

## Case information

---

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	201507100		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Easdale, slate quarries and associated workings		
<b>Index no</b>	M10355	<b>Grid Ref</b>	
<b>Date of Application</b>	06 February 2016	<b>Application Received</b>	15 February 2016
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Cutting back vegetation and filling wet path areas using loose slate quarry waste, moving larger loose stones within 5m of their original location, as specified in the path maintenance methodology.		

### 1. Summary recommendation

---

This report recommends that consent be granted.

### 2. Background

---

The monument comprises the remains of the slate quarries, working bays and associated industrial buildings and other infrastructure. It represents a well-preserved industrial landscape resulting from the extraction and working of slate, especially in the 18th and 19th centuries

The applicant has undertaken pre-application consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) to assist in developing proposals that may be appropriate for the monument.

### 3. Proposals

---

#### Consented works

Cutting back vegetation and filling wet path areas using loose slate quarry waste, moving larger loose stones within 5m of their original location, as specified in the path maintenance methodology.

## **4. Description of works**

---

Works would include the removal of limited amounts of loose quarry waste from spoil heaps throughout the scheduled area using hand tools, for the purpose of maintaining the paths and routeways around the island. Larger loose stones may be moved to within 5m of their original location to discourage access to areas where there are health and safety concerns. No more than 0.5m<sup>3</sup> of material shall be removed from the same place at any one time unless agreed in writing beforehand with HES and mechanical excavators will not be used unless agreed in writing beforehand with HES. Material shall not be removed from structures. The proposed works would continue for 10 years, but would be reviewed with HES after 5 years to ensure any impacts on significant features are identified and mitigated.

## **5. Representations received**

---

No representations were received.

## **6. Report**

---

### **a) Policy considerations**

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

AMAAA 1979, Part 1 Section 2:  
control of works affecting an ancient monument.

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy (2011):  
3.4. Scheduled monument consent is required for any works that would demolish, destroy, damage, remove, repair, alter or add to the monument or to carry out any flooding or tipping on the monument. It is a criminal offence to carry out any of these works without consent.

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.

3.19. 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.

#### **b) Assessment**

The proposals would involve removal of very limited amounts of loose quarry waste from spoil heaps to repair paths and routeways. The top 30cm of all modern paths were excluded from the designation at the time of scheduling, and the need to maintain these paths is accepted. The impact on the spoil heaps from the removal of very limited amounts of spoil by hand is likely to be negligible. Larger loose stones may also be moved within 5m of their original location, but there would be no removal of any material from structures (revetments, houses, buildings, enclosures, gardens). These safeguards should ensure that there is no significant impact on structures or any other important features or deposits that form part of the scheduled monument.

Overall, it is very unlikely that the works proposed would have an appreciable impact on the cultural significance of the monument. The proposals appear to have been carefully considered, sensitively designed and properly planned, and will follow a methodology that is appropriate for the site. In addition, it is likely that the proposed works would assist visitors to access the monument and enhance public appreciation and understanding of the monument.

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

The application site does not extend into any SSSI, SPA or SAC designation. National Biodiversity Network GIS data sets indicate no evidence for Protected Species in the relevant 100m grid squares.

#### **d) Conclusion**

The proposals would involve very limited disturbance to spoil heaps and the localised movement of loose larger stones that are not part of any structure. There

may be very small visual changes, but negligible impact on the cultural significance of the monument. This would therefore be consistent with SHEP para 3.18. The work would make the existing paths fit for purpose and the scheduling document excludes the top 30cm of all modern paths demonstrating an expectation that they would be maintained and repaired. The proposals appear to be carefully considered, sensitively designed and properly planned and should accord with SHEP para 3.20. They should also enhance public appreciation and understanding of the monument, by keeping access routes fit for purpose. Given that the proposals should have negligible impact on the cultural significance of the monument, there is no conflict with policy at SHEP para 3.16, which notes that interventions should normally be the minimum consistent with conserving what is culturally significant in a monument.

## **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.

## **7. Conditions**

---

Granted without conditions.

---

## **8. Approval**

---

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Richard Heawood</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>18/02/2016</b>
<b>Approved by</b>	<b>John Raven</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>18/02/2016</b>

## **Annex A – list of supporting documents**

Easdale SMC Method Statement