

██████████
Department of Energy Security and Net Zero
3-8 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

Our ref: PL00794649
Your ref: EN010147

Telephone: 0207 973 3749

Date: 16th July 2026

Dear ██████████

Application by Photovolt Development Partners (“the Applicant”) for an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed Botley West Solar Farm (“the Proposed Development”)

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Historic England is more formally known as the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. We are the Government’s statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment, including world heritage.
- 1.2. It is our duty under the provisions of the National Heritage Act 1983 (as amended) to secure the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment. There is also, in this case, the requirement in Article 4 of the 1972 ‘Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage’ to protect, conserve, present and transmit the values of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site.
- 1.3. Therefore, Historic England has engaged extensively with the Applicant as they developed their proposals and throughout the examination process. We have also engaged throughout the Examination with the Planning Inspectorate and have continued to liaise with the Applicant through the Secretary of State’s request for further information on the scheme. Throughout we have highlighted through discussions with the Applicant and in our submissions to the Examination, our concerns. These identified where further information, detail, clarity or amendments were needed, particularly around how the impacts of the scheme could be avoided or minimised.

2. Historic England Advice

- 2.1. The following is Historic England's response to the representations/observations to various documents submitted by the Applicant and other Interested Parties, which the Secretary of State has invited comments on by July 16 2026.
- 2.2. Whilst noting that representations/observations have been made by other parties, our approach has been to only provide comment if appropriate. In not responding to representations/observations, this should not be taken that an absence of comment is implicit agreement.

Heritage Impact Assessment

- 2.3. Historic England has engaged extensively with the Applicant in the review of the Heritage Impact Assessment. In our Concluding Statement (**REP7-118**) paragraphs 2.37 - 2.47 we set out the primary areas of the HIA that needed to be strengthened. Those areas are bullet pointed below and we have provided our updated comments beneath each of those headings in light of this revised HIA.
 - A more robust assessment of the property's attributes and the impact of the proposals on them (2.40 - 2.42).

The revised HIA now includes additional recognition of the contribution made by associative values in relation to Attributes 1, 4 and 5 but notes that the Applicant maintains its previous conclusions in relation to Attribute 4.

- Explain how sensitivity of each landscape parcel has been assessed in relation to the OUV of the WHS (2.43)

Historic England welcomes the additional information included in sections 1.4.37 and 1.4.40 of the revised HIA (**C1-054**) setting out further details of the methodology used to assess the sensitivity of the land parcels. This increases the clarity around the methodology used.

- The need for the HIA to address the concerns raised in the ICOMOS International Technical Reviews (2.44-2.46)

The HIA (**C1-054**) has not responded in detail to the specific concerns raised by ICOMOS International in its Technical Review reports regarding the potential impact of the proposals, where these comments would be of most value. However, the Applicant has submitted more detailed comments regarding these documents in its response to the Secretary of State's Request for information (**C1-087**).

- The need for a standalone cumulative impact assessment which follows the methodology recommended by UNESCO in relation to conducting HIA in World Heritage contexts (2.47).

Historic England welcomes the additional consideration of cumulative impact in this revised HIA (**C1-054**), with reference to the requirement for this to address the effect of changes since the property was inscribed in 1987 (1.4.154).

- 2.4. The publication of the Secretary of State's letter of 14 April also posed a number of points for the Applicant to address. We therefore sought early engagement with the Applicant regarding a possible update to the heritage impact assessment. As set out in our response submitted on 9 June 2026 (**C1-026**) to the Secretary of State's Request for further information, we identified a number of primary considerations for the Applicant to take into account in their consideration of whether an updated HIA was required. We also provided some additional suggestions and minor comments to further strengthen the HIA.
- 2.5. Having reviewed the revised HIA (**C1-054**) we can confirm that the Applicant has broadly addressed the main aspects of our advice on the following topics:
- updates to ensure that the live and in force legislative and policy context for decision making is accurately presented in the HIA with key definitions (of OUV and significance) drawn from the NPPF;
 - updates to address UNESCO's requirements regarding the assessment of cumulative impact with reference to the baseline at the point of inscription, and to provide additional clarity about the methodology used and explain the conclusions drawn;
 - updates to address the conclusions set out in previous Appeal Decisions regarding how change within Blenheim's setting can affect its OUV as well as its cumulative impact;
 - recommended clarifications, particularly around the role, origin and definition of attributes and the way in which summarised lists are created from the SOUV for inclusion in the WHS Management Plan;

- recommendations regarding implementation of the process of heritage impact assessment with reference to both UNESCO's published guidance (the Operational Guidelines, and the Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context, 2022) and that from Historic England (GPA3);
- corrections to misunderstandings about the relationship between a World Heritage property, its boundary and its setting – these comments addressed the ways in which setting can contribute to attributes of OUV, the ability to appreciate them, and to their conservation and management, with reference to UNESCO's Operational Guidelines, Historic England's GPA3 and the approach taken in the HIA;
- recommendations to engage in further detail with the content of ICOMOS' Technical Reviews and their findings and conclusions within the context of the HIA process, and corrections to what we perceive as misunderstandings in that advice relating to technical detail and national process;
- recommendations regarding what we perceive as misunderstandings by the Applicant of the requests made by the SoS in his letter of 14 April with respect to the definition of intangible attributes of OUV;
- recommendations about how the HIA treats other heritage and conservation values, including communal value;
- updates to address outstanding recommendations from Historic England in its Closing Statement (REP7-118) to the Examination;
- further recommendations regarding the approach to cumulative impact taken in the HIA.

2.6. We therefore recognise that within this revised HIA, the Applicant has addressed our Concluding Statement (**REP7-118**) and our 9 June 2026 response (**C1-026**) either in full or partially. Where our comments have only been partial addressed, in some instances this is the result of the different conclusions reached by the Applicant's assessment in relation to which attributes would be affected by the scheme. We remain on hand to discuss any outstanding issues with the Applicant. Overall, in light of this revised HIA, the Secretary of State should have greater confidence in the robustness of this assessment as they determine this application.

Response to Secretary of State Request for Information - 20.3 Botley West SofS Response 9.6.26 (**C1-087**)

2.7. Historic England has reviewed the Applicant's submission (**C1-087**) in which they include their response to those ICOMOS Technical Review reports either directly

related to or otherwise relevant to the current scheme and its cumulative impact.

- 2.8. The Applicant has concentrated on the most recent Technical Review report (August 2025) given changes to the scheme since its first report was received. The response addresses ICOMOS' comments point by point in isolation rather than addressing the understanding of the key concerns it raises in a more holistic way. The Applicant's main area of disagreement with ICOMOS' findings and recommendations surrounds the contribution made by Blenheim's setting to its significance and OUV.
- 2.9. ICOMOS' key comments in relation to the proposed scheme in its August 2025 Technical Review were focused on the approach taken in the Heritage Impact Assessment. In particular they stressed the need to take account of landscape character in understanding the contribution made by the WHS' setting to its significance and OUV, ensuring that the cumulative assessment in this World Heritage context includes change since the point of inscription. They also stressed the importance of recognising the potential impact of the level of development pressure seen within Blenheim's setting in more recent years. These themes were also addressed in the earlier Technical Reviews.
- 2.10. ICOMOS made a number of recommendations in its third report. Not all of these were directly implementable as part of the review and determination of the Botley West scheme but are being addressed more broadly by the site managers in relation to the overall management system for the property.
- 2.11. Historic England has advised the Applicant throughout the development of the HIA to take further account of and respond to the key considerations underlying these recommendations within the scope of the HIA. Namely:
- understanding the contribution that landscape character makes to the way in which the WHS' setting supports its OUV;
 - recognising the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape to change given the site's designed and Arcadian context;
 - the need to take further account of cumulative impacts and the potential for gradual erosion of the property's setting;
 - the need to show the workings of land parcel selection with reference to the WHS' OUV and its attributes.

- 2.12. These key overarching comments made by ICOMOS align with Historic England's own advice throughout the development of the scheme. This is despite the differing conclusions reached regarding the level of harm caused and the reduction in harm achieved by removal of panels from certain land parcels at Change Request 2.
- 2.13. In its response (**C1-087**) the Applicant repeats a point raised in its HIA (1.5.152) that most of the recommendations are aimed at the State Party (the whole of the UK Government represented by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport). As previously explained (**REP7-118**, 2.46), all ICOMOS International advice is directed to the State Party. In England the State Party ensures processes are in place to ensure that such assessments are undertaken, which the Planning System provides. The UK State Party devolves responsibility for actions required to manage World Heritage properties to local stakeholders.
- 2.14. Historic England can also confirm that the State Party (represented by DCMS) has kept UNESCO updated on its planning reforms, including the most recent consultation revising the NPPF.

Response to Secretary of State Request for Information - 6.5 ES - Appendix 8.3 AMS Rev 2 Part 6 (**C1-071**) and Part 8 (**C1-063**)

- 2.15. We note that these plans do not reflect the changes to the Order Limits and amended design to the scheme which were secured as part of Change Request 2 (**CR2-072**) and the updated Works Plans (Rev 3) submitted at Deadline 7 (**REP7-004**). We recommend these are updated to reflect the Project's current design.

Response to Secretary of State Consultation 1 - 2.3 - Works Plans - Rev 4 (**C1-036**)

- 2.16. As set out in our Closing Statement (**REP7-118**), following extensive discussion with the Applicant regarding the scheduled monument of Sansom's Platt we agreed that the Applicant would submit updated Works Plans removing Works from Field 1.13 to minimise the harm to the significance of the scheduled monument at Sansom's Platt and protect important archaeological remains outside the scheduled area. We are pleased to see these updated Work Plans reflect that agreed position and solar panels have been removed from Field 1.13.

Response to Secretary of State Consultation 1 - 20.2 Environmental Statement Addendum 2 (**C1-086**).

- 2.17. Proposed Change 1 (2.3) reflects the changes that were submitted at Deadline 7 to remove solar panels from Field 1.13.
- 2.18. Proposed Change 5 (2.7) proposes a 100-250m buffer between the edge of the solar arrays and residential properties. These would lead to solar panels being drawn further away from the Sansom's Platt Scheduled Monument, the Grade I listed Church of St Peter and St Paul at Church Hanborough, and the Grade I listed Church of St Peter at Cassington.
- 2.19. Based on the information supplied, we do not consider change 1 and 5 alter our conclusions as set out in paragraph 5.12 and 5.13 of our Closing Statement (**REP7-118**).

Response to Secretary of State Consultation 1 - 6.4 ES - Figures 2.1a - 2.4c - Illustrative Masterplan - Rev 4 (**C1-051**)

- 2.20. We note that the increase in the buffer around residential dwellings has removed panels in proximity to a number of designated heritage assets we have commented on in our submissions, including the Scheduled Monument Sansom's Platt and the Grade I listed churches of St Peter and St Paul at Church Hanborough and the Church of St Peter at Cassington.
- 2.21. We note those areas from which panels are being removed would instead be used for 'New Planting / Areas of Enhancement'. The definition of this includes grassland, improved grassland, new and reinforced hedgerow, bat corridor, new woodland and other tree planting. Until there is clarity on what landscape enhancements are chosen for each site, we are unable to make a judgement on what impact this would have on the historic environment. Retaining these fields as open grassland or enhanced grassland is likely to be the most sensitive solution. We however are content this can be picked up in detail within the written Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, as under Requirement 6 of the DCO (**CR1-038**) Historic England would be a consultee.

Additional Information: Latest ICOMOS Technical Review relevant to the Blenheim Palace WHS (June 2026)

- 2.22. On 22nd June 2026 the UK State Party to the World Heritage Convention received from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre a copy of a Technical Review report from ICOMOS International relating to one of the developments in the vicinity of the

Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site mentioned in the HIA that had been highlighted in relation to the cumulative impact. The development site is known as Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton on Cherwell (Application Reference 25/01510/OUT).

- 2.23. Within this report ICOMOS references the Botley West Solar Farm project within the context of restating previous recommendations to the UK State Party (represented by DCMS) for future enhancement of the management of the property, including through the WHS Management Plan at its next review (currently underway). A copy of this latest Technical Review report is appended to this letter for the Secretary of State's information.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1. Historic England has been involved in the application since 2022 providing constructive preapplication advice and statutory responses prior to the submission of the application. We have also advised extensively throughout the examination.
- 3.2. Historic England has consistently raised the HIA as an area of the assessment that needed strengthening. We therefore welcome this revised HIA, which better aligns the applicants' conclusions with our own. In light of this, the Secretary of State should have greater confidence in the robustness of this assessment as they determine this application.
- 3.3. Should the Secretary of State have any additional queries in relation to our response, or should further information be submitted, we would be pleased to continue to offer our assistance and support as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

[Redacted Email]@HistoricEngland.org.uk

ICOMOS Technical Review

Property	Blenheim Palace
State Party	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Property ID	425
Date of inscription	1987
Criteria	(ii) (iv)
Project	Urban Expansion in setting of the property: Perdiswell Housing proposal

I. Introduction

On 6 February 2026, the State Party of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland submitted a letter to the World Heritage Centre, under the provisions of paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, in which it provided information about a planned development of a 48.8 ha greenfield site within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property. The development, which proposes 500 single-family homes, is referred to as 'Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton on Cherwell' (National planning application system registration no. 25/01510/OUT).

The State Party submission includes:

- The State Party's notification letter (dated 6 February 2026), in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, outlining the process to date and context of the application;
- A letter from Historic England (dated 30 January 2026), outlining its assessment of the impacts the proposed development will have on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property and providing its recommendations;
- A cover letter from tor&co (dated 12 December 2025) regarding the project 'Land east of Park View (25/01510/OUT)';¹
- A document titled 'Amendments to the ES technical appendices' by tor&co (dated December 2025), and including a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed development of a land parcel referred to as 'Land east of Park View';
- An annex to the aforementioned HIA, presenting visualisations.

The Advisory Body provides this Technical Review to assist the State Party with its commitment to preserve the OUV of the Blenheim Palace Heritage property, including through the application of a HIA process to inform decision-making. This Technical Review is not a peer-review of the HIA as a scientific study, but rather aims to provide guidance on whether the HIA provides useful information to ensure informed decision-making to guarantee the maintenance of the property's OUV.

II. Background

Blenheim Palace was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987, in Decision **11 COM VII.A**, on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).

¹ The project 'Land east of Park View' is the same project as the project 'Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton on Cherwell' noted in the State Party's paragraph 172 submission letter.

In 2008, the World Heritage Committee adopted a Statement of Significance for the property in its Decision **32 COM 8B.95**, and subsequently in 2013, a Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (RSOUV) in Decision **37 COM 8E**.

In 2024, the World Heritage Committee adopted a proposal from the State Party for the clarification of the property's boundaries (Decision **45 COM 8D**).

The RSOUV for Blenheim Palace World Heritage property is available on the UNESCO website at: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/425/>.

III. Cumulative impact of projects in the immediate and wider setting of the World Heritage property

ICOMOS has since 2024 provided numerous Technical Reviews on project proposals that would affect the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property.

ICOMOS has consistently alerted to the significant contribution that the landscape setting of the Blenheim World Heritage property makes in supporting its OUV. ICOMOS has also consistently advised that the cumulative impacts of various project in the immediate and wider settings of the property could lead to a loss of the integrity of the property's OUV, and that cumulation should be assessed in any HIA undertaken for projects that may affect the property's OUV. In particular, in February 2024, ICOMOS provided a Technical Review in which it reviewed four proposed and partially approved urban development projects in the setting of the property, submitted by the State Party in response to a request under paragraph 174 of the *Operational Guidelines*. These include developments at Land East of Woodstock, Land East of Hill Rise, Land North of Banbury Road, and Land South of Perdiswell Farm. In its Technical Review, ICOMOS noted that, while two of the developments had already been granted planning permission, others remained undecided or had been withdrawn.

In the February 2024 Technical Review, ICOMOS also concluded that the approved projects had already led to a cumulative erosion of the property's rural setting and negatively affected its OUV, and warned that the remaining proposals - if granted - could intensify that harm. The Technical Review found that the current Management Plan and local planning framework did not sufficiently protect the property's setting, particularly in the absence of a buffer zone. In its conclusions, ICOMOS recommended that no further development in the setting be approved until a comprehensive Landscape Character Assessment is undertaken and a revised Management Plan is adopted.

IV. The project

The project proponent, Blenheim Estate Homes, has brought forward a project for the construction of 500 new homes within the immediate setting of the property on green-fields land that is used for agriculture. The project is proposed for a land allocation in the draft local plan. The proposal will expand the village of Woodstock, which has recently already seen new neighbourhoods added to its north-west and south-east. In both cases, these expansions have bordered on the World Heritage property's boundary.

In its February 2024 Technical Review on the Urban Expansion in the setting of the property, ICOMOS concluded, because of the potential threat the project would hold for the OUV of the property due to the conversion of its immediate setting from a predominantly rural to an urban character, that:

The two projects that have not yet been decided (Land North of Banbury Road and the Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton On Cherwell) may further constitute an erosion of the setting of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and these and other such projects should therefore not be granted until:

- *Further studies into the contribution of the setting of the property to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value have been undertaken, and*

- *Their impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value have been tested through independent Heritage Impact Assessments.* (p. 9)

V. The Heritage Impact Assessment

The submitted HIA supersedes the 2022 HIA undertaken for a previous version of the same project proposal. The HIA follows the method outlined in the 2022 *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context*. The HIA discusses the role of the setting and wider setting in supporting the value of heritage places, including through reference to the State Party's own published guidance on the topic, as well as reference to the aforementioned 2022 *Guidance*. It also makes reference to the two recommendations made by ICOMOS in its February 2024 Technical Review.

The HIA bases its assessment on the definition of the attributes that contribute to the OUV of the property that is included in the Management Plan for the World Heritage property, selecting only attribute 7 as relevant to the setting of the property. The HIA relies on the intervisibility of setting (key visual links) and property to establish impact (*"The countryside contributes to the OUV of Blenheim insofar as it is related to the two designed 'key visual links' between it and the WHS, as described above."* [HIA, par. 5.18, p. 24]).

The HIA concludes that the project will *"result in a negligible change and a **minor negative impact** on the OUV of the Blenheim Palace WHS"* (HIA, par. 7.46, p. 34, original emphasis), which it typifies as temporary due to the expected impact assessed as likely to occur only during the 12-year construction period.

The HIA contains a summary cumulative assessment, which refers to past and ongoing applications and the individual conclusions of Environmental Statements (Park View) and considerations of the State Party's Planning Inspector at appeal (Hill Rise), as well as ongoing application processes (Botley West Solar Farm).

VI. Historic England advice

Historic England has provided a submission on the project and the HIA. Historic England's analysis disagrees with the conclusions presented in the HIA regarding the proposed construction of 500 homes in the immediate setting of the World Heritage property, concluding that the proposal would result in negative impacts on the attributes number 1, 4, and 7, as defined in the Management Plan for the property, and therefore result in 'less than substantial harm' to the World Heritage property and other registered heritage resources.

ICOMOS notes that it has previously indicated, including in its February 2024 Technical Review of the Botley West Solar Farm proposal, that the attributes as outlined in the Management Plan require revision and that attribute frameworks defined in Management Plans need to be further developed for impact assessment procedures, to be able to achieve the level of detail required for decision-making for intervention planning.

Historic England highlights that the Setting Study (Annex III of the Management Plan) also identifies the rural setting, which includes open agricultural and enclosed forestry use, as important to the maintenance of the property's OUV. Its analysis highlights that the impact of the proposal cannot be assessed as temporary, and that the assessment downplays the potential impact on attributes 1 and 7. Historic England also noted that, while other individual projects are noted in the HIA, the HIA does not provide an assessment of their cumulative impacts.

VII. Analysis

ICOMOS concurs with the assessment of Historic England that the proposed project will have negative permanent impacts on the OUV of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property through land conversion in its immediate setting. ICOMOS considers that the presented HIA neither adequately assesses the potential impacts on the immediate setting of the property through the implementation of the project on the property's OUV, nor does it address the cumulative impact of the proposal in the context of other ongoing approved and planned projects in the immediate and wider setting of the World Heritage property, be this on the current situation or the baseline as at the time of inscription.

The HIA does not adequately address the impact of the project on the property's OUV through changes to its immediate setting, in part because it relies on assessing the intervisibility of the development site and the World Heritage property. In its February 2024 Technical Review, ICOMOS provided guidance, noting that: *"reducing the setting of the property only to views inside the property and views outward from the property would underrepresent the contribution of the setting towards the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property"* (p. 7).

ICOMOS notes that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024) provides guidance on decision-making in contexts where 'less than substantial harm' is expected due to a development:

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

ICOMOS advises, consistent with its past advice, that the process of 'weighing of harm' against public benefit is not aligned with the State Party's commitment under the 1972 World Heritage Convention to preserve Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS has also in the past advised that a Landscape Character Assessment, specifically focused on the relationship between the wider setting of the property and its OUV, be undertaken (ICOMOS February 2024 Technical Review, p. 9).

ICOMOS has previously recommended that the Landscape Character Assessment should be:

[...] specifically focussed on the relationship between the wider setting of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value as a baseline assessment from which a further assessment of the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property can be further developed. Such a Landscape Character Assessment should:

- *Be undertaken as foundational study to allow for the further development of the HIA, noted above,*
- *Assess the efficacy of the management of the immediate and wider setting in maintaining the landscape character of the immediate and wider setting of the property, and*
- *Clearly explore the importance of the wider setting, also in the understanding of the immediate setting and wider setting as what is passed through in the approach to the Park and Palace that cumulatively may have a large negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.*
(ICOMOS February 2024 Technical Review, Botley West Solar Farm, p. 8)

VII. Conclusions and recommendations

ICOMOS concludes that the proposed construction of 500 homes on land in the direct setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property will erode the contribution that its setting makes in support of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS also concurs with Historic England that the proposal will lead to a permanent negative impact.

ICOMOS considers that the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment does not adequately assess the consequence of the proposed development on the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property.

ICOMOS further concurs with Historic England that the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment does not provide a cumulative assessment of the impacts of the various ongoing and planned projects on the baseline as at the time of inscription.

ICOMOS therefore considers it urgent for the State Party to:

- Undertake the recommended Landscape Character Assessment, which should include a study that assesses the contribution of the setting to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, before any further projects are brought forward or approved.
- Undertake a revision and more thorough inventory of the attributes that contribute to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, as recommended by ICOMOS in its February 2024 Technical Review of the Urban Expansion in the setting of the property.

With regard to the 'Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton on Cherwell' project, ICOMOS advises that the planning permission be denied, due to the negative permanent impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage property through land conversion in its immediate setting.

ICOMOS remains at the disposal of the State Party for further clarification on the above or assistance as required.

ICOMOS, Charenton-le-Pont
June 2026