

## Case information

---

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	201508122		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Clickimin Broch, broch and settlement		
<b>Index no</b>	M90077	<b>Grid Ref</b>	HU464408 446400.0000 1140800.0000
<b>Date of Application</b>	29 March 2016	<b>Application Received</b>	29 March 2016
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Removal of turfed path and replacement with stone dust, coloured dusts used to demark features and some minor re-turfing. Works designed to address areas of erosion.		

### 1. Summary recommendation

---

This report recommends approval without conditions.

### 2. Background

---

Clickimin Broch is a complex archaeological monument, with evidence dating from the Bronze Age (around 1000 BC) through to the late Iron Age (around AD 500). The main elements are a small house and outbuilding of late Bronze Age date, an early Iron Age ring-fort, a middle Iron Age blockhouse and broch (with later alterations), a later Iron Age wheelhouse-type dwelling and several lesser foundations representing late Iron Age dwellings. The site is situated on a small rock knoll beside a shallow loch approached by a causeway. It has been the subject of early and extensive archaeological excavations followed by some reconstruction.

The monument is of national importance as one of the most comprehensively excavated examples of a late prehistoric defensive settlement. The reconstructed remains are an impressive example of a prehistoric settlement in an attractive location and a Property in Care.

The remains have been excavated to expose multiple phases of occupation and it is suggested that visitors find them difficult to 'read' and that this is exacerbated because there is inconsistent use of grass and gravel surfaces to distinguish between the interiors and exteriors of various structures. This inconsistency may also make management and maintenance more difficult.

The proposed works are primarily intended to improve the presentation of the site and increase understanding and appreciation among visitors. They have been subject to pre-application discussions and a draft application has been submitted to HMD for review.

### 3. Proposals

---

The proposals include several elements:

- **Interior surfaces**

Within three prehistoric dwellings to the west of the broch, turf would be removed and the underlying surface levelled before the laying of a new gravel surface. The depth of disturbance would be no greater than 100mm. The interiors of the structures would then be more clearly and consistently presented.

- **Exterior surfaces**

A 'roadway' running along the west edge of the broch is currently part gravel and part grass covered. It is proposed that the whole length of path should be re-surfaced with gravel of consistent appearance with other exterior surfaces.

In paved areas around the west and north of an earlier dwelling, vegetation would be removed by hand as necessary, paving slabs would be lifted to remove vegetation and to allow levelling of the ground below (using fine gravel where necessary). The paving slabs would be re-laid, as far as practicable, in the same locations as before.

Both activities would involve minor ground disturbance, with up to a maximum of 100mm excavated to provide a suitable foundation for the surfaces.

- **Presentation of hearths**

Extant hearths would be covered with red whin. Where paving is present around the hearths, this would be retained and vegetation removed using the same methodology as above. Associated ground disturbance would not extend deeper than 100mm.

- **Reburial of exposed stonework**

Exposed stonework or features which are *in-situ* but do not obviously relate to a known structure or that do not add to understanding the site would be turf-covered. This is intended to obscure elements that hinder visitor understanding. The affected areas are very limited in extent but it is anticipated that additional miscellaneous stones may be identified through the course of the proposed works. Any such would be dealt with on a case by case basis, in consultation with HES Cultural & Natural Resources and Heritage Management.

- **Reinstate turf on wall heads**

It is proposed that all structural walls (both internal and external) are capped with turf to protect and stabilise them. This work would involve no ground disturbance.

- **Erosion to rear of blockhouse**

The area to the rear and west of the blockhouse is suffering from erosion of turf. It is proposed that grass bars are installed to reinforce the ground and reduce further erosion. Strips of Caithness flagstone approximately 50mm wide and 100mm deep would be laid widthways across the affected area (lengths cut to fit the eroded area). Ground disturbance for the installation of the bars should not extend to a depth greater than 150mm.

### **Assessment of Archaeological Sensitivity and Impact**

The archaeological impact of the above works has been assessed using information provided by previous archaeological interventions. Where areas of high archaeological sensitivity have been identified (for example, areas known to have been left unexcavated during previous interventions) no ground disturbance or changes to the present management regime have been proposed.

The ground disturbance required for the proposed works set out above is assessed as likely to only involve the removal of turf and topsoil and so is not thought likely to impact on archaeological deposits. The affected surfaces are thought likely to have been created after earlier archaeological excavations.

### **Proposed Method**

Turf stripping within the interiors of the structures and the roadway would be undertaken by hand and with care by a member of HES MCU. In order to ensure the work is undertaken as specified, and in the unlikely event of any unexpected remains being encountered, a member of HES Cultural and Natural Resources with archaeological expertise would be present on site during ground breaking works, including the removal of turf within interiors, the lifting, weeding and levelling of the paved areas, and the installation of the grass bars.

If any archaeological features were encountered during any of the works, work would stop immediately. The features would be photographically recorded and the significance of the findings discussed with HES Heritage Management. If any further recording is deemed necessary, or any specific conservation methods appropriate, a short specification would be produced within 10 working days, and would be submitted and agreed with HES Heritage Management before work continued.

Following completion of on-site works the supervising member of HES CNR would produce a short report for distribution to HES Heritage Management and Conservation Group. The report would include a basic photographic record of the works and descriptive text; it would be submitted within 20 working days of completion of the works. Short reports would also be submitted to Discovery and Excavation Scotland and the OASIS database. The archive would be deposited in the National Monuments of Scotland.

## **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:

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

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy (2011):

1.28. Scottish Ministers are committed to protecting and managing Scotland's rich and diverse historic environment in a sustainable way so that current and future generations can understand, appreciate and benefit from it. Scottish Ministers have put in place, and will continue to support, a range of actions to achieve this.

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.

## **b) Assessment**

The works would involve limited ground disturbance. The archaeological sensitivity of the affected areas has been assessed and the proposed works are unlikely to have an adverse impact on any sub-surface archaeological remains or *in situ* surfaces. If any unexpected remains are encountered then controls have been put in place to ensure their identification, recording and preservation.

The work also involves re-covering some elements of stonework that do not contribute to a visitor's understanding of the site. This and proposed re-surfacing has been designed to create greater consistency in the presentation of structures across the site. The works should therefore result in improved presentation of a complex monument. Greater consistency of surfaces should also have a positive visual impact.

Covering small areas of exposed stonework that do not contribute to an understanding of the site, the removal of vegetation around paved areas and the turf capping of drystone walls should be beneficial to the monument's long term preservation.

The works should avoid adverse impacts on the cultural significance of the monument. They appear to have been carefully considered, sensitively designed and properly planned. They should result in an improvement in the monument's appearance that would assist appreciation and understanding of its significance. Some elements of the work should also assist in the monument's long-term preservation.

## **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 work would allow an improved understanding and appreciation of the monument, which may be considered to accord with SHEP 1.28.

The proposals would involve relatively limited disturbance, which is not likely to disturb *in situ* archaeological remains. Once completed the works should have a beneficial visual impact on the monument. Some elements of the work would contribute to the preservation of the monument. Excavations may uncover unexpected remains and the method includes suitable provision for dealing with such an eventuality and ensuring the preservation of such remains.

It can be concluded that the works should not have an adverse effect on the overall cultural significance of the monument. Hence the proposals accord with SHEP para 3.18 and are not contrary to SHEP 3.14 and 3.16.

The works have been accompanied by an assessment of their potential impacts and appear to have been carefully designed in accord with SHEP 3.20.

## **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>Simon Stronach</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>12/04/2016</b>
<b>Approved by</b>	<b>John Raven</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>22/04/2016</b>

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

Clickimin: Proposal for new grounds maintenance and site presentation plan  
Drawing 566-077-59 Rev B: Ground Texture Re-interpretation SMCP Application