# Scheduled Monument Consent:
Report on Handling

## Case information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Reference/Case ID** | 201601928 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Scheduled Monument** | Kilbride Chapel, old church and graveyard, Lamlash, Arran | | |
| **Index no** | M6639 | **Grid Ref** | NS032322 203200.0000 632200.0000 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Date of Application** | 11 July 2016 | **Application Received** | 11 July 2016 |
| **Summary of proposed works** | Vegetation removal, re-building collapsed sections of wall, re-pointing, rough racking/soft topping, removal of modern brick structure, rotating and renewing support to memorial and structural stabilisation. | | |

## 1. Summary recommendation

Because the works would consolidate the monument and have been designed to preserve its cultural significance, this report recommends approval is granted. Consent would be granted with one condition relating to notification of the timing of the works to HES.

## 2. Background

The monument includes the walls of a small and roofless church and part of the burial ground in which it stands. It was first documented in 1357 and might have been built in the previous century. It was dedicated to St Bride and was the parish church for the east of Arran.

The church measures approximately 20m east-west by 8m wide. The surviving walls stand to approximately 3m high. There are three doors and three windows in the south wall; some now blocked. There is a window in the north wall.

An assessment of the walls' phasing has been undertaken in advance of the application. There have been several phases of partial reconstruction. The earliest 13th-14th Century phase survives best in the north and east wall. A monogrammed stone with the date 1618 survives within a rebuilt upper section of the east wall and is likely to relate to a major refurbishment of the church. A collapse and rebuild of the east gable was also recorded in the 1800s.

The west elevation is thought likely to have been largely rebuilt in the early 17th Century. The condition of the west gable is very poor, particularly at the corners

where there has been some collapse. The date of the corners is ambiguous and there may have been considerable 'washing out' of mortar here. The absence of mortar makes dating difficult and there is no apparent evidence as to whether these were areas of dry-stone construction, clay or lime bonding.

Much of the lower parts of the south elevation are of indeterminate date but likely to relate to alterations and rebuilding undertaken from the 14th to 18th Century. The upper parts of the wall and the southeast corner are thought to have been rebuilt in the late 18th Century.

The interior of the church is divided into two unequal portions by a cross wall. Within the west part are two possible aumbries (recesses) and a possible piscine set at a similar level.

Within the east part of the church are several grave slabs standing on end and presented on plinths; one upside down. The latter is a significant medieval grave slab and it is proposed to rotate it to the correct orientation as part of the works. There are a number of finely carved post-Reformation headstones in the burial ground.

The church ceased to be used for worship in the later 1700s and was adapted for use as a mausoleum. This included the removal of the roof, construction of the cross wall noted above and the insertion of doors and windows. In the mid-20th century a grave-diggers' hut was built from brick on a concrete raft within the church.

The scheduled area is defined by, and includes, the walls of the older portion of the burial ground. The monument is of national importance because it is the only medieval church or chapel on Arran to survive as an upstanding monument. The standing and sub-surface remains of the church and burial ground have the potential to provide evidence for the development of medieval ecclesiastical architecture, medieval and post-medieval burial practices and sculpture.

The church is suffering from extensive erosion. The walls have been considerably weakened by the penetration of vegetation roots, particularly ivy, and through water ingress. This has led to a recent collapse at the west end of the north wall. Without intervention this erosion would continue with further collapse extremely likely.

The proposed works have been initiated by the monument's owner (North Ayrshire Council). The works are intended to consolidate the structure and ensure its long term preservation.

The application documents include a Project Specification and drawings prepared by the project's Conservation Architect and Structural Engineer. The proposed works have been informed by a Phasing and Significance assessment undertaken by Rathmell Archaeology. The works would be accompanied by archaeological mitigation and this has been set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

The works have been discussed at a site meeting with Historic Environment Scotland Heritage Management (HES HM). Draft proposal documents were submitted and commented on by HES HM. The application documents have been amended in light of those comments. Further clarification on certain aspects of the proposed works was provided during the application process (email from Robert Potter & Partners 26 July 2016).

## 3. Proposals

The proposed works are described briefly below. In summary, those works that require consent comprise:

- **Vegetation Removal**
- **Masonry Repairs**
- **Wall Head Consolidation**
- **Removal of Ferrous Fixtures and Fixings**
- **Structural Support**
- **Remedial works to Memorials and Gravestones**

They are described in detail within a Project Specification and on drawings provided by the Conservation Architect (Robert Potter & Partners) and the Structural Engineer (Harley Haddow Consulting Engineers).

**Vegetation Removal**
Vegetation would be cut back, treated with appropriate herbicide and left to decay. The state of the vegetation would be periodically checked until such time as it had decayed sufficiently to allow safe removal. This may require repeated treatment.

Stems would be removed carefully by hand. On areas of loose masonry ivy mats are often keeping masonry sections in place. Therefore withered ivy would be left on the wall until conservation work on that respective section was being undertaken.

Temporary masonry supports would be installed to affected areas prior to removing vegetation. These would not be fixed into masonry or mortar and propping would not come into direct contact with masonry.

Vegetation removal would not commence without attendant consolidation by an experienced stonemason. It is anticipated that some dismantling of masonry around large roots would be required and this would involve the removal of the root and resetting the original stonework. This is described further below.

**Masonry Repairs**
Roots would be removed by hand taking care not to destabilise walling or affect historic features as far as possible.

Down-taking would only be undertaken where absolutely necessary, for example to remove deeply embedded roots and when agreed with the Structural Engineer. The likely extent of required down-taking has been defined on drawings provided by Robert Potter & Partners.

Prior to any down-taking, a detailed photographic and dimensional survey would be undertaken of affected areas. The stones would be numbered in French chalk or lime to facilitate accurate rebuilding. All dismantled masonry would be reconstructed to match the original arrangement following removal of all roots.

The mortar used in rebuilding would be to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and the specific mixes have been agreed during pre-application discussions. Sample panels of each mix would be provided for approval, as set out below.

Existing fallen masonry would be sorted for reinstatement where possible. Stones would not be removed from site without consent from HES. Areas would be re-built only where the original construction and arrangement could be accurately determined from historical photographs or archaeological investigations. Photographs of the north-west corner of the church prior to its collapse, and where rebuilding would certainly be required, have been supplied by the Structural Engineer.

A mid 20th-Century gravediggers' brick-built hut within the church would be carefully dismantled. The concrete slab it is built on would be retained.

There are areas of inappropriate cementitious repair in the structure. These would be carefully removed using a chisel and drill where doing so would not damage the surrounding stone.

The structure would be re-pointed. All loose, friable and defective mortar would be raked out using hand tools to approximately twice the width of the joint or until a sound mortar face was reached. Sound original lime mortar would not be removed.

The mortar used in re-pointing would be to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and the specific mixes have been agreed during pre-application discussions. Sample panels of each mix would be provided for approval, as set out below.

Grouting would only be undertaken as a last resort and subject to the agreement of the Conservation Architect and Historic Environment Scotland. Where investigation of the walls revealed voids in the core a gravity lime grout would be introduced through existing voids.

Grouting mortar would be to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and the specific mixes have been agreed during pre-application discussions. Sample panels of each mix would be provided for approval, as set out below.

**Wall Head Consolidation**
Wall heads and other potential sources of water penetration would be consolidated before pointing. After vegetation was removed and areas of fallen masonry sorted there would be a detailed, non-intrusive survey to determine whether any missing cornice stones could be reinstated. Stones would only to be reinstated where their original position could be accurately determined.

Cornice bedding and pointing mortar would be to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and the specific mixes have been agreed during pre-application discussions. Sample panels of each mix would be provided for approval, as set out below.

Any existing turf and sedum on wall heads would be removed and set aside for re-use. It would be supplemented with local turf (taken from outside the scheduled monument) as required. Voids in the wall head would be filled and the wall head would be capped using lime mortar to a specification provided by the Scottish Lime Centre.

A bentonite clay/sand layer would be laid to create a concave profile, and two layers of turf (the bottom layer turned upside down) secured with timber pegs or stainless steel pins fixed into masonry joints together with a pitch biodegradable mesh. Sedum plug plants would be set into the upper layer of turf. The top layer of turf and sedum plugs would be installed within the growing season and suitably watered until established.

Where rough racking is to be undertaken the wall heads would be checked for voiding and grouted where necessary using lime mortar to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and the specific mixes have been agreed during pre-application discussions. Sample panels of each mix would be provided for approval, as set out below.

The wall head would be shaped to assist the shedding of rainwater with fallen undressed random rubble taken from the immediate vicinity. All sloping and horizontal wall head surfaces would be rough racked using a mortar to a Scottish Lime Centre Specification and subject to the approval of Historic Environment Scotland and the Scottish Lime Centre Trust. Sample panels would be provided for approval, as set out below.

Imported compatible sandstone to a specification provided by the British Geological Survey may also be used.

**Removal of Ferrous Fixings and Fixtures**
All existing ferrous fixings and fixtures would be removed, including a ferrous gate.

**Structural Supports**
Structural support work would be undertaken in accordance with recommendations by the project Structural Engineer and as set out on drawings that accompany the application. They comprise the fixing of Helifix screwed rods at several locations.

They would be fitted into stone coursing at vertical cracks to provide additional support.

**Remedial works to Memorials and Gravestones**
Memorials and gravestones within the immediate vicinity of down taking or scaffolding would be protected. Protective wood frames would be self-supporting and not fixed into the item being protected.

Where it is necessary to move memorial stones to facilitate consolidation, their position would be accurately recorded so they could be reinstated.

Memorial stones in the immediate vicinity of the church would be inspected by the Structural Engineer for signs of failure or collapse. Where required, and subject to the approval of Historic Environment Scotland, stainless steel or phosphor bronze fixings would be used to ensure their stability.

With regard to the memorial noted to be upside down in the east end of the church (M14). The ferrous restraint fixed to it would be carefully removed and the stone rotated 180$^{o}$ to the correct orientation. It would be fixed with new stainless steel restraints. This approach has been informed by comments by HES Conservation Group.

**Sample Panels**
Sample panels (measuring 1m$^{2}$) of all mortar mixes would be made available for approval prior to proceeding with remaining sections. A 1m linear sample of rough racking and soft topping would also be provided. Allowance has been made for two comparison pointing samples.

Samples panels would be carried out on surrounding cemetery walls, not within the scheduled monument, and subject to approval from North Ayrshire Council. They would be provided immediately upon commencement of Phase One vegetation removal in order that these could be inspected by the Conservation Architect and Historic Environment Scotland for approval.

**Interpretation Panels**
Allowance has been made for two free-standing interpretive boards with geo-textile material at their base. Details regarding the boards are not available at present, including proposed locations. If they are proposed to be located within the scheduled monument, details would be submitted to HES and their installation subject to HES approval.

**Archaeological Works**
The application has been accompanied by a Written Scheme of Investigation produced by Rathmell Archaeology that sets out the archaeological works that would accompany the consolidation.

The work would be undertaken in accordance with industry best practice and appropriate standards and guidance.

The WSI includes for archaeological monitoring of any ground breaking work in the scheduled monument (**Note**: none such is currently proposed and hence would not be considered as receiving consent).

The WSI also includes for monitoring alterations to the structure's fabric. In particular, it sets out a method for monitoring down-taking in a structured manner that reflects the potential significance of the affected fabric.

This significance has been defined in a Phasing and Significance document produced by Rathmell Archaeology and accompanying the application. It is also illustrated on a series of drawings produced by Robert Potter & Partners, and submitted in support of the application.

The WSI also includes for the inspection and recording of all faces of masonry exposed by the initial removal of vegetation and prior to consolidation. The provision of archaeological monitoring of the sorting of fallen masonry and supervision of rebuilding to ensure no loss of historic detail has been confirmed in separate correspondence (email from Robert Potter & Partners 26 July 2016).

The results of the work would be set out in a technical report (Data Structure Report) within 4 weeks of the completion of site works. The content and distribution of that report has been set out in detail and complies with industry standards.

HES HM would make the final determination as to whether the results of the work warranted further research, analysis and reporting. Any such works would be set out in a design produced by Rathmell Archaeology and accompanying the technical report.

## 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:

**Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979**

Part 1 Section 2 - Control of works affecting an ancient monument.

**Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, June 2016 (policy statement)**

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;
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;
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 monument comprises the standing remains of a medieval church. That the remains survive as an upstanding structure is a key reason why it is considered of national importance.

Invasive vegetation and the effects of weathering have weakened the walls and this has recently caused collapse of part of the structure. Without intervention the structure would undergo further collapse and its significance would be diminished.

The component parts of the proposed works are assessed below.

**Vegetation Removal**
Invasive roots are damaging the structure. The proposed works would cut and kill the vegetation is such a way as to allow the roots to decay gradually over a period of time. The roots would then be removed carefully with as little disturbance to the surrounding structure as possible.

The removal of vegetation would be beneficial for the structure's preservation and the proposals would achieve this with the minimum of disturbance.

**Masonry Repairs**
Existing areas of collapse would be re-built to match the previous build using photographic records. The removal of roots may require further areas of rebuild. The extent of likely down-taking has been illustrated and would be minimised to where it would be necessary to restore structural integrity.

Re-building would re-use existing masonry as far as possible, or a suitable replacement sandstone where required. The re-building would be done to match the former appearance of the structure using existing information such as photographs. It would be informed by an understanding of the building's form and phasing. Any existing historic features or details would be preserved and the repairs would

reconstruct the building as close as possible to its relatively recent condition and preserve its ‘readability’. Mortars used would be appropriate.

It is proposed to remove a modern brick built structure within the church. The modern structure inhibits an appreciation of the layout and nature of the monument during its medieval and post-medieval phases of use. It does not make a significant contribution to the monument’s cultural significance of its own accord. The structure’s removal would therefore not substantively reduce the church’s significance.

Overall, the masonry repairs would remediate the recent destruction caused by invasive vegetation and collapse. Repairs would be restricted to those areas where it was strictly necessary and where the reconstruction would not be speculative. Hence it would be done in a way that would largely preserve the building’s cultural significance.

**Wall Head Consolidation**
The wall heads would be consolidated by rebidding loose copes, rough racking or soft topping as appropriate. This would prevent water ingress and would be done using suitable mortars and materials.

Consolidation of the wall heads would be beneficial to the monument’s preservation. It would be done in such a way as to have no detrimental impact on the monument’s cultural significance.

**Removal of Ferrous Fixtures and Fixings**
Existing ferrous fixtures and fixings in both the building and memorials are adversely affecting the monument’s preservation. These would be carefully removed. This would be beneficial for the monument’s long term preservation. It would remove some corroding fixtures, which are of some historic interest. However, this interest is related to late phases of the monument’s use. The monument’s primary significance relates to its use as a medieval church and hence the removal of later fittings would enhance the survival of those elements of the monument that primarily contribute to its significance. The ferrous fittings are actively corroding and would not be durable if left *in situ*. On balance, their removal is beneficial to the monument’s cultural significance.

**Structural Support**
Helifix rods would be inserted into stone coursing, so there would be no direct impact on historic stonework. They would provide structural support where required and would not be visible. They would represent an addition to the monument’s fabric but would ensure its long-term stability. Hence, they are concluded to be beneficial to the monument’s long term preservation while having minimal effect on its significance.

**Remedial works to Memorials and Gravestones**
The structural stability of memorials and gravestones would be checked and remedied where required. A significant medieval grave slab within the church would be rotated and re-fixed using appropriate stainless steel fittings.

With the exception of the currently upside-down grave slab, remedial works would return the monuments to their existing form. The rotation of the upside down slab would improve its 'readability'. The remedial works would improve the structural stability of the memorials.

It is concluded that the proposed remedial works to memorials and gravestones would be beneficial to the long term preservation of the monument while not adversely affecting its significance.

**Summary**
While the works would result in some changes to the fabric and appearance of the church these are necessary for its long term preservation (Policy Statement paragraph 3.14).

Where it is unavoidable re-building would be informed by a thorough understanding of the monument. Masonry would be reinstated in a sympathetic manner and the mortars used would be appropriate. Consequently, re-building would not meaningfully modify the monument's character or affect the features that made it important in the first place (Policy Statement paragraph 3.15). It would be the minimum necessary to preserve the structure (Policy Statement paragraph 3.16).

The work would remove a modern brick built structure within the church and ferrous fixtures and fittings. The removal of these would not adversely affect the monument's cultural significance. The works do not, therefore, conflict with Policy Statement paragraph 3.18.

The works have been set out in detail and accompanied by appropriate assessments and proposals for archaeological mitigation. The work is justified because it is necessary for the monument's preservation (Policy Statement paragraph 3.17, 3.19 and 3.20).

The application is not accompanied by a timetable for the works, and any such would be subject to some variation, for example, because the amount of time taken for vegetation to decay sufficiently prior to removal cannot be precisely known in advance. Without a timetable it would not be possible for HES to monitor the works to ensure they are consistent with any grant of consent. Hence, the application of a condition to ensure HES is informed timeously in advance of each stage of works is considered necessary.

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

The application site does not lie in a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Special Protection Area. National Biodiversity Network GIS data sets indicate no evidence for Protected Species in the relevant 100m grid squares.

### d) Conclusion

The works would involve the controlled removal of vegetation now affecting the structural remains of a church. The walls would be re-built where strictly necessary and where the original form is known. There would be other consolidation works such as the re-building of an area of existing collapse, soft topping or rough racking, grouting, the insertion of structural supports, the replacement of memorial fittings and re-pointing.

The works are necessary for the long term preservation of the monument (Policy Statement 3.14 and 3.19). Although the works are to some extent intrusive this has been minimised and would not change the monument's character or those elements that make it nationally important. Hence they are consistent with paragraphs 3.15 and 3.16.

The work has been justified (Policy Statement paragraph 3.17) and because the monument's cultural significance would not be materially diminished the proposal is consistent with the Policy Statement paragraph 3.18.

The Project Specification, Statement of Significance, WSI and associated drawings make clear that the work has been properly planned and is likely to be executed appropriately (paragraph 3.20).

The application is not accompanied by a timetable for the works, and this would be subject to inherent variation. Without a timetable it would not be possible for HES to monitor the works to ensure they are consistent with the grant of consent. Hence, it is necessary to apply one condition to the grant of scheduled monument consent covering the following topic: 1) notification of the timing of the works (paragraph 3.22).

Subject to compliance with this condition the proposal is concluded to be consistent with relevant policy.

## 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.

## 7. Conditions

1. Not less than 2 weeks before any of the works to which this consent relates are begun on site, Historic Environment Scotland shall be informed in writing of the timetable for the proposed works.

*Reason: to ensure that Historic Environment Scotland is aware of the timing of the works and to enable monitoring of the works.*

## 8. Approval

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Officer** | **Simon Stronach** | **Date** | **27/07/2016** |
| **Approved by** | **John Raven** | **Date** | **02/08/2016** |

**Annex A – list of supporting documents**

- Architects Drawings (Robert Potter & Partners): 7690_Loc, 7690_01-08, 7690_P1-2, 7690_S1-2
- Project Specification: 7690 (Robert Potter & Partners)
- Structural Engineers Drawings (Harley Haddow): 301029_300-304.
- Written Scheme of Investigation (Rathmell Archaeology)
- Phasing and Significance (Rathmell Archaeology)
- Email from Robert Potter & Partners (26 July 2016)