



## Case Information

---

<b>Reference/Case ID</b>	300018681		
<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	Kinneil House, house and surrounding grounds		
<b>Index no</b>	SM90189	<b>Grid ref</b>	NS 98200 80500
<b>Date application validated</b>	04 November 2016		
<b>Summary of proposed works</b>	Rebuilding part of boundary wall bounding former Orchard		

## 1. Summary recommendation

---

This report recommends that approval for the downtaking and rebuilding of the orchard boundary wall be granted with conditions.

## 2. Background

---

The monument comprises a 16th-century tower with an associated palace block which was much altered in the 17th century before being condemned in 1936. The main tower having been gutted, it was saved from total demolition when, during the process, wall paintings were found in the palace block. The tower sits on the line of the Antonine Wall. The monument is of national importance because it is a well preserved example of a defensive tower gradually converted to more palatial living in the 17th century. The monument is of interest in the study of Roman defences, 16th-century fortification, 16th- and 17th-century architecture, Renaissance decoration, garden design and the development of the steam engine.

The focus of the proposed works is to that part of the boundary wall that bounds the former Orchard which is located on the north side of the main drive. The orchard wall lies to the northeast of the principal buildings that may date originally to the 1670's, but may have seen subsequent modification. The wall has some culturally significance and represents a part of the story of the development and use of the grounds in the 17th and 18th centuries. However, it is not a critical component in the cultural significance of the monument as a whole.

The proposed works follow on from the previously granted works to partially re-build this section of boundary wall resulting from the fact that this part of the wall is leaning considerably and was presenting a potential health and safety issue. The works are



needed to provide more robust foundations in order to support the wall and have been informed by the previous works, including archaeological mitigation. It has been submitted by HES Conservation Group.

HES Heritage Management Directorate has undertaken pre-application discussions with the applicant regarding the scope and timing of works, and this application accords with the outcome of those discussions.

### 3. Proposals

---

- Dismantling of the existing boundary wall to its present foundation level
- Building a new foundation for the new wall
- Re-building the wall

The consented works are to that part of the boundary wall that bounds the former Orchard which is located on the north side of the drive. The proposed works follow on from the previously granted works to partially re-build this section of boundary wall which was leaning considerably and presenting a potential health and safety issue. The works are needed to provide more robust foundations in order to support the wall.

They comprise the dismantling of the existing boundary wall to its present foundation level. This will be undertaken by setting the stones aside for re-use. The new foundation for the wall will be built under a watching brief. Finally, the wall will be re-built using the set aside stones. Both the foundations and the re-built wall will use an appropriate lime mortar.

### 4. Representations received

---

No third party 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 1979

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



## Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement June 2016

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.

### **b) Assessment**

The proposed works involve the rebuilding of a section of the south orchard boundary wall in order to provide more robust foundations. As such, the works comprise remedial and conservation works to mitigate health and safety risks to the public, and to maintain the structural integrity of the masonry.

The physical impact of the proposed works would be minimal. They involve the dunting of original masonry and rebuilding using the original masonry.

The proposed foundations could disturb archaeological remains. However, archaeological works were undertaken as part of earlier consolidation works, which revealed levelling material, but no artefacts or other dating material. This suggests the potential for disturbing sensitive archaeological deposits is likely to be low. Nevertheless, some form of archaeological mitigation is required in order to ensure any unexpected deposits are recorded and/or avoided, if appropriate.

The impact on the cultural significance of the monument is therefore likely to be relatively minor. The orchard wall may date originally to the 1670's and is culturally significant as it represents a part of the story of the development and use of the grounds in the 17th and 18th centuries. However, its authenticity is not a critical component in the cultural significance of the monument as a whole. Its overall form, which is its most important contribution to the monument, would be retained

Importantly, the health and safety benefits coupled with the long term preservation of the designed landscape features associated with the House, suggests that the wider benefits to the monument would be significant.

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

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



## d) Conclusion

The proposed works, comprising the dunting and rebuilding of the orchard boundary wall would preserve the designed landscape associated with the House and address health and safety concerns. Direct impacts are likely to be low. The works are therefore the minimum necessary to conserve what is culturally significant in this scheduled monument and so are compliant with paragraphs 3.16 and 3.18 of the policy statement.

However, archaeological mitigation would be required to ensure any potential direct impacts are recorded and/or avoided, a condition covering the production of a WSI is required, and a condition has consequently been added.

## 6. Recommended decision

---

Subject to compliance with the schedule of conditions, 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, subject to the condition detailed below.**

## 7. Conditions

---

1. No works shall take place until the applicant has secured the initiation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) and has had this WSI approved in writing by Historic Environment Scotland's Heritage Directorate. The WSI should set out how archaeological monitoring, recording and reporting will take place, and outline how any impacts on in situ sensitive deposits would be avoided. This scheme of works shall be fully implemented during the course of the approved development.

*Reason: to ensure that any impacts on sensitive archaeological structures or deposits are minimized, and that archaeological information is recovered and recorded to a satisfactory standard.*

## 8. Approval

---

<b>Case officer</b>	Nicola Hall	<b>Date</b>	30 November 2016
<b>Approved by</b>	John Raven	<b>Date</b>	01 December 2016



## **Annex A – list of supporting documents**

- Kinneil House: Garden Wall Reconstruction Details (Ref: EDS 4.1.100/06)
- Kinneil House: Watching Brief April 2016 (Ref: Kirkdale Archaeology June 2016)
- Addendum to Engineer's Report 29 April 2016 (Ref: EDS 4.1.100; John Turner 13 October 2016)