



Case Information

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Reference/Case ID | 300018484 | | |
| Scheduled Monument | Union Canal, Fountainbridge to River Almond; Union Canal, River Avon to Greenbank | | |
| Index no | SM11097; SM8952 | Grid ref | NT 20500 70200; NS 86400 79400 |
| Date application validated | 16 September 2016 | | |
| Summary of proposed works | Slateford and Avon Aqueducts - Temporary localised dewatering of the Union Canal to undertake leakage repairs | | |

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for canal channel repairs of the Slateford and Avon aqueducts on the Union Canal be granted without conditions.

2. Background

The monument is of national importance because, as an integral part of the Union Canal, and an important piece of Georgian civil engineering. Designed by a noted Scots Engineer, Hugh Baird, and built 1818-23, its continuous watercourse was without need of a single lock, and was graced by three major aqueducts inspired by another great Scots civil engineer, Thomas Telford.

This application relates to the Slateford and Avon aqueducts on the Union Canal. The Slateford and Avon aqueducts are major masonry constructed structures with cast iron canal channel troughs constructed between 1818 and 1822. Leaks have been detected at both aqueduct locations. The leak at Slateford is cause for concern as it is causing a public nuisance and potential risk. The water leaking from the aqueduct is saturating the public footpath, presenting a slip hazard. Avon is also leaking on the west end of the aqueduct but is not causing public nuisance. It will however continue to deteriorate the structure and monument. Scottish Canals are proposing to undertake canal channel repairs at both locations.

3. Proposals

Consented works - Canal channel repairs of the Slateford and Avon aqueducts on the Union Canal.



Description of works:

- The proposed works include the temporary localised dewatering of the aqueducts by damming them using fabric dams. (Material e.g. clay for temporary dam construction will not be permitted due to access constraints.)
- The cleaning and removal of all siltation and debris from the dewatered area.
- The Survey and identification of leakage path routes within the canal channel.
- Laying of approved geosynthetic clay linear to all suspect areas including overlap and factor of safety to ensure all suspect areas are covered.
- Over lay geosynthetic clay linear with approved puddle clay to include for over lapping linear edges.
- Over lay clay with mesh reinforced concrete slab to cover suspect area and protect against further erosion. Concrete slab will have downturns embedded into the clay to stop water paths underneath slab.
- The cleaning of exposed cast iron aqueduct trough and the waterproofing / caulking of trough interface joints as directed by Scottish Canals Project Manager.

4. Representations received

No representations were received.

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

Part 1 Section 2: Control of works affecting scheduled monuments.

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 relining of the aqueducts will have a very small physical impact on the monument and a minimal impact on its cultural significance. The works are for the maintenance and repair of the monument. The applicant provides a detailed plan of the works. I am content that the method statement covers the procedures which will be followed and these are acceptable and conform to industry standards.

The works will add a significant safety benefit as they will manage risk associated with the leaking canal aqueducts.

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

None

d) Conclusion

These works represent additions and alterations to the monument under Part 1.2.2.b. of the Act and as such scheduled monument consent is required.



The works involve very minor repairs. I consider this to represent a minimal impact on the cultural significance of the monument and to therefore accord with 3.15 and 3.16 of the policy statement.

The method statement indicates that the repair works have been carefully considered and sensitively designed. I am content that the detailed description of the works provided in the application complies with 3.20 of the policy statement. I am therefore content that no conditions are necessary.

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

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Case officer | James Bruhn | Date | 10 November 2016 |
| Approved by | George Findlater | Date | 10 November 2016 |

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Supplementary Information 1_Methodolgy
- Map 1_Avon aqu location plan 1 to 2500
- Map 2_Slateford Aqueduct 1 to 2500