

# Chapter 9:

## Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

## 9 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

### 9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This Chapter addresses the potential effects of the proposed development on cultural heritage assets which are here defined as all relict man-made features pre-dating the First Edition Ordnance Survey mapping (surveyed 1859 in this area) and selected sites post-1859, such as war-time or industrial sites. This includes all Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Battlefields and Conservation Areas. This chapter therefore includes all types of historic buildings and archaeological sites. The assessment was undertaken by Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd.

9.1.2 There is the potential for wind farm developments to effect cultural heritage assets, such effects could comprise:

- Physical damage to the fabric of cultural heritage assets, generally resulting from groundworks associated with the construction of the proposed wind farm; and
- Adverse effects upon the setting of cultural heritage assets, largely relating to visual impacts.

9.1.3 Cultural heritage assets considered are illustrated on **Figures 9.1 and 9.2** and listed in a Gazetteer and Concordance (**Technical Appendix 9.1**). In the interests of clarity undesignated assets are referred to by Asset (A) numbers issued in the course of this assessment. Designated assets are referred to by their Historic Scotland reference number (Index No. for Scheduled Monuments and HB No. for Listed Buildings).

9.1.4 This assessment was undertaken by, and this chapter has subsequently been written by, Headland Archaeology.

### 9.2 Policy, Legislation and Guidance

9.2.1 This assessment has been undertaken with reference to relevant legislation, which includes National Planning Policy, and regional and local planning guidance relating to cultural heritage. An overview of relevant legislation and planning policy that has been consulted is provided below.

9.2.2 The Scottish Government's planning policy in relation to Cultural Heritage is set out in paragraphs 110-124 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (February 2010), which is supported by the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) (December 2011). Further guidance is given in the form of the Managing Change in the Historic Environment series (2010) from Historic Scotland and PAN2/2011 Planning and Archaeology (July 2011). Please see **Chapter 5: Planning Policy and Context** for information on the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) published by the Scottish Government in February 2010.

9.2.3 The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979: Scheduled Ancient Monuments are sites of national importance that the Scottish Ministers have afforded legal protection under this Act. Historic Scotland works on behalf of the Scottish Ministers to compile, maintain and publish a schedule of these monuments. Any work directly affecting these sites can only be carried out with the consent of the Scottish Ministers, following guidance by Historic Scotland.

9.2.4 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act (as amended): The Act states that *"the planning authority, in determining any application*

*for planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” (Section 59(1))*

9.2.5 The Scottish Borders Consolidated Structure Plan (2009) covers cultural heritage under the Quality of the Environment heading with the objective “*to make sure new development maintains and improves the region’s important built, natural and cultural assets.*” The following policies are relevant to this assessment:

- Policy N14: National Archaeological Sites;
- Policy N15: Regional and Local Archaeological Sites;
- Policy N16: Archaeological Evaluation, Preservation and Recording; and
- Policy N17: Listed Buildings.

9.2.6 The following policies from the Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (2010) are relevant to this assessment:

- Policy BE2: Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments;
- Policy BE1: Listed Buildings; and
- Policy D4: Renewable Energy Development.

### 9.3 Methodology

9.3.1 This cultural heritage assessment comprises a baseline survey, undertaken through documentary research and field survey. This is followed by an assessment of the potential direct and indirect effects of the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed development. Mitigation is proposed and the significance of the residual effects assessed.

9.3.2 The desk-based assessment covered all known cultural heritage assets within the application site red line boundary (**Figure 9.1**) and the surrounding 5 km (**Figure 9.2**). A field survey was carried out to verify the findings of the desk-based assessment and to identify any additional unrecorded assets. Cultural heritage assets in the wider landscape that are considered to be susceptible to impacts upon their setting were visited.

#### Study Areas

9.3.3 The assessment utilised the following study areas:

- Inner Study Area (**Figure 9.1, Technical Appendix 9.1**), consisting of the application site. Within this study area all cultural heritage assets were considered in relation to both direct and indirect effects. The potential for previously unrecorded assets to be affected by the proposed development was also considered;
- Middle Study Area (**Figure 9.2, Technical Appendix 9.1**), extending 5 km from the application site red line boundary. Within this area all nationally important assets (Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes) were considered in relation to potential operational effects upon setting and to inform the potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets within the Inner Study Area. Additionally, non-designated cultural heritage assets recorded in the Scottish Borders Council Historic Environment Record were considered to further inform the

assessment of the potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets to exist within the Inner Study Area; and

- Outer Study Area: This is based on the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), as defined in **Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Assessment**, within which cultural heritage assets highlighted specifically by consultees or identified as being at risk of significant effects upon setting were considered.

### ***Data Sources***

9.3.4 The desk-based study has been based on readily available and relevant documentary sources. The following sources were consulted:

- Databases of designated assets held by Historic Scotland;
- Scottish Borders Council (SBC) Historic Environment Record (HER);
- Records held by the National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS);
- The National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) held by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS);
- Historic mapping held by the National Library of Scotland;
- Plans held by the National Archives of Scotland; and
- Other readily accessible published and online sources.

### ***Field Survey Methodology***

9.3.5 A targeted walkover survey of the Inner Study Area was carried out on the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011 and 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2011 guided by modern mapping and a handheld GPS system. The intention of this walkover was to assess the presence/absence, character, extent and condition of known assets and to identify previously unrecorded assets.

9.3.6 Assets in the Middle Study Area where there was potential for effects upon setting were visited on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2011 in order to gather baseline setting data. Assets were selected with reference to Historic Scotland and the SBC Archaeologist's Scoping responses (20.06.11 and 8.07.11) and following the desk-based study and with reference to the ZTV, which was used to determine whether assets or viewpoints relevant to their setting lay within the ZTV. Further visits to consider setting issues for Hermitage Castle and Nine Stones stone circle were undertaken on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2012 and 17<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

### ***Consultation***

9.3.7 Historic Scotland and the SBC Archaeology Service have been consulted during the course of this assessment. A summary of scoping and other relevant correspondence is set out in **Technical Appendix 9.2**. Further reference is made to the scoping process in **Chapter 3: EIA Process and Consultation**. In addition, information requirements concerning visualisations were also discussed at meetings with Historic Scotland (12<sup>th</sup> December 2011 and 21<sup>st</sup> September 2012) and the SBC Archaeologist (16<sup>th</sup> August 2012 and 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012).

### ***Significance Criteria***

#### ***Identification of predicted effects***

9.3.8 Potential effects include direct or indirect effects on the physical fabric of heritage assets, and effects on their settings.

- 9.3.9 Construction works have the potential to damage or destroy cultural heritage assets. Physical effects on the fabric of assets may occur either as a result of the design of the development or as an accidental consequence of construction plant movement. The effects may be direct, for instance where an archaeological deposit is removed or damaged during ground-breaking works; or indirect, for example where changes in hydrology lead to waterlogged archaeological deposits becoming desiccated and degraded. The location and extent of disturbance, and the likely physical effects on both known and unknown assets, have been predicted from the footprint of the proposed development.
- 9.3.10 Operational effects relate largely to effects on the setting of heritage assets and are primarily (though not exclusively) a result of visual intrusion. Plans of the proposed development, ZTVs, wirelines and photomontages have been examined in relation to the cultural heritage baseline to predict the likely visual effects on designated heritage assets.

### ***Assessment of sensitivity of cultural heritage assets affected by the development***

- 9.3.11 The sensitivity of a cultural heritage asset reflects the level of cultural significance assigned to it by statutory designation or, in the case of undesignated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor. 'Cultural significance' is a concept defined in SHEP Annex 1, Section 3, which should not be confused with the unrelated usage of 'significance' in referring to effects in EIA. Assets of National Importance (as defined in SHEP Annex 1, 7-10), which include Scheduled Monuments, non-designated assets considered to be of schedulable quality, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Inventory Battlefields, are assigned the highest level of cultural significance and their sensitivity is high. Assets of regional or more than local importance are considered of medium sensitivity, while assets of local importance are considered of low sensitivity. Category B and C(S) Listed Buildings are categorised, respectively, as being of regional and local importance (Historic Scotland 2011, 12).

**Table 9.1 Guideline Criteria for Assessing the Sensitivity of Cultural Heritage Assets**

Sensitivity of Receptor	Guideline Criteria
High	Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings and undesignated archaeological assets of national importance
Medium	Category B Listed Buildings and undesignated archaeological assets of regional importance
Low	Category C(S) Listed Buildings and undesignated archaeological assets of local importance
Negligible	A badly preserved or extremely common type of archaeological asset or building of little value at local, regional or national levels

- 9.3.12 The cultural significance of monuments and other heritage assets derives from a wide range of characteristics which, following SHEP Annex 1, Section 5, are grouped into three categories:
- *Intrinsic* - those relating to the fabric of the asset;
  - *Contextual* – those relating to the monument's place in the landscape or in the body of existing knowledge; and

- *Associative* – more subjective assessments of the associations of the monument, including with current or past aesthetic preferences.
- 9.3.13 The assessment of sensitivity consists of an analysis of the characteristics that contribute to the overall cultural significance of the asset, and their relative weighting. Not all the characteristics listed in SHEP Annex 1 need be present for an asset to be assigned to a certain level of importance; and different characteristics will contribute to a greater or lesser extent depending on the type of asset and its unique attributes. Generally an asset will have certain 'key' characteristics, which cannot be compromised without an asset losing much or all of its cultural significance. These need to be carefully defined and distinguished from other characteristics which are less valued.
- 9.3.14 The cultural significance of a heritage asset derives both from its physical fabric and from its setting. Setting is defined by Historic Scotland (2010, paragraph 2.1) as *"the way in which the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is experienced, understood and appreciated"* and accounts for much of the contextual character of an asset. All heritage assets have a setting, inasmuch as they survive as recognisable places in a wider landscape. However, the extent to which setting contributes to the overall cultural significance of heritage assets varies widely. Setting may not be among the key characteristics that contribute to an asset's cultural significance, and even where it is, only certain attributes of that setting will be relevant.
- 9.3.15 Attributes of an asset's setting that have significantly influenced its design and function are considered particularly relevant and are likely to be among its key characteristics. Such 'functional' relationships can also exist between an asset and later features where, for example, a church or castle acts as the focus for a developing town, continuing to shape its surroundings through time. Setting may include localised factors, such as the integrity of a rural settlement and its related field system, or a more distant visual relationship, such as a designed vista or the view from, for example, one Roman signal station to another. The former is referred to in this assessment as immediate setting and the latter as landscape setting. In many cases, only the immediate setting will be functionally relevant in this way and more distant visual relationships will be fortuitous.
- 9.3.16 Valued setting characteristics of some assets may reside largely in aesthetic/artistic factors or a site-specific and subjective 'sense of place' that is more or less unrelated to their original function. For example, a building surviving as a 'romantic ruin', which has become linked to the work of a famous artist, may be valued for views which have much to do with the way it has been depicted, but little to do with the character of the building when in use. Such considerations, which generally fall under the heading of 'associative' characteristics, may be difficult to define, but are relevant and can sometimes be corroborated by previous written accounts of an asset and its contribution to the wider landscape.
- 9.3.17 The relevance of setting to the cultural significance of a heritage asset does not depend on it being visited (Historic Scotland 2010, 4.10), accessible to the public, or recognisable by the average visitor. Nevertheless, setting is likely to contribute more to the cultural significance of an asset that provides a rich and informative experience for potential visitors. Setting is therefore considered particularly relevant in the case of well-preserved assets that are prominent features in the landscape. The integrity and preservation of the setting is also a factor; where a heritage asset survives as part of a well-preserved historic landscape that includes many related features, setting is accorded greater weight than in cases where more recent land use has disrupted the coherence of the asset's setting, making the location of the asset more difficult to appreciate. Settings that have experienced change may

nevertheless continue to contribute to the value of a heritage asset and therefore remain sensitive to further change.

### ***Assessment of the magnitude of identified effects***

- 9.3.18 Magnitude of an effect is a measure of the degree to which the significance of a heritage asset will be increased or diminished by the proposed development. The magnitude of an effect reflects the extent to which relevant characteristics of the cultural heritage asset's fabric or setting are changed by the development, and the effect that this has upon the cultural significance of the asset as a whole. The magnitude of effects is assessed as high/medium/low, and adverse/beneficial, or negligible, using the criteria in **Table 9.2** as a guide.
- 9.3.19 In cases where only the setting of an asset is changed, it should be noted that the magnitude of effect refers to the consequences of those changes for the overall cultural significance of the asset. If the most valued characteristics of an asset derive from its setting, even small changes to that setting can result in a significant effect. Conversely, in cases where setting is considered largely irrelevant to an asset's cultural significance, changes to that setting can affect only that small part of its significance that is derived from its setting, and a significant effect is unlikely to occur. Changes within the 'visual envelope' of an asset do not necessarily result in an effect on setting, since to do so they would have to affect one or more of the characteristics from which the asset derives its significance. Where such relevant characteristics are unaffected, there is considered to be 'no effect' even if the asset is inter-visible with the development. The magnitude of effects on setting is assessed in relation to the factors listed in Historic Scotland 2010, paragraph 4.14, taking account of changes to views both from and towards the asset, and changes to the character of the landscape.

**Table 9.2 Guideline Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Effects on Cultural Heritage Assets**

Magnitude of effect	Guideline Criteria
High beneficial	The asset is preserved in situ, where it would be lost if the 'do nothing' scenario was played out; or the cultural significance of the asset is substantially enhanced by changes to its setting which restore key characteristics which were previously lost or obscured.
Medium beneficial	The asset is preserved by record, where it would be lost if the 'do nothing' scenario was played out; or the cultural significance of the asset is appreciably enhanced by changes which make key characteristics of the asset's setting easier to appreciate.
Low beneficial	The asset is preserved by record where it would otherwise continue to naturally degrade; or the development leads to a slight improvement in the asset's setting, but in ways that do not substantially affect its key characteristics, slightly enhancing the asset's cultural significance.
Negligible	The asset's fabric and/or setting is changed, but in ways which do not substantially affect any of the characteristics from which its cultural significance derives, and with no appreciable reduction or enhancement in the asset's cultural significance.
Low adverse	Parts of the asset's fabric and/or setting are lost or changed, but without substantially affecting key characteristics, leading to a slight reduction in the asset's cultural significance.
Medium adverse	One or more key characteristics of the asset's fabric and/or setting is considerably degraded, substantially reducing the asset's cultural

---

Magnitude of effect	Guideline Criteria
	significance.
High adverse	Key characteristics of the asset's fabric and/or setting are lost or fundamentally altered, leading to total or near-total loss of the asset's cultural significance.

### **Assessment of the significance of effects**

- 9.3.20 The significance of an effect on a cultural heritage asset, whether a physical effect (direct or indirect) or an effect on its setting, is assessed by combining the magnitude of the effect and the sensitivity of the cultural heritage asset. The matrix in **Table 9.3** provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the sensitivity or effect magnitude levels are not clear or are borderline between categories. Predicted effects of major or moderate significance equate to potentially significant effects in terms of the EIA Regulations.

**Table 9.3 Guideline Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects on Cultural Heritage Assets**

Magnitude	Sensitivity			
	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
<b>High</b>	Minor	Moderate	Major	Major
<b>Medium</b>	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
<b>Low</b>	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Moderate
<b>Negligible</b>	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor

## **9.4 Baseline Conditions**

### **Summary**

- 9.4.1 No designated assets are present within the Inner Study Area (**Figure 9.1**). Non-designated assets within this area predominantly relate to medieval and later agriculture, though medieval settlement is recorded in lower lying parts. Any earlier settlement is likely to be situated in similar areas.

### **Archaeological and historic context**

- 9.4.2 The SBC HER has no records of any archaeological survey or excavation having taken place within the Inner Study Area and the area appears to have received limited attention compared to adjacent parts of Liddesdale. Intensive surveys have been carried out to its south, by RCAHMS as part of its Liddesdale Survey in the 1990s, whilst a pre-afforestation survey was carried out of the land to the immediate west by CFA Archaeology in 2011. The southern edge of the Inner Study Area forms the northern limit of the RCAHMS Liddesdale Survey which entailed intensive walkover survey of the area and subsequent high precision recording of features. The survey paid particular attention to the immediate area of Hermitage Castle and recorded many land-use and boundary features associated with the castle, including some which were previously unknown. As a result of this survey, there are a large number and relatively high density of field monuments recorded south of the Inner Study Area, in marked contrast to the land within it.

### **Prehistoric to early medieval**

- 9.4.3 There is evidence for human exploitation of the landscape of the Middle Study Area from at least the Neolithic period onwards. The focus of recorded prehistoric activity in general appears to be to the south of the Inner Study Area, around Hermitage Water and Liddesdale, and at the north and east of the Middle Study Area in the catchments of Allan Water and Slitrig Water.

- 9.4.4 The recorded monuments around Hermitage Water include the Nine Stones stone circle at Ninestane Rig (SM1688), a Scheduled Monument, lying c.1 km east of the Inner Study Area. Nine Stones forms part of a group of three ceremonial sites overlooking the confluence of the Whitrope and Roughley Burns with Hermitage Water, the others being the Buck Stone standing stone (SBC-HER 3030055) and a further standing stone at Graystone Hill (NMRS- NY49NE18). During later prehistory, settlements appear to have developed in the vicinity of these earlier ritual features and it may be presumed that earlier settlement was also focussed on these areas.
- 9.4.5 The sites around the Allan Water lie c. 5 km north of the ridge of high ground which forms the northern edge of the Inner Study Area. They comprise the Neolithic stone circle at Burgh Hill (SM3354: outwith Middle Study Area) and a number of later prehistoric forts and settlements, the majority of which are Scheduled Monuments. Many of the records around Slitrig Water relate to finds of Bronze Age artefacts during construction of the railway through the area in the 19th century.
- 9.4.6 In contrast to the areas to the north and south, recorded evidence for prehistoric activity is sparse within the Inner Study Area. A circular feature, located during the walkover survey near Sundhope Burn, may be the remains of a hut circle (**Figure 9.1:** A10). If this feature is of this date, it would represent a marked departure from the presently established pattern as prehistoric settlement has not previously been recorded in this area.
- 9.4.7 There are also several extensive linear features within the Middle Study Area. These comprise sections of The Catrail, a linear earthwork, and a number of shorter cross-rig dykes. Four sections of The Catrail (**Figure 9.2:** SM3457, SM3466, SM3468 and SM3495), all Scheduled Monuments and with a total length of c.6.5 km, are recorded to the north of the ridge of high ground that forms the northern edge of the Inner Study Area. Whilst the date and function of such features is the subject of some debate, it has generally been accepted that The Catrail marks a long-distance boundary feature of probable early medieval date (Barber 1999, 138). A cross-rig dyke exists within the Inner Study Area (**Figure 9.1:** A13) and is composed of a bank and ditch, approximately 300 m long, which runs across the south end of Sundhope Rig. Such features are usually ascribed a later prehistoric to early medieval date and are thought to function as some kind of boundary, possibly delimiting a change in land-use, e.g. from arable to pasture.
- Medieval**
- 9.4.8 Records of medieval activity focus mainly on settlement and agriculture amongst the valleys within the lower reaches of the Inner Study Area and bordering its edges. They are dominated by Hermitage Castle which sits at the centre of an extensive landscape of related features. The castle was founded in the 13th century with the present structure dating from the 14th to 16th century and is both a Scheduled Monument and a Listed Building (**Figure 9.2:** SM90161). It is regarded as one of the finest castles in the Borders, illustrating key developments in defensive architecture and had a prominent place in border conflicts throughout its occupation. In addition, it has significant associations with key characters in Scottish history, including Mary Queen of Scots, and also with the romanticising of the Borders' historic sites by Sir Walter Scott and JMW Turner in the early 19th century.
- 9.4.9 Features associated with the castle include a complex of earthworks west of the present castle, which may relate to an earlier castle or moated site, a chapel, also to the west, and a deer park on the hillside above the castle, to its north. The boundary of the park is represented by a feature known as the White Dyke (**Figure 9.2:** SBC-HER 3030147 & 3030065). The White Dyke was identified as a park boundary by

the RCAHMS Liddesdale survey and recorded as stopping 200 m east of the Inner Study Area boundary and no westwards continuation was recorded. As any projected westwards continuation of the boundary might continue up to the Inner Study Area boundary, perhaps utilising the line of the Day Sike as part of the boundary circuit, this area of the Inner Study Area was subject to detailed walkover. Although some features were located in this part of the Inner Study Area, no features similar in character to the White Dyke were found. The features within this area consist of a small enclosure containing rig and furrow, two sections of bank, a possible small platform and several areas of quarrying (**Figure 9.1: A4, A5, A6, A7 & A8**). Most of these features are likely to be of medieval or early post-medieval date.

- 9.4.10 The medieval settlement of Sundhope (**Figure 9.1: A14**) lies mostly outwith the Inner Study Area, to the north-east of the present farmstead of the same name. Several extensive areas of pre-improvement settlement are visible as earthworks to the south and east of the present farm buildings, implying this settlement was probably more extensive than a single farmstead during the medieval period and may perhaps be better regarded as a clachan or township.
- 9.4.11 Additional features associated with pre-improvement settlement and land-use were recorded within the Inner Study Area during the walkover and from analysis of aerial photography. These consist of banks and enclosures, many containing rig and furrow (**Figure 9.1: A1, A2 & A3**), as well as two possible shieling sites (**Figure 9.1: A9 & A15**). Extensive remains of a pre-improvement landscape (**Figure 9.1: A3**) previously survived on Balderston Hill, north of Braidlie. The features on Balderston Hill were recorded from aerial photographs taken in 1948 and appear to have been largely plough-levelled since this date as few earthworks are visible on current aerial photography and no earthworks were observed in this area during the walkover survey.
- 9.4.12 The HER also records two drove routes of probable medieval origin running through the Inner Study Area (**Figure 9.1: A12 & A16**). These connect the valleys south of the Inner Study Area, via the uplands, to the valley of the Allan Water at the northern edge of the Middle Study Area; one (A12) runs through the centre of the Inner Study Area near the Sundhope Burn, whilst the other (A16) is located in an area of commercial forestry in the eastern part of the site near Whitrope Burn.

#### ***Post-Medieval to Modern***

- 9.4.13 The Inner Study Area appears to have attained by the 18<sup>th</sup> century a similar balance of land-use as exists at present. A survey of Buccleuch lands, dated 1718, includes Sundhope and Hermitage farms and contains plans of the extent of each farm and a brief description of the nature of land contained within it (National Archives: RHP9629). The extent of Sundhope farm shown on this plan matches the present extent of the main farm holding, which includes much of the eastern half of the Inner Study Area. The plan shows the farm's houses as lying in the vicinity of the present farm buildings, near the confluence of Sundhope Burn and Windy Cleuch. The farm's land appears to have mostly comprised rough grazing and is described as *"but sorry land and no corn land nor but little meadow"*. The farms at Braidlie and Gorrenberry were not covered by this survey.
- 9.4.14 By the 19<sup>th</sup> century the landscape of the Inner Study Area appears to have been almost entirely composed of open rough grazing and divided between the farms of Braidlie and Sundhope. Consequently, numerous sheepfolds are found across the Inner Study Area. Whilst the majority of sheepfolds are stone built and are recorded on present OS mapping, some remains of an apparently earlier sheepfold (**Figure 9.1: A11**) were found adjacent to the Sundhope Burn during the walkover survey.

---

***Designated cultural heritage assets in the Inner Study Area***

- 9.4.15 There are no designated cultural heritage assets in the Inner Study Area.

***Non-designated cultural heritage assets in the Inner Study Area***

- 9.4.16 There are 16 non-designated cultural heritage assets within the Inner Study Area (**Figure 9.1; Technical Appendix 9.1**). Four were already known from the SBC-HER. The remaining 12, however, were identified during the course of the baseline assessment and walkover survey. These are largely related to post-medieval agriculture and include settlements, enclosures, banks, drove roads and sheepfolds. There is also a possible hut circle and a possible platform.

***Archaeological Potential***

- 9.4.17 The Inner Study Area takes in an extensive area of uplands that has significant variations in archaeological potential (**Figure 9.1**).

- 9.4.18 The greater part of the Inner Study Area has low to negligible potential to contain previously unrecorded archaeological sites. This is the result of a combination of three main factors:

- Altitude and remoteness. Most of the Inner Study Area lies at altitudes of over 300 m aOD. Land at such altitudes in southern Scotland has never been suitable for pre-industrial settlement as it cannot support cultivation. Consequently, it has only been suitable for low intensity activities such as hunting and seasonal grazing. The only departures from this that might be reasonably expected are hillforts and ritual sites, such as cairns and stone circles. However, these are generally placed to overlook communication corridors or cultivable land. Given the remoteness of the Inner Study Area from such features, such exceptions are unlikely to occur.
- Visibility. Given the low intensity of land-use, archaeological assets are likely to have survived as upstanding features, as there have been no episodes of land improvement to remove surface traces.

- 9.4.19 The potential for unrecorded assets to be present in the higher parts of the Inner Study Area is consequently restricted to features such as sheepfolds, which the survey has demonstrated are present. The potential for unrecorded assets is low between 300 m and 400 m aOD and negligible above 400 m aOD.

- 9.4.20 In the remainder of the Inner Study Area there is moderate potential for archaeological assets to be present, in particular in the vicinity of the farmsteads. Here more intensive land-use, particularly during the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, has removed traces of preceding phases of activity and it is to be expected that activity has concentrated throughout history on these small areas of cultivable land. It might be expected that traces of medieval and earlier settlement and cultivation lie in these areas, though their condition is unknown.

***Designated cultural heritage assets in the Middle Study Area***

- 9.4.21 There are 24 Scheduled Monuments within the Middle Study Area (**Figure 9.2, Technical Appendix 9.1**). These range from early prehistoric to late medieval in date and include a standing stone and stone circle, forts, enclosures and settlements, linear earthworks, Hermitage Castle and Chapel and two Pele Towers.

- 9.4.22 There are four Listed Buildings in the Middle Study Area. Two of these are Category A Listed Buildings - Hermitage Castle and Hermitage Chapel. As these buildings are also Scheduled Monuments, their scheduled status takes precedence and they are therefore discussed under that designation. The remaining Listed Buildings are both

Category B structures and are part of the dismantled Waverley line: the Shankend Viaduct (**Figure 9.2:** HB2064) and the Whitrope Viaduct (**Figure 9.2:** HB49311).

- 9.4.23 There are no Conservation Areas, Inventory Designed Landscapes and Gardens or Inventory Battlefields within the Middle Study Area.

***Cultural heritage assets considered in the Outer Study Area***

- 9.4.24 As requested by the SBC Archaeologist during consultation, the Scheduled Monument Ruberslaw, fort and signal station (SM2129), which lies roughly 16.4 km to the north-east of the development, has also been considered during the course of this assessment.

## 9.5 Predicted Effects

### ***Construction***

- 9.5.1 Within the Inner Study Area, the drove road (A12) – is crossed by the new access track between Turbines 16 and 17 and, again, by the track to the eastern permanent met mast. The proximity of Turbine 10 means that it may also give rise to accidental impacts on the drove road during the construction of the wind farm. Although first recorded on the Ordnance Survey map of 1863, as a traditional route-way it is likely to have been used since at least the medieval period. As a relatively discrete example of a common site type across rural Scotland, the drove road is considered to be an asset of low sensitivity to direct effects. The access track will cross the drove-way at two locations, removing two small sections of this long asset. Such an effect will be of low adverse magnitude to the drove road. An effect of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity will therefore constitute an adverse construction effect of negligible significance on the drove-way (A12).
- 9.5.2 Also within the Inner Study Area, the drove road (A16) is crossed by the existing forestry road between the entrance at Windshielknowe and the easternmost borrow pit. This drove road is only recorded on Stobie's map of 1770 and is absent from Ordnance Survey maps of the area. Stobie's map is relatively stylised and there is some doubt that the route of this drove road has been transcribed accurately. Given current land-use, which places the route in a modern forestry plantation, and the very nature of the record itself, the drove road (A16) is considered to be an asset of negligible sensitivity to direct effects. The access track will cross the conjectured route of this drove road once, however as the access track will use the existing forestry road there will be no effect on the drove road (A16).
- 9.5.3 Effect significance cannot be meaningfully assessed for unknown assets, as neither the sensitivity of the receptor nor the magnitude of the effect can be known. Consequently, only the likelihood of construction effects is considered here.
- 9.5.4 The potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets within the Inner Study Area above 400 m aOD is negligible and it is highly unlikely that unknown assets will fall within the construction footprint.
- 9.5.5 The potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets within the Inner Study Area between 300 m and 400 m aOD is low. Due to the size of the construction footprint it is considered that it is unlikely for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets to be subject to construction effects.
- 9.5.6 In the remaining area below 300 m aOD there is moderate potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets, particularly in the vicinity of the farmsteads. Due to the size of the construction footprint it is considered that there is low to moderate potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets to be subject to

construction effects. This potential will be greatest in the vicinity of previously recorded cultural heritage assets. However, with the exception of a small area to the north-east of Sites A2 and A3 (**Figure 9.1**), all areas of moderate potential have been avoided by the proposed development.

### **Operation**

9.5.7 The potential for the operational phase of the proposed development to affect cultural heritage assets has been considered. Setting issues are the only operational effects of the proposed development that have the potential to have significant effects on cultural heritage assets. The starting point for the assessment of setting effects is reference to the ZTV, which is used to identify those assets that may have visibility of the proposed development and third party viewpoints relevant to the setting of assets in which it may be visible. It should be noted that the ZTV is based on a bare earth model that does not allow for the screening effects of local topography, vegetation and buildings. It is therefore possible for assets that are within the ZTV to, in reality, have no visibility due to local conditions. This phase of work was therefore supported by site visits.

9.5.8 The setting of assets within the ZTV, or with relevant third party viewpoints within the ZTV, has been defined and the spatial/visual relationship of the proposed development to the asset and its setting briefly described. Where the wind farm has the potential to have effects on the setting of an asset, this has been taken forward to a detailed assessment.

### **Scheduled Monuments with little or no visibility of proposed wind farm**

9.5.9 Of the Scheduled Monuments within the Middle Study Area, ten lie wholly outwith the ZTV and have no culturally significant views towards them which could be affected by the proposed development. These assets are listed in **Table 9.4**. These assets will not be subject to setting effects from the proposed development and are not assessed further.

**Table 9.4 Scheduled Monuments not in the ZTV and with no third party views.**

Index No	Name
79	Pyat Knowe enclosure
3353	Dod earthworks
3356	Dod enclosure
3365	Penchrise Pen earthwork
3428	Pen Sike earthwork
3458	Tinlee standing stone
3461	Priesthaugh earthwork
3496	Hawkhass Linn earthwork
3497	Cairn Sike earthwork
4007	Riccarton Tower

9.5.10 Hermitage Castle and Hermitage Chapel also lie outwith the ZTV of the proposed development. There are, however, third party view-points from which both the assets and the proposed development will be visible. These assets are therefore taken through to a full assessment.

### ***Hermitage Castle and Chapel***

- 9.5.11 Hermitage Castle (SM 90161) is the ruined remains of one of the great medieval Border castles. Historic Scotland, in their listing information, describes it as “*the most perfect of the medieval castles on the Scottish Border*” (Historic Scotland: HB-220). The castle is a Scheduled Monument, a Category A Listed Building and is also a Property in Care of the Scottish Ministers which is promoted as a visitor attraction. As such Hermitage Castle is clearly an asset of national importance and high sensitivity to effects. The castle’s nearby chapel forms part of the same scheduling (SM 90161) and, for the purposes of this assessment, is treated as part of the same heritage asset.
- 9.5.12 Hermitage Castle is located on the valley floor of the Hermitage Water, the hills rising steeply to the north and south. As Historic Scotland have noted (HS correspondence: 28 November 2012, “*the castle commands views to the east and west and the approach from the east is the most attractive views (sic) from the site.*” The view of the castle from this eastern approach as it emerges from the trees that line the Hermitage Water is also an attractive view of the castle and the one that will be most familiar to visitors.
- 9.5.13 The location of Hermitage Castle was partly chosen to control movement through the adjacent valleys, which acted as communications corridors between England and Scotland, the border then being marked by the River Liddel, and to curtail the activities of the Reivers; raiders who plundered both sides of the Border between the late 13<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries). During subsequent years it was altered and augmented as defensive architecture and tactics developed. These alterations were essential given the frequency with which the castle was involved in conflict. It finally fell into disrepair in the 17<sup>th</sup> century following the Union of the Crowns in 1603, which put an end to the border clashes that were the castle’s *raison d’être*. The 19<sup>th</sup> century saw the romanticisation of the border conflicts and the castle was repaired and consolidated by the Dukes of Buccleuch and Queensberry. The 19<sup>th</sup> century restoration saw “*most of the superstructure .... rebuilt, as well as the E side, the upper part of the SE tower and the arch that links that tower to its neighbour on the N.....The battlements, together with most of the corbelling and the wall-walk, have likewise been rebuilt*” (RCAHMS 1956, 77). It is this programme of restoration and repair that has created the foreboding structure seen today, with sheer walls only broken by blind arches on the east and west sides.
- 9.5.14 Surrounding the castle are the remains of many earthworks and structures related to different phases in the history of this site. Immediately surrounding the castle are numerous defensive earthworks, whilst to the west is the associated chapel which lies within the substantial earthworks that may mark the site of the 13<sup>th</sup> century castle or a slightly later moated farmstead.
- 9.5.15 On the southern slopes of Hermitage Hill, to the north of the castle, are the remains of a large enclosure, part of which is defined by a stone-built dyke, denoted as White Dyke on Ordnance Survey Maps. The antiquity and function of the enclosure is uncertain. It is not depicted on the Buccleuch estate map of 1718, the earliest sufficiently detailed map of the area. The survey and construction of a dyke around Hermitage Park, however, is recorded under the years 1750 and 1752 in the Braidlie Day Book and work on the dykes in the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is also mentioned in the Old Statistical Account. By the time of the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map in 1863, the area within the White Dyke was labelled as ‘Deer Park’. Moreover, the Original Name Book notes that the name was ‘*applied to a considerable tract of ground surrounding Hermitage Castle formerly a forest*’.

- 9.5.16 The reference to 'forest' is significant because of its relationship in medieval times to hunting whilst unpublished survey work by the RCAHMS in the 1990s has identified a possible deer trap on the hillside to the north-west of the castle. Represented by two converging arcs of dyke, the structure in effect forms a funnel down which deer could be driven towards a killing ground.
- 9.5.17 The likely relationship between various strands of historical and archaeological evidence, have been expertly brought together by Professor Oram in his recent study of the castle and its wider landscape. Accepting that some elements of the White Dyke enclosure may be no older than the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, he has suggested that the area bounded by the White Dyke possibly represents the area of the 14<sup>th</sup> century park, referred to in a 1376 rental, in which the demesne herd or flock would have been kept as a 'live larder' for the support of the castle's household (Oram 2012, 27-28). If this is the case, then the location of the deer trap is redundant within the boundary of a park formed by the White Dyke: *'it is too grand in scale even for a 114ha park and records a time when the surrounding landscape was more open'* (Oram 2012, 27). He has suggested therefore that the deer trap predates the late 14<sup>th</sup> century park enclosure, forming instead part of an earlier hunting landscape. Both the deer trap and the later park thus represent key elements for understanding how the castle can be seen to relate to its wider landscape: *'To observers from the castle, the landscape to the west would have been framed within the divergent arms of the trap. The construction of the park enclosure changed that perspective. The wider landscape remained a hunting-ground where Douglasses and Hepburns exercised their right to pursue deer, but the area closer to the castle took on a new significance as part of a different economic system'* (Oram 2012. 27).
- 9.5.18 The area enclosed by the White Dyke, including the deer trap, currently lies outwith the scheduled area. The SBC Archaeologist confirmed that *'the Council should treat the White Dyke and Deer Park as being of national importance, as they form the curtilage of Hermitage Castle'* (SBC correspondence 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012). More recently, Historic Scotland has confirmed that their assessment indicates *'this is a site of national importance and we will in due course prepare a scheduling proposal for Scottish Ministers to consider'* (HS correspondence 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012). Clearly, these features contribute to the cultural significance of the castle and this assessment recognises that the White Dyke park enclosure and its associated features is an asset of high sensitivity and national importance.
- 9.5.19 The castle has been described as *'the most perfect of the medieval Border Castles'* (Baldwin 1997, 119) and its intrinsic value – that is to say the value that is encapsulated in its fabric as a data source regarding the history of the site's occupation and, more broadly, the developmental sequence of the castle and the original and subsequent functions of the monument – is great. However, equally important are its contextual and associative values.
- 9.5.20 The castle's functional relationship with its surroundings is readily apparent. It is clear that it controlled movement along the valley of the Hermitage Water, though its key relationship with Liddesdale is less readily apparent, as trees in the middle distance largely screen the castle from view from the B6399 and the valley is not a prominent feature from the environs of the castle. The presence of the deer park is not readily appreciable but the survival of the White Dyke contributes to contextual value as the castle does not survive in isolation; instead its related features survive in the surrounding landscape.
- 9.5.21 In addition to this functional relationship with its surroundings, the castle's sense of place and associative value also draws on its surroundings. The castle is an exceptionally imposing structure with a unique appearance that seems to reflect its

brutal history. The fact that it is isolated with no modern development visible, with the exception of the ticket kiosk to its west and forestry in the distance, and is surrounded by moorland, contributes further to its bleak sense of place.

- 9.5.22 This bleak sense of place contributes to the romantic drama of the most famous historical association of the castle, namely Mary Queen of Scots, who visited the injured Bothwell there in 1566, having ridden from Jedburgh<sup>1</sup> Returning to Jedburgh later the same day, a return journey of perhaps as much as 60 miles, Mary was thrown from her horse into a bog, contracting a fever from which she was reportedly lucky to recover. The Queen's Mire, the name given to an area of bog to the north-west of the Inner Study Area, commemorates the event.
- 9.5.23 The sense of place for Hermitage is heightened by the legacy of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Romantic Movement and its association with Sir Walter Scott. Scott popularised Hermitage Castle in his collection of poetry and ballads, the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, which was printed in three volumes, the first of which was published in 1802. Included in this collection was John Leyden's poem 'Lord Soulis', an account based on local folklore. It depicts the evil Lord Soulis resident in Hermitage Castle and tells the story of how he met his end, being boiled in lead in a great cauldron that was set up over the stone circle on Ninestanes rig. This poem added to the mystical and supernatural sense of place associated with Hermitage Castle as the home of the practitioner of black magic and mysterious activities. Hermitage Castle also appears in the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* in the work *Cout o'Keeldar* which also refers to Lord Soulis and depicts events by Hermitage Water close to the location of the chapel. As Professor Oram (2012, 33) has noted, the two poems are 'heavily overlain with the supernatural and present the landscape of upper Liddesdale as lying almost on the threshold between the real world and the world of Faery'.
- 9.5.24 The sense of place of Hermitage Castle is also captured in a series of 19<sup>th</sup> century paintings. Sir Henry Raeburn's (1808) portrait of Sir Walter Scott depicts Scott sitting beside an unnamed ruin with, in the background, a view of the unrestored castle, from the south-east, with the open hills of the moorland beyond. Subsequent engravings, such as Horsburgh's 1837 engraving which was used for the centenary edition of *Waverley* in 1886, together with the popularity of Scott's writings themselves, reinforce the aesthetic associations of the site.
- 9.5.25 Roughly contemporary with the Raeburn portrait is an early 19<sup>th</sup> century engraving of the castle by Grieg from a painting by Weber which was published in 1815 (HS 2008, 3: cf similar view in Oram 2012, 20<sup>2</sup>). Set below the castle, with the line of the Hermitage Water in the foreground, it too emphasises the view from the south-east, with the hills beyond.
- 9.5.26 JMW Turner was commissioned in 1831 to produce a number of sketches to illustrate Walter Scott's Poetical Works including *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, in volume IV of which Turner's sketch of Hermitage Castle was included. A series of 14 preliminary sketches were produced, comprising both east- and west-facing views of the castle along the line of the Hermitage Water<sup>3</sup>. The Turner engraving included in the volume, and therefore the one that will be most familiar, depicts the castle from the south-east, along the line of the Hermitage Water, with the hills

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/places/propertyresults/propertyabout.htm?PropID=PL\\_149&PropName=Hermitage Castle](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/places/propertyresults/propertyabout.htm?PropID=PL_149&PropName=Hermitage Castle)

<sup>2</sup> see also <http://www.clanhay.org/news/2012-clan-hay-journal-to-be-published/attachment/hermitagecastle1814/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/research-publications/jmw-turner/joseph-mallord-william-turner-hermitage-castle-liddesdale-r1134260>

beyond – the same or similar angle of view to that shown in the 1815 Grieg engraving. The 1831 Turner sketches are the latest images of the castle prior to the programme of works that the Dukes of Buccleuch and Queensberry commenced two years later in 1833 which saw the consolidation, restoration and creation of the building that we recognise today.

- 9.5.27 Although Hermitage Castle is a large imposing structure, perhaps surprisingly it is not a prominent or particularly dominant feature in the wider landscape of Liddesdale, a reflection of its relatively low-lying position beside the Hermitage Water. Whether approached from the east or the west, the castle is not visible until the visitor is virtually upon it; its sudden appearance adding to the sense of mystery that is reflected in the descriptions of the site by early 20<sup>th</sup> century travel writers (summarised in Oram 2012, 34-37) which emphasise the antiquity, greyness and solitude of the site. Oram (2012, 34), for example, has noted how Alexander Eddington's description, from 1926, *'roots the visitor experience of Hermitage absolutely in the interplay between landscape and building, drawing a figurative line between the softness of the lowland scene of the approach from the south and east with the sudden crossing of the threshold into the waste in which Hermitage is set.'*
- 9.5.28 It is clear that Hermitage Castle was not built with long-distance views in mind. Two ZTVs demonstrating the theoretical visibility of the castle – based on a bare-earth model, without trees, buildings or other obstructions – have been produced to illustrate this point. They also help us to understand the visual relationship between the castle and the proposed development. The blue-coded area on **Figure 9.3** shows the extent within which the full height of the castle will be theoretically visible; the blue-coded area on **Figure 9.4** shows the same for the visibility for the highest point of the castle. The yellow-coded area indicates the theoretical visibility of the wind turbines, whilst the green-coded area shows those areas of the landscape from which both the castle and the wind farm will be theoretically visible.
- 9.5.29 It is worth considering how the cumulative ZTV for the castle – as represented by the blue- and green-coded areas on **Figure 9.3** and **Figure 9.4** – relates to how the site is approached and how it is experienced by the visitor because this is the aesthetic that lies at the heart of how setting contributes to the cultural significance of the site; in short, those elements that give the site its sense of place.
- 9.5.30 For the visitor travelling along the B6399 Newcastleton to Hawick road, there is a glimpsed view of the castle at grid reference 350633, 595624 (**Figure 6.23**). The castle lies at the left-hand margin of this view, whilst Turbines 9 - 17 will be theoretically visible at the right-hand margin. It is clear, however, that visibility will be limited by landform screening and, in any event, the castle and the development lie in opposite view-directions. Moreover, this location contributes nothing to the cultural significance of the castle and the sense of place that gives the site its particular cultural heritage value.
- 9.5.31 From the B6399, the visitor will then turn off on to the minor road which leads up to the castle itself. For this approach from the east (**Figure 6.21**), the photomontage indicates that the very tips of nine turbines (T9 – T17) may be visible in the right-hand side of the view. Filtered by trees, such views will neither dominate nor compete with the historic asset itself which lies in an opposing field of view to the north-west. Significantly, none of the western turbine group will be visible from the eastern approach to the castle.
- 9.5.32 There is no intervisibility between the castle and the wind farm in views along the western approach. Careful design and the iterative design process has ensured that the turbines are entirely shielded behind the landform (**Figure 9.5**).

- 9.5.33 Similarly, the proposed development will not be visible from the castle itself. **Figure 9.6** depicts the view from Hermitage Castle in a transparent wireline which clearly demonstrates that all the turbines of the proposed development will be hidden from view by the intervening topography. The framed view that Professor Oram has suggested for the deer-trap and its relationship to the castle will not be affected by the proposed development either.
- 9.5.34 A key challenge for this assessment has been to ensure that the essential sense of place of the castle and its wider landscape is preserved. Hermitage's sense of place is reflected in both ancient and modern descriptions of the site, from the writings of Scott to the Borders travel writings of more recent times. It is also reflected in the paintings of Raeburn, Turner and others, all of which emphasise views of the site from the east or south-eastern quarter. It is also reflected in its association with some of the most iconic figures in Scottish history. None of this will be affected by the proposed development. With the exception of those blade tips which may be discerned from the eastern approach (**Figure 6.21**), the visitor who comes to the castle and experiences it in its wider landscape will not be aware of the presence of a wind farm some 3 km to 4 km distant. The physical and metaphorical thresholds which enhance the visitor experience – the juxtaposition of castle and moorland, the soft lowland and the waste beyond, the real world and the world of Faery – all of these will remain to be appreciated as previously.
- 9.5.35 Nonetheless, it is possible to identify viewpoints from which both the castle and the proposed development will be visible – these are clearly indicated by the green-coded areas on **Figure 9.3** and **Figure 9.4** although this will be less extensive than shown because of intervening landforms, buildings and trees. At the request of the SBC Archaeologist and Historic Scotland, a photomontage from one of these locations, at Tofts Knowes on the hillside above and to the south of the castle, was produced (**Figure 6.20**). In the foreground is the castle, the rising ground of Hermitage Hill beyond, whilst along the horizon to the west of a large modern forestry plantation are nine turbines, six visible from hub-height, another three marked only by their blade-tips.
- 9.5.36 In their responses to the original wireline views and the subsequent photomontage from this location, Historic Scotland (28.11.12 & 07.05.13 respectively) concluded that *'the turbines will be visually dominant disrupting the landscape relationship of the monument to the north and drawing views away from an appreciation of the topographic location of the monument. Due to the scale, dominance and location of these turbines, the development would become a dominant feature in this landscape setting. We consider the turbines would reduce our capacity to understand and appreciate this monument in its setting.'* Historic Scotland has therefore concluded that this constitutes *'a significant adverse impact on the setting of Hermitage Castle'*.
- 9.5.37 This assessment by Historic Scotland, however, fails to distinguish between visual change and impact on setting. The cultural relevance of the Tofts Knowes viewpoint also has to be considered, along with the contribution it makes to the cultural significance of the castle and its setting. The functional argument, for example, would note – as already seen – that the castle was clearly not built with the intention of being seen from any great distance. Long-range views, therefore, across the valley of the Hermitage Water and the hills beyond cannot lend it cultural significance.
- 9.5.38 Nor is the Tofts Knowes viewpoint of any cultural heritage significance in itself. For example, it does not relate to how the castle was accessed, nor is it associated with an historical event or form part of the cultural package through which the cultural significance of the site has been previously expressed. Neither Raeburn nor Turner, for example, considered this view to be particularly enlightening for their perceptions

of what Hermitage Castle and its landscape meant to them. This does not, of course, mean that this view cannot be significant to other individuals. Indeed, as Historic Scotland have noted, '*sense of place is a social phenomenon that exists independently of any one individual's perceptions of experiences*' (Historic Scotland correspondence, 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012). It is important, however, that this assessment concentrates on what this view means for the cultural significance of the site itself.

- 9.5.39 The Tofts Knowes viewpoint is a location whence it is possible to view the castle in combination with the proposed development. The fact that the castle is intervisible and that the turbines are located on moorland that once formed part of the castle's lands does not, of itself, constitute an impact on its setting.
- 9.5.40 Access to the Tofts Knowes viewpoint is not promoted as a public right-of-way, nor, so far as this study has been able to determine, has this location been championed prior to Professor Oram's recent study (Oram 2012, plate on p.26). Right-to-roam, however, means that it is accessible to those who wish to see the castle and its moorland landscape setting from this elevated position above the Hermitage Water. The extent to which this view contributes to the cultural heritage significance of Hermitage Castle and its valued sense of place, however, is what is at issue.
- 9.5.41 It is clear from the photomontage (**Figure 6.20**) that turbines will be visually prominent and they would compete with the castle for the viewer's attention. However, contrary to the position adopted by Historic Scotland, this assessment concludes that the castle remains by far the dominant feature in this view on account of its scale, bulk and proximity. The turbines, by contrast, will be recessive, part of the distant landform beyond Hermitage Hill.
- 9.5.42 The physical separation of the heritage asset and visible elements of the wind farm, which is some 4.35 km distant, means that there is a real sense of 'here' (the castle, its adjacent chapel, as well as the White Dyke and its surrounding landscape) on the one hand, whilst on the other hand there is an 'over there', where the wind turbines and the modern forestry plantations are. The presence of turbines on a distant horizon does not substantially affect any of the characteristics from which Hermitage Castle and Chapel derive their cultural significance, and there is no appreciable reduction in their cultural significance. This is an effect of negligible magnitude: such an effect on an asset of high sensitivity would constitute an effect of minor significance.
- 9.5.43 Contrary, therefore, to Historic Scotland's assessment of this particular viewpoint, it is concluded that appreciation of the castle's topographic location is not significantly affected by the presence of turbines on a distant horizon, whilst those elements of the landscape that inform the cultural heritage significance of the castle and give it meaning (the hillside, the White Dyke, the water-side location and the overarching sense of place) remain intact and perfectly legible.
- 9.5.44 Hermitage Castle, with its substantial remains, historic associations, folklore and poetic background evokes a strong sense of place. To some this will be in the historical past and the association with Mary Queen of Scots. To others it will be the cultural identity they attribute to the castle and its place in the bloody border warfare prior to the act of Union. Others still will look to the supernatural and the folklore associated with the castle. To all, Hermitage Castle evokes a sense of remoteness. Effects of minor significance on its setting have been identified. The key characteristics that give it its cultural significance, however, will not be significantly affected by the proposed development.

### ***Scheduled Monuments within the ZTV of the proposed wind farm***

- 9.5.45 There are twelve Scheduled Monuments (**Table 9.6**) in the Middle Study Area that are located within the ZTV of the proposed wind farm. The potential effects on these assets are assessed.

**Table 9.5 Scheduled Monuments within the ZTV**

Index No	Name
1688	Nine Stones, stone circle
2294	White Hill fort
2296	Penchrise Pen fort
2297	Blakebillend fort
3364	Blakebillend cairn
3391	Dod earthworks
3432	Gray Coat pele-house
3457	The Catrail, linear earthwork, 650 m long, on SE slope of White Hill
3459	Gray Coat settlement
3466	The Catrail, linear earthwork, Robert's Linn Bridge to Leap Burn
3468	The Catrail, linear earthwork, W of Leap Burn to 100 m E of Langside Burn
3495	The Catrail, linear earthwork, SE slope of Singley Brae to Barry Sike

### ***Nine Stones Stone Circle***

- 9.5.46 Nine Stones stone circle (**Figure 9.2**: SM1688) consists of the remains of a stone circle, located in boggy ground on Ninestane Rig in what was a small unplanted area of rank vegetation within a forestry plantation. The intended relationship with its surroundings is unclear, but it must be assumed, given its location near the southern end of Ninestane Rig, that it was intended to overlook the confluence of Roughley Burn, Whitrope Water and Hermitage Water and activity in this area. In its current state, the stones to the south-west are the largest and appear to frame views in this direction. However, this may simply be an accident of survival as several of the stones may have been broken in antiquity.
- 9.5.47 Surrounding forestry has recently been felled and replanted. This has temporarily helped restore the ability to appreciate the stone circle, views from it and its place in the wider landscape (**Figure 6.26**). Any appreciation of the site, however, is diminished by the presence of extensive areas of brash.
- 9.5.48 As a Scheduled Monument Nine Stones stone circle is considered to be of high sensitivity to effects.
- 9.5.49 The cultural significance of the stone circle is largely derived from its intrinsic value as a potential source of data that may inform the understanding of Neolithic/Early Bronze Age ritual activity, both locally and at other similar sites in the Borders and as an example of an early prehistoric ritual feature. It has some contextual value deriving from its apparent functional relationship with the topography to the south. In addition, there is some associative value: folklore has it that 'Bad Lord Soulis' of Hermitage Castle was taken there and boiled in a vat of lead when the people of the area rose up against him. The site itself, however, has no sense of place as the

circle is slight and overgrown, it is not discernible from a great distance and it has no aesthetic relationship with its surroundings.

- 9.5.50 Of the above, only the contextual element relating to views to the land to the south contributes to the experience of the stone circle and appreciation of its significance on the ground. It is considered therefore that the setting of the stone circle relates primarily to the valleys to the south: it is these views that contribute significance to the setting of the monument. The landscape elsewhere contributes substantially less to its cultural significance as it is unlikely to be functionally linked and the stone circle has no aesthetic relationship with its surroundings (**Figure 6.26**).
- 9.5.51 The proposed development will be visible at a distance of 2.8 km to the north-west of the stone circle. However, there is nothing to suggest that this view direction contributes cultural significance to the setting of the monument, whilst those setting elements that arguably do will not be affected by the presence of the proposed development. It is concluded, therefore, that there will be no significant effect on the cultural significance of Nine Stones stone circle.

#### ***Forts and settlements***

- 9.5.52 There are 12 scheduled forts, earthworks and enclosures to the north of the Inner Study Area, five of which are located within the ZTV of the proposed development (**Figure 9.2**: SM 2294, 2296, 2297, 3459 & 3391). Wirelines from two of the most prominent assets in this group illustrate the nature of the visual change that would be experienced here (**Figure 9.7**: Penchrise Pen Fort (SM2296); **Figure 9.8**: Blakeblland Fort (SM2297)).
- 9.5.53 This group of monuments are essentially fortified settlements of late prehistoric to early medieval date that survive as earthworks. They utilise local topography for defensive purposes and were placed in proximity to cultivable land. They do not have designed long range visual relationships with other assets or landscape features, though they do have a high degree of inter-visibility within the group.
- 9.5.54 These assets have intrinsic value as potential sources of data and as examples of their kind. They have contextual value which derives from their clustering in the landscape. This clustering aids in the appreciation of the density of historic settlement in the Scottish Borders. The contrast between the settled farmed landscape that is visible to the north, and the unimproved uplands that extend to the south, aids in the appreciation of the factors that have led to the concentration of settlements forming and surviving in the landscape.
- 9.5.55 It is considered that the setting of these assets can be defined primarily as the topographic features that they occupy, nearby cultivable land and adjacent cultural heritage assets, including later farmsteads. General views of the more distant landscape also contribute to an appreciation of the assets' significance. However, none of these forts appear to have a culturally significant relationship with the area of land on which the proposed development will be located (e.g. **Figure 9.7**; **Figure 9.8**). It is therefore concluded that the proposed development will not affect the cultural significance of these forts and settlements.

#### ***Catrail earthwork***

- 9.5.56 Four of the scheduled areas relate to discrete elements of the same monument, the Catrail linear earthwork (**Figure 9.2**: SM3457, SM3466, SM3468 & SM3495), located to the north of the Inner Study Area. The Catrail is currently largely surrounded by plantation forestry with no views out to the surrounding landscape. At the request of the SBC Archaeologist, a wireline view was also produced to illustrate the nature of

the visual change that would be evident in south-facing views from the earthwork (**Figure 9.9:** Catrail wireline).

- 9.5.57 As Scheduled Monuments these earthworks are considered to be of high sensitivity to impacts. The Catrail comprises a bank and ditch that is thought to be a long distance boundary marker dating to the early medieval period (Barber 1999, 138). Such earthworks have intrinsic value as a source of data and as historic landscape features. They also have contextual value as elements of palimpsest landscapes that aid our understanding of the distribution of other assets. Visual relationships with the surrounding landscape contribute little to the cultural significance of the monument and its setting is defined as the topographic features that it follows. It therefore follows that the operation of the proposed development will not affect those elements of setting that contribute to the cultural significance of the Catrail.

### ***Blakebillend Cairn***

- 9.5.58 Blakebillend Cairn (**Figure 9.2:** SM 3364) is a Bronze Age cairn located at the end of the northern shoulder of Stirkcleuch Height. As a Scheduled Monument this cairn is considered to be of high sensitivity to effects on its cultural significance. It lies immediately adjacent to a scheduled fort (SM 2297) and appears to have been placed in order to overlook and be visible from the valley of the Lang Burn, which lies to the north. The cairn survives as a dilapidated, turf-covered cairn; a flag-staff was once erected on top of this cairn (RCAHMS 1956) but this has since been removed.

- 9.5.59 The cairn has intrinsic value as a potential source of data and as a well-preserved example of its type. Its contextual value lies in its relationship with the surrounding landscape, as part of the archaeological palimpsest of forts, settlements and other earthworks in the area. The setting of the cairn resides in the shoulder of land on which it is located, the valley it overlooks and its relationship with later cultural features in the landscape, in particular Blakebillend Fort (SM 2297) which was built approximately 30 m to the north-east, avoiding the earlier monument. There is no associative value to the cairn.

- 9.5.60 The proposed development will be theoretically visible to the south of Blakebillend Cairn at a distance of 5.4 km to the nearest turbine. At this distance the proposed development will lie outwith any culturally significant views to or from the cairn. Therefore, there will be no effect to the Blakebillend Cairn.

### ***Gray Coat Pele House***

- 9.5.61 The scant remains of a pele house (**Figure 9.2:** SM 3432) lies some 4.6 km to the north of the proposed development. Pele houses are essentially fortified farmhouses and are frequently placed in slightly hidden locations adjacent to cultivable land, as is the case with this example. Only slight surface remains of this pele house survive.

- 9.5.62 Grey Coat Pele House has some intrinsic value in the remains of its fabric which could provide an information source on the domestic, architectural and defensive properties of 16th century pele houses. The contextual value of this asset can be seen in its relationship with the surrounding landscape, the adjacent cultivable land and the small valley in which it lies. There is no associative value to this asset.

- 9.5.63 The proposed development will be theoretically visible to the south of the pele house at a distance of 4.6 km to the nearest turbine. At this distance the proposed development will lie outwith the culturally significant views to and from the pele house over the surrounding cultivable land and small valley. It is therefore concluded that there will be no effect to the Gray Coat Pele House.

---

***Listed Buildings in the Middle Study Area***

9.5.64 There are four Listed Buildings within the Middle Study Area:

- Hermitage Castle;
- Chapel, Hermitage;
- Whitrope Tunnel, Viaduct and Culvert; and
- Shankend Viaduct.

9.5.65 Hermitage Castle and Chapel are discussed above. The remaining Listed Buildings are elements of the dismantled Waverley railway line.

9.5.66 The Shankend Viaduct (**Figure 9.2**: HB2064) is a 15 span viaduct crossing tributaries of the Lang Burn, located some 5 km from the Inner Study Area. Whitrope viaduct is a single span viaduct (HB49311) that carried the Waverley Line over the B6399, whilst the adjacent culvert takes the Whitrope Burn under the railway. To the north the tunnel took the railway under Sandy Edge. They lie approximately 1 km to the east of the Inner Study Area.

9.5.67 These structures have intrinsic value as examples of 19<sup>th</sup> century engineering in a hostile environment and they derive contextual value because they were part of a historic railway. The Shankend viaduct has associative value as a result of its striking appearance in bleak surroundings. The structures' setting can be defined as the topography that necessitated their construction, associated infrastructure and, in the case of the Shankend Viaduct, the moorland that forms a backdrop when seen from the B6399 to the east. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will not impact the cultural significance of the Shankend or Whitrope viaducts.

***Conservation Areas and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes in the Middle Study Area***

9.5.68 There are no Conservation Areas or Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes within the Middle Study Area.

***Designated Assets in the Outer Study Area***

9.5.69 In addition to the scheduled forts within the Middle Study Area, the Scheduled Monument Ruberslaw, fort and Roman signal station (SM 2129: **Figure 9.10**) in the Outer Study Area is included in this assessment at the request of the SBC Archaeologist. Ruberslaw is the remains of an Iron Age fort and possible Roman signal station located on the summit of the eponymous hill. Ruberslaw itself is one of the most prominent hills in the surrounding area and it would have afforded the inhabitants of the fort wide views in all directions over the surrounding landscape, qualities of course that were not lost on the Romans when they established their signal station on the site. However, there are no notable foci in the wider landscape and no obvious relationship between Ruberslaw fort and the Inner Study Area. At its nearest, the proposed development will be 16.4 km to the south west of Ruberslaw. At this distance and outwith any views that contribute cultural significance to the setting of the hill fort, it is clear that the proposed development will not affect the cultural significance of Ruberslaw.

***Decommissioning***

9.5.70 Decommissioning of the proposed development will not directly affect any known cultural heritage assets.

## 9.6 Mitigation

### **Construction**

- 9.6.1 There will be an adverse effect of negligible significance on the Drove Road (A12). Any construction effects upon the Drove Road will be mitigated through a programme of archaeological works, to be approved by the SBC Archaeologist. This programme will allow for features of the Drove Road to be recorded appropriately and is likely to comprise a watching brief on ground-breaking works in the vicinity of the drove road with further work being undertaken as appropriate.
- 9.6.2 Effect significance cannot be meaningfully assessed for unknown assets, as neither the sensitivity of the receptor nor the magnitude of the effect is known. Consequently, only the likelihood of construction effect is considered here.
- 9.6.3 The potential for previously unrecorded assets within the Inner Study Area in the area below 300 m aOD, and in particular in areas surrounding known farmsteads, is moderate. The likelihood of previously unrecorded assets lying within the construction footprint and hence being affected by ground works is considered to be low to moderate. The only construction areas coincident with the zone of moderate archaeological potential lie to the north-east of Sites A2 and A3. Any construction effects upon previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets in the zone of moderate archaeological potential will be mitigated through a programme of archaeological works, to be approved by the SBC Archaeologist. This programme will allow for features to be recorded appropriately and is likely to comprise a watching brief on ground-breaking works with further work being undertaken as appropriate.
- 9.6.4 The potential for previously unrecorded assets within the Inner Study Area above 300 m aOD is negligible to low. It is considered likely that there will be at most negligible potential for construction effects on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets above 300 m aOD. No mitigation is proposed in this area.

### **Operational**

- 9.6.5 An effect of minor significance on the setting of Hermitage Castle and chapel is predicted as a result of the operation of the proposed development. This is not significant in terms of the EIA regulations. No mitigation is proposed.

### **Decommissioning**

- 9.6.6 No direct decommissioning effects are predicted for any known cultural heritage assets within the Inner Study Area.

## 9.7 Residual Effects

### **Construction**

- 9.7.1 Following mitigation there will be a low beneficial residual construction effect on the Drove Road (A12) as small sections of these assets, which would otherwise continue to degrade naturally, will be preserved by record.
- 9.7.2 Following mitigation there will be no adverse residual construction effects on any other cultural heritage assets.

### **Operational**

- 9.7.3 An operational effect of minor significance on the setting of Hermitage Castle will remain for the lifetime of the proposed development.

---

### **Decommissioning**

- 9.7.4 No mitigation is proposed for the decommissioning phase

### **9.8 Cumulative Effects**

- 9.8.1 The cumulative effects of the proposed development with developments in the wider area, as set out in **Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual Assessment**, have been considered.
- 9.8.2 No significant operational effects on cultural heritage assets are predicted as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed wind farm. It is equally considered that any combination of the developments will not result a significant cumulative effect during the operational phase.

### **9.9 Summary**

- 9.9.1 The potential effects of the proposed development upon cultural heritage assets resulting from its construction, operation and decommissioning have been considered.
- 9.9.2 A construction effect of negligible significance is predicted for the Drove Road (A12). This effect will be mitigated through a programme of archaeological works. This will result in a low beneficial effect on the Drove Road.
- 9.9.3 There is low to moderate potential for the construction phase to have an effect on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets below 300 m aOD and a negligible potential above this height. A programme of archaeological works will be agreed with the SBC Archaeologist pre-construction to mitigate such effects through preservation by record.
- 9.9.4 Potential operational effects upon the setting of cultural heritage assets in the surrounding area have been considered. An operational effect of minor significance on the setting of Hermitage Castle will remain for the lifetime of the proposed development.
- 9.9.5 No effects are predicted on cultural heritage assets as a result of decommissioning.

### **9.10 References**

- 9.10.1 Barber, J W 1999 'The Linear Earthworks of Southern Scotland; survey and classification', with contributions from Lawes-Martay, E and Milln, J. *Trans. Dumfries and Galloway Nat. Hist. & Antiq. Soc.* 73, (1999), 63- 164
- 9.10.2 Historic Scotland 2008 *Hermitage Castle*. HMSO Booklet.
- 9.10.3 Historic Scotland 2010 *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*
- 9.10.4 Historic Scotland 2011 *Guide to the Protection of Scotland's Listed Buildings: what listing means to owners and occupiers*
- 9.10.5 Oram, R 2012 *Hermitage Castle: a report on its history and cultural heritage significance*