



## Case Information

---

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	300018481		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Jedburgh Abbey, 50m ESE of Abbey House		
<b>Index no</b>	SM13126	<b>Grid ref</b>	NT 65000 20400
<b>Date application validated</b>	06 September 2016		
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Clean out existing hole re-erect headstone		

### 1. Summary recommendation

---

This report recommends that consent be granted without conditions

### 2. Background

---

Jedburgh Abbey was an Augustinian house, established by King David I and Bishop John of Glasgow in the 12th century on the site of an earlier Anglian religious establishment affiliated to Lindisfarne. Like the other major Border Abbeys, it was a wealthy establishment which suffered during the Wars of Independence. After the Reformation, the main Abbey building continued in use as the parish church until 1875 with the area around the site forming the main graveyard for the burgh: some lairs within the graveyards still have active burial lairs to this day.

In 2015, Scottish Borders Council carried out safety audits of its graveyards after a serious incident in another Council area highlighted issues with loose and poorly secured headstones and memorials. As a result of this audit, a large number of memorials in the graveyard at Jedburgh Abbey were laid flat or partially dismantled to ensure public safety. This application represents action to restore an individual family plot affected by that dountaking.

### 3. Proposals

---

Re-erection of fallen memorial

The works will comprise the following elements -



- Cleaning out of existing socket
- Lay new mortar bed within socket
- Lift headstone and rebed in original position.

## 4. Representations received

---

None

## 5. Report

---

### a) Policy considerations

The application should be considered 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

3.14. 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 works involve the cleaning out of an existing socket for the headstone, the addition of new mortar to the socket and the lifting and rebedding of the stone within the prepared socket. The stone will be lifted using a small scaffold frame and "endless chain" mechanism.

The works should result in no additional ground disturbance within the monument and as such I do not consider that archaeological supervision is required in this case.

As the works will restore this part of the monument to its original condition, I also consider the application will not have an adverse impact on the character or setting of the monument.

The works will be carried out by an established stone masonry company, run and staffed by the direct descendants of the individuals commemorated on the headstone.

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

None

#### **d) Conclusion**

The works described in this application represent disturbance and additions to the monument under part 1: 2: 2(b) of the Act and as such, scheduled monument consent is required.

I am content that the works described in this application will result in no disturbance to archaeological deposits and will not significantly alter the character or setting of the monument. As such I consider they will have a minimal impact on the cultural significance of the monument, in accordance with sections 3.16 and 3.18 of the Policy Statement.



I am content that the documentation supporting the application is sufficiently detailed to show that the proposals have been carefully considered, based on good authority, sensitively designed and properly planned, in compliance with section 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

---

No conditions have been attached to this decision.

## 8. Approval

---

<b>Case officer</b>	Deirdre Cameron	<b>Date</b>	28 October 2016
<b>Approved by</b>	George Findlater	<b>Date</b>	28 October 2016

### Annex A – list of supporting documents

- 1) Photographic location plan.
- 2) Photograph of headstone to be re-erected.
- 3) Method statement for works (contained in e-mail of 6 September 2016 from Robert Laidlaw to Deirdre Cameron)