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EDUCATION CULTURE AND SPORT COMMITTEE

AGENDA

11TH Meeting, 2000 (Session 1)

Wednesday 22 March 2000

The Committee will meet at 9.30 am in Committee Room 3, Committee Chambers, Edinburgh.

1. **Update on Committee business**: The Committee will be updated on business in its current work programme.

2. **Hampden Park**: The Committee will consider the remit and timetable of an investigation into the National Stadium.

3. **Petition PE9 on Roman Remains at Cramond**: The Committee will consider a report by Mr Brian Monteith on the Petition by Mr Ronald Guild.

4. **Children (Leaving Care) Bill**: The Committee will consider a Memorandum by the Executive on the Scottish provisions in this Bill.

5. **Ethical Standards in Public Life etc. (Scotland) Bill**: The Committee will consider oral and written evidence received on this Bill at Stage 1.

Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee
Room 2.7 Committee Chambers
Ext. 85204
Email: gillian.baxendine@scottish.parliament.uk

The following papers are attached for this meeting—

Note by the Clerk on Hampden Park investigation (Agenda Item 2) ED/00/11/1

Report by Mr Brian Monteith on Petition PE9 by Mr Ronald Guild (Paper to be circulated later) (Agenda Item 3) ED/00/11/2

Letter from Minister for Children & Education on Children (Leaving Care) Bill (Agenda Item 4) ED/00/11/3
The following paper is issued for information:

Letter from Helen Eadie MSP about funding of study support in schools.
EDUCATION CULTURE AND SPORT COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Hampden National Stadium

1. The Committee agreed at its meeting on 7 March that it should consider further at this meeting the proposal for an investigation into Hampden National Stadium.

Remit

2. Suggested issues for the inquiry are
   • to review the contribution and future use of the national stadium
   • to review the recent financial difficulties and future viability of stadium
   • to consider the role of and funding by public agencies

Evidence

3. Mr Galbraith, the Minister for Children and Education, has agreed to attend the Committee as soon as there is a settlement to discuss. It is suggested that this should be scheduled at the earliest opportunity.

4. Other witnesses suggested by the Committee are:
   • The Scottish Football Association
   • Glasgow City Council
   • Queen’s Park FC
   • The National Stadium company
   • The administrators, Arthur Andersen

   The committee may also wish to seek evidence, not necessarily orally, from other funders of such as sportscotland and the Millennium Commission.

Timetable

5. The Committee has a fairly full agenda until the summer recess including:
   • Stage 2 of the Standards in Scotland’s Schools etc. Bill (most of May)
   • consideration of Education Department budget for 2001/2 (late May)
   • oral evidence, visits, etc for SEN inquiry (most of June)
   • follow up to the ITC report on Grampian Television
   • development of research proposal for consulting children & young people

   No doubt other ad hoc business will also arise. It is therefore suggested that the Hampden inquiry should be scheduled for after the summer recess, alongside the school infrastructure inquiry.

Conclusion

6. The Committee is invited to agree the remit, evidence and timetable for this inquiry.

Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee 16 March 2000
CHILDREN (LEAVING CARE) BILL

Thank you for your letter of 28 January seeking background information about the Children (Leaving Care) Bill.

I attach a note. As you will see, we are at an early stage of our detailed examination of arrangements involved in making unified local authority funding for care leavers work for the best advantage of these young people.

The Working Group set up to make the examination is unlikely to be able to form a view before the end of this year at the earliest. One of the main reasons for this is the need to examine the initial results of the study into present provision for care leavers currently being undertaken by York University. We expect these will become available in August this year. As I said in the Parliamentary debate on Looked After Children on 12 January, we shall make this information available to the Working Group. Until such time as the new arrangements are ready, the present arrangements for DSS benefit entitlement for Scottish care leavers will continue.

I hope this is helpful.

SAM GALBRAITH
CHILDREN (LEAVING CARE) BILL

Background Note

1. The Children (Leaving Care) Bill currently before the Westminster Parliament seeks to introduce a package of measures for careleavers in England and Wales. The majority of the proposals were not considered relevant for Scotland given the statutory duties placed on local authorities in sections 29 and 30 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 and the guidance on performance of these functions issued to local authorities at the time of the Act's implementation. However Scottish Ministers did see merit in the principle of unified funding of services for these vulnerable young people achieved through the transfer to local authorities of DSS resources currently spent on careleavers.

2. Public consultation was held during September and October last year. There were a total of 44 replies (22 local authorities, 6 associations and 16 voluntary bodies). Of these, 29 agreed with the central proposal for an integrated fund; 10 did not support the proposal; and 5 were undecided and wished further details.

3. In the light of the responses, Scottish Ministers decided that the principle of unified funding had merit. This decision was announced in answer to a Parliamentary question by Karen Whitefield on 19 November. Benefit entitlement is a reserved matter. Legislation to enable the change to benefit entitlement in the form of Clause 6 to the Children (Leaving Care) Bill has been introduced in Westminster. Officials have been in touch with the Department of Health and DSS to discuss the resource transfer.

4. The changes to benefit entitlement in Scotland will not come into effect until appropriate alternative arrangements are in place. This position has been confirmed by both Scottish and Westminster Ministers. Peter Peacock in the Scottish Parliamentary debate on Looked after Children on 12 January; Lord Hunt of Kings Heath during the Lords Grand Committee debate on the Bill on 10 February.

Througcare and Aftercare Working Group

5. In considering the response to the consultation paper, Scottish Ministers recognised the concern that further detailed consideration should be given to how such enhanced local authority resources should operate for the good of the young people concerned. To enable this to be done, a working group has been set up under the chairmanship of a Scottish Executive official.

6. The membership of the working group is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association of Directors of Social Work</th>
<th>Monica Boyle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Heaney</td>
<td>Fred McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention of Scottish Local Authorities</td>
<td>Steve Driscoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Stewart</td>
<td>Tam Baillie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Througcare and Aftercare Forum</td>
<td>Vivienne Boyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association of Careers Service Companies in Scotland</td>
<td>Mary Carson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.
The group first met on 10 February and agreed the following remit:

To consider issues arising from unified funding under local authority control to support young people requiring throughcare and aftercare services within the context of other relevant policy developments and overall quality of services; and to advise Ministers how best such current and future resources might operate for the good of these young people.

The group is considering such issues as ringfencing of resources; a safety net for young people who have lost contact with their local authority; and an appeals procedure. It will also have sight of the initial results of the study (funded by the Scottish Executive) which is being conducted by York University into the present provision for young people leaving care in Scotland. The results are expected to be available in August this year.

Scottish Legislation

Scottish Ministers have recognised that it is important to have an element of standardisation throughout Scotland for any proposals which emerge from the working group’s deliberations. Ministers therefore propose to amend the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 to permit better regulation for young people formerly looked after away from home by local authorities. Ministers also propose to amend the 1995 Act to enable Scottish local authorities to provide aftercare support to an eligible young person from other parts of the United Kingdom. This parallels measures contained in the Westminster Bill in respect of local authorities in England and Wales regarding support for young care leavers moving from Scotland.

The proposals are contained in the consultation paper issued in December 1999, ‘Regulating Care and the Social Services Workforce’. The consultation period ends on 10 March. Dependent on the outcome of consultation it is intended to publish a draft Bill this is expected in the summer.

Scottish Executive
March 2000
Education, Culture & Sport Committee

A report in response to petition PS9 concerning the Roman Remains at Cramond, Edinburgh, and neighbouring building development.
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Terms of the Report

The Public Petitions Committee at its meeting on 21 September 1999 referred petition PS9 from Mr RH Guild to the Education Culture & Sport Committee. That Committee nominated Brian Monteith to prepare a report on its behalf for discussion at a future committee meeting.

The petition was concerning the impact of current developments on Roman remains at Cramond, Edinburgh.

Mr Guild wrote: 'That the local situation over the last twenty five years has become a disgrace. A wide range of people and organisations are interested and enthusiastic but individually unable to act.'

Mr Guild called for the Parliament to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that a full assessment is made of the Cramond area, taking into account transport issues; the sale by the University of Edinburgh of the Moray House complex; East of Scotland Water's requirements in the area; and the protection and interpretation of the Roman ruins.

Roman history of Cramond

In 'The Buildings of Edinburgh' Professor Gordon S. Maxwell states: 'The Roman site at Cramond (the name means 'Port on the Almond') comprised a stone-vaulted castellum, an extensive extramural settlement, and very probably a harbour, though no trace of it survives.'

'The existence of a Roman station at Cramond was long suspected because of the discovery over the years of Roman coins, pottery and inscriptions, but the exact site remained unknown until the excavations of 1954-66. The fort was found to have been occupied during three separate phases.'
In its submission to this report the Council for Scottish Archaeology stated that 'the national importance of Cramond as a key site in terms of Roman military activity, political impact and social influence in Scotland cannot be over-emphasised.'

Cramond was the major supply base for the Roman army during Scottish military campaigns led personally by the Emperor Septimus Severus in the early third century AD.

The survival of upstanding remains at Cramond, which are relatively rare in Scotland, is of national cultural heritage significance.

Cramond is closely associated with the monument marking the north-west frontier of the Roman Empire, the Antonine Wall, being one of only three outpost coastal forts helping to protect Roman-occupied territory south of the Wall. The fort at Cramond and the Antonine Wall form an extant monument complex where the value of each is augmented by the survival of the other.

Cramond has the potential for evidence of early Roman occupation. If this potential is realised it would result in Cramond being the sole fort in Scotland with evidence of occupation during all three phases of Roman presence in southern Scotland (late first, mid second and early third centuries AD).

The remains of the associated features of the Roman fort including the civilian settlement, are generally thought to extend beyond the scheduled Monument area in all directions. The ground surrounding the Scheduled Area might be reasonably expected to harbour other remains such as burial grounds and industrial works.

Modern day Cramond

Modern day Cramond comprises of two main components:

i) The village that developed around the south side of the mouth of the river Almond and on both sides of the main arterial route leading out to Edinburgh up to the Cramond Kirk;

ii) The large housing developments, mostly but not exclusively private, which are a mixture of bungalows, villas and latterly some flats, which have grown to the south of the village and are now quite extensive.

Cramond is separated from much of Edinburgh by Green belt on its East and West flanks and by the Firth of Forth on the north and the River Almond on the West. Its Community focus is towards the Cramond Kirk and its hall, the local primary school and the use it enjoys of the Moray House Campus. Cramond has very few shops of its own with the main focus being towards the Safeway and wide range of local shops to be found at Davidson Mains.

The scheduled site of the Roman remains

Historic Scotland does not own any part of the site of the Roman Remains and as such is therefore unable to instigate plans for the site's redevelopment or improving its presentation. A map of the Scheduled Ancient Monument showing its boundaries before and after its enlargement in January 1998 is appended.

There are five owners of the land within the site of the Scheduled Monument. Historic Scotland is not able to provide details of the landowners within the
The recent discovery of a Roman sculpture of a lioness, pulled from the mud at Cramond Ferry steps, outside of the scheduled area, only served to emphasise the site's importance and of the likelihood of further discoveries being made both inside and outside the scheduled area.

Historic Scotland states that excavations over the years have shown that prehistoric and mediaeval remains are also present within the scheduled area and the vicinity.

Cramond Conservation Area covers all of the scheduled site.

Background to the planned developments

1. The pumping station

Prior to 1976 when the Edinburgh Sewage Treatment Works at Seafield opened, all sewage from Edinburgh was discharged untreated through numerous outfalls into the River Forth of which one example was the Cramond Island outfall.

Following the opening of the Seafield works interceptor sewers were constructed to divert, largely by gravity, all the inland catchments to the treatment works. The remaining coastal outfalls were diverted by the construction throughout the 80s and 90s of coastal interceptor sewers and pumping stations, including the Western Interceptor Sewer which took most of the sewage from the western part of Edinburgh.

The remaining sewage flows to Cramond are from the Almond Sewer and The Promenade Sewer. The topography of the catchment means that these flows must be pumped in order to be diverted to Seafield for treatment. The high costs and politically sensitive nature of constructing a pumping station and associated works at Cramond fore shore has caused this outfall to become one of the last untreated sewage discharges into this area of the River Forth.

East of Scotland Water considered several possible options for dealing with sewage discharges:

i) Constructing a sewage treatment plant at the fore shore, which was ruled out due to the environmental impact of such works;

ii) Constructing a pumping and screening station at Cramond sea front. This was ruled out due to the size of the building required to enable the handling and screening of flows and the processes involved;

iii) Construct a pumping station at Cramond fore shore to deal only with flows from the Almond and Promenade sewers. It was decided to proceed with this option since it minimised the size of the building required at the Cramond fore shore.

Having chosen to proceed with option iii), three sites were considered by East of Scotland Water:

a) The site of the existing comminutor station. This was considered in some detail but was ruled out due to the height and size of the building required and the technical problems of dealing with existing flows during construction;
b) Constructing the pumping station on the beach to the north of the promenade. Again, the visual impact due to the size and height of the building ruled out this site;

c) Part bury the pumping station in the embankment between the public car park and the promenade. It was decided to proceed to detailed design stage and submit a planning application on the grounds that this site offered the best opportunities of blending the building in with the surroundings and thus minimising the visual impact.

The proposed development by East of Scotland Water therefore comprises of the following:

1) A new pumping station to divert an existing raw sewage discharge from the Cramond area to Edinburgh wastewater treatment works at Seafield for treatment;

2) A new stormwater management system to reduce the impact of major combined sewage discharges to the River Almond during storm conditions;

3) Refurbishment and duplication in part of the existing long sea outfall at Cramond; and,

4) Rehabilitation of the River Almond sewer and removal of the combined sewage overflows.

The pumping main and pumping main require to be commissioned by December 2000 to meet a legislative deadline under the Urban Wastewater (Scotland) Regulations.

In its submission to this report East of Scotland Water stated: ÔThe new pumping main from the pumping station will follow the same route as an existing major storm sewer running through the scheduled area of the Roman remains. This ground will already have been disturbed when the storm sewer was laid a number of decades ago. The proposed pipe laying operation will affect no virgin ground. Appendix III provides a drawing of the existing and proposed pipeline routes.Ô

The local authority's Recreation Department commented: ÔThe site of the proposed new development has, however, been substantially affected by the construction in 1947 of an earlier settling tank and by the laying of series of associated pipelines across the area.Ô

ÔThe scale of the previous ground disturbance at the site indicates that the impact of the proposed development on any surviving archaeological remains is limited; however it is essential that in the areas outwith the settling tank and its associated pipeline that the site should be stripped under archaeological supervision, with a professional archaeologist in attendance to carry out a watching brief.Ô

Historic Scotland commented in its submission to the local authority: ÔWe wish to draw your attention to our concern over the route of the proposed rising main pipeline and its possible impact on archaeological deposits in the scheduled area. As proposed the pipeline crosses the whole northern end of the scheduled area, and continues immediately to the east. We would have preferred the pipeline to have avoided this area altogether and we are disappointed that, according to East of Scotland Water (ESW) Waterway Consultancy, no alternative route is available. Unfortunately, it appears we may now have to accept this
fact. In our view, it would be advisable for an archaeological watching brief also to take place on pipeline works to the east of the scheduled area.

The argument that the existing pipe trench will already have removed all deposits in this area is not only untested, but it is also unlikely to be true across the whole working (15m) width of the pipeline. For this reason, it will be a condition of any scheduled ancient monument Consent granted that trial excavations must take place at intervals along the approximately 50m length of the pipeline and across its entire 15m width.

We would also add that the programme of archaeological works should explicitly include the line of the proposed new access footpath, immediately to the west of the proposed pumping station, as well as any previously undisturbed areas which are proposed for subsequent planting of trees or deep-rooting shrubs. We will be recommending that similar archaeological conditions are attached to any Scheduled Monument Consent granted for that portion of the pumping station which lies within the scheduled area.

In the opinion of Margaret Smith MSP: The sea and river are currently unsafe for bathing and local people are encouraged not to allow their children to come in contact with the water. So there is a need for something to be done.

Having stated the important role that the Roman remains play in the life of the area I must say that their protection and preservation must be weighed against other considerations when we are looking at the needs of a modern suburb of a modern city.

The Cramond Association believed that there was a public consensus in favour of the pumping station being located 200 yards further east and that impact of construction traffic would be significantly lessened by routing heavy equipment along the promenade. Historic Scotland did seek to persuade East of Scotland Water to change the route of the pipeline but have reluctantly relented to the proposed route.

East of Scotland Water’s planning application was approved on 3 February 2000 subject to conditions which reflected archaeological procedures. In particular the local authority has determined that: No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the planning authority.

Given the need to upgrade waste water facilities by eliminating discharge of untreated sewage to the sea as required by European Community law, and the screening of stormwater overflows, the location of the proposal would in this instance be acceptable. A relaxation of Green Belt policy is acceptable, and in terms of the design and landscaping of the proposals are not considered to adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area or Area of Great Landscape Value.

The City of Edinburgh Council Recreation Department and Historic Scotland state that this site should be stripped under the guidance of a professional archaeologist working to a brief prepared by the City of Edinburgh Council Archaeologists Service. This will probably mean a series of trial excavations and full excavation, if necessary.

East of Scotland Water has altered various design aspects of the pumping station taking into account some local concerns raised at two public meetings and in the planning procedure. As the proposed pipeline and the route of a new pathway
will travel through the scheduled area, Historic Scotland will have to grant
Scheduled Monument consent prior to work commencing.

A large portion of the pumping station will be buried below the existing ground
level. Landscaping is proposed to soften the roof area of the pumping station
onto which the public will also have access.

A specialist archaeological contractor has been commissioned by East of Scotland
water to undertake a pre-start investigation and to oversee the construction
works. The remit for this work will require the full approval of Historic
Scotland prior to any works being undertaken in the area.

Once all of the necessary consents are in place, it is envisaged that a start on
site would be made in the Spring of 2000.

2. The proposed housing development at Moray House Campus

The campus of Moray House Institute of Education was brought into the ownership
of the University of Edinburgh when the two institutions merged in August 1996.
Originally built in 1965 as Dunfermline College of Physical Education, the
campus lies mainly to the south of the boundary of the scheduled site and
comprises of halls of residence, lecture theatres, indoor sports facilities,
administrative offices and a considerable area for playing fields. The small
part of woodland that lies within the scheduled monument is designated as Ògreen
beltÓ with no development being possible. About three fifths of the developable
land is playing fields and has been earmarked for recreation and amenity use.

The Cramond Campus will become surplus to requirements from the summer of 2001
and the University marketed the site with the intention of investing the
proceeds into new facilities at Holyrood and Peffermill. Prior to marketing the
site an archaeological report, comprising a desktop study and sample
excavations, was commissioned and made available to potential developers who
were asked to take account of its findings. Given the sensitivity, size and
location of the site the City of Edinburgh CouncilÓs Planning Committee approved
a detailed planning brief in January 1999 to facilitate the marketing of the
site. This planning brief addressed the issue of protecting the archaeological
remains, protecting the playing fields and woodland and included consultation
with Historic Scotland.

The Bryant Homes/AMA consortium was selected as preferred bidder in summer 1999
proposing a mixed residential and leisure development. Before submitting a
planning application the consortium had discussions with the City Planners, City
Archaeologist and Historic Scotland regarding how the archaeological criteria
might be taken into account.

Several confidential pre-application meetings have been held with the
University's agents and the developers regarding the potential development of
the site. These consultations are continuing and it is expected will will result
in the submission of a planning application by the Spring of this year.

From the available research and documentation the University of Edinburgh
believes that Òhere is only limited prospect of significant archaeology being
discovered on the campus.

However there is concern that the developer is now in negotiation with the
council about changing the planning brief quite dramatically prior to submitting
a planning application. The developers are considering ÒflippingÓ their scheme
over and building on the existing Ògreen fieldÓ site and returning the Òbrown
fieldō site to ōgreen fieldō for use as playing fields. This would, obviously, be in contradiction of the planning brief which had been generally acceptable to the community and the Planning Department.

Bryant Homes are now about to commission a site wide excavation involving pits and trenches to see what archaeological sites there are across the site. This will then be used to determine whether their plans are better or worse than the brief in archaeological terms.

The Council for Scottish Archaeology was keen that development should be directed towards areas where previous development had already taken place and that in any event advice should constantly be sought from the local authority archaeology service.

It was also stated that ‘while archaeological investigation in advance of development could possibly extend knowledge, excavation is nevertheless destructive, and should only be used when preservation and other non-destructive means of investigation prove impossible.’

In her submission to this report, Margaret Smith MSP stated: ‘The local archaeologists feel that the archaeological tests done for the University by AOC were inadequate and that as stated before the archaeological history of the area involves much more than the scheduled area around the Fort.’

‘Local People are very concerned at the prospect of development at the Cramond Campus site. Many of the concerns that people had about the future of the 'green field' element of the site were allayed by the planning brief's protection of the playing fields and wooded area closest to the village. I believe that any plans to move away from the brief as agreed will meet opposition.’

‘It is not for this report to consider the impact of the redevelopment of the Campus site other than what threats and opportunities that it presents to the maintenance and enhancement of the Roman Remains at Cramond.

Although the proposed housing development lies outside the scheduled monument its impact on the integrity of the site should also be considered.

Opportunities and obstacles to developing the Roman Remains

Historic Scotland agrees that there is considerable potential for improved management and presentation of the Historic remains at Cramond and it has previously expressed concern about the condition of the remains within the scheduled area, in particular the Roman bathhouse which is now obscured by vegetation.

Historic Scotland would support the adoption of an integrated management and presentation strategy for the site as a whole and in particular the development of a Conservation Plan for the Area.

The main physical obstacle to developing the Roman Remains is the large number of visitors such a development might attract through the old village with narrow roads and the intrusion this would bring to local inhabitants. The local Councillor, Kate MacKensie, believes that Cramond residents would object to any increase in traffic if it was routed through Cramond village. At the moment there is no alternative public highway leading to Cramond. Although wide enough to take vehicles, the promenade from Silverknowes to Cramond has not been designed to have traffic on a permanent basis and would require significant alterations to the adjoining public parks and beach. The undeniable loss of
amenity and greater risk to pedestrian safety would attract its own objectors probably as significant in scale and influence as Cramond residents.

The only probable solution to providing vehicular access would be a new access road possibly through the currently unused South east access to the campus site. This could allow a new road to follow a route along the eastern boundary of the campus, through the scheduled site (not part of the Campus development) and down to the car park.

This could then meet an area which might have host an interpretive centre together with the Roman Bathhouse being revealed to visitors. The Cramond Heritage Trust has suggested that an interpretation centre could be created, using the disused kennels building between the Fort and Bathhouse.

Great care would have to be taken in developing such a site that more harm than good was not visited upon the Roman Remains and there is undoubtedly a body of professional opinion that would prefer to see such remains left well alone. The developer might balk at the provision of this road adjacent to expensive high quality housing but as long as it remained a dead end and the traffic generated would not be extensive.

Beyond physical constraints, the usual obstacle to the development of the Roman Remains would normally be the financial limitations of public authorities. In the case of cramond the difference is that there is also a clear lack of leadership from any one organisation as the scheduled site is split between five owners, none of which include Historic Scotland.

Given that the City of Edinburgh Council is such a significant landowner within the site one might have expected a greater lead from the local authority. However Edinburgh is graced with many fine buildings and sites of historic interest and as a result has many competing demands on its budgets. The dilapidated state the the Royal High school has been allowed to fall into is just one example of the difficulty the city faces in keeping all of its historical jewels shining brightly.

Lottery funding could, of course be applied for, and although the millennium funding has now passed by there remains various heritage funds that can be applied for. This would, however, require matching funding to be provided and this again requires clear political leadership before such fundraising can be organised.

Bryant Homes have also suggested the possibility of building a community museum, purpose built on the Campus site, possibly in response to local concerns about the loss of campus facilities currently enjoyed by local residents. However this would be some distance from the Roman Fort and the Roman Bathhouse in particular. If the bathouse were to become a prominent feature for educational or tourism purposes then any interpretive centre would need to be close to the remains.

Conclusion

In researching the opportunities for improved presentation and preservation of the Roman Remains that the proposed developments present it has been clear that Historic Scotland and the City of Edinburgh Council have sought to uphold the public interest in protecting the nation's heritage whilst allowing works to proceed within the laws of the land. This is not an easy balance to strike when development or disturbance has already taken place.
The development of the pumping station is a necessity that should and will proceed. On all of the available evidence the public bodies appear to be proceeding with the least objectionable option that will meet legal obligation. In an ideal world it might have been done differently but in an ideal world there would be no sewage pipes travelling through Cramond at all.

The development of the Moray House complex is still at an early stage and any attempt to significantly alter the initial planning brief should be strongly resisted by the City of Edinburgh Council. The issues surrounding loss of amenity to local residents by the redevelopment of the campus site is not pertinent to this report.

I have not found any evidence that the public bodies or the other interested parties have not been consulted or held consultations themselves. On the contrary, the problem is that there appears to be no clear leadership in directing the improvement of the presentation and maintenance of the Roman Remains together with a scarcity of funding due to priority which put Cramond well down the pecking order.

During the site visit carried out in October it was clear that the current presentation of the Roman Fort is appalling. The signage is poor and has not been maintained, while the cobbled sets give a very poor impression of the layout of the Roman Fort.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are therefore made to the Education Culture and Sport committee:

i) That in the short term the signage and descriptive information at the site of the Roman Fort be significantly improved and maintained;

ii) That for the consideration of a medium to long term development proposal Historic Scotland should initiate a meeting with the five land owners within the site of the Scheduled Monument to set up a management group that can prepare and consider a number of options for the improved presentation of the Roman Remains, including the possibility of a new interpretive centre and the exposure to public view of the Roman Bathouse, and to explore what funding might be required and might be available;

iii) That Historic Scotland regularly inform the education, Culture and Sport Committee of its progress on this matter;

iv) That the City of Edinburgh Council consider transferring the ownership of any or all of its share of land within the Cramond Scheduled Monument to another public body that might have funds available, if the City is unable to assist in the proper maintenance and presentation of the Roman Remains;

v) That the City of Edinburgh Council, the Management Group and the Moray House Campus developers give urgent consideration to the possibility of a new access road to the Cramond Car Park following a route down the Eastern boundary of the campus site as part of the Moray House Campus development in agreement with neighbouring landowners;

vi) That the new management group consult and involve the Council for Scottish Archaeology, local amenity groups and local representatives and hold a number of public meetings to discuss their proposals;
vi) That the new management group give strong consideration to the disruption to the natural beauty and amenity of Cramond village if greater tourist traffic has to be routed through the village and to work towards alternative solutions;

vii) That the conditions attached to the planning consent for the pumping station be strictly adhered to;

viii) That similarly tight conditions be applied to the Moray House Campus development and that the planning brief be followed by the Council without significant alteration.

Appendix i
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City of Edinburgh Council
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Historic Scotland

Dr Simon James

Cllr Kate MacKenzie

Margaret Smith MSP

University of Edinburgh
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Map of Scheduled Ancient Monument