4 - War

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.5 - Terrorism

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕		✕	✕				

4.9.6 - Civil unrest

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.9 are affecting the property either negatively or positively


Repetition of instances of metal detecting, fire damage, wild camping, hare-coursing, vehicle damage & vandalism within WHS. WHS staff hold refresher sessions for Wiltshire Police on Heritage Crime within the Rural Crime unit, who work closely with partners onsite. WHS Coordination Unit produced guidance for landowners to understand impact & restrictions on metal detector use within WHS.

4.10. Climate change and severe weather events

4.10.1 - Storms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.10.2 - Flooding

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.10.3 - Drought

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.10.4 - Desertification

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.5 - Changes to oceanic waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant











Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.6 - Temperature change

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.10.7 - Other climate change impacts

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.8 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.10 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

The effects of climate change, warmer wetter winters & unprecedented high temperatures in summer 2022 in particular, are evident across those areas of National Trust & English Heritage land most popular with visitors at Stonehenge & Avebury. Visitors are encouraged to disperse across the landscape to minimise damage of desire lines & heavily impacted areas are rested to aid surface recovery and prevent damage to underlying archaeological remains.

4.11. Sudden ecological or geological events

4.11.1 - Volcanic eruption

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.2 - Earthquake

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.3 - Tsunami/Tidal wave

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.4 - Avalanche/Landslide

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.5 - Erosion and siltation/Deposition

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant











Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.6 - Fire (wildfire)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.11.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.11 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

4.12.1 - Translocated species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.2 - Invasive/Alien terrestrial species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.3 - Invasive/Alien freshwater species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.4 - Invasive/Alien marine species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.5 - Hyper-abundant species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.6 - Modified genetic material

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.12 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.13. Management and institutional factors

4.13.1 - Management system/Management plan

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔊 Potential	📍 Inside	🌐 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
➕ Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
➖ Negative							

4.13.2 - Legal framework

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.13.3 - Governance

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔊 Potential	📍 Inside	🌐 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
➕ Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				↗
➖ Negative							

4.13.4 - Management activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕				
 Negative							

4.13.5 - Financial resources

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕		✕	✕	✕			
 Negative							

4.13.6 - Human resources

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.13.7 - Low impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕	✕			
 Negative							

4.13.8 - High impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (25/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.13.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.13 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

More coordinated approach to management of both sites of WHS. After review & public consultation, separate Management Plans for Stonehenge & Avebury replaced in 2015 by joint Stonehenge & Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan. Alongside the Avebury & Stonehenge Steering Committees, a Partnership Panel enables consistent approach across WHS & a Coordination Unit now works across both sites. Governance Review funded by NHLF Resilient Heritage programme. WHS considering establishing a CIO.

4.14. Other factor(s)

4.14.1 - Other factor(s)

4.15. Factors Summary Table






4.15.1 - Factors Summary Table

Name	Impact		Origin		Trend	
4.1 Buildings and Development						
4.1.1 Housing						
4.1.2 Commercial development						
						
4.1.3 Industrial areas						

4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
4.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure						
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure						
4.2.3 Air transport infrastructure						
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
4.3 Services Infrastructures						
4.3.1 Water infrastructure						
4.3.2 Renewable energy facilities						
4.3.4 Localised utilities						
4.3.5 Major linear utilities						
4.4 Pollution						
4.4.3 Surface water pollution						
4.4.6 Input of excess energy						
4.5 Biological resource use/modification						
4.5.3 Land conversion						
4.5.4 Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals						
4.5.5 Crop production						
4.5.10 Forestry/Wood production						
4.6 Physical resource extraction						
4.6.4 Water (extraction)						
4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
4.7.1 Wind						
4.7.6 Water (rain/water table)						









4.7.7 Pests						
4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses						
4.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage						
4.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation						
4.9 Other human activities						
4.9.1 Illegal activities						
4.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage						
4.9.3 Military training						
4.9.5 Terrorism						
4.10 Climate change and severe weather events						
4.10.1 Storms						
4.10.2 Flooding						
4.10.3 Drought						
4.10.6 Temperature change						
4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events						
4.11.6 Fire (wildfire)						
4.13 Management and institutional factors						
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan						
4.13.3 Governance						
4.13.4 Management activities						
4.13.5 Financial resources						
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities						

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1.3 Industrial areas						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity

	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	  		
	  		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread





Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.2 Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure			
	 	 	






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive

	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure	<div> <div>+</div> <div></div> <div>📌</div> </div>	<div> <div>📍</div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div>→</div> </div>
	<div> <div>-</div> <div></div> <div>📌</div> </div>	<div> <div>📍</div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div>→</div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity

	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.3 Air transport infrastructure			
			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes






	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure			
			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive






	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.3 Services Infrastructures

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.3.1 Water infrastructure			
	⊖	📢	➡

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity

✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.3.2 Renewable energy facilities			
			  






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major






Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.3.4 Localised utilities						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised

✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.3.5 Major linear utilities						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity

✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.4 Pollution

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.3 Surface water pollution						
	⊖	📢		🌱		➡

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources






Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.6 Input of excess energy						
	⊖	📢	📢	🌱	🔄	➡

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted









	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.5 Biological resource use/modification

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.5.3 Land conversion	 		
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	High capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Static
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Increasing











Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.5.4 Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals	 		
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Localised
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Extensive
<input type="checkbox"/>	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
<input type="checkbox"/>	One off or rare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermittent or sporadic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequent
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Insignificant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Minor
<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
<input type="checkbox"/>	High capacity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Static
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.5.5 Crop production	  		
	  		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
---	--





	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.5.10 Forestry/Wood production						
	⊖		📢	🕒		➡

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.6 Physical resource extraction

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.6.4 Water (extraction)						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric





Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
------	--------	--------	-------

4.7.1 Wind							
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
	Static						
	Increasing						

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.7.6 Water (rain/water table)						









Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant

✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.7.7 Pests						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses	 		
	 		



Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing











Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
-----------------------------------	--

	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	  	 	
	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing




Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
------	--------	--------	-------

4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation							
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
	Static						
	Increasing						




4.9 Other human activities

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.9.1 Illegal activities			
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor			
	Restricted		
	Localised		
	Extensive		
	Widespread		
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact			
	One off or rare		
	Intermittent or sporadic		
	Frequent		
	On-going		

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.9.3 Military training			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes



	Insignificant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.9.5 Terrorism			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor





	Restricted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going





Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.10 Climate change and severe weather events

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.10.1 Storms						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static

✕	Increasing
---	------------

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.10.2 Flooding			
	 		





Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources



Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.10.3 Drought			
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent





	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.10.6 Temperature change						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static




✕	Increasing
---	------------

4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.11.6 Fire (wildfire)			
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.13 Management and institutional factors

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan	 		





Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.3 Governance						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.4 Management activities						





Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources





Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.5 Financial resources						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
---	--

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✗	Static
	Increasing

4.17. Serial inscriptions (national or transnational)

4.17.1 - If your property is a serial inscription (national or transnational) please identify which components of the property are impacted by each factor

The factors listed on most occasions apply universally to Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites, although sometimes vary in impact. Site specific examples are given where relevant.

4.18. Prediction of the state of conservation at next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

4.18.1 - Please predict what the state of conservation of each attribute will be approximately 6 years from now (at the time of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting)

	Attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
4.18.1.1	Stonehenge itself as a globally famous and iconic monument.	✗			
4.18.1.2	The physical remains of the Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial monuments and associated sites.		✗		
4.18.1.3	The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the landscape.	✗			
4.18.1.4	The design of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to the skies and astronomy.		✗		
4.18.1.5	The siting of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary and ceremonial sites and monuments in relation to each other.		✗		

5. Protection and Management of the Property

5.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

5.1.1 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries **do not limit the ability to maintain** the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they **could be improved**

5.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known and recognised?

The boundaries **are known by both** the management authority and local communities/landowners

5.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property has **no buffer zone, but there is a need for one**

5.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the buffer zones known and recognised?

The property has **no known and recognised** buffer zone

5.1.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Setting Study Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for adoption within the next Periodic Reporting cycle in alignment with the timeline for Wiltshire Council Local Plan review, ICOMOS review & findings from UNESCO's 2022 Guidance for HIAs. Potential for boundary modification & buffer zone will be reviewed following completion of the SPD. Further funding will be required to undertake work & exploration of options to achieve this will be progressed soon.

5.2. Protective Measures

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

Specific local planning policies to protect against adverse development: (Salisbury Local Plan, Kennet Local Plan 2004, HH3). The Stonehenge WHS management plan was adopted as supplementary planning guidance. Statutory designations for conservation of the historic environment, nature conservation and landscape: scheduled monuments, listed buildings and other designations

Specific local planning policies will be replaced by Policy 59 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy which states that "The OUV of the WHS will be protected & sustained by :

- giving precedence to the protection of the WHS and its setting,
- development not adversely affecting the WHS and its attributes of OUV this includes the physical fabric, character and appearance, setting of views into or out of the WHS" The full policy within Wiltshire Core Strategy is likely to be adopted by late 2013.

Source: Periodic Reporting Cycle 1; Periodic Reporting Cycle 2

Comment

National Planning Policy Framework (2021) paragraph 189 describes WHS as heritage assets of the highest significance. WHS Management Plan (2015) adopted as supplementary planning guidance. Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) Core Policy 6: Stonehenge & Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury & Associated Sites WHS & its Setting give precedence to OUV protection in WHS development decisions, the strength of which Officers seek to retain in the Wiltshire Local Plan. Article 4 Directions for both sites. Please refer to the State Party's Section I questionnaire for a list of national legislation relevant to UK World Heritage Sites.

5.2.2 - Please list any legislation and other measures (regulatory -including spatial planning- contractual, institutional or traditional) not included in 5.2.1 and indicate the category

5.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation including spatial planning) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and/or Authenticity of the property?
An **adequate legal framework** for maintaining 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**

5.2.4 - 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 has **no buffer zone**

5.2.5 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation) in the broader setting of the World Heritage property adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and/or Authenticity of the property?
An **adequate legal framework** exists for the broader setting of the World Heritage property, **but there are some deficiencies in implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the property

5.2.6 - Can the legal 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 of enforcement remain

5.2.7 - Please provide a short summary of how the legislation, including spatial planning and other regulation, works in practice
The WHS Coordination Unit, Historic England & others are consulted on planning applications with the potential to impact the WHS. Reference to the Planning Framework detailed in 5.2.1 informs partner responses & the decision taken by Planning Officers. The adoption of the Setting Study SPD will further strengthen the protection of the WHS's OUV & if deemed suitable the future consideration of a buffer zone.

5.2.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations about the information related to the measures taken to protect the World Heritage property
Multiple agencies are involved in enforcement for protection of the WHS and its OUV. Deficiencies in enforcement contribute to the factors indicated in Chapter 4, due to a lack of capacity and resources. These vary in severity, from major to minor.

5.3. Management System/Management Plan

5.3.1 - Please check the box which most closely match the character of the governance and management system of the property
Public management system joint regional/local

If 'Other', please specify

5.3.2 - Management System: Please indicate which of the various management tools listed below are used to help protect the property.

Mechanisms to promote equal participation among and within groups, including different levels of authority, local communities, indigenous people, women and men, and other specific groups

A management plan





A joint approach to management of cultural and natural heritage

Other (please specify below)

Other protected landscapes Management Plans such as North Wessex Downs AONB

5.3.3 - Please give a brief description of the management system currently in place at your property
Since the last Periodic Report there's a more coordinated approach to the management of both sites of the WHS. After review & public consultation, separate Management Plans for Stonehenge & Avebury were replaced in 2015 by a joint Stonehenge & Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan. Alongside the Avebury & Stonehenge Steering Committees, a Partnership Panel enables a consistent approach across the WHS & a Coordination Unit (Wiltshire Council/Historic England) now works across the WHS.

5.3.4 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan	N/A	Available	1998	
Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan	N/A	Available	2000	
Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan. August 2005	N/A	Available	2005	
Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan 2009	In Force	Available	2009	

Comment
Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site Management Plan 2015 Available to download from:
[https://www.stonehengeandaveburywhs.org/assets/Stonehenge-Avebury-and-Associated-Sites-World-Heritage-Site-Management-Plan-2015 .pdf](https://www.stonehengeandaveburywhs.org/assets/Stonehenge-Avebury-and-Associated-Sites-World-Heritage-Site-Management-Plan-2015.pdf)

5.3.5 - Has any use been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in developing policies and best practices for the protection of this property?
No use has been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

5.3.6 - If the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation has been used at this property, please describe briefly what has been done.

5.3.7 - Has any use been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property?

Some use has been made of the World Heritage Policy for Climate Change

5.3.8 - If the Climate Change policy has been used, please briefly describe what has been done along with any research on the impacts of Climate Change on the property:

The Climate Change Policy was used when forming the Stonehenge and Avebury WHS Climate Change Risk Assessment (2014), which was prepared by local colleagues working in the WHS and national experts on climate change. Action 65 of the WHS Management Plan encourages monitoring and adaption strategies identified in the risk assessment, which itself is intended for review every 5 years. Partners carry out this work on an ongoing basis.

5.3.9 - Has any use been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property ?

No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties

5.3.10 - If the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties has been used, please briefly describe what has been done

5.3.11 - Rate the coordination between the various levels of administration (i.e. national/federal; regional/provincial/state; local/municipal etc.) involved in the management of the World Heritage property

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property, but it could be improved

5.3.12 - 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

5.3.13 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being only partially implemented

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

An annual work/action plan exists and many of its activities are being implemented

5.3.15 - Does the management system include formal mechanisms and procedures that ensure participation and contribution of the following groups, living within or near the World Heritage property and/or buffer zone in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

		Not applicable	No mechanisms for participation	Some participation	Direct participation	Transformative participation in all relevant decision processes
5.3.15.1	Local communities				✗	
5.3.15.2	Local authorities				✗	
5.3.15.3	Landowners in the property and the buffer zone				✗	
5.3.15.4	Indigenous peoples	✗				
5.3.15.5	Women	✗				
5.3.15.6	Other specific groups	✗				
	If you selected, 'Other specific groups' please specify					

5.3.16 - Please rate the cooperation/relationship between the World Heritage property managers/coordinators/staff and the following groups

		Not applicable	Non-existent	Poor	Fair	Good
5.3.16.1	Local communities					✗
5.3.16.2	Local/Municipal authorities					✗
5.3.16.3	Indigenous peoples	✗				
5.3.16.4	Landowners					✗
5.3.16.5	Women	✗				
5.3.16.6	Youth/Children					✗
5.3.16.7	Researchers					✗
5.3.16.8	Local Visitors/Tourists					✗
5.3.16.9	National/International tourists					✗
5.3.16.10	Tourism Industry					✗

5.3.16.11	Local businesses and industries					×
5.3.16.12	NGOs					×
5.3.16.13	Other specific groups	×				
	If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify					

5.3.17 - Please rate the extent to which the management system of your property contributes towards achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Committee's Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the *World Heritage Convention*

		Not applicable	No contribution	Limited	Significant	Full achievement
5.3.17.1	The management system of the property contributes to gender equality			×		
5.3.17.2	The management system of the property provides ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants)				×	
5.3.17.3	The management system of the property contributes to social inclusion and equity, improving opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status				×	
5.3.17.4	The management system of the property integrates a human rights-based approach	×				
5.3.17.5	The management system of the property contributes to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood				×	
5.3.17.6	The management system of the property contributes to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around the World Heritage property				×	

5.3.18 - Please provide further details on the ratings of the management system given in the table above

5.3.19 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the management system/plan

Individual members of Partnership conducting activities in Management Plan & monitoring impacts. Actions range from complete to outstanding. Monitoring not currently centralised. Consultation with communities most active through the Parish/Town Council & local landowner representatives at Stonehenge & Avebury Steering Committees. The Management Plan (action 114) seeks to work with the local community to understand how they would most like to be involved with the management of the WHS.

6. Financial and Human Resources

6.1. Funding

6.1.1 - If your funding sources do not exactly fit those shown, put the relevant amounts against the funding type that most closely represents your situation, and use the comment box below to provide more details.

		Project costs	Running costs
6.1.1.1	Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.2	Bilateral international funding	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.3	World Heritage Fund (International Assistance)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.4	Contribution from other conventions and programmes	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.5	International donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.6	Governmental (national/federal)	60 %	60 %
6.1.1.7	Governmental (regional/provincial/state)	10 %	10 %
6.1.1.8	Governmental (local/municipal)	10 %	10 %
6.1.1.9	In-country donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	20 %	20 %
6.1.1.10	Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, toilets, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.11	Commercial activities (e.g. merchandising and catering, filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.12	Other	0 %	0 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

6.1.2 - Please comment here on any other aspects of funding sources not covered in the table above

Since the previous report, the new English Heritage Trust is a charitable body that conserves and manages Stonehenge and the Visitor Centre alongside other sites in the WHS along with over 400 properties held in guardianship for the nation. Historic England was formed (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) to carry on as the government's advisors on the historic environment.

6.1.3 - 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

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

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

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

Currently two partners fund WHS Partnership. To address the longer term funding and several Management Plan Actions, the partnership is undertaking a funding and governance review through a Lottery Funded project. It has been agreed to form a new charitable trust to raise funds and add value to the WHS, its partners, and the wider community.

6.1.6 - Estimate the distribution of men and women involved in the management, conservation, interpretation of the World Heritage properties and the extent to which they are drawn from local communities.

		From local communities %	From elsewhere %
6.1.6.1	Men	50 %	50 %
6.1.6.2	Women	50 %	50 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

6.1.8 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Conservation	Good
Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Good
Administration	Good
Research and monitoring	Good
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Good
Marketing and promotion	Good
Interpretation	Good
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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

Conservation	Good
Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Good
Administration	Good
Research and monitoring	Good
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Good
Marketing and promotion	Good
Interpretation	Good
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

6.1.10 - Has any use been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building at the property?

Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building

6.1.11 - If the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building has been used, please briefly describe what has been done.

English Heritage has taken account of the WHS capacity building advice when considering planning for the future of the Visitor Centre complex and the area around the Stonehenge monument.

6.1.12 - Are there site-specific capacity building plans or programmes that develop local expertise and that contribute to the transfer of skills for the conservation and management of the World Heritage property?

A site-based capacity building plan or programme is in place and fully implemented; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally

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

7. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

7.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values and attributes of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values and attributes of the World Heritage property is adequate

7.2 - 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

7.3 - Are results from research programmes publicly available and disseminated?

Research results are shared widely with active outreach to local communities and national and international audiences

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

New combined Avebury & Stonehenge Archaeological & Historical Research Group ASAHRG in 2014 from well-established Avebury group. Stonehenge & Avebury Research Framework (2016) united research agenda & strategy for first time. Number of notable studies & university research eg Stonehenge Riverside Project & ongoing geological research at Stonehenge monument. Research recorded on Wiltshire Historic Environment Record. Engagement through events including conference for WHS status 30th anniversary

8. Education, Information and Awareness Building

8.1 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities	Fair
Local/municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Women	Not applicable
Youth/children	Fair
Researchers	Good
Local visitors	Fair
National/international tourists	Fair
Tourism industry	Good
Local businesses and industries	Fair
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please describe	

8.2 - Does the property have a heritage education programme(s) for children and/or youth, that can contribute to a better understanding of heritage, promote diversity and foster intercultural dialogue?

There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme for children and youth that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

8.3 - Who are the target audiences for education and awareness programmes at your property?

Local communities
Local/municipal authorities
Landowners

Youth/children
Researchers
Local Visitors
National/international tourists
Tourism industry
Local businesses and industries
NGOs
Other specific groups
Stonehenge is visited regularly by Pagan and Druid groups who consider the sites a place of worship. English Heritage organises a Round table for communication with these groups on a regular basis.

8.4 - Please rate the adequacy of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property for education, information, interpretation and awareness building

Visitor centre	Good
Site museum	Good
Information booths	Good
Guided tours	Good
Trails/routes	Good
Printed information materials	Good
Online (website, social media, etc.)	Good
Transportation facilities	Fair
Other	Not needed
If 'Other' is selected, please specify	

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

Now dedicated education space at Stonehenge & comprehensive education programme across WHS. Stones & Bones: Stonehenge in its Landscape schools sessions developed by English Heritage Trust & National Trust. Sessions & resources by partner museums Wiltshire Museum & Salisbury Museum. During reporting cycle Stonehenge Learning & Outreach Coordination Group (SALOG) formed to work on partner projects. English Heritage planning for improvements to education facilities to address STEM learning.

9. Visitor Management

9.1 - Please provide estimated annual visitor numbers (including national and international visitors) since the last Periodic Report

977,316 / 334,087 / 1,560,000 / 1,570,000 / 1,555,868 /

9.2 - What information sources are used to collect visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys
Other
Footfall counters

9.3 - What is the average length stay of a visitor to the World Heritage property?

One day (no overnight stay)

9.4 - Please provide the source of information

WHS is multisite, large areas of open access. Figures: ticketed entry to Stonehenge. Avebury open access approx. 300,000 annually. Pedestrian counters installed in landscape to indicate trends. Overnight increased 10% after new Stonehenge Visitor Centre. Impact of Covid: Stonehenge open 5 months 20/21, normally approx. 70% of visitors overseas (SoC 2021). Wiltshire Tourism Recovery Plan (Visit Wiltshire 2021) estimates value of tourism won't recover to 2019 rates before 2024.

9.5 - What is the approximate average daily visitor expenditure? (Please provide an estimated monetary figure in USD)

n/a / 3.01 / n/a / 23.75 / n/a / 5.99 /

9.6 - Please provide the source of information

Access to much of the WHS is free. The average admission fee reflects Stonehenge entry, as does food and beverage and retail average spend.

9.7 - Does the management system/plan for the World Heritage property include a strategy with an action plan to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts?

There is a planned and **effective strategy** to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on the World Heritage property

9.8 - Please provide any comments relating to the answer provided above in question 9.7

Impacts of tourism felt at both sites, and more acutely at Avebury due to proximity of community. Sustainable tourism in the WHS features in management plans & guidance of WHS partners eg North Wessex Downs AONB & Visit Wiltshire. Through the policies & actions of the WHS Management Plan partners work together to deliver greater local economic benefit, balancing extended dwell time in wider WHS with managing impact of access on long-term protection of OUV & communities.

9.9 - Is visitor use effectively managed to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

9.10 - Is the effectiveness of tourism management regularly monitored?

Yes, using a different system

If a different system, please specify

Site specific for English Heritage Trust and National Trust

9.11 - How does the tourism industry cooperate with the site management to improve visitor experiences and maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property?

There is **good cooperation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry **to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation**

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

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property **is adequately presented and interpreted**

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

In **many locations** and **easily visible** to visitors

9.14 - How does visitor/tourism revenue (e.g. entry charges, permits) contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

Fees are collected and make a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

9.15 - Are there locally driven sustainable tourism initiatives?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Exploring the World Heritage Site & Beyond: Landscape Access, Sustainable Transport & Tourism Strategy

9.16 - Are the benefits of tourism shared with local communities?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

eg employment & volunteering opportunities, access pass to Stonehenge

9.17 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to visitation/tourism/public use of the World Heritage property

WHS supports jobs, infrastructure & services which benefit the local community. Legacy Benefit Project 'Exploring the World Heritage Site & Beyond: Landscape Access, Sustainable Transport & Tourism Strategy' (started 2019) plans for sustainable growth which benefits the local economy while preserving OUV & residents' experience. Tourism supports 29,000 jobs in Wiltshire (Wiltshire Tourism Recovery Plan, Visit Wiltshire 2021). Stonehenge Local Residents Pass enables local Parishes free access

10. Monitoring

10.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property directed towards management needs and/or towards improving the understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value?

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

10.2 - Is necessary information available in order to define key indicators for measuring the state of conservation and are they used in monitoring how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **adequate** and **key indicators have been defined** but **monitoring of the status of indicators could be improved**

10.3 - Are key indicators defined and in place for the following principal aspects of the property?

	Extend of indicators	Not applicable	No indicators	Indicators have been defined but are not yet in use	Indicators are in place and in use since the last Periodic Reporting cycle
10.3.1	State of conservation				✗
10.3.2	Effectiveness of the management system				✗

10.3.3	Character of governance				×
10.3.4	Appropriate synergy with other conservation designations				×
10.3.5	Contribution to sustainable development				×
10.3.6	Capacity development				×

10.4 - Please provide information on relevant key indicators adopted at the property

Success measures are given for the Actions within the Management Plan.

10.5 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups:

World Heritage managers/coordinators and staff	Good
Local/municipal authorities	Good
Local communities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Women	Not applicable
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Local businesses and industry	Good
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify	

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

Implementation is underway

10.7 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee.

Since the last cycle of Periodic Reporting, the State Party has produced a number of State of Conservation Reports that have addressed the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and provided progress updates on implementation. The most recent of these reports was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2023.

10.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to Monitoring

Monitoring is overseen by individual partners in the WHS, and collated for some but not all aspects of the entire site. A Condition Survey of all archaeological monuments within WHS was commissioned by Historic England in 2022, includes the use of volunteers as well as professional staff. Monitoring of visitor numbers supports management of visitor access.

11. Identification of Priority Management Needs

11.1 - Identification of Priority Management Needs

5.1	Boundaries and Buffer Zones	
5.1.3	The property has no buffer zone, but there is a need for one	
5.1.4	The property has no known and recognised buffer zone	×
5.2	Protective Measures	
5.2.3	An adequate legal framework for maintaining 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	×
5.2.4	The property has no buffer zone	
5.2.5	An adequate legal framework exists for the broader setting of the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but there are some deficiencies in implementation which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the property	×
5.2.6	There is acceptable capacity/resources to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies of enforcement remain	×
5.3	Management System/Management Plan	
5.3.5	No use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	
5.3.7	Some use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	×
5.3.9	No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	
5.3.11	There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property, but it could be improved	×

5.3.13	The management system at the property is only being partially implemented	✕
5.3.17	• In a limited manner , the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to gender equality	
6.1	Funding	
6.1.3	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs of the World Heritage property	✕
6.1.10	Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	✕
9	Visitor Management	
9.9	Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but improvements could be made	
10	Monitoring	
10.2	Information on the values of the World Heritage property is adequate and key indicators have been defined but monitoring of the status of indicators could be improved	✕
Please select 0 more issues.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please save this question to reflect changes		

12. Summary and Conclusions

12.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

12.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

4.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	Management Plan: Aim 6 for Sustainable Traffic Management and Transportation - Policies 6a/b/c: 17 Actions	Management Plan: no further archaeology damage by road use, record road & parking use to monitor congestion, traffic visual/noise intrusion diminished, wider WHS access/footfall increase, visitor confidence/safety improved, highways clutter reduced	Ongoing	National Highways & Wiltshire Council with Department for Transport/Department for Culture, Media & Sport/HM Treasury/Historic England/English Heritage/National Trust/World Heritage Site Coordination Unit/Town&Parish Councils/North Wessex DownsAONB	Avebury WHS Transport Strategy (2015) & Exploring the World Heritage Site & Beyond: Landscape Access, Sustainable Transport & Tourism Strategy inform this work.
4.2.2	Underground transport infrastructure	This is a potential factor for the WHS. Current impact of the A303 to Criteria & Attributes is reviewed in detail alongside potential impact/enhancements to OUV of proposed scheme in State of Conservation Reports by the State Party 2018/19/20/22/23	This is a potential factor, and responds to Aim 6: Policy 6a, Actions 133/134 of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS Management Plan.	This is a potential factor rather than a current factor to monitor.	Ongoing	National Highways with Wiltshire Council/Department for Transport/Department for Culture, Media & Sport/HM Treasury/Historic England/English Heritage/National Trust	N/A
4.2.5	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	See answers for 4.2.1	See answers for 4.2.1	See answers for 4.2.1	See answers for 4.2.1	See answers for 4.2.1	N/A
4.3	Services Infrastructures						
4.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2, 3, 5 and 6	Management Plan Aim 1: Statutory and Policy Framework - Policy 1d: Action 9/10 and Aim 2: The Boundary and Setting of the World Heritage Site - Policy 2b: Action 14/15	Partners consulted on relevant planning applications within and affecting the WHS.	Ongoing	WHS Coordination Unit with Wiltshire Council, Historic England, North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A
4.3.4	Localised utilities	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2, 3, 5, and 6	Management Plan Aim 3: Conservation of the World Heritage Site - Policy 3a: Action 20 and Policy 3d: Actions 41 - 44	Management Plan: Power cables in sensitive positions identified and underground. Access on site by utilities, sometimes in an emergency, is monitored for impact to OUV.	Ongoing	WHS Coordination Unit with North Wessex Downs AONB, Wiltshire Council, Scottish and Southern Electricity and Private Landowners.	N/A
4.4	Pollution						

4.4.6	Input of excess energy	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attribute 4.	Management Plan Aim 1: Statutory and Policy Framework - Policy 1e: Action 11	Management Plan: existing light pollution minimised, clear guidelines available on avoiding light pollution in the WHS.	Ongoing	Wiltshire Council with MoD/National Highways/Historic England/WHS Partnership Panel/North Wessex Downs AONB/Town&Parish Councils	Management Plan works to minimise light pollution to avoid adverse impacts on WHS, its setting OUV. Within Setting Study SPD, develop guidelines building on existing evidence & guidance to avoid negative impacts of light pollution to OUV.
-------	------------------------	---	--	---	---------	--	--

4.5 Biological resource use/modification

4.5.3	Land conversion	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2 and 6	Management Plan Aim 3: Conservation of the World Heritage Site - Policies 3f/g/h: Actions 51-61.	Management Plan: WHS Condition Survey results reflect improvement, number of monuments & sites on Heritage at Risk Register reduced (9 Scheduled Monuments recently removed as detailed in Chapter 14, increase in biodiversity.	Ongoing	Natural England with private landowners/WHS Coordination Unit/Historic England/Wiltshire Council/National Trust/English Heritage/North Wessex Downs AONB.	The Management Plan establishes land management activities & measures to maximise protection of archaeological monuments/sites as well as their settings, including opportunities for expansion of chalk grassland.
-------	-----------------	---	--	--	---------	---	---

4.5.5	Crop production	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2 and 6	Management Plan Aim 3: Conservation of the World Heritage Site - Policies 3f/g/h: Actions 51-61.	Management Plan: decrease in area under plough, increase in number of uptake and amount of funding for agri-environment schemes.	Ongoing	Natural England with private landowners/WHS Coordination Unit/Historic England/Wiltshire Council/National Trust/English Heritage/North Wessex Downs AONB	The Management Plan establishes land management activities & measures to maximise protection of archaeological monuments/sites as well as their settings, including agri-environment schemes and consultation with farmers.
-------	-----------------	---	--	--	---------	--	---

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage

4.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	This factor has minimal impact to Criteria and Attributes.	Management Plan Aim 4: Visitor Management and Sustainable Tourism - Policy 4b: Action 78 / Policy 4d: Action 91 and Management Plan Aim 5: Interpretation, Education and Community Engagement - Policy 5c: Action 118.	Management Plan: successful solstice observances, production of information for residents, volunteer/apprenticeship opportunities,	Ongoing	WHS Coordination Unit / Town&Parish Councils / Wiltshire Council / National Trust / English Heritage	N/A
-------	--	--	--	--	---------	--	-----

4.8.6	Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	This factor has the potential to affect Criteria i, ii and iii and Attributes 2 and 6	Management Plan Aim 4: Visitor Management and Sustainable Tourism - Policies 4a/b/c/d: Actions 67 - 91.	Management Plan: increased collation & sharing of visitor numbers across WHS, changes to visitor numbers responded to & negative impacts avoided, increase in visitor understanding of behaviours that harm the WHS.	Ongoing	World Heritage Site Coordination Unit / National Trust / English Heritage / Wiltshire Council / Visit Wiltshire / Town & Parish Councils	To preserve the physical remains (attributes 2 & 6) its important that, while optimising physical & intellectual access to the WHS, protective measures are in place to protect the WHS and OUV.
-------	--	---	---	--	---------	--	--

Summary - Factors affecting the Property **completed**

12.2. Summary - Management Needs

12.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

5.1	Boundaries and Buffer Zones						
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		

5.1.4	The property has no known and recognised buffer zone	Management Plan Aim 1: Statutory and Policy Framework - Policy 1b: Action 4 and Management Plan Aim 2: The Boundary and Setting of the World Heritage Site - Policy 2b: Actions 14/15.	Within next Periodic Reporting cycle	Wiltshire Council with Historic England, WHS Coordination Unit, North Wessex Downs AONB & others	Statement of OUV: The setting of some key monuments extends beyond boundary. Provision of buffer zones or planning guidance based on comprehensive setting study should be considered to protect the setting of individual monuments & overall setting.
5.2	Protective Measures				
5.2.3	An adequate legal framework for maintaining 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	Management Plan Aim 1: Statutory and Policy Framework - Policy 1b: Actions 3-5 and Policy 1d: Actions 8-9	Within next Periodic Reporting Cycle	Wiltshire Council with Historic England, WHS Coordination Unit & others	The protection of the property and its setting from inappropriate development could be further strengthened through the adoption of a specific Setting Study Supplementary Planning Document
5.2.5	An adequate legal framework exists for the broader setting of the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but there are some deficiencies in implementation which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the property	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3
5.2.6	There is acceptable capacity/resources to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies of enforcement remain	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3	See 5.2.3
5.3	Management System/Management Plan				
5.3.7	Some use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	Management Plan: Aim 3 for Conservation of the World Heritage Site - Policy 3j: Action 65.	Review every 5 years	WHS Coordination Unit with National Trust / English Heritage / Landowners / Natural England	Implement monitoring & adaptation strategies identified in the Stonehenge and Avebury WHS Climate Change Risk Assessment (2014).
5.3.11	There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property, but it could be improved	Management Plan: Aim 8 for Management, Liaison and Monitoring - Policy 8a: Action 171 / Policy 8b, Action 8c.	Ongoing currently	WHS Partnership	Current NLHF funded Trust Transition project to further improve coordination, ways of working and fundraising potential of the WHS Partnership.
5.3.13	The management system at the property is only being partially implemented	Management Plan Aim 8: Management, Liaison and Monitoring - Policy 8a: Action 171	Within Management Plan Review	WHS Coordination Unit with cooperation and input from all partners.	Actions range from complete to ongoing and in some cases not carried forward, which will be assessed in Management Plan Review. Work towards centralising areas of monitoring.

6.1	Funding				
6.1.3	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs of the World Heritage property	Management Plan Aim 8: Management, Liaison and Monitoring - Policy 8b: Actions 172 - 175.	Within next Periodic Reporting cycle	World Heritage Site Partnership Panel with Historic England/National Trust/Wiltshire Council/ WHS Coordination Unit.	Current NLHF funded Trust Transition Project seeking to establish long-term funding arrangements, increase private funding, explore establishing a WHS fund & maximise project funding.
6.1.10	Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	Management Plan Aim 4: Visitor Management and Sustainable Tourism - Policy 4b: Action 78.	Ongoing	Wiltshire Council with Parish & Town Councils / Visit Wiltshire/National Trust/English Heritage/Local Economic Partnership/Local Nature Partnership	Work with communities on capacity building through apprenticeships and other skills development opportunities such as volunteering to spread sustainable economic benefit to the surrounding area.

10	Monitoring				
10.2	Information on the values of the World Heritage property is adequate and key indicators have been defined but monitoring of the status of indicators could be improved	Management Plan Aim 8: Management, Liaison and Monitoring - Policy 8c: Actions 176 & 178.	Within next Periodic Report cycle	WHS Coordination Unit & Partnership Panel with all partners	Review of WHS monitoring indicators to ensure they encompass all relevant impacts on OUV. To be covered within Exploring the World Heritage Site & Beyond Strategy & future Management Plan Review.

Summary - Management Needs completed

12.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

12.3.1 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Authenticity of the World Heritage property?

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

12.3.2 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Integrity of the World Heritage property?

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

12.3.3 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value?

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

12.3.4 - What is the 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 **intact**

12.3.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the state of conservation of the property.

The active management of the WHS through the Partnership Panel, two Steering Committees and the Management Plan has meant that issues are addressed effectively within the resources and constraints available. Actions to mitigate risks to Authenticity, Integrity and Outstanding Universal Value are delivered through the ongoing work of partners alongside targeted funded programmes of work.

13. Impact of World Heritage Status

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive

Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal/Policy framework	Positive
Advocacy	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Positive
Gender equality	Not applicable
Provision of ecosystem services/ benefits to local communities	Positive
Social inclusion and equity, and improvement of opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status	Positive
Fostering inclusive local economic development and enhancing livelihood	Positive
Contributing to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around heritage properties	Positive
Other	Not applicable
If 'Other', please specify	

13.2 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to World Heritage status and its impacts

14. Good Practice in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

14.1 - Example of good practice in World Heritage protection, identification, conservation or management at the property level

Chalk Grassland Reversion in the Stonehenge Landscape In response to priority one of the Stonehenge & Avebury WHS Management Plan (2015) to 'Protect Buried archaeology from ploughing and enhance the setting of monuments by maintaining and extending permanent wildlife rich chalk grassland' the National Trust has commenced a new phase of grassland reversion in the Stonehenge landscape. This project secures land use and management change over 168 hectares of land containing 60 archaeological sites, including a substantial part of the Stonehenge Avenue, Coneybury Henge, the Coneybury Anomaly, Neolithic burials and occupation sites, and numerous Bronze Age round barrows which were all under risk of further damage or loss due to ploughing. The National Trust has brought additional land under its direct care through the buy-out of the leasehold interest of an Agricultural Holdings Act (AHA) tenancy. This covering 151 hectares of land that the National Trust already owned, but did not have management control of, and a further 21 hectares of outright acquisition of freehold land known as Bow Tie Field. Using seed harvested from the ancient chalk grasslands of Salisbury Plain, the capital works delivery is now underway to restore this land from intensive arable to species rich chalk grassland - protecting archaeological remains, enhancing the biodiversity and improving access for people. This is one of many examples of good practice in World Heritage protection, identification, conservation and management across the WHS. For example, English Heritage Trust continue to carry out conservation projects at Stonehenge itself such as the removal of cement mortar from the lintels and replacement with lime mortar. Also re-examining the conservation of the monument field and control of visitor footfall in order to protect buried archaeology.

14.2 - Define which topics are covered by this example of best practice at the property level

Sustainable Development
State of Conservation

15. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.1. Relevance of Periodic Reporting

15.1.1 - Has the Periodic Reporting process improved the understanding of the following?

The World Heritage Convention
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Integrity and/or Authenticity
Management effectiveness to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting

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

State Party	Good
Site Managers	Good
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Good
Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM)	Good

15.2. Use of Data

15.2.1 - How do the authorities in charge of the property plan to use the data recorded from this cycle of Periodic Reporting?

Revision of priorities/strategies/policies for the protection, management and conservation of heritage

Update of management plans

Fundraising

Awareness raising

Advocacy

15.2.2 - Comments on use of data from the Cycle of Periodic Reporting

The third cycle of of Periodic Reporting provided a useful opportunity to review the overall state of both parts of the WHS.

15.3. Timing and resources

15.3.1 - Entities involved in the filling out of this online questionnaire (tick as many boxes as applicable)

Governmental institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage

Site Manager/Coordinator World Heritage property staff

Local communities

Non-Governmental Organizations

15.3.2 - Has a gender balanced contribution and participation been considered in the filling out of this questionnaire?

Gender balance has **not been explicitly** considered or implemented in the process.

15.3.3 - Were you given adequate time (i.e. roughly ten months) to gather necessary information and to fill in this questionnaire?

Yes

15.3.4 - Please estimate the time (working hours) needed to complete this questionnaire

20 / 10 / 30 /

15.3.5 - Did you mobilise any additional resources to fill out this questionnaire?

	Additional resources	No	Yes
15.3.5.1	Human resources		×
15.3.5.2	Financial resources for organizing consultation meetings/ training	×	

15.4. Format and content of the Periodic Report

15.4.1 - How accessible was the information required to complete this questionnaire?

Most required information was accessible.

15.4.2 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?

		Very Difficult	Difficult	Easy	Very easy
15.4.2.1	Ease of use of questionnaire			×	
15.4.2.2	Clarity of questions			×	

15.4.3 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

The way in which the responses to each factor in Chapter 4 were split into two data captures, one with the factor itself and one at the end of the chapter, was a little difficult to navigate for consultation.

15.5. Training and Guidance

15.5.1 - Please rate the level of support in terms of training and guidance from the following entities in completing this questionnaire

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Good
UNESCO (other sectors/field offices)	Not applicable
UNESCO National Commission	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	Not applicable
IUCN International	Not applicable
ICCROM international/regional	Not applicable
ICOMOS national/regional	Good

IUCN national/regional	Not applicable
------------------------	----------------

15.5.2 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Reporting questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Good
State Party Representative (national Focal Point)	Good
UNESCO other sectors (e.g. field office)	Not applicable
National Commission for UNESCO	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	Not applicable
ICCROM International/regional	Not applicable
ICOMOS national/regional	Good
IUCN national/regional	Not applicable
IUCN International	Not applicable

15.5.3 - Were the online training resources prepared by the World Heritage Centre regarding Periodic Reporting adequate for you to complete this questionnaire?

Yes

15.5.4 - If you found that the online training resources were not adequate, what changes would you like to see implemented?

15.6. Actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

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

- **Geographic information table**

Reason for update: Please can the property (ha) for the Avebury site be updated to 2546 and the Total to 5154.2. The current figure displayed for Avebury reflects the site before the minor boundary review of 2008 (Decision 32COM 8B.71) and was requested to be updated in the previous Periodic Report.

- **Map(s)**

Reason for update: The World Heritage Centre identified in December 2022 that they did not hold an up-to-date clear map which showed the delimitation of the property. We are in the process of producing the requested map in line with the World Heritage Centre's technical requirements, with support from Historic England. It will be submitted for the approval of the World Heritage Committee in advance of 46COM along with others from the UK State Party.

Changes to these items will need to go through the proper processes.

15.7. Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.7.1 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

This report has been produced by the Stonehenge & Avebury World Heritage Site Coordination Unit, in collaboration with specialist partners and stakeholders from within and beyond the site. The data provided has been sourced from a literature review, most notably of the site's Management Plan and State of Conservation Reports, and through thematic consultation.

15.7.2 - Thank you for having filled in all the questions. Please contact your National Focal Point for validation.