



MALMESBURY MARKET CROSS

2023 Condition Survey

dittrich**hudson**vasettiarchitects

CONTENTS

A	Summary & Recommendations	Page
1.0	Summary	2
2.0	Recommendations by Category of Urgency (with Approximate Costs)	7
B	Condition Survey	9
1.0	External Elevations	10
2.0	Interior	17
3.0	Roof, Lantern & Roofspace	22
4.0	Landscape	34

A SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS



Figure 1.1.1: The Market Cross from the south

Introduction

- 1.1.1 This is the report of the condition survey and inspection of the Malmesbury Market Cross, undertaken on the 24th May 2023 by Izaak Hudson RIBA AABC.

1.1.2 Recommended repair work in the detailed description is categorised by urgency of repair as follows:

- U** Urgent (within the next year)
- 1** Within the next 1-3 years
- 2** Within the next quinquennium (5 years)
- 3** Long-term (subsequent quinquennia) but still important to achieve
- 4** Desirable but non-essential

1.1.3 Cost estimates in section 2.0 are approximate only. They include an allowance for fees and access only where noted. Costs are exclusive of VAT. Costs are based on 2023 estimates and additional allowance should be made for inflation and contingency for work in subsequent years.

1.2 Brief History

1.2.1 This report includes only a very cursory description of the structure, which is well covered by displays and texts held in the nearby Althelstan Museum.



Figure 1.2.1a: 1688 engraving of the Market Cross



Figure 1.2.1b: The Cross in 1913 showing new stone

1.2.2 The Market Cross was built by the monks of Malmesbury Abbey in around 1490-1500, in the Perpendicular Gothic style.

1.2.3 The structure was repaired in c. 1800, funded by the 15th Earl of Suffolk. Further repairs followed in around 1880, following advice from the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, funded by public subscription.

- 1.2.4 A major programme of repairs and stone replacement was undertaken under the direction of the architect Harold Brakspear in early 1912, with funding led by the 19th Earl of Suffolk. The specification for this work is held in the Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre. Further repairs were undertaken in 1951; in 1979 (after a car transporter demolished 5 pinnacles); in 1991 (cleaning funded by English Heritage); and in 2003 (undertaken by Minerva). A recycling lorry caused damage which was repaired in 2018 by Andrew Nurden.
- 1.2.5 The 1680s engraving indicates that the Market Cross is still likely to be in its original form, with very little alteration to the *design*. However, the exposure of the delicate, and soft Bathstone carving; a number of repair programmes; and several vehicle strikes mean that the majority of the structure, particularly carved elements, isn't the original stonework.
- 1.2.6 A good quality interactive computer model of the Market Cross was commissioned by Malmesbury Civic Trust and can be downloaded at:
<https://malmesburycivictrust.weebly.com/our-achievements.html>



Figure 1.2.7: Extract from the 3D Model viewed from the south

1.3 Statuary Designation

- 1.3.1 The Market Cross is a scheduled monument (list entry number 1005660). It is also in the Malmesbury Conservation Area and forms a key focus for Area 1: Market Cross and Upper High Street.

1.4 Summary of Condition and Recommendations

- 1.4.1 The Market Cross is generally in very good condition and is well cared-for. The roof and leadwork is in very good order requiring only a small number of patch repairs. The lantern statuary (mostly if not all replaced in the early twentieth century) is vulnerable and is eroding and would benefit from some conservation work to try and arrest the rate of decay. Low-level and jamb stonework is friable in places and would benefit from a programme of stone repairs in places.
- 1.4.3 Several figurative head mouldings and two crocketed finials are loose. They are likely to have internal securing dowels, but this should be confirmed by cover meter survey and the heads and finials should be pinned and pointed-in so that they are secure.
- 1.4.4 The loft hatch is rotten and needs to be replaced with a new lead cover.
- 1.4.5 The landscaping around the monument needs improvement. Drains are blocked and the southern paved area does not drain well. The north of the Market Cross is very vulnerable to vehicle strikes and has no protection from the constant stream of vehicles that park and turn in close proximity to the stonework. Parking against the monument significantly mars the setting and safety of users. The stone paving in the square is deteriorating due to heavy vehicle movements.



Photos 1.4.5a & 1.4.5b: The monument crowded by vehicles



Photo 1.4.5c: Damaged paving from vehicles



Photo 1.4.5d: Vehicle strike damage in 2018

1.4.6 The monument needs protection with wider pavements; a high kerb; bollards; traffic control. This would require a landscape project that will have to extend into the square. This is probably the most important recommendation of the condition survey.

1.4.7 Improvements to the traffic and landscaping around the Market Cross are one of the seven enhancement proposals to Area 1 in Wiltshire Council's Malmesbury Conservation Area Character Appraisal ("Consider an enhancement scheme to control traffic manoeuvres and parking around the Market Cross"). A well-detailed project with natural landscaping materials should thus be fully supported by Wiltshire Council.

1.5 Recommended Work

Urgent Work (U)

1.5.1 The only urgent work is to unblock the east and west drainage gullies; this is estimated at **£250** but could be done by Town Council staff.

Work Recommended for the Next 1-3 Years (1)

1.5.2 Work which should be done in the next 3 years is set out in detail in section 2. Moss needs to be removed from string courses and the leadwork. The loose finial heads and finials need to be re-secured. A programme of small repairs to the leadwork is needed. The landscape project needs to be developed. The cost of this work is estimated at **£13,900** excluding VAT, contingency, fees and inflation. This includes an allowance of £10,000 for the design of the landscaping.

Work Recommended for the Next 3-5 Years (2)

1.5.3 Work which should be done in the next 3 years is set out in detail in section 2. A small programme of stone repairs to the external plinth and jamb stonework is recommended. Rope access repairs to the lantern statuary would arrest deterioration. The roof access hatch needs to be replaced. The cost of this work is estimated at **£9,250** excluding VAT, contingency, fees and inflation.

Work Recommended for Subsequent Quinquennial (3)

1.5.4 Work which should be done in subsequent quinquennia is set out in detail in section 2. The internal vault pointing needs to be addressed in localised areas; one very eroded jamb stone could be replaced; and the gutter flashings need to be repaired or replaced where they are cracking. This work is estimated at **£5,250** excluding VAT, contingency, fees and inflation.

Desirable Work (4)

1.5.5 Work which is desirable is set out in section 2, and is estimated at **£57,500** excluding VAT, contingency, fees and inflation. This includes the landscaping work, which although non-essential for the condition of the monument is highly recommended. The cost of this is difficult to ascertain; an allowance of £50,000 is included but this could be insufficient.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REPAIRS

U	<u>Work which should be undertaken urgently</u>	Under-taken by TC	Text Reference	Approx Cost (£)
U.01	Clean out blocked pavement drainage gullies to the east and west.	Y	4.9	250
Total of all urgent work excluding VAT, fees, contingency and inflation (£)				250
1	<u>Work which should be undertaken within the next 1-3 years</u>	Under-taken by TC	Text Reference	Approx Cost (£)
1.01	Remove moss from string courses (including access) and the leadwork	N	1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 1.4; 3.4; 3.8	600
1.02	Re-pin and repoint the loose finial projecting small crocket figurative heads to Bay 2 (NE); Bay 5 (S); and Bay 7 (W); and re-secure the entire length of the two flanking finials to Bay 1 (N).	N	1.3; 1.6; 1.8; 3.11	1,800
1.03	Regularly inspect the vent meshes to ensure pigeons don't access the roofspace.	Y	1.9	-
1.04	Commission a programme of minor lead repairs – replace lead patches to three lead patches on the roof. Regularly inspect the restrained upper lead gutter bays and patch weld any forming cracks. Replace the gutter upstand lead patch to Bay 7 (W). Repair the crumpled end to the drainage chute to Bay 5 (S), including access.	N	3.2; 3.5; 3.6	1,500
1.05	Develop a landscaping project for the north landscape around the monument to prevent vehicles parking close to the stonework and improve the presentation of the Market Cross area; apply for consents and tender the work.	N	4.4	10,000
Total of all work which should be undertaken within the next 1-3 years excluding VAT, fees, contingency and inflation (£)				13,900

2.00	<u>Work which should be undertaken within the next 4-5 years</u>	Under-taken by TC	Text Reference	Approx Cost (£)
2.01	Commission a small programme of stone repairs – Mortar repair or fit stone replacements to the friable stone beneath the gutter spout to Bay 3 (E); repair the small crack to the Bay 3 north buttress arris; repair the small crack to the Bay 5 (S) buttress arris; rake-back and repoint the small crack to the Bay 7 (W) jamb stone; mortar repair fractured external plinth stonework on Bay 1 (N); mortar repair the spalling external plinth stone to Bay 2 (NE); de-frass and shelter coat the very eroded stone to the east outer jamb of Bay 5 (S); and the south jamb of Bay 6 (SW).	N	1.3; 1.6; 1.8; 2.6; 2.7; 2.10; 2.11	2,500
2.02	Replace the adjacent rusting litter bin to the north.	Y	1.9	500
2.03	Replace the rotten roof hatch.	N	3.9	1,250
2.04	Commission a programme of rope access conservation repairs to the vulnerable lantern statuary.	N	3.15	5,000
Total of all work which should be undertaken within the next 4-5 years excluding VAT, fees, contingency and inflation (£)				9,250
3.00	<u>Work which should be undertaken in the longer-term (but still important to achieve)</u>	Under-taken by TC	Text Reference	Approx Cost (£)
3.01	Repoint the internal vault pointing in localised places, including access.	N	2.4	2,000
3.02	Replace the very eroded stone to the east outer jamb of Bay 5 (S).	N	2.10	750
3.03	Replace the lead patches to the gutter flashings, or renew the flashings in shorter lengths.	N	3.5	2,500
Total of all long-term works excluding VAT, fees, contingency and inflation (£)				5,250
4.00	<u>Work which is desirable but non-essential</u>	Under-taken by TC	Text Reference	Approx Cost (£)
4.01	Re-pave the margin stonework between the south bay and the main road with dished drainage channels to protect the stonework.	N	4.2	5,000
4.02	Install CCTV cameras and enforce traffic restrictions at the junction between the High Street and Gloucester Street to reduce the risk of vehicle strikes against the monument at this vulnerable point; and to discourage unauthorised access to the roof of the Market Cross.	N	4.3; 4.6	Unknown
4.03	Deliver a re-landscaping project to the north of the monument to protect it from vehicle strikes and improve the setting; wider pavements; higher kerbs against the Market Cross; bollards; replacement stone paving and traffic exclusion measures.	N	4.4	50,000
4.04	Improve interpretation of the Market Cross on site.	N	4.5	2,500
Total of all desirable non-essential work excluding VAT, fees, contingency and inflation (£)				57,500

B **CONDITION SURVEY**

1.0 ELEVATIONS

1.1 The eight elevation bays are numbered 1-8 starting from the north (facing the abbey) and running clockwise.



Photo 1.1a (Bay 1 N)



Photo 1.2b (Bay 2 NE)



Photo 1.3b (Bay 3 E)



Photo 1.4b (Bay 4 SE)



Photo 1.5a (Bay 5 S)



Photo 1.6b (Bay 6 SW)



Photo 1.7a (Bay 7 W)



Photo 1.8b (Bay 8 NW)

1.2 Bay 1 (N) has a very weathered spandrel to the east (photos 1.2a and 1.2b), and a crisper, leaf-carved spandrel to the west. There is some scaling to the east spandrel and arch stone. The low-level ashlar is very worn and joints are washed out and would benefit from pointing (2). The buttress crocket finials are intact (they are 'engaged' stone so will be secure) – see photo 1.2c. There is some weathering of stone below the parapet, and to the base stone (photo 1.2d), but this doesn't warrant conservation work for now. Moss should be removed from the string course (1). The buttress finial to the south is secure.



Photo 1.2a



Photo 1.2b



Photo 1.2c



Photo 1.2d

- 1.3 Bay 2 (NE) has quite weathered spandrels (photo 1.3a) and the arch stonework is quite scaled (photo 1.3b). There is a small area of mechanical damage to the south and some blistering to the north (photos 1.3c and 1.3d), however, no conservation work is warranted for now. A finial crocket head to the south is loose. It is secured by a rod but needs to be re-pinned and pointed (1) – see photo 1.3e. The parapet stonework is weathered, but apart from moss removal (1), no conservation work is warranted.



Photo 1.3a



Photo 1.3b



Photo 1.3c



Photo 1.3d



Photo 1.3e



Photo 1.3f

- 1.4 Bay 3 (E) has very weathered spandrels and arch stonework. There's been some stone replacement to the north arch. An area of stone beneath the gutter spout is very friable (see photo 1.4c) and needs extensive full-face mortar repairs, or replacement with stone-tile repairs or stone replacement (2). Moss needs to be removed (1). There is a crack to the mortar behind a previous, poorly-pieced-in stone repair to the north buttress arris (photo 1.4d). Ideally a replacement stone-piecing-in should be fitted, coursed to match the joints (2).



Photo 1.4a



Photo 1.4b



Photo 1.4c



Photo 1.4d

1.5 Bay 4 (SE) has weathered spandrels. The carving in the west spandrel is interesting. The arch leans outwards here – the buttresses have been rebuilt plumb to support the lean. The parapet stonework is weathered. There are a number of fracture cracks to the east spandrel. The low-level stonework is weathered but joints are reasonable. Despite the high-level stone erosion, intervention and conservation work is probably not warranted here.



Photo 1.5a



Photo 1.5b



Photo 1.5c



Photo 1.5d

- 1.6 Bay 5 (S) spandrel carvings are completely missing now due to stone weathering. The arch visibly sags but this is most likely to be historic movement. There has been quite a bit of stone replacement to the west parapet. Older stones are very weathered, particularly to the west buttress head (photo 1.6c). There is a crack to the west buttress arris (photo 1.6d) which needs a stone piecing-in repair **(2)**. One of the crocket heads to the west is loose and needs to be pinned and pointed in **(1)** – see photo 1.6e. Low-level stonework is weathered (photo 1.6f) but pointing is still intact.



Photo 1.6a



Photo 1.6b



Photo 1.6c



Photo 1.6d



Photo 1.6e



Photo 1.6f

- 1.7 Bay 6 (SW) has two intact carved spandrels (the entire arch head is replacement stone). There is some scaling to the east arch joint (photo 1.7b). The band of stone above the projecting cornice is quite friable and previous mortar repairs have fallen off. For now, it would probably be best to leave it to weather before intervention is warranted.



Photo 1.7a



Photo 1.7b



Photo 1.7c



Photo 1.7d

1.8 Bay 7 (W) spandrel and arch stonework is all replacement stone and is weathering well. A lower jamb stone has a crack (photo 1.8b) which could be raked-back and pointed (2) and there is some scaling to the south buttress (photo 1.8c). The finial head to the south (photo 1.8d) has a crack at the neck and wobbles – it should be pinned and pointed in (1).



Photo 1.8a



Photo 1.8b



Photo 1.8c



Photo 1.8d

- 1.9 Bay 8 (NW) has crisply-carved spandrel replacements. The lower-level jambs have some scaling and there is erosion to the seat stone at the base, but generally, this bay is in good order. The buttress to the east (to Bay 1) has had recent deep pointing repairs by the contractor AC Nurden Ltd. following a waste lorry strike (photo 1.9b). Mortar is all intact. The west buttress finial has an open perp joint behind – it is a replacement stone so might just have been poorly bedded. The vent opening for the roof space has been infilled with mesh fixed with resin – it is secure for now but this isn't the best fixing method -see photo 1.9d. These openings should be regularly inspected as pigeons must not be allowed back into the roof space (1). The rusting litter bin here should be replaced or relocated as it mars the setting of the Grade I listed building (2).



Photo 1.9a



Photo 1.9b



Photo 1.9c



Photo 1.9d

2.0 INTERIOR

- 2.1 The interior is formed from a central, octagonal shaft and eight four-centred perimeter arches. Ribbed tierceron vaulting springs from the shaft and arch piers. Floor paving is limestone, almost certainly replaced in the twentieth century. The arch openings are infilled on six sides with low-level mixed coursed stone – some in regular courses and some in ashlar, of a variety of limestones and sandstones. The infill walling has been in place since at least 1683 (it is shown on the engraving of this date). The northeast (Bay 2) and southwest (Bay 6) arches are open for access.



Photo 2.1

- 2.2 The central shaft has a very worn bench seat. The shaft base above is very scaled with spalling stone. All carving detail has gone. Some conservation work would be ideal, but it might be vulnerable to damage at sitting level.



Photo 2.2a



Photo 2.2b



Photo 2.2c



Photo 2.2d

- 2.3 The main pier has had replacement shafts on all sides. These are weathered but still intact. The capitals have interesting hood arches from which spring the 16 ribs. These have had mortar repairs in the past which are now eroded. They are probably fine to leave to weather-back.



Photo 2.3a



Photo 2.3b

- 2.4 Sections of vaulting have been previously replaced to Bays 3 (east); Bays 4/ 5 (south); Bays 6/ 7 (west – almost entirely replaced); and Bay 8, although some bosses were retained. The vaulting generally is in good condition. Some bosses retain crisp carving; some are weathered and the replacements to Bays 3/ 4 have been left entirely uncarved (a Brakspear motif). No stone repairs are warranted. There is some green algae staining to the east (Bay 3). It's not clear what has caused this as there is no evidence of water ingress to the roofspace above. Some pointing here is loose and would benefit from repointing (3).



Photo 2.4a



Photo 2.4b



Photo 2.4c



Photo 2.4d



Photo 2.4e



Photo 2.4f

2.5 The arch stonework is scaled in places, but is intact and could be left to slowly weather.

2.6 The outer shaft stonework to Bay 1 (N) is scaled in places. There are mortar repairs to the west jamb. All is fine for now. The low wall is of weathered coursed ashlar with infill stones to the west. Some are fractured and would benefit from mortar repairs (2) – see photo 2.6b.



Photo 2.6a



Photo 2.6b

2.7 The open Bay 2 (NE) stone surrounds are weathered to the north. There is a fractured stone to the south at low level which needs a mortar repair to protect it from being knocked off and losing the face (2) – see photo 2.7b.



Photo 2.7a



Photo 2.7b

2.8 The outer stonework to Bay 3 (E) is generally in good condition. There is a piecing-in repair to the north which is cracked and eroded on both sides of the perp joint (photo 2.8b), but is fine to leave for now. The limestone wall copings are very worn but intact.



Photo 2.8a



Photo 2.8b

2.9 Outer stonework to Bay 4 (SE) is scaling in places but is generally sound. The wall copings are sandstone which might be accelerating run-off decay below. An area to the south is undercut but is fine to leave for now.



Photo 2.9a



Photo 2.9b

2.10 The east jamb of Bay 5 (S) is very eroded at the base. Stone replacement will be needed in time (3) for now de-frassing and shelter coating may prolong the life of the stone (2). The wall is of squat, coursed squared-rubble with sandstone copings and is markedly different from the outer low wall stonework. Joints are open but the rounded rubblestones won't take re-pointing well.



Photo 2.10a



Photo 2.10b



Photo 2.10c



Photo 2.10d

- 2.11 The outer stonework to Bay 6 (SW) is scaled. The south jamb is friable and would benefit from de-frassing and shelter coating to prolong its life (2).



Photo 2.11a



Photo 2.11b

- 2.12 The outer stonework to Bay 7 (W) is free of any major issues. A jamb stone to the north is cracked but repair isn't warranted for now – see photo 2.12b.



Photo 2.12a



Photo 2.12b

- 2.13 The outer stonework to Bay 8 (NW) is scaled but is generally fine. The low wall is a mixture of coursed and jumper stone in limestone and sandstone. The coping is weathered sandstone – the western end is oddly jointed (see photo 2.13b).



Photo 2.13a



Photo 2.13b

3.0 ROOF, LANTERN & ROOFSpace

- 3.1 The roof is of radial lead sheets with principal king rolls and lower smaller sized rib rolls, draining to a lead parapet gutter. The eight flying buttresses land on buttress feet which have lead bridges so the gutter can drain to the four catch points and chutes (there are no downpipes). The central lantern is supported from an octagonal shaft. Lead bays are numbered 1 to 8 with Bay 1 due north (facing the Abbey).



Photo 3.1a



Photo 3.1b



Photo 3.1c



Photo 3.1d

3.2 Lead bays are a maximum of 2.5m long by 0.8m girth, which is adequate for code 7 lead or thicker. Boards are showing through in places, and there are four lead patches. The lead welds to three of these have hairline cracks and should be replaced with larger patches (1) – see photo 3.2b. The upper gutter bays (ie. bays without catch pits) are formed from single pieces of lead welded to a small apron at the catch pit. They are therefore restrained at the point the lead passes through the buttresses. This lead weld will be prone to splitting (a tiny split is forming to Bay 1 (N) – see photo 3.2d). These points should regularly be inspected and lead patch repaired when required (1).



Photo 3.2a



Photo 3.2b



Photo 3.2c



Photo 3.2d

3.3 The flat leads on rolls are in fair condition. There is little moss which should be removed (1).

3.4 There is a minimum 120mm fall into the 350mm wide parapet gutters. Flashings are all secure and the lead is well-detailed.



Photo 3.4a (Bay 1 N)



Photo 3.4b (Bay 2 NE)



Photo 3.4c (Bay 3 E)



Photo 3.4d (Bay 4 SE)



Photo 3.4e (Bay 5 S)



Photo 3.4f (Bay 6 SW)



Photo 3.4g (Bay 7 W)



Photo 3.4h (Bay 8 NW)

3.5 Parapet flashings have small flashing patches over splits (the flashing are over-long). The Bay 7 (W) patch has come out and needs to be wedged and re-mortared (1) – see photo 3.5a. It is suspected that these patches are not wedged and all may need attention in forthcoming years as thermal movement loosens them (3). The flashing to Bay 6 (SW) has a crack which needs a patch in the longer term (3) – see photo 3.5c.



Photo 3.5a



Photo 3.5b



Photo 3.5c



Photo 3.5d

- 3.6 The four drainage chutes are held on bronze Y-brackets. The end of chute to Bay 5 (S) is crumpled due to damage and needs to be repaired (1) – see photo 3.6a.



Photo 3.6a



Photo 3.6b



Photo 3.6c



Photo 3.6d

- 3.7 The chute to Bay 6 (E) has a lap joint which has a mastic bed (which has failed) – see photo 3.7. Ideally the lead chute should be a single piece, as other chutes, but the joint is beyond the outer stone moulding so any leaks shouldn't be too problematic as they will drain externally.



Photo 3.7



Photo 3.8

- 3.8 There is a high level of moss in gutters (as well as stonework) and this should all be removed by hand with a spatula and water (1) – see photo 3.8.

- 3.9 There is a lead lined timber hatch to Bay 2 (NE) which allows access to the vaults beneath. The timber hatch is rotten and needs to be re-formed (2).



Photo 3.9a



Photo 3.9b

- 3.10 The parapet crenelations are all in good condition. There are small areas of cracked pointing and stone erosion but none that warrant attention for now.



Photo 3.10a



Photo 3.10b

- 3.11 The crocketed finials all appear to be in good condition visually. The two flanking finials to Bay 1 (N) (photos 3.11a and 3.11h) both wobble about the bed joint. They will undoubtedly have metal internal rods, so should be secure, but they do need re-setting and additional bed joint dowels to strengthen them (1).



Photo 3.11a



Photo 3.11b



Photo 3.11c



Photo 3.11d



Photo 3.11e



Photo 3.11f



Photo 3.11g



Photo 3.11h

3.12 The sundial slates are recent.



Photo 3.12a



Photo 3.12b

3.13 The eight flying buttresses are in good condition. There are some small areas of stone blistering, loss of pointing and frost damage to a roll-mould, but nothing that would warrant repair for now.



Photo 3.13a



Photo 3.13b



Photo 3.13c



Photo 3.13d



Photo 3.13e



Photo 3.13f

- 3.14 The lantern statuary almost certainly dates from the twentieth century (they were all reported to be traces only in 1909). They are difficult to access for inspection, but some are clearly not aging well. The stone is eroded and some statues are barely discernible. The statue of St Aldhelm to Bay 2 (NE) is missing a head and the statue in Bay 5 (S) is completely eroded (and might be pre-1909). Pigeons perch on the statuary heads and guano will accelerate stone erosion, but little can be done about this.



Photo 3.14a (Bay 1 N – St Lawrence)



Photo 3.14b (Bay 2 NE – St Aldhelm)



Photo 3.14c (Bay 3 E – The Virgin and Child)



Photo 3.14d (Bay 4 SE – King Athelstan)



Photo 3.14e (Bay 5 S – Unknown benefactress)



Photo 3.14f (Bay 6 SW – St Paul)



Photo 3.14g (Bay 7 W – The Rood)



Photo 3.14h (Bay 8 NW – St Peter)

- 3.15 The fine carving is vulnerable to weathering. There are a lot of previous mortar repairs, some of high quality, and some are now detaching. There is blistering to the left ear of King Athelstan , and to the cusped mould over Bay 5 (S). Protective lead weather hoods may arrest deterioration, and some conservation treatment would be ideal to prolong the life of the statuary (2) – this may be more cost-effective by rope access.



Photo 3.15a



Photo 3.15b

- 3.16 The roof space is dry (albeit after a long period without rain). Radial rafters span to large beams which span between the buttress stones. All timberwork is tarred softwood and appears to date from the Brakspear restoration phase. The vault stonework is intact. Bronze tie rods span from the lantern base to the buttresses. They aren't particularly tight and their contribution to the integrity of the structure might be questionable.



Photo 3.16a



Photo 3.16b



Photo 3.16c



Photo 3.16d

4.0 LANDSCAPE

- 4.1 The waterspouts drain to a stone set margin which drains to gullies to the north (photo 4.1 a), east (photo 4.1b) and west (photo 4.1c). The south spout water thus has a long route to drain to the side gullies across a threshold (photo 4.1d) – water probably just sinks into the ground. The east and west gullies need cleaning out as a matter of urgency (**U**).



Photo 4.1a



Photo 4.1b



Photo 4.1c



Photo 4.1d

- 4.2 Re-paving the margin stonework with dished channels and better falls from the south in particular would be desirable (**4**).
- 4.3 A high sandstone kerb to the south road provides limited protection from vehicles. Lorries in particular struggle to make the turn from High Street to Gloucester Street and there is a high risk of vehicle strike here, but there might not be much scope for improvement to the junction. CCTV coverage would be very useful to cover this junction so that vehicle strike damage can be pursued via vehicle insurance – HGVs are frequently routed through the town when drivers use inappropriate sat navs (**4**).



Photo 4.3a



Photo 4.3b

- 4.4 The parking area to the north creates high risks with reversing vehicles. Although there are double yellow lines around the Market Cross, there is a near constant stream of vehicles parked here, some legitimately with blue badges but mostly just for short stop-offs to use the shops. This mars the setting of the Market Cross. The constant vehicle movements mean a high risk of vehicle strikes; most probably causing more damage to the vehicles than the masonry, but a waste lorry caused substantial damage recently. The stone paving in the square is deteriorating in places (see photo 4.4d). Re-landscaping of the area around the Market Cross would be a substantial benefit – wider pavements and a higher kerb with cast iron bollards would substantially protect the building and improve the setting (4). Developing a landscaping project here would probably be the best value project to protect the Market Cross fabric (1).



Photo 4.4a



Photo 4.4b



Photo 4.4c



Photo 4.4d

- 4.5 There is little interpretation of the Market Cross on site. An information board would be an easy way of increasing access to heritage, which is so often a prerequisite of grant funding (4).
- 4.6 People have been known to climb onto the roof of the Market Cross (damaged buttress finial/crocket heads might be caused by this). This might be hard to discourage. CCTV (and signs nearby warning people about the CCTV to discourage access) would certainly help (4) – there