

Report of the Director of City Strategy

## **Progress on York and Possible World Heritage Status**

### **Purpose of Report**

1. In April 2007, a report was presented to the Executive on the work carried out by the York World Heritage Steering Group (YWHSG) to answer the question “should York be a World Heritage site?”. The Executive asked officers to: 1) undertake a programme of public consultation; 2) examine in more detail the boundary options for a York World Heritage Site; 3) await advice to potential World Heritage Sites from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS); 4) report back to the Executive on these items. This Report responds to these requests and asks the Executive to consider the options for action.

### **Executive Summary**

2. The public consultation process has demonstrated overwhelming support for York gaining World Heritage status (paras 17-28)
3. The Statement of Significance developed by the YHWSG which describes the outstanding universal value of the City is used to assess the options for a boundary to a York World Heritage site (paras 29-44)
4. The boundary for a York World Heritage site should be based on the existing Central Historic Core Conservation Area boundary; this will introduce no additional statutory controls or constraints (paras 39-44, 72-75)
5. The DCMS intends to introduce a simpler, cheaper, 2-stage route for sites seeking nomination to a new, shorter UK Tentative List (paras 51-54)
6. The costs for York of seeking nomination to a revised UK Tentative List through the proposed 2 stage process in 2009 to 2010 will be limited to provision of officer time (paras 58-60)
7. Once nominated to a revised UK Tentative List, the costs of preparing and submitting documentation to UNESCO for approval as a World Heritage site will be £50k pa from 2012/13 for four years plus £50k in 2014 to 2016 (paras 64-65)

8. The costs of operating a York World Heritage site will be around £50k pa from 2016/17 onwards (para 66)
9. It will be a difficult, though not impossible, task for York to be nominated to the new UK Tentative List. However, once on this List, progression to formal approval by UNESCO by 2016 is almost guaranteed.

## Background

10. The World Heritage (WH) Convention (adopted by UNESCO in 1972) was ratified by the United Kingdom (UK) in 1984. The Convention provides for the identification, protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural sites of "outstanding universal value", and requires a WH List to be established under the management of an inter-governmental WH Committee.
11. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) is responsible for the UK's general compliance with the Convention, and for nominating sites in England. In 1999, the DCMS announced that 25 sites (including three in the UK's Overseas Territories) would form the UK Tentative List of sites from which nominations to UNESCO WH status would be made. Inclusion of a site on a Tentative List is a pre-requisite for formal nomination to UNESCO. In 2007, the DCMS announced that a review of the 1999 Tentative List would take place in 2007-08.
12. To inform this Review the DCMS stated that it would commission an assessment of the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status, the balance currently achieved between them, and the implications for the future management, promotion and funding of such sites. It has now published the results this research (<http://tinyurl.com/7zpbhq>)
13. In April 2007 the Executive received a report from the YWHSG convened by the then Lord Mayor, Janet Hopton. The Report assessed the advantages and disadvantages and recommended that the City of York Council should commit itself to pursuing World Heritage status. The Executive considered the Report and asked officers to carry out a process of public consultation, to undertake a more detailed assessment of potential boundaries for a York World Heritage Site, and to report back on the DCMS research and recommendations.
14. In 2007 and 2008, officers have carried out a programme of public consultation. The YWHSG has continued to meet. It has considered the issues of the boundary of a York World Heritage site, the issues relating to the definition of a Buffer Zone around a York World Heritage Site and has also carried out a programme of raising awareness about World Heritage issues.
15. The ***York Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-25*** (September 2008) states

*The Without Walls Partnership will take on a small number of crosscutting challenges. Initial priorities for action are ...*

- *Evaluate the case for York to become a World Heritage site*

(<http://tinyurl.com/acgzfl>).

16. This Report summarises the results of the public consultation, presents an analysis of the boundary options, responds to the York Sustainable Community Strategy and reports on the consultation documentation and advice issued by the DCMS in December 2008.

## **Summary of Consultation**

17. Extensive public consultation was carried out by officers and by the YWHSO. This included using the York Talkabout Panel and an on-line survey on [www.york.gov.uk](http://www.york.gov.uk). In addition, the YWHSO continued to raise awareness of World Heritage and its implications for York. Presentations were made to Ward Committees and to business groups; Parish Councils were contacted by letter; talks were given to local groups and local societies; an information panel was displayed at libraries; and a leaflet circulated which people could use to send their views to the Council. Letters of support have been received from MPs, leading organizations and individuals.
18. The Talkabout panel comprises around 2,000 local people who receive postal questionnaires at regular intervals throughout the year. The panel is broadly representative of York in terms of age, gender and area and includes residents from different geographic, social, economic and cultural groups.
19. A total of 1489 completed questionnaires were returned for the September 2007, giving a response rate of 65%. A sample of this size is accurate to + / - 3% at a 95% confidence level. The data has been weighted to reflect the demographic profile of the overall panel and therefore of York. All figures are reported as percentages. When responses do not total 100% this may be due to multi responses or decimal rounding.
20. The online survey contained the same questions as the World Heritage Status section of the talkabout survey. The survey was on the council's website and ran from July 24, 2007 till December 23, 2007. The online survey gave all residents the opportunity to participate and have their say on whether York should apply for World Heritage Status. A total of 77 people completed the online survey.
21. Both the talkabout panellists and the online survey sample believed there would be advantages for the City if it applied for World Heritage Status. 83% of the talkabout panellists said this compared with only 8% feeling that there would be no advantages for the city. Of the online sample 87% said it would be advantageous compared to 1% saying it would not. The main advantage cited in both the talkabout and online survey is that York's natural and cultural

heritage will be preserved, 82% in talkabout and 92% in the online survey.

22. However, although over a third of respondents (34%) who completed talkabout believe that there will be no disadvantages, over half (52%) feel that there will be disadvantages for the city if it acquires World Heritage Status. Respondents who completed the online survey were unsure if there would be any disadvantages with over four-fifths (88%) answering 'don't know.' In the online survey only 6% believed there would be disadvantages of acquiring World Heritage Status, and a further 6% believed there would be no disadvantages. The main disadvantage reported for both surveys was that World Heritage status will increase traffic congestion in York: 72% of the talkabout sample and 80% of the online survey sample said this.
23. The majority (70%) of the talkabout sample felt that York should apply for World Heritage Status, however the much smaller online survey sample were again unsure. Over four-fifths (84%) of the online survey sample responded 'don't know' whilst only 13% believed that York should apply for World Heritage Status. The most common reason given from the talkabout survey for supporting York's application is to preserve York's heritage and discourage out of place development (42%). For the online survey the most common reason for supporting the application was that York is worthy of the status or it deserves the recognition (22%).
24. The YWHSG produced a leaflet with a form which could be filled out and returned to the Council and an accompanying banner. The leaflet and banner was produced and sponsored by the Continuum Group and the Yorkshire Architectural and York Archaeological Society met printing costs. A total of 373 comments have been returned. Only four were against York pursuing world heritage status.
25. In addition three YWHSG leaflets in support have been received from City of York Councillors; letters in support have been received from MPs for Ryedale (Mr John Greenaway), Vale of York (Ms Anne McIntosh) and Selby (Mr John Grogan); one leaflet in support has been received from prospective parliamentary candidate (Mr Julian Sturdy); eleven letters and emails from Parish Councils (nine in favour, one against World Heritage status for York, and one not wishing to comment at this stage); 27 letters of support have been received from a wide range of institutions, societies, groups and individuals including the Archbishop of York, the Dean of York, VisitYork, York University and the University of York St John, and the York Civic Trust; and three letters from the general public (one in favour, two against).
26. Copies of the Talkabout and on-line survey results, a summary of the comments received on the YWHSG leaflet, copies of the letters received, and a list of groups addressed by the YWHSG and officers are available as background papers.

27. The Without Walls Partnership received a presentation on World Heritage status for York on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2008. It resolved that

*Partners were happy to support continuation of the World Heritage bid process, pending confirmation of detailed planning guidance from DCMS*

28. In summary, there is overwhelming local support for the proposal that York should be a World heritage Site.

## **Options for boundaries for a York World Heritage Site**

29. Three options have been examined by the YWHSG: Option One - Minster Precinct; Option Two – the Minster Precinct St Mary's Abbey City Walls and Defences including York Castle; Option Three – an area co-terminus with Central Historic Core Conservation Area.

30. The original report of the YWHSG contained a Statement of Significance. The Statement of Significance sets out those aspects of the heritage of the City of York which constitute its universal value.

31. The Statement of Significance concludes:

*York therefore is of outstanding universal value.*

*It contains masterpieces of human creative genius (York Minster; York Minster and other medieval glass, York City walls and gates, Merchant Adventurers' Hall, Minster masons' tracing floor); outstanding examples, both above ground and in buried though well-preserved archaeological deposits, of structures illustrative of various traditions of urban settlement over 2000 years.*

*It exhibits important interchanges of human values over a long span of time on developments in architecture, monumental arts and town planning.*

*It bears unusual testimony to cultural traditions and civilizations both living and disappeared, and has direct association with events, traditions, persons and movements of universal significance.*

*It is especially worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List because no other place on earth combines the same series of functions over so a long period, such continuity of occupation and activity, all in such a relatively small area, such excellent above and below ground preservation, and such complete documentation.*

32. The boundary options are discussed in relation to the Statement of Significance. It is essential to match the Statement of Significance with an appropriate World Heritage site boundary, though it has to be recognized it will be difficult to convince the DCMS on any of the options.

*Option 1: Minster Precinct (Plan A)*

33. The York Minster Precinct proposal comprises the area shown on Plan A. It includes the York Minster Precinct and that section of York City Walls which runs between Bootham Bar and Monk Bar. It includes Deangate and College Green. This proposal has the same boundary as the York Minster Precinct Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). It lies wholly within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area.
34. This proposal is the one which fits most closely with people's perceptions of York as a World Heritage site. However, it offers a poor fit to the Statement of Significance – it excludes many of the buildings mentioned in the Statement. More importantly it excludes those areas which preserve the deep, waterlogged, rich organic deposits which are critical to the Statement of Significance.
35. This proposal - a European medieval cathedral precinct - also replicates a number of existing western European World Heritage sites. UNESCO has stated that this is precisely the type of site which is well represented on the World Heritage List. As such, it is very unlikely to be a successful nomination.

*Option 2: York Minster Precinct, St Mary's Abbey Precinct and York City Walls and Defences including York Castle (Plan B)*

36. The York Minster Precinct, St Mary's Abbey Precinct and York City Walls and defences including York Castle proposal comprises the area shown on Plan B. It includes the York Minster Precinct (as in Option 1) St Mary's Abbey Precinct including Kings Manor, the Art Gallery and Exhibition Square, York City Walls including all gateways, towers and posterns, and York Castle including part of the Castle car-park. This proposal includes the areas included within the York Minster Precinct SAM, St Mary's Abbey Precinct SAM, St Mary's Abbey Walls SAM, York City Walls SAM and York Castle SAM. It lies wholly within the Central Historic Core Conservation Area.
37. Option 2 offers a closer fit with the Statement of Significance. However, as with Option 1, it excludes many of the buildings and structures mentioned in the Statement. It also excludes those areas which preserve the deep, waterlogged, rich organic deposits which are critical to the Statement of Significance
38. Option 2 also replicates many existing western European World Heritage sites. As with Option 1, UNESCO has stated that this is precisely the type of site which is well represented on the World Heritage List. As such, it is unlikely to be a successful nomination

*Option 3: Area co-terminus with the York Central Historic Core Conservation Area (CHCCA) (Plan C)*

39. The area covered by Option 3 is shown on Plan C. It includes the areas in Option 1 and Option 2. However, it covers a much greater area than either Option 1 or 2. It includes all of the area within the City Walls and elements of the approaches to the main gateways of

the City Walls. The boundary is the same as the boundary of the CHCCA.

40. Option 3 offers the closest fit to the Statement of Significance. It includes all the structures, buildings, deposits and locations relevant to the Statement of Significance.
41. Option 3 fits into the general “historic towns” class of UNESCO World Heritage sites. There are about 30 European world heritage sites that fall into this general category. Therefore, it will be a very difficult task to convince DCMS that York should be placed on the UK Tentative List based on this option.
42. The intention of the boundary of a world heritage site is to define an area that best represents the universal value of the site. YWHSG consider that Option 3 represents the most appropriate boundary for a York World Heritage site as it represents the closest fit with the Statement of Significance. This option also includes almost all of the “*buried though well-preserved archaeological deposits*” identified in the Statement of Significance
43. It is also clear from a recent consultation by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG – see paras 58-60 below) that World Heritage status will have the same statutory controls as currently apply to Conservation Areas. .
44. A York World Heritage site boundary based on the CHCCA will not introduce any additional statutory planning controls. Therefore the YWHSG recommends that the CHCCA should form the basis of a City of York World Heritage Site.

#### *Buffer Zone*

45. UNESCO suggests that each World Heritage Site should have an accompanying Buffer Zone. The role of a Buffer Zone is to
46. *give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection ... Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, should be provided in the nomination.*
47. The YWHSG has not at this stage made any recommendations about the size and location of a Buffer Zone. It recommends that detailed consideration of the extent and boundary of a buffer zone be carried out if the City seeks and achieves nomination to a revised UK Tentative List.

**World Heritage Policy consultation, review and advice published by DCMS**

48. DCMS has carried out a review of the UK's approach to selecting and nominating World Heritage sites. As part of this review it commissioned Pricewaterhouse Coopers LLP (PwC) to undertake a comprehensive study into the costs and benefits associated with World Heritage Site status in the UK. The review had the following terms of reference:

*To explore the extent to which the UK's current approach to World Heritage supports the interests of the UK Government and those of the Governments of the Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories in protecting and promoting their cultural and natural heritage; their wider strategic priorities; and their international goals, particularly in relation to UNESCO.*

*To examine the costs and benefits, rights and responsibilities of World Heritage Site status, the balance currently achieved between them, and the implications for the future management, promotion and funding of such sites.*

*To consider what measures might be taken to clarify and/or strengthen protection for World Heritage Sites.*

*To recommend a policy on making future nominations for World Heritage Site status.*

49. The results of this review and the PwC study were published as a consultation document in December 2008 (<http://tinyurl.com/7zpbhq>). The Consultation period ended on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2009. A holding response has been sent ending consideration of this report by the Executive.
50. The conclusions reached by the review are detailed. Therefore only those elements which describe the preferred option for future policy on World Heritage sites are summarized here.
51. The DCMS states that its preferred option for WHS in UK and Dependent Territories is to create a new UK Tentative List. Sites on the current list must reapply. The DCMS will provide guidance and training to potential applicant sites on the criteria DCMS will use to assess potential WHS. The DCMS will adopt a 2 Stage process to create a new, short Tentative List. The DCMS will nominate one site from the new Tentative List to UNESCO every other year starting in 2012 (then 2014 2016 2018 2020). This is a sound proposal and it is recommended that the City of York should support it.
52. The 2 Stage application process would be as follows:
53. At Stage 1 (deadline July 2009) applicants would be required to complete an application form outlining: prima facie evidence of Outstanding Universal Value including authenticity and integrity; whether the site falls into an under-represented category on the World Heritage List as defined in the ICOMOS Gap Studies and how it relates to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee Global



Strategy; the extent to which the site is subject to development pressures which might affect outstanding universal value and how this will be managed; the extent to which there is international cooperation or linkages to be followed up actively; and whether the application could be viewed as an extension to an existing site either in the UK or in any other country

54. Applicants successful at Stage 1 will be asked to complete a Stage 2 application (deadline April 2010). This will provide more detail on the areas above including: evidence that the site is the best or most representative example nationally and internationally of the kind of cultural or natural heritage which it represents; how the application meets the requirements of the global strategy and the gap studies; evidence of strong local support for the application; proposed arrangements for managing the site in future in ways which will protect its outstanding universal value, including funding where appropriate; and the support they would be able to offer to a country or countries whose heritage is under-represented on the World Heritage List.
55. The PwC Report which supports the DCMS review details a range of potential costs and benefits that a prospective World Heritage Site should take into account. The Report breaks the potential costs down into three stages: Bidding costs of WHS nomination; costs of producing a management plan; management costs of a World Heritage Site. The YWHSG believe that the costs sets out in the PwC Report are not directly relevant to the situation here in York.
56. PwC suggests that the costs of Bidding for WHS could be as high as £380k; that the costs of producing a management plan could be between £56k and £90k; and that the costs of managing a world heritage site could range between £13k and £615k depending on the management model.
57. These costs quoted in the PwC report relate to the procedures in place prior to the 2008 DCMS Policy Review. The costs are generalized and do not take into account local arrangements and partnerships.
58. How do these costs relate to the situation in York and to the suggested simplification of the nomination process set out in the DCMS consultation document? The timing, procedures and costs for York are summarized in the following table and detailed in subsequent paragraphs:

	<b>When</b>	<b>What is involved?</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Partner Involvement</b>
<b>Stage 1</b> (para 59)	July 2009	Training on and completion of nomination forms	Existing Officer time only	YWHSG support (no cost)

<b>Stage 2</b> (paras 60-61)	April 2010	Provision of more detail to support case for nomination	Existing Officer time only	YWHSG support (no cost)
<b>Nomination to UNESCO</b> (paras 62-65)	From April 2012 to April 2016	Creation and Appointment to new post of WHS coordinator	£200k (£50k p.a.)	YWHSG support (no cost) Potential Sponsorship from external partners
	From April 2014 to April 2016	Appointment of Consultants  Preparation and submission of documentation to UNESCO	£40k  £10k	Potential Sponsorship from external partners
<b>Management of a York World Heritage site</b> (para 66)	From April 2016	Continued employment of a WHS Coordinator	£50k p.a.	YWHSG support; Potential Sponsorship from external partners

59. If the Executive is minded to agree to submit a Stage 1 application this would involve completing the proposed DCMS pro-forma application form by July 2009. All the information for this process has been provided by the YWHSG. Costs will be limited to officer time to complete and submit the form.
60. If York is successful at Stage 1, it will be required to submit more detailed information for Stage 2. At this stage, York will be expected to provide evidence that the site is the best or most representative example nationally and internationally of the kind of cultural heritage which it represents; how the application meets the requirements of UNESCO's global strategy and the gap studies; evidence of strong local support for the application; proposed arrangements for managing the site in future in ways which will protect its outstanding universal value, including funding; where appropriate, the support they would be able to offer to a country or countries.
61. Again, most of the information which will be required at Stage 2 is already available. Some of this information, the evidence of strong local support, is presented in this Report. The emerging LDF City Centre Area Action Plan and the Central Historic Core Conservation

Area Appraisal will provide the policy context for managing the site in the future. Costs relating to completion and submission of a Stage 2 bid will therefore be limited to providing officer time.

62. Additional costs will occur only if York is successful at Stage 2 and is nominated to the new UK Tentative List. The scale of these additional costs will relate to which management model is chosen to manage the world heritage site and to producing documentation for submission to UNESCO. There are four management models described in the PwC Report: Special Ownership Model; No WHS Coordinator; WHS Coordinator; and the Separate Entity model.
63. The WHS Coordinator model will be the most relevant to the situation in York. The WHS coordinator model is the most common approach taken to WHS management, with ten of the 24 UK sites included in this category. In these locations (Durham, Bath, Liverpool, Saltaire, Greenwich, Orkney, Ironbridge, Blaenavon, Derwent Valley, and Stonehenge and Avebury) there is a steering group or management group in place that is supported by a dedicated WHS Coordinator, sometimes with partnership support, and a number of other working groups or technical panels which meet periodically. PwC suggests that costs generally associated with this model are circa £130-£215k p.a.. In addition, there are costs associated with producing the documentation required for the formal nomination stage to UNESCO. PwC suggest that these formal nomination costs are in the region of £380k.
64. For York, analysis suggests that the costs associated with this model would be much less than these quoted by PwC. The costs would primarily arise through the appointment of a World Heritage Site Coordinator and to servicing an enlarged and reconstituted YHWSG. It is anticipated that in York these costs would be no more than £50k p.a. (based on a WHS Coordinator at Grade 10, plus postage, printing, room hire etc at 2009 prices). If York sought nomination to UNESCO in 2016 these costs would be incurred at the earliest in 2012/13. However, there is merit in making an appointment earlier, especially where partnership support and funding could be secured. This would enable a role / remit that could begin to deliver on some of the benefits we seek to secure through attaining WHS status. This may be possible if partnership working and funding can be put in place immediately after a positive result at Stage 2.
65. In order to produce the documentation required for the formal nomination to UNESCO, York would need to spend a further sum of around £40k on suitable external consultants and £10k on production costs for the documentation. These costs would be incurred at the earliest in 2014/15 if York targeted formal nomination to UNESCO in 2016.
66. If York is designated a World Heritage site by UNESCO, the costs of managing a York World Heritage site will lie in the continued employment of a WHS Coordinator, running an enlarged and

reconstituted YHWSG (c £50k p.a.), and carrying out such other promotional and educational activities that Members would wish to carry out (not estimated in this Report).

67. It is clear from the experience so far of the YWHSG that the City of York Council will not have to meet all these costs. York has benefited greatly from the time and expertise freely donated by the Members of and advisors to the YWHSG. In addition, the private sector and a charity have sponsored the production of the YWHSG leaflet and exhibition banner. Other private sector companies have indicated they will make financial contributions towards the nomination costs. In other regions, the Regional Development Agencies have contributed substantially towards the costs of making bids for World Heritage status and managing World Heritage sites (eg *One North East* for Durham and Hadrian's Wall). It is clear from this experience that there is significant potential to create either a formal or an informal public/ private partnership which will meet these costs of achieving and managing World Heritage status in York.
68. PwC do not provide a financial analysis of the financial benefits which accrue from World Heritage status. Instead they highlight the potential benefits under a series of headings: Partnership; Additional Funding; Conservation; Tourism; Regeneration; Civic Pride; Social Capital; Education and Learning. These are similar to the benefits identified by the YWHSG in their 2007 Report (see paras 79 and 80 below).
69. PwC state:
  70. *Where the [World Heritage] status has been used to full effect it has provided benefits by bringing partners together and leveraging additional funding and not infrequently it has led to new developments and enhanced educational benefits as well as improved conservation and even regeneration in some locations. Where these opportunities have not been seized there have been more limited benefits.*
71. In short, WHS delivers what each site makes of it.
72. In addition to the consultation by the DCMS, a consultation has been carried out by DCLG on a draft Planning Circular on World Heritage sites in England. This consultation document sought views on measures proposed by the DCLG to enhance the protection of World Heritage Sites in England. The document also contains guidance on World Heritage sites from the DCMS and English Heritage (<http://tinyurl.com/4upwc5>)
73. At present, there is no additional statutory protection conferred by gaining World Heritage status. There is currently no specific guidance on how planning authorities should frame policies for the protection and enhancement of a World Heritage site.

74. In brief, DCLG have recommended that World Heritage sites should in future have the same level of protection as that currently given to Conservation Areas.
75. This means that if this recommendation is adopted, and if York were to be successful in gaining World Heritage status, there will be no additional planning or statutory constraints in York as the whole of the City Centre is already a Conservation Area.

## **Analysis**

76. Option A, *That the City of York Council does not pursue World Heritage status and inclusion on a revised UK Tentative List.*
77. The 2007 Report of the YWHSO and the PwC Report makes it clear that there are disadvantages to gaining World Heritage status. There is the possibility of external scrutiny of decisions taken by the City Council (by UNESCO and its advisors). There is the possibility of greater congestion arising through an increase in visitor numbers. Any benefits that may arise depend greatly on the effort invested in WHS by the site and its managers. There are unlikely to be any significant costs associated with making a Stage 1 and Stage 2 bid to DCMS to get on to a revised Tentative List. However, if York is nominated to a revised Tentative List, the costs associated with submitting a bid for WHS to UNESCO are likely to be in the order of £250k over four years (2011 to 2016) and around £50k p.a. thereafter.
78. Option B, *That the City of York Council will support a bid for World Heritage Status and inclusion on a revised UK Tentative List*
79. There is significant public support for the proposal that York should be a World Heritage site. The YWHSO strongly recommends that the City of York Council should pursue nomination to a revised UK Tentative List of World Heritage Sites. It believes that the benefits that would accrue to York through enhancing the level and quality of tourism, attracting and retaining businesses and students, protecting York's heritage, and raising of civic pride outweigh the costs that might be incurred.
80. The 2007 YWHSO Report was strongly influenced by a Scrutiny Report prepared by the City of Edinburgh Council in 2006. Edinburgh has been a World Heritage site since 1995. The Scrutiny Report makes it clear that designation has had positive benefits for the City. It has not been a constraint on major developments, it has promoted better design, and it has been a major factor in tourism initiatives. The PwC Report in part supports this view of the benefits of WHS. The PwC Report points out that WHS delivers what each site makes of it. York is already a successful tourist attraction. WHS would support and augment that position. York has a desire to see design-led development. WHS can clearly promote design-led development. Again to quote the PwC Report

81. *it was felt, particularly amongst developers that WHS status does have an impact on the cost of development, primarily because the status ensures that a much higher degree of scrutiny is given to development applications. Developers would expect to have to support a design team throughout the process and to have those designs amended periodically and in some instances they would expect to have to pay for some additional expertise*
82. The costs of pursuing nomination to a revised Tentative List will be significantly lower than those estimated in the 2007 Report to this Executive. If the DCMS implement their preferred procedure, the costs of the two stage nomination process will be almost completely restricted to officer time only. The more substantial costs for a bid to UNESCO would be spread over a four year period and would not be incurred until 2012/13 at the earliest. Experience demonstrates that there is considerable scope for effective partnership working and financial support. This will mean these costs should not be born only by the City of York Council
83. However, successful nomination to the new UK Tentative List will be difficult to achieve. Once on this List, formal approval by UNESCO by 2016 is achievable and realistic.
84. If York wishes to pursue World Heritage Status, now is the time to do it. Once a new Tentative List is created, it will be in place until at least 2022.

## **Corporate Priorities**

85. This proposal contributes to the Corporate Direction statement
86. *The Council will provide strong leadership for the city using partnerships to shape and deliver the Community Strategy for the City*
87. It also addresses the Corporate Priority to
88. *Improve the actual & perceived condition and appearance of city's streets, housing estates & publicly accessible spaces*
89. It also responds to the **York Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-25** (September 2008) which states
- The Without Walls Partnership will take on a small number of crosscutting challenges. Initial priorities for action are [to] ...*
- Evaluate the case for York to become a World Heritage site*

## **Financial Implications**

90. Option A carries no financial implications for the City. Option B means that the City would potentially have to identify a sum of up to £50k p.a. from 2012/13 onwards to go towards the cost of appointing a WHS Co-Coordinator and of producing the

documentation to submit to UNESCO. This full cost would arise only if no other financial support is received from the private sector, charitable sources or Yorkshire Forward.

## **Legal Implications**

91. There are no legal implications.

## **Human Resources (HR) Crime and Disorder, Sustainability, Equalities and other implications**

92. At this stage there are no HR, Crime and Disorder, Sustainability, Equalities or other implications.

## **Risk Management**

93. There are minimal risks associated with this proposal. Perhaps the most significant risk is that there are raised expectations that York will make a bid for World Heritage Status. A decision not to pursue would certainly disappoint a lot of people. This can be managed through an appropriate communication strategy if it is decided not to accept the recommendations in this report.

## **Recommendations**

94. It is recommended that the Executive support the DCMS's proposal to adopt a new, short UK Tentative List and for a two-stage nomination and decision process to create the new UK Tentative List

95. Reason: the DCMS preferred proposal is a cost-effective means of gaining nomination to a revised Tentative List

96. It is recommended that the Executive agree (a) to submit a Stage 1 application for nomination to the new UK Tentative List based on Option 3 and (b) if successful at Stage 1, submit a Stage 2 application for nomination to the new UK Tentative List.

97. Reason: This is the only route available to be nominated to a revised UK Tentative List. Option 3 offers the best fit to the Statement of Significance. It acknowledges the case that York is of outstanding universal value and merits World Heritage status.

98. It is recommended that if members are supportive of the World Heritage site bid going forward that they also support approaches and investigations to secure partnership funding to facilitate the early appointment of a World Heritage Site project officer.

99. Reason: This would facilitate further promotion of and possible early delivery on some of the key benefits outlined in this report, also allowing work to commence in good time to develop the more detailed bid information, by reducing the burden on existing CYC officers.

100. It is recommended that the Executive is updated on progress at each Stage and that a further Report is made to the Executive on partnership, finance, timetable HR and other arrangements if York is successful at Stage 2.

101. Reason: To ensure the Executive is fully aware of progress and to decide on key issues if York is successful in gaining nomination to a revised UK Tentative List.

<b>Author:</b>		<b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>			
John Oxley Archaeologist Planning & Sustainable Development 01904 551550 ext 1346		Bill Woolley Director of City Strategy			
		<b>Report Approved</b>	√	<b>Date</b>	05/03/09
<b>Specialist Implications Officer(s)</b> none					
<b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i>					<b>All</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>					

## Annexes

3 plans (Plan A, Plan B and Plan C) illustrating options for the proposed WHS area

## Background Papers

1 **Report to Executive Leader and Advisory Panel 24<sup>th</sup> April 2007**

2 **File EC 224 containing**

TalkAbout Survey Results and Analysis

Analysis of returned World Heritage Leaflets

Letters from MPs organisations and individuals

List of Groups addressed by YWHS