

Case information

Reference/Case ID		201506418	
Scheduled Monument	Burghead, fort, graveyard and chapel, including the Clavie		
Index no	M2205	Grid Ref	NJ108691 310700.0000 869100.0000
Date of Application	10 January 2016	Application Received	12 January 2016
Summary of proposed works	Installation of a historic fishing vessel and interpretation panel (in retrospect)		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for the installation of a historic fishing vessel and interpretation panel (in retrospect) be granted without conditions.

2. Background

The monument comprises the remains of a massive promontory fort of the early Historic period, some 1500 years old, and the possible remains of a contemporary or later Christian centre. The remains of the fort are in two parts, the upper and lower wards. The upper ward is now defined on its northern and western sides by ramparts of soil and stone. There are no traces of the southern rampart. The original three massive ramparts on the eastern side have largely been built over by the town of Burghead, but one fragment of the system survives, in the form of the Doorie Hill, which has the Clavie Stone on it. The lower ward is bounded on its north side by a rampart. The possible early Christian complex, which may be contemporary with or later than the fort, comprises two features, the old graveyard on Grant Street, which contains below ground the remains of a structure known as St Aethan's Chapel, and the rock-cut well, identified as a possible baptistry, which is in the care of the Secretary of State for Scotland.

This application relates to an area of ground to the immediate north of the rampart that defines the northern edge of the lower ward. This area of ground has been built up when a sewer was installed in the late 1970s just to the north of the rampart.

HES visited the monument in December 2015 to discuss the works with the applicant, and this application (in retrospect) accords with the outcome of these discussions.

3. Proposals

Consented works – Installation of a historic fishing vessel and interpretation panel (in retrospect).

The proposals comprise:

- Excavation of four holes each approximately 0.8m square by 0.8m deep to accommodate vertical steel posts set in concrete.
- Installation of a historic fishing vessel resting on the ground surface, with the four vertical steel posts acting as supports to keep the vessel upright and stable.
- Excavation of a hole 0.5m by 1m by 0.35m deep to accommodate a frame for an interpretation panel set in concrete.

4. Representations received

No third party representations were received.

5. Report

a) Policy considerations

The application should be viewed with the following legislative and policy considerations in mind:

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

Part 1 Section 2 - Control of works affecting an ancient monument.

Part 1 Section 2 (3) – authorises works where Scottish Ministers or Historic Environment Scotland Have granted consent (scheduled monument consent) for the execution of the works where the works are executed in accordance with the terms of the consent and of any conditions attached to the consent.

Part 1 Section 2 (4) – allows consent to be granted with conditions.

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy

3.14. Scottish Ministers include a monument in the Schedule to secure the long-term legal protection of the monument in the national interest, in situ and as far as possible in the state it has come down to us. Scheduled monuments have an

intrinsic value as monuments, not related to any concept of active use. It is the value of the monument to the nation's heritage, in terms set out in the section on Scheduling in Chapter 2 of SHEP, that is the primary consideration in determining applications for scheduled monument consent.

3.16. Works on scheduled monuments should therefore normally be the minimum level of intervention that is consistent with conserving what is culturally significant in a monument.

3.18. Scheduled monument consent applications must be considered in terms of the cultural significance of the monument and the impact that the proposals would have upon this cultural significance. The more important particular features of the monument are to its cultural significance, the greater will be the case against interventions which modify these features.

3.20. Where change is proposed, it should be carefully considered, based on good authority, sensitively designed, properly planned and executed, and where appropriate in the context of an individual monument, reversible.

b) Assessment

The works involve the installation of a historic fishing vessel and interpretation panel (in retrospect).

The physical impact of these works on the preservation of archaeological deposits associated with the monument is likely to be negligible. The ground level at the location of the historic fishing vessel has been built up by approximately 2m when the public sewer was installed in the late 1970s, and this depth of build-up can be seen in section to the west of the application site where the sewer meets the sea. The support posts for the historic fishing vessel are set at a depth of approximately 0.8m into this built-up ground, and as such the likelihood for impact upon buried archaeological deposits associated with the rampart that might lie preserved beneath the sewer and built-up ground is negligible. The impact of the foundation pad for the interpretation panel is also negligible.

The works do constitute an addition to the monument, and as such there is an impact on the way that the ramparts are understood and appreciated and on the setting of the monument. The historic fishing vessel sits directly in front of a long stretch of well-preserved rampart, and as such there is likely to be an impact on the way that the rampart is appreciated when viewed from the sea.

c) Other material considerations, including impact of the works on Protected Species and Places

No impact on Protected Species and Places considered likely – see PP&S assessment.

d) Conclusion

Whilst the works are not for the benefit of the long term preservation of the monument, they are unlikely to impact upon buried archaeological deposits, and therefore it is the visual impact of the addition to the monument that requires consideration.

Whilst the physical impact on archaeological deposits is likely to be negligible, the impact on the setting of the monument and the way that the monument is understood and appreciated is more tangible. Given the scale of the rampart, the historic fishing vessel is largely screened in outward views from the upper levels of the monument, so it is the inward views from the north and looking along the face of the rampart where the impact will be greatest. In light of para 3.18, given the nature of the addition (a historic fishing vessel) and the nature of its surroundings (a prominent fort around which a fishing village has developed), we consider that the historic fishing vessel will not detract from the monument and its setting in a way and to an extent that significantly harms the cultural significance of the monument.

Therefore to works can be considered the minimum level of intervention that is consistent with conserving what is culturally significant in a monument. The works do result in a minimal impact and this can be justified under SHEP 3.16.

6. Recommended decision

The works proposed are considered acceptable in meeting the terms of national policy for scheduled monuments, and also accounting for other material considerations.

I recommend consent is **granted without conditions**.

7. Conditions

None.

8. Approval

Officer	Oliver Lewis	Date	03/03/2016
Approved by	George Findlater	Date	03/03/2016

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Scheduling document (annotated)
- Description of works
- Photograph of headland