



Case information

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reference/Case ID | 201601494 | | |
| Scheduled Monument | Kincardine o'Neil, old church and hospital | | |
| Index no | M88 | Grid Ref | NO592996 359200.0000 799600.0000 |
| Date of Application | 17 June 2016 | Application Received | 17 June 2016 |
| Summary of proposed works | Removal of existing cement mortar and repointing with lime mortar on all elevations. | | |

1. Summary recommendation

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

2. Background

The monument comprises a church of medieval date, which survives as an unroofed structure, and the site of a medieval hospital, within an associated burial ground. The main body of the church consists of an unroofed rectangular structure measuring 20.6m from E to W by 8.3m transversely. On the north wall there is an ornate arched doorway of early Gothic style. Further architectural features take the form of two lancet windows in the W gable wall, and three in the east. On the basis of the doorway, it has been suggested that the main fabric of the church dates to the 13th century, but it is possible that the windows in the E gable were later additions or insertions. A granite belfry was added to the west gable in the 17th Century. The building continued to be used as the local parish church until a new structure was completed in 1861.

There were no pre-application discussions, the building is maintained by the council and they are proposing repointing the structure.

3. Proposals

Consented Works: Removal of existing cement mortar and repointing with lime mortar on all elevations.

Description of works:

- Any cement based mortar which has been previously applied to the building will be raked out using hand tools, along with any degraded historic lime

mortar, to ensure longevity of historic asset. This is to be replaced with a lime based mortar.

- Raking out is to be achieved using hand tools only.
- The most severe degradation of mortar has been identified on the west elevation, however all four walls of the structure will be repaired as required.

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)

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.

3.16. 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 removal of cement mortar and the repointing of the monument with lime mortar.

The physical impact of these works to the monument and its cultural significance will be comparatively minor, but the benefits to the long term preservation of the monument will be significant. The works will be kept to a minimum to achieve the long term preservation of the monument, and include the selective removal of failed and OPC mortar and repointing in lime. This is sound conservation work and will support the long term preservation of the monument. After clarifying the lime mortar mix with the applicant I am content that the mix will be suitable for the conservation works. The repointing works are all considered sound conservation practice as they aim to retain historic fabric in situ using established conservation techniques, in such a way that should stabilise loose masonry. This work is reversible if required.

It is therefore to the benefit of the long term preservation of the monument that the consolidation is undertaken now, and I consider that the prescribed methodology will have a positive impact on the monument.

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

The protected species and places assessment has been carried out and indicates that there may be the potential for bats in this area. The applicant has commissioned a bat survey, which indicates that the potential for bats at the site is not likely but makes a few recommendations to minimise the likelihood of disturbing any potential bats. The applicant will follow the report's recommendations to not fill in potential bat hibernaculum.

d) Conclusion

The application should be viewed as works as set out in both Part 1 Section 2 of the AMAA Act 1979 and paragraph 3.4 of the policy statement.

The proposed works will be of benefit to the long term preservation of the monument. They will stabilise vulnerable elements of the monument using appropriate techniques. The works 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 policy statement.

The works detailed in the application are also being carried out in such a way that their impact on the cultural significance of the monument is minor, and as such the application is compliant with 3.18 of the policy statement.

The works detailed in the application are designed in such a way as to be reversible (where relevant), are well planned with identified funding, and as such the application is compliant with 3.20 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 without conditions.**

7. Conditions

None

8. Approval

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Officer | James Bruhn | Date | 29/07/2016 |
| Approved by | George Findlater | Date | 11/8/2016 |

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Kincardine O'Neil Auld Kirk site location plan
- Kincardine O'Neil Auld Kirk west gable location plan
- Kincardine O'Neil Photos
- Bat Survey
- Email detailing Mortar Mix