



Case Information

Reference/Case ID	300018623		
Scheduled Monument	Stirling Castle		
Index no	SM90291	Grid ref	NS 78800 94100
Date application validated	25 October 2016		
Summary of proposed works	Installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Cafe roof		

1. Summary recommendation

This report recommends that approval for the installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Cafe roof be granted without conditions.

2. Background

The historic environment asset and its cultural significance

The monument comprises Stirling Castle and its immediate setting. Stirling Castle is a strongly-fortified royal castle occupying a volcanic outcrop which commands the upper Forth valley. The defences define three main enclosures: the outer defences (on the main line of approach), the main enclosure (at the summit of the rock) and the nether bailey (to the N). The principal buildings for royal occupation at the summit of the rock form a square enclosed by the King's Old Building, the Great Hall, the Chapel Royal and the Palace.

The rock has been fortified since at least the 12th century, and probably for long before that, in view of the defensive and strategic advantages of its location. The outer defences (1708-14) incorporate part of an important early artillery bastion and flanking works, probably built for Mary of Guise c.1559, known as the Great Spur. Behind the central section of this bastion and adjacent to the Overport Gate was built a series of double height casemates for the Counterguard with battery above. These casemates are now fronted by the modern Overport Cafe, and a modern extension to house the café extends to the north of the casemates behind the bastion wall. Where



the northern wall of the casemates meets with the restaurant extension at roof level there is a change to the thickness of the casemate wall resulting in a ledge which currently covered in modern (1980s) paving slabs. It is this thickness of wall that is the subject of this application.

The cultural significance of this part of the monument lies in its survival as a component of the Italian-designed c.1559 bastion that was subsequently modified in 1708-14.

The applicant

The application is for the installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Café roof, and it is designed to address existing water ingress issues to the café below. The application has been submitted by HES Conservation Group, who manage Stirling Castle as one of the top paid-for visitor attractions in Scotland. The application is accompanied by a detailed drawing showing the minimal level of intervention to historic masonry (ie the casemate wall) and modern fabric (the 1980s slabs).

Pre-application discussions

The applicant has discussed the proposed works with HES Heritage Directorate, and the current application accords with the outcome of these discussions.

3. Proposals

- Installation of ply backing board wrapped in roofing felt using screws into joints of 1980s slabs.
- Installation of lead capping over the ply backing board, including an upstand ragged into the historic masonry.

Consented works – the works comprise the installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Café roof.

Aims – the purpose of the works is to resolve a known water ingress issue where water is entering the café below. The existing ledge is fairly flat, meaning that there is an inability for water to be shed. The proposed works aim to introduce a slope to this ledge, and to improve the interface between ledge and vertical wall face to the south to prevent water entering the masonry.

Timetable – the applicant hopes to undertake the work within the next year so as to minimise the impact of much further water ingress.



Personnel – the works will be undertaken by the in-house HES Monument Conservation Unit, who are suitably qualified and locally based.

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

3.14. 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.

3.16. 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 installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Café roof, so as to address existing water ingress issues to the café below.

The physical impact of the installation of the lead capping on the monument and its cultural significance will be very minor, as the works have been designed to not physically impact on historic fabric except for the raggle into the joints of the north wall of the casemates, but the benefits to the long term integrity of the masonry will be tangible. The works do comprise an addition to the monument, although the change from what is effectively a ledge covered by concrete slabs to a ledge covered by a lead capping is not considered to impact on the cultural significance of the monument, and it is therefore the insertion of a raggle into historic masonry joints that has greatest impact on the monument.

The replacement of the covering of this ledge is considered sound remedial work as it aims to retain historic fabric in situ (and indeed avoids removing modern slabs that might then disturb historic masonry below), and is reversible if required.

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

No impact on Protected Species and Places is considered likely.

d) Conclusion

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, comprising the installation of a lead capping on top of the existing slabs covering the ledge formed by the change in wall thickness above the Overport Café roof, are being done to elements of the monument in such a way that they will have a negligible impact on the cultural significance of the monument. They do not, therefore conflict with paragraphs 3.16 and 3.18 of the policy statement.

The works have been proposed in order to address a maintenance need that is impacting upon the long term preservation of historic fabric and upon the operation of the visitor attraction, and as such the works meet with paragraph 3.17 of the policy statement.



The application meets with paragraph 3.20 of the policy statement because it has demonstrated that the works have been carefully considered, based on good authority, sensitively designed and properly planned. Consequently, no conditions are considered 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	Oliver Lewis	Date	16 December 2016
Approved by	Andrew Martindale	Date	19 December 2016

Annex A – list of supporting documents

- Location plan – 333/291/D/205
- Drawing showing lead capping to paved projection – 333/291/D/204