



Case Information

Reference/Case ID	300018659		
Scheduled Monument	Fort Charlotte, Lerwick		
Index no	SM90145	Grid ref	HU 47500 41500
Date application validated	01 November 2016		
Summary of proposed works	Removal of Wall, replace with 1.8m high wooden gate		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for removal of a wall and replacement with wooden gate be granted.

2. Background

Fort Charlotte is an artillery fortification that was built in the second half of the 17th century and modified later. It is a Property in Care. The fort is roughly pentagonal in shape, with a battery set behind a zig-zagged parapet wall facing out over Bressay Sound to the east, and angled bastions defending the landward sides. The scheduled area encompasses the area contained within the walls of the fort, the walls themselves, and a zone extending for 2m in front of the base of the walls on all sides.

The monument is of national importance as an almost completely preserved example of a post-medieval coastal battery and associated barrack. It was built to control one of the principal shipping lanes between Europe and the rest of the World.

The proposal is to dismantle part of a boundary wall between properties that adjoin the fort on its north side. The wall does not form part of the fortifications, is not tied into the fort wall and is separated from it by a gap. The wall would be replaced by a wooden gate.

3. Proposals

- Removal of part of a boundary wall
- Replacement with a wooden gate



The wall stands immediately north of Fort Charlotte and forms a boundary to the rear of No 8 Harbour Street. The wall is not tied into the fort wall. The owner of the property wishes to dismantle the wall because it is in a poor state and replace it with a wooden gate. It is proposed to remove the wall by hand. The replacement wooden boundary would be secured by posts set into concrete in holes in the ground.

4. Representations received

No representations have been 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 1979

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

Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement June 2016

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.

b) Assessment

The scheduled area extends out to 2m from the base of the fort wall. The boundary wall proposed to be taken down extends to within this distance of the fort wall. Therefore its dismantling, and the erection of a gate to replace it, would require scheduled monument consent.

The boundary wall to be dismantled is nor part of the fortifications, being of later date, is not tied into the fort wall and does not contribute to the cultural significance of the monument. Consequently, its removal would have no effect on the fabric of the monument or affect its cultural significance.

The replacement gate would not affect the fabric of the wall. It would be secured by posts set into concrete in holes excavated into the ground. Ground outside the fort



walls is not thought likely to contain sensitive archaeological remains associated with the fort. The erection of the gate should not physically impact on the fort or related remains. The wooden gate is similar to other examples around the fort and would not substantively alter its visual appearance.

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

No impact on Protected Species and Places is considered likely – see PP&S assessment.

d) Conclusion

The proposed work would change a boundary wall that extends into the scheduled area but does not contribute to the fabric or cultural significance of the monument. It would replace the wall with a gate that would also have no impact on the monument. The work would therefore have no effect on the fabric or cultural significance of the monument and is consistent with the policy statement paragraph 3.18.

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	Simon Stronach	Date	15 November 2016
Approved by	John Raven	Date	21 November 2016

Annex A – list of supporting documents

Email from the applicant to HES Casework (15 November 2016)
Photographs showing boundary wall