



Case Information

Reference/Case ID		300018457	
Scheduled Monument	Huntly Castle		
Index no	SM90165	Grid ref	NJ 53200 40700
Date application validated	07 September 2016		
Summary of proposed works	Sika Wallhead and conservation works		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for the replacement of the lead wallhead capping with lead detailing and SIKa liquid membrane be granted without conditions.

2. Background

The historic environment asset and its cultural significance

Huntly Castle is a highly complex multi-period castle with at least three separate phases of castle construction. The castle is located at an important river junction and strategic route way in to Morayshire. The first castle on the site, the Peel of Strathbogie, was constructed by Duncan the earl of Fife in the 12th C as a motte-and-bailey earth and timber castle. This was replaced by a stone castle in the 15th C, though much of what is visible today relates to later phases of construction and refurbishment carried out in the 16th and early 17th century. Today the site is dominated by the red sandstone, magnificent southern facade of the later castle.

The proposed conservation works

The proposed works are in response to the deterioration of the stonework of the southern facade, the loss of this capping has increased the water ingress in the stonework, these works are designed to help prevent such deterioration occurring. The previous lead capping was removed from the site as the result of vandalism and theft. The proposed works include the replacement of the stolen capping with lead detailing in the highly visible areas and SIKa liquid membrane in the less obtrusive areas.



The applicant

The castle is cared for by HES Conservation Directorate as a Property in Care, and it is operated as a popular paid-for visitor attraction. Recent works to the monument have focused on improving public access and signage.

Pre-application discussions

The applicant has discussed the proposed works with HES Heritage Directorate, and the current application accords with the outcome of these discussions.

3. Proposals

Replacement of the lead wallhead capping with lead detailing and SIKA liquid membrane

The proposals comprise:

- The replacement of the stolen lead wallhead capping with lead detailing in the visible areas and SIKA liquid membrane capping to be used in the less visible areas.

4. Representations received

No representations were received.

5. Report

a) Policy considerations

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

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

Part 1 Section 2: Control of works affecting scheduled monuments

Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement June 2016

3.14. A monument is included 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 this policy statement that is the primary consideration in determining applications for scheduled monument consent.

3.15. Monuments are subject to decay and the threat of destruction, from natural and human causes. Conservation work is normally needed to prolong the life of a monument, but there is a risk that this can be so invasive that it irreversibly modifies the monument's character and affects the special interest or features that made the monument important in the first place.

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.

3.17. As each monument will require treatment specific to its individual nature, characteristics, significance and needs, any proposed change to it must be fully and explicitly justified.

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.

3.19. Extensive intervention will only be allowed where it is clearly necessary to secure the longer-term preservation of the monument, or where it will clearly generate public benefits of national importance which outweigh the impact on the national cultural significance of the monument. Such public benefits could come from, for example, interventions which make public access to scheduled monuments easier, or assist public understanding, or will produce economic benefits once the works are completed.

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.

3.22. Where consent for the range of works set out in paragraph 3.4 is granted, conditions are normally applied to ensure the works are undertaken in an appropriate manner. Common requirements are:

- a. the use of appropriate assessment methodologies to determine the full impact of any proposed management, use or development;
- b. the avoidance of irreversible change particularly wherever its effects cannot be adequately assessed;



- c. that where change is necessary, strategies should be adopted to mitigate its impact and limit intervention;
- d. that the management and execution of alteration, including remedial work, is sympathetic to the historic character;
- e. that appropriate skills and techniques, materials and construction techniques are specified where appropriate;
- f. that an appropriate level of record is made before, during and after any work and deposited in local and national archives, and, where appropriate, published;
- g. that it is possible, on close inspection, to differentiate new work from old particularly on masonry structures;
- h. that any archaeological excavation or other intrusive investigation should be based upon a detailed research strategy, with adequate resources, using appropriately skilled and experienced archaeologists with a satisfactory record of the completion and publication of projects; and
- i. that the design, planning and execution of works on scheduled monuments are undertaken by people with appropriate professional and craft qualifications, skills and experience.

b) Assessment

The proposed works include the replacement of the stolen capping with lead detailing in the highly visible areas and SIKa liquid membrane in the less obtrusive areas. The SIKa liquid membrane will involve the application of a liquid latex layer to a section of masonry on the top of the wallheads. A coat of SIKa liquid plastic will be painted onto this. The treatment will alter the appearance of the small area of the monument involved from visible masonry to a uniform coated surface similar to asphalt. The treated area will also prevent some water ingress and egress within the masonry, affecting the moisture levels in the structure. The areas visible from ground level will be capped with lead detailing. The use of the SIKa coating minimises disturbance to the masonry and is fully reversible. The SIKa membrane will remove the risk of future lead theft and given the minimum visibility of the SIKa membrane it will not detract from the cultural significance of the monument.

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

No impact on Protected Species and Places.

d) Conclusion

As an addition to the monument, the application should be viewed as works as set out in both Part 1 Section 2 of the AMAA Act 1979 and paragraph 3.4 of the policy statement.



I am content that the works will not have an adverse effect on the cultural significance of the monument, and that they represent the minimum necessary to minimise water penetration to the wallhead of the monument and reduce the threat to the sculpted elements from water-related problems. I therefore consider SHEP policy 3.16 is met.

The application is supported by a detailed stone conservator's report which lays out the reasoning behind the decision to undertake this course of action. The works will be carried out by experienced practitioners and are reversible. I therefore consider that SHEP policies 3.17 and 3.20 are met.

From the information provided with this application, and based on pre-application discussions with the applicant, further conditions as outlined in paragraph 3.22 to ensure the works are undertaken in an appropriate manner are not required.

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

No conditions have been attached to this decision.

8. Approval

Case officer	James Bruhn	Date	01 November 2016
Approved by	George Findlater	Date	01 November 2016

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Stone report
- Photos of view of wallhead from round tower
- Location Plan 429-165-315
- Drawing 429-165-317