

## Case information

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	201600170		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Turnberry Castle		
<b>Index no</b>	M6183	<b>Grid Ref</b>	NS196072 219600.0000 607200.0000
<b>Date of Application</b>	14 April 2016	<b>Application Received</b>	15 April 2016
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Turf stripping and re-excavation and extension of previous archaeological evaluation trenches within lighthouse enclosure		

### 1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends approval of proposals to remove the turf and top 10cm-15cm of topsoil throughout the lighthouse enclosure and re-open and extend earlier archaeological evaluation trenches in order to assess the depths of archaeological deposits and inform future works.

### 2. Background

Turnberry Castle consists of the remains of a large masonry castle, possibly on the site of a twelfth-century or earlier structure, occupying a promontory, with wider views over the nearby coastline and adjacent seaways. The castle's association with the Bruce family, and particularly the widely held assumption that it was Robert the Bruce's birthplace and/or childhood home, substantially raises its cultural significance. The centre of the castle was largely truncated by the erection of the B Listed lighthouse and associated structures. These are contained within a formal enclosure. The raised ground immediately surrounding the lighthouse drops to create a flat open area on the seaward side, this gives the impression of terracing.

The lighthouse is currently under renovation and it is intended to accommodate luxury accommodation and activities relating to the adjacent golf course there. It is also intended to use the lighthouse enclosure and an outdoor entertainment and events area. Ultimately, the applicant hopes to pave over the enclosure, enlarge and formalise the upper terrace, and improve and widen the stair linking the upper and lower terraces.

Pre-application discussions have emphasised that whilst the inside of the lighthouse enclosure makes little contribution to the ability to appreciate and understand the layout and character of the castle, and thus makes little contribute its wider cultural significance, any impacts on underlying deposits associated with the castle should be avoided.

### **3. Proposals**

---

- Turf stripping
- Re-opening and extension of previous archaeological evaluation trenches.

The works are to be monitored and a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), prepared by an established and reputable commercial archaeological company, Northlight Heritage, has been submitted which outlines the methodology for the works. Northlight Heritage would also undertake the works specified.

The current proposals are to remove the turf and 10cm-15cm of topsoil in order to assess if the proposed paving levels are achievable and to assess the nature and depth of archaeological deposits in order to inform the final scheme.

The turf and topsoil are to be removed by mechanical excavator under an archaeological watching brief. The WSI is clear that should any unanticipated in situ medieval or earlier archaeological deposits be encountered, the work will cease and discussions with Historic Environment Scotland take place.

It is proposed that the re-opening of the previous excavation trenches will include mechanical excavation of upper levels, which have already been disturbed, and hand excavation of lower levels, closer to surviving archaeological deposits, in order that any impacts can be avoided. The purpose is to characterise the nature of surviving deposits and ascertain their depth.

The WSI suggests that this trench will be extended to encompass the full width and depth of the proposed stair. However, as this is an evaluation to inform future works, it has been agreed in discussions with the applicant subsequent to the application, that the trench will only be extended lengthways to cover the stair area.

A recording and reporting strategy has been included within the WSI.

### **4. Representations received**

---

No representations were received.

### **5. Report**

---

#### **a) Policy considerations**

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

*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.

3.20. 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 (see Note 3.10); 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 turf removal should be confined to modern ground build-up associated with the lighthouse. Archaeological monitoring should ensure that work will stop at any unexpected castle deposits.

If conducted in accordance with the WSI the reopening of the earlier excavations should have no impact upon in situ archaeological deposits associated with the castle. The results will help better understand the castle and inform future management.

The extension of the trench will disturb new ground. It is proposed that the modern overburden would be removed by machine and that only the lower levels would be hand excavated. As this is new ground, the depth and presence of underlying archaeological structures and deposits is unclear. Hand excavation would allow for much more accurate control, so it a condition to enforce this is specified below.

The WSI proposes that the full width of the proposed stair area would be excavated. As these excavations are intended to be evaluation, to inform future works, this would be excessive at this stage. It has been agreed with the applicant that the extension would be more limited, but this has not been confirmed in writing. A suspensive condition has therefore been added below.

Although the intention of the excavations is to clean, record and characterise castle deposits without excavation, the wording of the WSI is slightly ambiguous, as to which deposits should remain untouched. Consequently, a condition has been added to clarify where works should stop.

The WSI does not contain a reporting timetable, so this also has been added as a suspensive condition.

Likewise, the WSI makes no provision for reinstatement of the evaluation trench. A related suspensive condition has been added.

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

The works fall within two SSSIs. SNH have been consulted and they have indicated that the works would have minimal consequences.

**d) Conclusion**

If the works are undertaken as specified as outlined in the WSI there would be limited impact on subsurface archaeological deposits.

As this phase of works is to evaluate the site and inform future works, the proposals to excavate the full area of the proposed stair seems excessive at this stage. It is therefore proposed to limit to the size of the trench through conditions.

The WSI also allows for mechanical removal of modern ground make-up in the extension of the evaluation trench. No evidence of the depth of deposits has been presented and

therefore mechanical removal would not allow for sufficient control of excavations and could result on unintended impacts to be incurred. Consequently, a condition has been added to ensure sufficient controls are in place, through the use of hand excavation techniques.

Whilst pre-application discussions have indicated that the intention of the excavations is to avoid impacts on archaeological deposits associated with the castle, the wording in the WSI is unclear. A condition has been added for clarification.

The WSI does not allow for reinstatement. As the resulting works will not follow immediately, the evaluation trench should be backfilled in order to prevent collapse and protect any exposed deposits. Reinstatement has therefore been implemented through the addition of a related condition.

Whilst the WSI says that the resulting report will be submitted to Historic Environment Scotland, a timeframe has not been supplied. In order to ensure timeous reporting a condition has been added.

Provided the works outlined in the WSI, amended by the above conditions, are adhered to the works should have a minimum impact on the monument's fabric and cultural significance. The results should also inform future works and improve management of the castle's archaeological remains. The works, therefore, would not conflict with para 3.14 of SHEP.

Despite the clarifications recommended above the WSI is largely well thought through and the works well considered, this meets SHEP paras 3.20 and 3.22.

## **6. Recommended decision**

---

Subject to compliance with the schedule of conditions, 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, subject to the conditions detailed below.**

## **7. Conditions**

---

1. No works shall take place until the length and location of the extension of the previous evaluation trenches have been agreed in writing by Historic Environment Scotland.

*Reason: to help minimise any impacts on archaeological structures and deposits and to maintain an accurate record of works on the monument.*

2. All excavations to extend the previous evaluation trench shall be undertaken by hand. No machine excavation shall take place to assist in extending the previous evaluation trench unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by Historic Environment Scotland.

*Reason: to ensure sufficient monitoring and controls are in place in order to minimise impacts on subsurface structures and/or deposits*

3. All work shall be confined to modern ground levelling deposits. There shall be no disturbance of any in situ subsurface archaeological deposits associated with the castle, its construction, use or occupation.

*Reason: to minimise impacts on subsurface structures and/or deposits associated with the castle.*

4. Within one week of the completion of works on site a geotextile membrane shall be placed at the base of the previous evaluation trench and the trench shall be backfilled to the level of the surrounding contours unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by Historic Environment Scotland.

*Reason: to help protect and minimise impacts on subsurface structures and/or deposits*

1. Within three weeks of the completion of works on site, two copies of the Data Structure Report shall be submitted to Historic Environment Scotland.

*Reason: to maintain an accurate record of works on the monument.*

## **8. Approval**

---

<b>Officer</b>	<b>John Raven</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>22/04/2016</b>
<b>Approved by</b>	<b>George Findlater</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>26/04/2016</b>

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

- 1) Written Scheme of Investigation
- 2) Layout Plan and Section