Case information

Reference/Case ID	201507371

Scheduled Monument	Kinneil House, house and surrounding grounds		
Index no	M90189	**Grid Ref**	NS982805 298200.0000 680500.0000

Date of Application	24 February 2016	**Application Received**	25 February 2016
Summary of proposed works	New steel doorway through previously blocked doorway in NE Palace Block		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that consent be granted.

2. Background

This monument comprises a 15th-16th century tower with an associated palace block, which was much altered in the 17th century. The former surrounding gardens are included and the line of the Antonine Wall passes through the south part of the scheduled area. The tower and palace are properties in care.

The monument is of national importance because, despite its partial demolition, it is a well-preserved example of a defensive tower gradually converted for more palatial living in the 17th century. It also contains very rare and well-preserved examples of Renaissance painted wall decoration. A building in the grounds is associated with James Watt and the development of the steam engine.

SMC for reopening a blocked doorway at first floor level in the stair of the palace block was granted in February 2015 (Case 201407121). It was originally planned to secure the re-opened doorway with a timber frame and door. However, when the door was re-opened it was evident that the original dressings, including the lintel, had been robbed out or damaged, and the insertion of a timber frame was not viable. The current application is to insert a steel door and frame instead. It is also proposed to create new timber steps to accommodate the change in level from the door to the existing internal landing.

The re-opened doorway allows access into the currently roofed parts of the palace block from former rooms, which are currently unroofed and so external spaces. The application has been discussed with HES Heritage Management prior to submission.

3. Proposals

Consented works
Create a new metal door and frame in a recently unblocked doorway in the palace block, with internal access provided by a short stretch of freestanding timber steps.

Description of works
Missing parts of the re-opened doorway surrounds would be replaced with carefully cut new parts of stones to match existing courses and to maximise retention of original stones. Any remaining voids would be blocked with stone pinnings to match existing profiles. A new stone threshold would be fixed in place. The door frame would be anchored by means of steel threaded rods (five each side) and fixed a minimum of 200mm into existing masonry joints.

The number and depth of the rods required has been assessed by a HES Conservation Directorate Civil Engineer and their impact minimised through design. In particular:

- The rods would be inserted into joints in the masonry core of the wall.
- Normally there would be two rods per fixing location but in this case only one is proposed.
- The rods are the minimum length and at the maximum spacing possible while ensuring that the frame is securely fixed and that no damage would occur to the masonry if the door slams shut.

The holes for the rods would be drilled and the rods fixed in place with chemical resin. The rods would secure a hollow steel box section frame, fabricated to fit the opening. Stone pinnings and dry packed mortar infill would be used to infill between the frame's upper plate and the underside of the current opening.

A door would be fabricated from steel plate welded to a box section frame. The door would be finished with gloss paint 'HES Green'. Masonry around the frame would be rendered to match existing and as required (wet dash render externally and hardwall lime plaster internally).

Freestanding timber steps would be placed internally to facilitate access. A hook and eye latch would be fixed to an existing, external wall to secure the door in an open position when required.

4. Representations received

No representations have been received.

5. 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 the fixing of a steel door into an unblocked and original doorway. The door is required to secure access to the interior from the unroofed section of the palace block. It would prevent unauthorised access and maintain the structure in a wind and watertight state. Hence, the proposal would assist in the long term preservation of the scheduled monument.

The proposed methodology would include replacing lost stonework around the re-opened doorway and drilling into existing fabric to fix rods that would support the door frame. Drilling would be into existing joints (to minimise impacts) and restricted to the minimum number and depth of holes required to provide adequate support. On completion the faces of the surrounding stonework would be rendered to match existing.

The proposed works would cause minimal disturbance to the fabric of the monument. Repaired areas of stonework would be rendered to match existing. The resulting new, steel door would be a new insertion, but clearly readable as a modern addition. Consequently, the door is assessed as unlikely to have an appreciable impact on the cultural significance of the monument. By preventing unauthorised access and making the structure wind and watertight it would contribute to the long term preservation of the monument. The proposals appear to have been carefully considered to minimise impacts.

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

The application site does not lie close to 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 the repair of stonework around an original doorway. Drilled holes into the surrounding fabric would be restricted to existing joints and would extend at least 200mm into original fabric. The drilled holes would support the minimum number of rods needed to support a steel frame and door. Following completion the surrounding stonework would be rendered to match existing. This should cause negligible impact on the cultural significance of the monument, which accords with SHEP para 3.18. The proposals appear to be carefully considered, based on good authority, sensitively designed and properly planned and should accord with SHEP para 3.20. By preventing unauthorised access and maintaining the structure in a wind and watertight state the insertion of the door should also contribute to the long term preservation of the monument (according with SHEP 3.14) and 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

Officer	**Simon Stronach**	**Date**	**11/03/2016**
Approved by	**John Raven**	**Date**	14/3/16

Annex A – list of supporting documents
D.01.SMC Proposed Steel Access Door (Drawing)
D.02.SMC Proposed Timber Access Steps