



## Case information

---

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	201602056		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Jarlshof, broch & settlement		
<b>Index no</b>	M90174	<b>Grid Ref</b>	HU398095 439900.0000 1109500.0000
<b>Date of Application</b>	15 July 2016	<b>Application Received</b>	15 July 2016
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Selective repointing of battered sea wall at rear of beach		

### 1. Summary recommendation

---

This report recommends **approval without conditions**.

### 2. Background

---

Jarlshof is a multi-period settlement lying just west of Sumburgh on the south Mainland of Shetland. Although best known for its Norse settlement remains, it is remarkable in the range and time-depth of occupation represented, and includes Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement evidence, an Iron Age broch, Pictish and Norse settlement remains, a medieval farm, and a 16<sup>th</sup>-century laird's house. It was excavated extensively in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century by various luminaries of the time including Alexander Curle and V.G. Childe.

In terms of setting, the site's location by the coast with dramatic views into the West Voe of Sumburgh and to Sumburgh Head to the south east are significant as they emphasise the historic importance of sea-power to the site, particularly during the Norse period. Landward views to the Sumburgh Hotel and Sumburgh Home Farm emphasise the continuity of occupation in the landscape from the Neolithic to the present day.

The site was taken into care by the state in 1928, and is now a popular visitor attraction. It has long been threatened by coastal erosion, indeed it was damaged during a severe storm in the later-19<sup>th</sup> century that led to the discovery of many of the remains. A modern sea-wall forms a significant part of the protection in place to manage this threat. The monument was recently rescheduled and this explicitly included the sea-wall within the scheduled area.

### 3. Proposals

---

The works comprise selective repointing and repair of the sea-wall which runs along the south west of the site.

A small scaffold will be erected on the beach (outside of the scheduled area) to allow access. Failed pointing will be raked out before being repointed, with packing/grouping of deep voids. Isolated repairs will be undertaken along the length of the wall but the wallheads, base, and construction joints are in particularly poor condition and so will see more extensive repointing.

The works will be the minimum required to undertake the necessary maintenance.

### 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 (2016)

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. 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.

3.20. 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 proposed works to the sea-wall are selective and minimal – targeting largely isolated areas of damage along the length of the wall. As the wall is of 20<sup>th</sup>-century date, minor repairs should have no potential to damage sensitive historic fabric or adversely impact the cultural significance of the monument in terms of its overall character

In terms of visual impact, the works should not have any negative impacts on views from the monument as the exterior of the wall is not visible from the site itself. Views of the site from sea or from Scatness across the bay will not be affected as the repair fabric will be barely distinguishable from that which is currently there.

The works are the minimum required to keep the sea-wall in a good state of repair, and the wall itself is crucial to the long term survival and conservation of the monument.

#### **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 proposals should have minimal effect on the character and physical fabric of the monument. The cultural significance of the monument would not, therefore, be materially affected. The proposals are not inconsistent with paragraph 3.14 and 3.18 of the policy statement. The works are required to prevent further decay or destruction of the site and are the minimum necessary to do so and so are in keeping with paragraphs 3.16 and 3.17 of the policy statement.

## 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.

I recommend consent is **granted**.

## 7. Conditions

---

None

## 8. Approval

---

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Kevin Grant</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>22/07/2016</b>
<b>Approved by</b>	<b>John Raven</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>25/07/2016</b>

### Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Images with accompany descriptions showing areas of wall requiring repair.
- Location Plan