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Decisions that potentially impact upon World Heritage Site status

- The role of the State Party
- Which Government Departments do what?
- Who advises the World Heritage Committee?

Case Study: former Royal High School
- The role of ICOMOS
- How is the decision for Reactive Monitoring made?
- What is the process for Reactive Monitoring?
Case study: the former Royal High School, Calton Hill
Timeline of events

End 2014/Early 2015:
Developer’s Public Presentation

January 2015:
PAN

Jan – Dec 2015:
Application Assessment

February 2015:
PUBLIC MEETING

October 2015:
ICOMOS UK Objection letter

October 2015:
ICOMOS UK exploratory visit

Statutory process

ICOMOS involvement
Timeline of events

December 2015: Planning Committee Hearing
January 2016: Decision Issued
March 2016: Appeal on Decision made to Scottish Ministers

November 2015: ICOMOS UK report
February 2016: UNESCO letter (from WH Centre)

Statutory process
ICOMOS involvement
"Secrecy surrounding Icomos’ fact-finding visit to the Capital threatens the credibility of the World Heritage status it seeks to defend."

"It was with breathtaking arrogance that Unesco’s masonically-appointed world heritage guardian James Simpson declared there was no need to identify the inspectors coming to see if Edinburgh was looking after itself properly."

Edinburgh Evening News
16 October 2015
Edinburgh council reject plans for old Royal High school hotel

Don’t treat Edinburgh like Dubai, Unesco chief tells planners
• What is the experience from other UK sites where UNESCO and ICOMOS are involved in the planning process?

• Does this work?

• Is there a better/different way?