Scheduled Monument Consent:
Report on Handling

Case information

Reference/Case ID	201602265

Scheduled Monument	Invercauld Bridge		
Index no	M90171	**Grid Ref**	NO185910 318500.0000 791000.0000

Date of Application	27 July 2016	**Application Received**	27 July 2016
Summary of proposed works	Grouting of a cutwater, and the infilling of a fractured rock pool with concrete to prevent cutwater from undermining and scour		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for the grouting of a cutwater, and the infilling of a fractured rock pool with concrete to prevent cutwater from undermining and scour be granted **without conditions.**

2. Background

The historic environment asset and its cultural significance

The monument comprises one of the best preserved examples of an 18th-century military road bridge built by Major William Caulfield. Built in 1752, the bridge carries the road linking Blairgowrie in the south with Fort George and Aberdeenshire in the north, and links Corgarff and Braemar Castles together (at a time when they were being converted into small garrison posts). The road and bridge construction campaign was led by General Wade (and assisted by Caulfield) in response to the 1745 Jacobite Uprising, and easing the movement of government troops was seen as critical in the control of the Highlands.

The cultural significance of the monument is vested in its preservation as one of the largest and finest of Caulfield's bridges. It provides information on the architectural and engineering skills of the 18th-century army, and has a place in the national history as a component of the first coherent road network to cover the northern part of the country.

The applicant

The bridge is cared for by HES Conservation Directorate as a Property in Care, and public access is possible (although not promoted). Recent works to the monument have focused on repointing and minor masonry works. The bridge is occasionally used for emergency access across the River Dee.

The works are in response to damage to the bridge that occurred during Storm Frank in December 2015, and are required in order to maintain the structural integrity of the masonry.

Pre-application discussions

The applicant has discussed the proposed works with HES HMD, and early issues to do with protected species were flagged up. The current application accords with the outcome of these discussions.

3. Proposals

Consented works - Grouting of a cutwater, and the infilling of a fractured rock pool with concrete to prevent cutwater from undermining and scour.

The proposals comprise:

- Grouting of the cutwater, including installing a temporary scarcement of sandbags, rocks, and lime concrete all backfilled with clay so as to prevent leakage of grout into the river.
- Infilling of a fractured rock pool with concrete topped by cobbles, so as to help prevent further undermining and scour of the cutwater and downstream bank.

These works are in response to damage caused to the bridge during Storm Frank in December 2015. Whilst the applicant has also intends to undertake river bank reinstatement works alongside the consented works, these are outwith the scheduled area and as such do not require SMC.

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 (the policy statement)

3.14. A monument in 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, which 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. (Annex 1 sets out guidance as to how cultural significance and national importance should be determined).

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 works involve the grouting of a cutwater, and the infilling of a fractured rock pool with concrete to prevent cutwater from undermining and scour.
Overview of works

The physical impact of the grouting works is such that they are within the framework of the existing bridge fabric, and are akin to extensive repointing already undertaken elsewhere on the bridge. The infilling of the fractured rock pool with dowels, mesh, concrete and cobbles will match an approach previously taken on the north side of the bridge, and is to bedrock that had been blasted during construction of the bridge. The residual aesthetic impact of the works is likely to be limited to the cobbles visible under the relieving arch once the works have been completed. As such, the grouting of the cutwater close to water level and the infilling of the fractured rock pool will have little or no discernable impact on the archaeological or cultural significance of the bridge. These works are those that go beyond the scope of routine maintenance works.

Methodology

The drawings attached to the application set out a detailed methodology for the works. This methodology focuses on ensuring that the cutwater can be safely grouted without any leakage into the river ecosystem by using a system of sand bags, rocks, and lime concrete to create a scarcement to contain a clay infill around the cutwater – this allows any leakage to be contained, and is removable once the grout has cured. The concrete will be held into the fractured bedrock using a series of dowels resin-fixed into the bedrock, with a wire mesh attached so as to provide suitable reinforcement. The concrete will be pumped from a truck sitting on the bridge overhead, and once nearly cured then cobbles will be set into the surface so as to soften the aesthetic impact of the works.

Summary

The works are required in order to maintain the structural integrity of the cutwater and to help prevent further damage from scour during flood events. They have been designed to be as least invasive as possible, avoiding more heavy engineering approaches, and as such will benefit the monuments cultural significance. Whilst there will be an aesthetic impact from there being a rock pool visible beneath the relieving arch to there being a cobbled surface, this change is not considered significant. The works do not, therefore, conflict with paragraph 3.16 of the policy statement.

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

No impact on Protected Species and Places. A report on freshwater pearl and otter has been submitted as part of the application due to the presence of various natural heritage designations, but no concerns are identified. The works also require a licence from SEPA, which is in hand.

d) Conclusion

As works to support the conservation of a monument, 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 works have been designed in such a way that they do not impact on the cultural significance of the monument. As such, the work is justified under paragraph 3.16 of the policy statement. The methodology is such that the works can be undertaken without detriment to potential natural heritage issues or water quality issues, and although not effectively reversible they are considered to be well planned. As such, the application complies with paragraph 3.20 without the need for any 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	**Oliver Lewis**	**Date**	**19/09/2016**
Approved by	**John Raven**	**Date**	**20/09/2016**

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Scour protection works – concrete infill details – EDS.4.1.29/03
- River bank reinstatement – slope protection detail – EDS.4.1.29/04
- Ecological survey – Alba Ecology – June 2016
- Archaeological assessment – July 2016