Scheduled Monument Consent:
Report on Handling

Case information

Reference/Case ID	201601445

Scheduled Monument	Lochore Castle		
Index no	M858	**Grid Ref**	NT175958 317500.0000 695800.0000

Date of Application	15 June 2016	**Application Received**	15 June 2016
Summary of proposed works	Installation of two site interpretation markers and an electrical supply duct under the existing path.		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that consent be **granted** without conditions.

2. Background

Lochore Castle is situated on a mound at the east end of what was formerly a sheet of water, Loch Ore or 'Inchgall Loch' which was drained at the end of the 18th century.

Present appearances suggest that the original castle had been of the motte-and-bailey type and that the motte-hill was reduced in height before the present tower of stone was built. The base of the mound has been enclosed by a barmkin of coursed rubble, now fragmentary and nowhere more than 3m in height but still traceable all round. At the north-eastern, north western and south-eastern angles there have been small rounded towers, which may have been added in the 16th century. The entrance to the barmkin enclosure was on the north-west through an arched doorway. The main tower probably dates from the 14th century. To the north and west of the tower lie the foundations of later outbuildings.

Conservation works are currently taking place at Lochore Castle, through the Living Lomonds Landscape Partnership. The partnership, formed of a number of organisations in Fife and Perth and Kinross includes Fife Council and Fife Coast and Countryside Trust and is part funded through the Heritage Lottery Fund. Scheduled Monument Consent was granted for the conservation works for the main castle block in September 2014 and this was amended to include the barmkin walls in April 2015. Scheduled Monument Consent was granted also in July 2015 for a community archaeology project which included excavation as part of the same Landscape Partnership Project.

Pre-application discussions took place on the 10th of May 2016 between HES staff and the applicants regarding the latest proposals. That meeting confirmed that the works would require scheduled monument consent. The present application accords with the outcome of these discussions.

3. Proposals

Consented Works: Installation of two site interpretation markers and an electrical supply duct under the existing path.

Description of works:

- Dig two trenches in the existing gravel path along the south side of the side. The two trenches will be approximately 7.5 metre length, 450mm wide and 600mm in depth.
- Two 100mm wide ducts will be place in each of the trenches and will supply the interpretation markers.
- The two interpretation markers will comprise shaped ashlar stones, carved out to provide housing for LED flood lights, and set on in-situ concrete bases which will be cast in the ground just off to the north of the path. As shown on drawing 592-00 revision C and 592-SK01 revision A. (Additional interpretation and floodlighting works are also being proposed for the site, but these are out-with the Scheduled Site boundary).

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:

The 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)

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.

3.19. 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 proposed works comprise two elements, the first is the addition to the monument of two interpretation markers and the second is the digging of two trenches to supply these markers.

The addition of the two interpretation markers is part of a larger access and interpretation strategy for the monument, most of the path and interpretation markers are being installed out with the scheduled area to minimise their impact on the monument. The two interpretation markers on the south side of the monument need to be installed within the scheduled area because of the incorporation of the pre-existing path on this side and the proximity of the River Ore. I am content that the scheme is well designed and the overall interpretation strategy will be beneficial in enhancing the visitor experience while maintaining the cultural significance of the monument. The impact of the concrete bases, given their size and location adjacent to the gravel path, will be minor and I am content that they will not have an impact on the cultural significance of the monument.

The digging of the two trenches to supply the interpretation markers will be confined to the existing path. This path post-dates the channelization of the River Ore in this area. Excavations undertaken in 2015 (Case 201501683), as part of this restoration project, indicate that the path sits on an area of significant made-up ground which was probably part of the landscaping to create the modern parkland. The applicant has not provided a written scheme of investigations, detailing any archaeological mitigation strategy for the works. In my professional opinion given the depth and location of the trenches, within an existing gravel path, they are unlikely to disturb archaeological deposits associated with the castle. I am content that the works do not require any form of archaeological mitigation as they will be contained within later made-up ground. I am also content that the proposed plans will not detract from the cultural significance of the monument.

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

The proposed excavations form part of a wider set of conservation works, part funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund and by Historic Environment Scotland and as such should not be viewed in insolation.

d) Conclusion

The intervention should be viewed as works as set out in both Part 1 Section 2 of the AMAAA 1979 and section 3.4 of the HES policy statement. The works are in the form of an addition to the monument.

I am content that excavation of two trenches at Lochore Castle and installation of the two interpretation markers will not have a negative impact on the cultural significance of the monument and are a necessary part of the ongoing conservation and interpretation work being undertaken at the monument and can therefore be considered as the minimum level of intervention that is consistent with conserving what is culturally significant in a monument, and thus compliant with 3.16 of the HES policy statement.

The works are discrete, not directly affecting any known archaeological deposits. I am content therefore that while representing an intervention, the proposed works will have no significant impact upon the cultural significance of Lochore Castle.

Further, I am content that given the nature of the works, which are within later made-up ground, that archaeological mitigation is not necessary and that the application contains sufficiently detailed methodologies and justification that a consent may be granted without the requirement for conditions.

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 without conditions.**

7. Conditions

None

8. Approval

Officer	**James Bruhn**	**Date**	**26/07/2016**
Approved by	**George Findlater**	**Date**	**26/07/2016**

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Timeline Markers 592-SK01A
- Interpretation Plan Outline Proposal 592-00C