

**1. World Heritage Property Data**

**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Dorset and East Devon Coast

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**

**State(s) Party(ies)**

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

**Type of Property**

natural

**Identification Number**

1029

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

2001


**1.3 - Geographic Information Table**

| Name  | Coordinates (longitude / latitude) | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Total (ha) | Inscription year |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| Orcombe Rocks to Chit Rocks, Sidmouth , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela      | 50.66 / -3.277                     | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| River Sid, Sidmouth to Seaton Hole , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela         | 50.687 / -3.127                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| River Axe, Axmouth to The Cobb, Lyme Regis , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela | 50.706 / -2.99                     | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| Lyme Regis to West Bay , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela                     | 50.722 / -2.842                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| Chesil, the Fleet and Portland Coast , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela       | 50.631 / -2.57                     | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| Portland Harbour Shore , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela                     | 50.596 / -2.458                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| Bowleaze Cove to Peveril Point , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela             | 50.615 / -2.165                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| New Swanage to Studland Bay , Dorset and East Devon , England , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irela                | 50.638 / -1.927                    | 0             | 0                | 0          | 2001             |
| <b>Total (ha)</b>   |                                    |               | <b>0</b>         |            |                  |

**Comment**

The actual areas for each of the parts of the Site, in the same order as above, are as follows. THIS has not changed since inscription: Orcombe Rocks to Chit Rocks, Sidmouth 155.884 ha River Sid, Sidmouth to Seaton Hole 193.891 ha River Axe, Axmouth to The Cobb, Lyme Regis 344.064 ha Lyme Regis to West Bay 282.158 ha Chesil, the Fleet and Portland Coast 1048.8341 ha Portland Harbour Shore 14.8305 ha Bowleaze Cove to Peveril Point 411.989 ha New Swanage to Studland Bay 23.2575 ha

**1.4 - Map(s)**

| Title  | Date       | Link to source  |
|--|------------|---|
| Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site: set of 8 maps | 26/06/2000 |  |

**1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property**

- Christopher Young  
English Heritage  
Head of World International Advice
- Paul Blaker  
Department for Culture, Media and Sport  
Head of World Heritage

**Comment**

DCMS Representative is Francesca Conlon, e-mail Francesca.conlon@culture.gsi.gov.uk

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

- Sam Rose  
Dorset County Council  
World Heritage Project Coordinator

**Comment**

Sam Rose World Heritage Site Manager Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team Dorset County Council County Hall Dorchester DT1 1XJ

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

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [The Jurassic Coast of Dorset and East Devon](#)
3. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

**Comment**

2. is now www.jurassiccoast.org NOT www.jurassiccoast.com Also, please make this the 1st choice for people to access the Site by the web - the OUR PLACE Site is not mediated.

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

**Comment**

The property is protected under the following designations / conventions: 2 RAMSAR Site for wetlands conservation; 4 European Special Areas of Conservation (SAC); 2 Special Protection Areas (SPA); 13 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); 2 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); 2 National Nature Reserves (NNR); Numerous Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS); 3 Heritage Coasts (HC); 66 Geological Conservation Review (GCR) sites and; 1 Coastal Preservation Area (CPA).

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

##### Brief synthesis

The Dorset and East Devon Coast has an outstanding combination of globally significant geological and geomorphological features. The property comprises eight sections along 155 km of largely undeveloped coast. The property's geology displays approximately 185 million years of the Earth's history, including a number of internationally important fossil localities. The property also contains a range of outstanding examples of coastal geomorphological features, landforms and processes, and is renowned for its contribution to earth science investigations for over 300 years, helping to foster major contributions to many aspects of geology, palaeontology and geomorphology. This coast is considered by geologists and geomorphologists to be one of the most significant teaching and research sites in the world.

**Criterion (viii):** The coastal exposures along the Dorset and East Devon coast provide an almost continuous sequence of Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous rock formations spanning the Mesozoic Era and document approximately 185 million years of Earth's history. The property includes a range of globally significant fossil localities - both vertebrate and invertebrate, marine and terrestrial - which have produced well preserved and diverse evidence of life during Mesozoic times. It also contains textbook exemplars of coastal geomorphological features, landforms and processes. Renowned for its contribution to Earth science investigations for over 300 years, the Dorset and East Devon coast has helped foster major contributions to many aspects of geology, palaeontology and geomorphology and has continuing significance as a high quality teaching, training and research resource for the Earth sciences.

##### Integrity

The property contains all the key, interdependent elements of geological succession exposed on the coastline. It includes a series of coastal landforms whose processes and evolutionary conditions are little impacted by human activity, and the high rate of erosion and mass movement in the area creates a very dynamic coastline which maintains both rock exposures and geomorphological features, and also the productivity of the coastline for fossil discoveries. The property comprises eight sections in a near-continuous 155 km of coastline with its boundaries defined by natural phenomena: on the seaward side the property extends to the mean low water mark and on the landward side to the cliff top or back of the beach. This is also in general consistent with the boundaries of the nationally and internationally designated areas that protect the property and much of its setting. Due to the high rate of erosion and mass movement, it is important to periodically monitor the boundaries of the properties to ensure that significant changes to the shoreline are registered.

##### Protection and management requirements

The property has strong legal protection, a clear management framework and the strong involvement of all stakeholders with responsibilities for the property and its setting. A single management plan has been prepared and is coordinated by the Dorset and Devon County Councils. There is no defined buffer zone as the wider setting of the property is well protected through the existing designations and national and local planning policies. In addition to its geological, paleontological and geomorphological significance, the property includes areas of European importance for their

habitats and species which are an additional priority for protection and management. The main management issues with respect to the property include: coastal protection schemes and inappropriate management of visitors to an area that has a long history of tourism; and the management of ongoing fossil collection research, acquisition and conservation. The key requirement for the management of this property lies in continued strong and adequately resourced coordination and partnership arrangements focused on the World Heritage property.

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

(viii)

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

1) Stratigraphy (the rock record) and structure; a near-continuous sequence of Triassic, Jurassic & Cretaceous rock exposures 2) Palaeontological record; a diverse range of internationally important Mesozoic fossil localities 3) Geomorphological features and processes; a wide range of significant geomorphological features and processes 4) Ongoing scientific investigation and educational use, and key role in the history of science. 5) Underlying geomorphological processes in the Site's setting

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

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

## 3. Factors Affecting the Property

### 3.14. Other factor(s)

#### 3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

Coastal defences. Man-made coastal defences would stop natural processes and negatively impact the Site. This factor is current and potential, and inside the Site.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

|               | Name   | Impact    |          |          |        |         |  | Origin |  |
|---------------|--|-----------|----------|----------|--------|---------|--|--------|--|
| <b>3.1</b>    | <b>Buildings and Development</b>                                     |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.1.3         | Industrial areas   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.1.4         | Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure            |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.1.5         | Interpretative and visitation facilities                             |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.2</b>    | <b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>                                 |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.2.3         | Marine transport infrastructure                                      |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.2.4         | Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure            |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.3</b>    | <b>Services Infrastructures</b>                                      |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.3.2         | Renewable energy facilities  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.4</b>    | <b>Pollution</b>   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.4.1         | Pollution of marine waters   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.4.5         | Solid waste  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.6</b>    | <b>Physical resource extraction</b>                                  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.6.2         | Quarrying  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.6.3         | Oil and gas  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.7</b>    | <b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>                    |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.7.6         | Water (rain/water table)   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.8</b>    | <b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>                              |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.8.2         | Society's valuing of heritage  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.8.5         | Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.8.6         | Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation                            |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.9</b>    | <b>Other human activities</b>  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.9.1         | Illegal activities   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.9.3         | Military training  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.10</b>   | <b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>                      |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.10.1        | Storms   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.10.2        | Flooding   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.11</b>   | <b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>                        |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.11.4        | Avalanche/ landslide   |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.11.5        | Erosion and siltation/ deposition                                    |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>3.13</b>   | <b>Management and institutional factors</b>                          |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.13.1        | Low impact research / monitoring activities                          |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.13.2        | High impact research / monitoring activities                         |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| 3.13.3        | Management activities  |           |          |          |        |         |  |        |  |
| <b>Legend</b> | Current  | Potential | Negative | Positive | Inside | Outside |  |        |  |

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

|              | Spatial scale                     | Temporal scale | Impact                   | Management response | Trend           |            |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| <b>3.4</b>   | <b>Pollution</b>                  |                |                          |                     |                 |            |
| <b>3.4.1</b> | <b>Pollution of marine waters</b> | extensive      | on-going                 | insignificant       | medium capacity | static     |
| <b>3.4.5</b> | <b>Solid waste</b>                | restricted     | intermittent or sporadic | minor               | medium capacity | increasing |
| <b>3.9</b>   | <b>Other human activities</b>     |                |                          |                     |                 |            |
| <b>3.9.1</b> | <b>Illegal activities</b>         | restricted     | one off or rare          | minor               | high capacity   | static     |

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

There are a number of factors in the list, such as landslides, flooding and climate change impacts that may have strong negative impact on the infrastructure that supports the Site, but none on the attributes themselves, which is why they are not down here as current negative impacts. It is the potential long-term implications of these changes that may have an impact on the Site and its OUV and attributes, but only indirectly, through an increased need for coastal defences.

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

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

**There is no buffer zone**, and it is not needed

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

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

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

#### 4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

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

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

The position with respect to a buffer zone is reviewed each time the Management Plan is reviewed. The Site boundaries are based on the written definition, and move with the cliffs as they erode. The changes are slight, but a definitive map of the boundaries at a point in time will be provided to UNESCO as and when it is appropriate to review it. Any changes would be very minor.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The Site is protected by existing UK planning and conservation laws and by specific planning guidance on World Heritage Sites.

Protection through the planning system: The UK planning system is the key mechanism for the protection of World Heritage Sites, through specific national and local policies, and policies in relation to the conservation designations that cover the majority of the Site. National Planning Policy Planning Policy Guidance 15 (PPG15)26 gives broad overarching protection for World Heritage Sites, but a recently published Planning Policy Circular (07/2009) on the Protection of World Heritage Sites sets out clearer mechanisms for their protection. The principles of this document are:

- protecting the World Heritage Site and its setting, including any buffer zone, from inappropriate development;
- striking a balance between the needs of conservation, access, the interests of the local community and the achievement of sustainable economic growth;
- protecting a WHS from the effect of changes which are relatively minor but which, on a cumulative basis, could have a significant effect. It also states that authorities should "treat relevant policies in Management Plans as material considerations in making plans and planning decisions, to take them fully into account when devising core strategies and other local development documents."

In respect of the setting, it states that "it is important to consider carefully how to protect the setting of each WHS so that its outstanding universal value, integrity, authenticity and significance is not adversely affected by inappropriate development."

In addition to the planning circular, a range of other national policy guidance has specific relevance to this WHS. Of most relevance are:

- Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development, in which "The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection."
- Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
- Planning Policy Statement 9; Biological and Geological Conservation, in which the government aims "to conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England's wildlife and geology by sustaining, and where possible improving, the quality and extent of natural habitat and geological and geomorphological sites; the natural physical processes on which they depend; and the populations of naturally occurring species which they support."
- Planning Policy Statement 22; Renewable Energy in which "Planning permission for renewable energy developments likely to have an adverse effect on a site of international importance for nature and heritage conservation (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR Sites and World Heritage Sites) should only be granted once an assessment has shown that the integrity of the site would not be adversely affected."
- Planning Policy Statement 25; Development and Flood Risk

• Minerals Policy Statement 1; Planning and Minerals, which includes a presumption against major minerals developments in a WHS.

The Heritage Protection White Paper (2007) introduced a new proposal to increase the protection of World Heritage Sites and ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value for which the Site is inscribed is properly reflected in development proposals. This has since been clarified in the planning circular cited above as: "planning authorities are required to consult the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government before approving any planning application made on or after 20 April 2009 to which English Heritage maintains an objection and which would have an adverse impact on the outstanding universal value, integrity, authenticity and significance of a World Heritage Site or its setting, including any buffer zone. The Secretary of State then has the discretion to call-in the application for his own determination if he considers it appropriate to do so."

This regulation places increasing importance on English Heritage's comments with respect to planning applications. In the case of the Dorset and East Devon Coast, being England's only natural WHS, the planning circular does not give Natural England the same role with respect to call-in as English Heritage. This could lead to more pressure being put on English Heritage to seek appropriate advice from Natural England on proposals that relate to a natural Site. Regional and local planning policy Fundamental to the success of policies in this plan to protect the Site is their integration within the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and particularly the local authorities' Local Development Frameworks (LDFs).

Key policies in the Draft RSS are: ENV1 Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Historic Environment, CO1 Defining the Coastal Zone, which includes a presumption against development in the undeveloped coast, CO2 Coastal Planning, and ENV5 Historic Environment which refers to the World Heritage Site in its pre-amble text. Non-statutory plans Statutory planning policies at local and national level are supplemented by a great many other non-statutory plans and policy documents. Of these, the most significant at the strategic level for the World Heritage Site are the Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs), providing guidance on where man-made coastal defence structures might be built. Because artificial structures that obscure the geology and hinder natural processes are the greatest threat to maintaining the World Heritage Site's OUV and integrity, these plans need to accurately reflect its values. Other non-statutory plans that have a significant bearing on the management of the Site include the Dorset Coast Strategy, community strategies for Dorset and Devon, parish plans, Local Area Agreements, local site management plans (e.g. for the National Trust properties, Local Nature Reserves and so on), the regional economic and cultural strategies and other regionally and locally significant documents.

Conservation designations : The Site is covered in its entirety by one or more conservation designations, made either for geological, wildlife or landscape value. These include designations set out under international and UK law, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), National Nature Reserve (NNR), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and others that have no legal statute, but carry varying degrees of weight in the planning system.

Of particular significance to the Management Plan, and the conservation of the Site and setting, are the AONB Management Plans, a statutory requirement under the CROW Act 2000. The CROW Act also 'placed a duty of regard to AONB purposes' on relevant authorities. The parts of the WHS

designated as SACs under the EC Habitats Directive<sup>27</sup> also play a significant role in the protection of the Site. Even though they are not protected for their geology, reasons for their designation are consistent with the needs of the WHS, e.g. vegetated sea cliffs require a naturally eroding coastline. Moreover, because they are designated through European Law, developments that may affect SACs (or SPAs) require an exceptionally high level of test to be applied to ensure effective protection for the environment.

### Comment

The UK planning system has changed recently: Planning Policy Statements have been largely replaced by a National Planning Policy Framework. Planning Policy Circular (07/2009) on the Protection of World Heritage Sites is still in place and will be revised in 2013. Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks have been abolished. The conservation designations - UK (SSSI, NNR, AONB), European (SA, SPA) and Global (RAMSAR) - that cover the majority of the Site are unchanged.

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

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

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

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

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

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

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

There is **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

#### 4.3.1 - Management System

The responsibility for management of the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site lies with a non-executive committee known as the Steering Group. This Group is made up of representatives of organisations that have a key role to play in the delivery of the aims and policies in this Management Plan, as well as individuals with relevant expertise. The Group

is led by Dorset and Devon county councils, as the two main authorities responsible for initially securing the designation of the Site. The list of the other partners represented on the Steering Group is listed below. The need for the Group and its role was set out in the draft Management Plan originally submitted alongside the nomination to UNESCO in 1999. This management approach was accepted by both UNESCO and the UK Government's Department for Culture Media and Sport, to which the Steering Group reports. This devolved approach ensures that management of the Site is undertaken at a local level, but with national representation and advice where necessary, particularly through Natural England and English Heritage. The Group's primary function is to oversee the delivery of the aims and policies in this Management Plan, which sets out the UK Government's commitment to meet its obligations to the World Heritage Convention with respect to this WHS. Because the Group itself has no executive powers, its primary means for ensuring the delivery of the Plan is through its individual and collective member activity, and through inspiring, influencing and lobbying others. The mechanism for undertaking this is in many cases the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team, which includes relevant specialists to support delivery of the Plan.

Steering Group partner roles with respect to Management of the WHS:

Devon County Council: Co-originator of bid and joint lead organisation; Mineral and Waste Planning Authority; Highways Authority; Rights of Way responsibility; support for visitor centre development

Dorset County Council Co-originator of bid; joint lead organisation and host authority; Mineral and Waste Planning Authority;

Highways Authority: landowner; Rights of Way; countryside service (including the Durlston project) Dorset Coast Forum Co-originator of bid; consultative forum on coastal issues in Dorset

Natural England: Responsible for landscape and nature conservation designations that protect the coast; provide technical expertise at national level

Department for Culture Media and Sport: Represents UK Government to UNESCO and lead department for World Heritage

Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team: Implementation of the Management Plan through advice, support, coordination, facilitation and project delivery

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: Responsible for Natural England, Environment Agency and Shoreline Management Plans

Government office for the South West: Representative of central government at the regional level; including for DEFRA, BERR, CLG and DCSF, all of whom might play a role in Management Plan delivery East Devon District Council

Local planning authority: countryside, public realm infrastructure functions; landowner; coastal defence responsibility; support for East Devon visitor centres; public safety

West Dorset District Council: Local planning authority; tourism and visitor infrastructure functions; landowner; coastal defence responsibility; public safety

Purbeck District Council: Local planning authority; tourism and visitor infrastructure functions; landowner; coastal defence responsibility; public safety

Weymouth and Portland Borough Council: Local planning authority; tourism and visitor infrastructure functions; coastal defence responsibility; public safety

Environment Agency: Lead agency for Shoreline Management Plans and coastal defences; strategic coastal overview

English Heritage: Lead agency for the historic environment, and principal advisor to the government on the World Heritage Convention

East Devon AONB Team: Responsible for implementation of the AONB Management Plan

Dorset AONB Team: Responsible for implementation of the AONB Management Plan

National Trust: Major landowner and land manager with a strong conservation, education and awareness remit

Ministry of Defence Estates: Major landowner

Jurassic Coast Trust: Registered Charity established to raise funds for education and conservation projects on the WHS

Devon Maritime Forum: Consultative forum on coastal issues in Devon

British Geological Survey: Provides expertise on geological or geomorphological issues; representation of national geological interests

Country Land and Business Association: Representatives of landowners: Dorset represented by Lulworth Estates; Devon represented by Clinton Devon Estates

Dorset Geologist Association and RIGS Representation of local geological interests

South Devon and Dorset Coastal Action Group: Overseeing the development of the South Devon and Dorset Shoreline Management Plan

South West Regional Development Agency: Economic development in the South West of England

Arts Council England, South West: Funding body for the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme

South West Tourism: Provides strategic leadership for tourism in the South West

British Holiday & Home Parks Association: Representing tourism interests for the industry

Other representation:

Fossil collecting community: Representative of the interests of the community of fossil collectors along the World Heritage Site

Working groups chairs

Observer role:

Natural History Museum: Centre of excellence for the earth sciences and public engagement; formal partnership with Steering Group



UK Government technical advisor for Natural World Heritage Sites

A small Management Group has been established to support both the Steering Group and Team. This Group is more focused on the detail of implementation, including finding resources, monitoring progress against business plans, overseeing the Team and forward planning for the Steering Group. It will be delegated certain decision-making authority from the Steering Group. The Management Group comprises the Chair of Steering Group, Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team Leader, and representatives from the core funding partners (currently Dorset and Devon County Councils and Natural England) and the other relevant statutory agencies (English Heritage and the Environment Agency). Working, advisory, or consultative groups. Since before designation, the Steering Group has relied upon advisory or working groups to play a key role in the delivery of the Management Plan. Such groups enable a much wider group of people, including experts and frontline delivery staff, to be involved in the process of Site management, and they can be very effective at helping many partners to all work towards a mutually beneficial common aim. The Chairs of these groups also meet annually to discuss priorities and improve cross-sectoral working.

**Comment**

Please make the following changes: Steering Group partner roles: Following bodies no longer exist: Government office for South West, South West Tourism, South West Regional Development Agency. Following bodies added to the Steering Group: Jurassic Coast Trust Other representation: Also includes "Individual representative from the Tourism Industry" Observer role: Joint Nature Conservation Commission is the UK Government technical advisor for Natural World Heritage Sites (name missing above)

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

| Title   | Status   | Available | Date       | Link to source  |
|---|----------|-----------|------------|---|
| Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site Management Plan | N/A      | Available | 01/01/2003 |  |
| Dorset and East Devon Coast Management Plan 2009-2014           | In Force | Available | 01/12/2009 |  |

**4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?**

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

**4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?**

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

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

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

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

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

**4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer**

**zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

**No indigenous peoples** are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

**4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?**

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

Regarding question 4.3.10, the industries with which we have contact are tourism and quarrying.

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

Changes to the planning system reported in 4.2.1

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

**4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)                           | 0%  |
| International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)                     | 0%  |
| Governmental (National / Federal)                                     | 16% |
| Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)                          | 0%  |
| Governmental (Local / Municipal)                                      | 82% |
| In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)                        | 2%  |
| Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)  | 0%  |
| Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.) | 0%  |
| Other grants  | 0%  |

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

**Comment**

None received.

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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

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

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

In respect of 4.4, this is a reflection of 'core' costs to manage the Site and doesn't account for external grants for different projects from a wide variety of sources, which vary on a year by year basis.

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

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Full-time | 45% |
| Part-time | 55% |

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

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

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

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

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

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

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

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

|                         |        |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Research and monitoring | Medium |
| Promotion               | Medium |
| Community outreach      | Medium |

## Section II-Dorset and East Devon Coast

|                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Interpretation                   | Medium         |
| Education                        | High           |
| Visitor management               | Medium         |
| Conservation                     | Medium         |
| Administration                   | Medium         |
| Risk preparedness                | Medium         |
| Tourism                          | Medium         |
| Enforcement (custodians, police) | Not applicable |

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

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

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

There are many people involved in the management of the Dorset & East Devon Coast World Heritage Site. The only ones referred to in 4.4.9 and 4.4.10 are those who are paid, and whose job descriptions specifically includes & element of managing the Site. There are many staff from other organisations & volunteers who also contribute to Site management, but this form does not enable us to express this. In 4.4.15, we do not do capacity building as such because the Site is managed locally.

## 4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

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

There is a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

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

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

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

The Site remains a major location for scientific study & research. There have been too many publications about the property to list here. Of note are the BGS (2011) Special Memoir Geology of South Dorset & South-East Devon & its World Heritage Coast & references in Hart, M. (2013) Developments in Mesozoic and Cenozoic stratigraphy and palaeontology during the last fifty years (1962–2012)



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

The Site remains a major location for scientific study & research, but this form does not allow for this to be expressed. In addition to the papers, Redcliff Point has been proposed as a Global Stratotype Section & Point (GSSP) for the base of the Oxfordian sequence, a range of important palaeontological finds have been made, and we have an ongoing strategic monitoring programme.

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

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

In many locations and easily visible to visitors

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

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Local communities / residents                                    | Excellent      |
| Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property | Excellent      |
| Local Indigenous peoples   | Not applicable |
| Local landowners   | Excellent      |
| Visitors   | Average        |
| Tourism industry   | Excellent      |
| Local businesses and industries                                  | Average        |

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

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

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

World Heritage status has been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

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

|                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Visitor centre            | Adequate   |
| Site museum               | Adequate   |
| Information booths        | Not needed |
| Guided tours              | Adequate   |
| Trails / routes           | Excellent  |
| Information materials     | Adequate   |
| Transportation facilities | Adequate   |
| Other                     | Adequate   |

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

There is an extensive education programme for the Site which has led the way nationally & internationally. There are a range of Visitor Centres & small museums along the Site, all of which interpret the Site to some extent, but there is no single location for either fully interpreting the Site and its stories, or for displaying the definitive collection of fossils. 4.6.6.8 is Arts facilities

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

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

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

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

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

The Site Management Plan is the key document in respect of Visitor Management, and contains all relevant policies under Aims 5, 6 and 7. Other documents we have produced include a Marketing Strategy (2003), a Transport Strategy (2005), an Interpretation Action Plan (2005) and a Jurassic Coast Sustainable Transport Improvements and Actions Plan (2010).

**4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

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

**4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?**

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

**4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?**

**No fees are collected**

**4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property**

It is very difficult to assess visitation to a 150km stretch of open coastline. There are no gates, entry points or toll booths.

People come and go as they please. All visitor trends are estimates. We work with the tourism industry and raise funds through a visitor giving scheme which gives a small contribution towards managing the Site.

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

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

**4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?**

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff | Excellent      |
| Local / Municipal authorities                    | Not applicable |
| Local communities                                | Not applicable |
| Researchers                                      | Average        |
| NGOs   | Not applicable |
| Industry   | Not applicable |
| Local indigenous peoples                         | Not applicable |

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

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

Monitoring is undertaken in collaboration with the UK Government's conservation agency, Natural England.

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

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

Please refer to question 5.2

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

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

|              | World Heritage criteria and attributes affected | Actions   | Monitoring   | Timeframe  | Lead agency (and others involved)  | More info / comment   |  |
|--------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <b>3.4</b>   | <b>Pollution</b>                                |   |  |  |  |   |  |
| <b>3.4.1</b> | <b>Pollution of marine waters</b>               | Criterion XIII, Attribute 3) Geomorphological features and processes; a wide range of significant geomorphological features and processes This also has an impact on the presentation of the Site | Two issues: 1) The potential for a serious oil spill to affect the beach geomorphology. ACTION: Limited ability to act at local level - need UNESCO & Government input 2) Ongoing marine litter: ACTION: Campaign to reduce sea-borne litter | Issue 1: Ongoing field monitoring of beaches. National monitoring of se vessels by MCA Issue 2: Bi-annual monitoring of beach litter accumulation through beach cleans. Monitoring of campaign impact through media. | Ongoing  | Issue 1: The MCA is responsible for sea vessel safety, & the Dorset & Devon Local Authorities have emergency plans in place Issue 2: The Dorset Coast Forum (hosted by Dorset County Council) leads the Marine litter campaign with many other partners | Issue 1: Oil spill risk is only a potential impact, not current. Issue 2: The marine litter issue is current and ongoing |
| <b>3.4.5</b> | <b>Solid waste</b>                              | This has no direct impacts on criteria or attributes, but does impact on the presentation of the Site   | The issue relates primarily to a location in West Dorset where an old landfill site has been exposed by erosion, and is continually falling onto the beach. ACTION: The waste is regularly removed by the local authority.                   | Ongoing monitoring by the Local Authority and others in the area.  | Ongoing, and the rate of release of material will depend on the rate of erosion. | West Dorset District Council.   | This is an isolated occurrence.  |

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

| 4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects |  |   |   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
|  | Actions  | Timeframe   | Lead agency (and others involved)   | More info / comment  |   |  |
| <b>4.5.2</b>                                 | <b>Research in the property is not planned</b> | To identify specific research needs as part of the Management Plan review 2013-2014, then identify a resource plan. | One year to develop the needs and resource plan, 5 years to undertake the identified research | Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team and its Science and Conservation Advisory Group | Some research is undertaken within the Site by external researchers, but the Site Management is not always aware of this and it is not always relevant. |  |

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

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

Not applicable (for sites inscribed exclusively under criteria vii to x)

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property is intact

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

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

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

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

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

**5.4.1 - Comments**

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

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

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Conservation   | Very positive  |
| Research and monitoring                                      | Positive       |
| Management effectiveness                                     | Very positive  |
| Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples | Positive       |
| Recognition  | Very positive  |
| Education  | Very positive  |
| Infrastructure development                                   | Very positive  |
| Funding for the property                                     | Positive       |
| International cooperation                                    | Positive       |
| Political support for conservation                           | Very positive  |
| Legal / Policy framework                                     | Positive       |
| Lobbying   | Positive       |
| Institutional coordination                                   | Positive       |
| Security   | Not applicable |
| Other (please specify)                                       | Not applicable |

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

The designation has been very positive for Dorset and East Devon, but only because the Local Authorities have realised the opportunity, and invested in it.

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

|  |
|--|
| Governmental institution responsible for the property  |
| Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff |
| Staff from other World Heritage properties             |
| Non Governmental Organization                          |

|                  |
|------------------|
| Local community  |
| Donors           |
| External experts |
| Advisory bodies  |
| Others           |

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

no

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

Guidance is not clear, particularly about impacts - whether on OUV / Attributes only, or wider. The questions were too generic, and didn't allow for clarification. It is too formulaic & not allowing enough detail. It would be useful for spaces to add in details of specific impacts so that we can explain what we mean. It should also allow for more details of positive WHS management, case studies & examples that can be shared around the world. The 500 character limit is too constraining.

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

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| UNESCO                     | Poor |
| State Party Representative | Good |
| Advisory Body              | Poor |

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

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

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

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

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

- Geographic Information Table**  
Reason for update: The actual areas for each of the parts of the Site, in the same order as above, are as follows. This has not changed since inscription: Orcombe Rocks to Chit Rocks, Sidmouth 155.884 ha River Sid, Sidmouth to Seaton Hole 193.891 ha River Axe, Axmouth to The Cobb, Lyme Regis 344.064 ha Lyme Regis to West Bay 282.158 ha Chesil, the Fleet and Portland Coast 1048.8341 ha Portland Harbour Shore 14.8305 ha Bowleaze Cove to Peveril Point 411.989 ha New Swanage to Studland Bay 23.2575 ha

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