Document history

Author	Steve Lancaster	31/01/2022
Checked	Ruth Paterson	02/02/2022
Approved	Emily Galloway	18/11/2022

Client Details	
Contact	Julie Aitken
Client Name	Fred Olsen Renewables Limited
Address	2nd Floor, 36 Broadway, London, SW1H 0BH

Issue	Date	Revision Details
A	07/10/2021	Draft released to client
B	08/11/2021	Draft released for legal review
C	25/03/2022	Draft released for legal review
D	18/11/2022	Released

Chapter 10

Cultural Heritage

Contents

10.1 STATEMENT OF COMPETENCE 3

10.2 INTRODUCTION 3

10.3 SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT 3

Scope 3

10.4 CONSULTATION 3

10.5 LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE 4

Legislation 4

National Policy 4

Local Planning Policy 5

Draft NPF 4 Scotland 2045 5

Guidance 5

10.6 METHODOLOGY 5

Study Areas 5

Data Sources 5

Site Inspection 5

Assessment of Effects 5

Introduction 5

Assessment of Value 6

Contribution of Setting to Value 6

Magnitude of Impact 6

Significance of Effect 7

Zone of Theoretical Visibility Analysis (Figures 10.3 to 10.9) 7

10.7 BASELINE CONDITIONS 7

Designated Heritage Assets 7

Known Heritage Assets Within the Inner Study Area 10

Historic Mapping 11

Historic Landuse Assessment 11

Other Sources 11

Potential for Unrecorded Assets 11

10.8 IMPACT ASSESSMENT 11

Introduction 11

Direct Impact Assessment 11

Indirect Impact Assessment: Inner Study Area 12

Introduction 12

Designated Heritage Assets 12

Non-Designated Heritage Assets *13*
Indirect Impact Assessment: Outer Study Area **14**
Cumulative Impact Assessment *18*
Mitigation *18*
Residual Effects *19*
10.9 SUMMARY OF PREDICTED EFFECTS **19**
10.10 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE **19**

Glossary

Term	Definition
Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is a means of drawing together by the developer, in a systematic way, a description of the development and information relating to the likely significant environmental effects arising from a Proposed Development
Environmental Impact Assessment Report	A document reporting the findings of the EIA and produced in accordance with the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 Regulation 5
Inner Study Area	Proposed Development Area plus 1 km from the red line boundary
Outer Study Area	Area 10 km from the edge of the Inner Study Area
The Proposed Development	The proposed Scawd Law Wind Farm development
The Proposed Development Area	The development area within the red line site boundary (application area) as shown in Volume 3a Figure 1.2: Site Layout.

List of Abbreviations

List and describe your abbreviations here.

Abbreviation	Description
AGL	Above Ground Level
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
DTM	Digital Terrain Model
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GDL	Garden and Designed Landscape
GIS	Geographic Information System
HER	Historic Environment Record
HES	Historic Environment Scotland
ISA	Inner Study Area
LDP	Local Development Plan
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
NRHE	National Record of the Historic Environment
OSA	Outer Study Area
SBC	Scottish Borders Council
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

10.1 STATEMENT OF COMPETENCE

10.1.1 The Assessor undertaking this chapter is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, has 19 years of professional experience in the cultural heritage sector, including twelve years undertaking EIA.

10.2 INTRODUCTION

10.2.1 This section presents the impact assessment for Cultural Heritage. The purpose of the assessment is to identify the potential effect of the proposed Scawd Law Wind Farm development (Proposed Development) on the historic environment and its heritage significance within the area in which the development is proposed. This assessment follows policy and best practice guidance in order to establish a robust and transparent analysis of the issues.

10.2.2 This chapter refers to the following sections of the EIAR:

- Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual;
- Appendix 10.1: Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area;
- Appendix 10.2: Walkover Survey Report for the Proposed Development Area;
- Appendix 6.1: Landscape & Visual Impact Methodology;
- Figure 10.1: Designated Cultural Heritage Assets within 10km of the proposed turbines;
- Figure 10.2: Cultural Heritage Assets within Inner Study Area;
- Figure 10.3: Elibank Castle SM6163 wireline;
- Figure 10.4: Leithen Lodge LB13475 wireline;
- Figure 10.5: Hillside Knowe SM2731 wireline;
- Figure 10.6: Grieston Hill SM3169 wireline;
- Figure 10.7: Chester Hill Fort SM2961 wireline;
- Figure 10.8: Orchard Rig SM2680 wireline;
- Figure 10.9: Bowhill GDL wireline;
- Figure 6.3: ZTV to Hub Height (A3 Size);
- Figure 6.29a-f: Viewpoint 13: Traquair; and
- Figure 6.38a-f: Viewpoint 22: Cairn Hill Cairn.

10.3 SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT

Scope

10.3.1 The heritage assets which form the historic environment constitute a finite and non-renewable resource. Direct physical impacts on assets are permanent and irreversible. Some indirect setting impacts are temporary and/or reversible, particularly with respect to those due to construction activity.

10.3.2 The key potential effects on cultural heritage associated with the construction and/or operation of the Proposed Development include:

- Direct effects through partial or complete removal during ground breaking operations on known or currently undiscovered buried remains of archaeological interest;
- Indirect effects on the settings of cultural heritage assets, including those resulting from intervisibility between a heritage asset and the Proposed Development;
- Cumulative effects on settings of heritage assets with other existing or proposed schemes or developments.

10.3.3 The long term elements of the Proposed Development, i.e. the turbine foundations, access tracks, compounds and earthworks may have permanent direct impacts on buried archaeological remains within the footprint of these elements and in the immediate vicinity within working areas. This is reflected in the proposed impact assessment methodology, specifically the Inner Study Area, consisting of the Proposed Development Area and an extending 1 km from the boundary of the Proposed Development Area as shown in Figure 10.1.

10.3.4 The long term elements also have the potential for long term impacts due to change in the settings of heritage assets.

10.3.5 The temporary elements of the Proposed Development, e.g. construction compounds and temporary access routes may also have permanent direct impacts on buried archaeological remains. Most of these elements are included within the extents detailed in the red line boundary for the project and are already taken into account in the Inner Study Area.

10.4 CONSULTATION

Table 1: Consultation Summery

Consultee	Summary of Key Issues	Response/Action
	The methodology proposed in the report for an EIA appears generally acceptable in the proposals for desk-based assessment, walkover survey and setting visits, as well as to inform mitigation works – but there is some work to better it required. The assessment, as well as any related and should also indicate to what standards and guidance more than that generically which has been given so far in the Scoping Report.	SBC Policies and relevant best practice guidelines have been taken into account in the EIA (see section 10.4 of this chapter)
Scottish Borders Council Archaeology Service Scoping Report Response (20/10/2020)	The Scottish Borders Council (SBC) Historic Environment Record (HER) should be consulted as part of the EIA.	Noted: the HER has been consulted and the data incorporated into the baseline.
	It is suggested that the use of visualisations, particularly the selection of locations, should be discussed with consultees. A list of suggested locations is given.	The selection of the viewpoints employed for the cultural heritage assessment based on the characteristics of the cultural heritage assets. HES have been consulted with and have provided suggested assets for assessment, which may include use of visualisations. The suggested possible locations for visualisations are noted and have been given due consideration.

Consultee	Summary of Key Issues	Response/Action
	Photomontages should not be taken from within the site in question if at all possible but rather from a position showing the site in the foreground with the development beyond.	The approach to visualisations has been determined on a case-by-case basis, taking account of the nature of the asset and the character of the most significant elements of the setting including to centre the visualisation where appropriate .
	Available Lidar resources should be also consulted. In particular any Phase 3 Scottish Government/Scottish Power Lidar that is available on the Scottish Government Remote Sensing Portal.	The suggestion to make use of potentially relevant LiDAR data is noted. The archives and sources consulted are described in the methodology section within the cultural heritage chapter.
	The desk-based assessment's recording of newly identified archaeological and historical sites should include the provision of information as a GIS shapefile and gazetteer of the sites.	Any newly identified heritage assets will be added to the gazetteer, and location information as a GIS shapefile will be provided to the SBC HER.
	The desk-based assessment should provide information on where further archaeological work, e.g. mitigation, is required for the Proposed Development site and the associated access routes.	Noted
	The desk-based assessment should help in informing the layout of the scheme, and the impact of all elements of infrastructure assessed. Further field based archaeological investigations should also be considered and if necessary, also carried out towards the assessment. This includes for the peatland assessment for their archaeological and historical potential to yield possible evidence about the past environmental record that would be otherwise destroyed in the progression of this application.	The desk-based assessment and walkover survey will be targeted on the full range of infrastructure of the Proposed Development. The results of the peat assessment will be incorporated into the cultural heritage assessment, and will take account of the issues of palaeoenvironmental potential and archaeological visibility. We do not concur that investigatory investigations are appropriate at this stage in the application process. Geophysical survey may be considered, subject to the results of the peat assessment and walkover survey, which will allow the validity of geophysical approaches over the Proposed Development Area footprint to be determined.
Historic Environment Scotland Scoping Report Response (20/10/2020)	Notes that there are no designated heritage assets within HES' remit within the boundary of the Proposed Development. Notes a number of such heritage assets within proximity to the Proposed Development that may be subject to indirect impacts due to setting change. A suggested list of assets to be assessed for such impacts is provided.	The list of assets for consideration has informed the selection of assets for assessment for potential indirect impacts.
	The presence of existing and planned windfarm developments in the region should be considered in terms of cumulative impacts through setting change.	The effect of operational windfarms has been incorporated into the main assessment, and potential cumulative impacts from windfarm developments, that have been consented or have active planning submissions or appeal have also been assessed.

10.5 LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Legislation

10.5.1 The key pieces of legislation that cover the historic environment with respect to terrestrial planning are as follows:

- Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953;
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997; all acts as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011; and
- Electricity Works (EIA Scotland) Regulations 2017.

National Policy

10.5.2 The key national policies are as follows:

- Scottish Planning Policy 2014, paragraphs 135-151;
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland 2016; and
- Historic Environment Circular 1: Policies and Procedures 2016.

Local Planning Policy

10.5.3 The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (LDP) 2016 is in the process of being superseded by the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2. Within the current 2016 LDP the key relevant policies are:

- EP 7 Listed Buildings;
- EP 8 Archaeology;
- EP 9 Conservation Areas; and
- EP 10 Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

Draft NPF 4 Scotland 2045

10.5.4 The Scottish Government published the draft National Planning Framework on the 10th November 2021 and laid it before Parliament at the same time to allow the consultation process and the Parliamentary process to run together.

10.5.5 The draft NPF4 will supersede NPF3 and SPP and Part 3 – National Planning Policy will become part of the statutory development plan.

10.5.6 The planning policy overview provided above is therefore subject to the adoption of the final NPF4 and the applicant proposes to update the policy position at the appropriate time as part of this application.

Guidance

10.5.7 The key guidance documents referred to are:

- *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting.* Historic Environment Scotland 2016; and
- *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment*. Charted Institute for Archaeologists 2014, updated 2020.

10.5.8 Due cognisance has also been taken of the *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook,* Scottish National Heritage (now NatureScot) and Historic Environment Scotland 2018.

10.6 METHODOLOGY

Study Areas

10.6.1 The cultural heritage assessment has employed two study areas. The Inner Study Area (ISA) comprises the redline boundary of the Proposed Development and an area of 1 km surrounding it. This study area has allowed the development of the local historic environment to be understood, and on this basis the assessment of the significance of known heritage assets located in proximity to the Proposed Development. This in turn has facilitated the assessment of potential for currently unknown assets to be present within the area of the Proposed Development.

10.6.2 An Outer Study Area (OSA) comprising the area from the boundary of the ISA to 10 km from the locations of the proposed turbines is used to identify heritage assets of national importance for the purpose of assessing potential impacts on these assets resulting from changes in their setting. Indirect impacts on designated heritage assets of regional importance will be assessed in an area up to 5 km from the locations of the proposed turbines, The distance of 5 km selected to reflect the realistic prospect of significant effects on heritage assets of this level of importance.

10.6.3 Assessment of the potential indirect effects resulting from setting change will be carried out on all the assets within the ISA.

10.6.4 The extents of the Study Areas are shown in Figure 10.1 (Volume 3b).

Data Sources

10.6.5 The baseline study that provides an overview of the historic environment within the Study Areas is based on the following

- Consultation of the SBC HER;
- Consultation of the National Record of the Historic Environment (NHRE) (Canmore);
- Historical map regression using historical map sources covering the ISA to identify changes in /development of the historic landscape;
- Review of available Historic Landscape Characterisation of the ISA;
- Review of relevant geotechnical and geological data;
- Review of available LiDAR data via the Scottish Remote Sensing Portal;
- Readily available published sources;
- Online data on designated assets held by Historic Environment Scotland (HES); and
- Walkover survey.

10.6.6 The records from these various sources have been combined to form a single gazetteer of heritage assets within the ISA. The full gazetteer forms Appendix 10.1 (Volume 4).

Site Inspection

10.6.7 A walkover inspection of the Proposed Development Area, covering all the proposed infrastructure elements including the proposed primary access track, was undertaken on 20th May 2021. The weather was overcast to wet. Three previously unrecorded assets were observed during the course of the walkover survey: a possible peat cutting (Asset 55), a clearance cairn (asset 66) and a cairn/the remains of an enclosure (asset 67). These assets have been incorporated into the gazetteer (Appendix 10.1, Volume 4) and the walkover survey report forms Appendix 10.2 (Volume 4).

Assessment of Effects

Introduction

10.6.8 Assessment of effects has been assessed in the following stages:

- Description of asset (baseline) (where appropriate, assets may be addressed in related groups);
- Assessment of the value of the heritage asset, and for indirect effects, how the setting of the asset contributes to its value;
- Assessment of the magnitude of effects cause by the Proposed Development, taking into account the sensitivity of the asset to that form of change, and;
- An assessment of the significance of the effects, which are considered in the following stages: construction, operation and decommissioning (the latter with regard to temporary access and infrastructure).

10.6.9 The assessment have been carried out using professional judgement, taking into account designations and the value of the heritage asset as assessed against standards derived from national policy (see Table 10.2 and section 10.4 of this chapter). Significance of effect has been assessed on the basis of a combination of the value of the cultural asset and magnitude of impacts.

10.6.10 Impacts are considered to be caused by the Proposed Development where it changes the baseline condition of either the asset itself or its setting.

10.6.11 In accordance with The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017, the assessment identifies impacts as either direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial, and short-term, long-term or permanent. Direct impacts are those which physically alter an asset. For the purposes of this assessment indirect impacts are those which cause change within its setting and therefore have the potential to affect the contribution the setting makes to the value of the heritage asset.

10.6.12 Impacts on the heritage assets have been identified and the effect assessed with reference to guidance from HES (see section 10.4 of this chapter). Assessment has been carried out in the following stages:

- Initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- Assessment of the significance of potentially affected assets;
- Assessment of the contribution of the setting to the significance of those assets;
- Assessment of the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development due to causing change within the setting of the assets; and
- Prediction of the significance of the effect.

Assessment of Value

10.6.13 Heritage asset value has been assessed using professional judgement, with reference to Table 10.2 which has been devised with reference to HES policy and guidance. The value of a heritage asset is based on its qualities, including intrinsic, contextual and associative characteristics, such as age, state of preservation and level of supporting knowledge. These characteristics are independent of the differing potential impacts on the heritage assets. Table 10.2 show the potential levels of value of an asset related to current designation criteria, using a scale of Highest to Negligible value. These values are used in the exercise of professional judgement and provides transparency in evaluating the conclusions reached in this assessment.

Table 10.2 Value Categories of Heritage Assets

Value	Revision Details
Highest	Heritage assets of international value: World Heritage Sites
High	Heritage assets of national significance, such as: • Scheduled Monuments; • Category A Listed Buildings; • Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory; • Battlefields included on the national inventory; and • Non-designated assets of equivalent value.
Medium	Heritage assets of regional value, such as: • Category B Listed Buildings; • Most Conservation Areas; and • Non-designated assets of equivalent value.
Low	Heritage assets of regional value, such as: • Category C Listed Buildings; and • Non-designated assets of equivalent value.
Negligible	Sites of minor importance or with little of the asset remaining to justify a higher significance.
Unknown	Further information needed to assess the significance of these assets.

10.6.14 The criteria for assigning value include the archaeological period to which the heritage asset belongs; its rarity or representativeness; the level of documentation concerning the asset; potential to contribute to our understanding of the past, the value of association with other sites; the preservation condition; and the chronological and typological diversity of the asset.

Contribution of Setting to Value

10.6.15 Setting is the 'the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experience.' (HES 2016).

10.6.16 The surroundings of each heritage asset or heritage asset groups is described, considering aspects such as location and orientation of the heritage asset, obvious views or vistas, both towards and from an asset, additional screening through small scale topographic variation, buildings and vegetation, how much change to the historic setting has occurred, integrity of the setting, topography, land use (including currently operational roads, railways, other wind farms and other sources of visual movement nearby and modern intrusive conifer plantations) and intervisibility to other contemporaneous and related heritage assets. All of these aspects are considered in relation to how they affect the understanding, appreciation and experience of the heritage asset.

10.6.17 Once the setting of each heritage asset or heritage asset group has been defined, the aspects of the setting which contribute to the value of the heritage asset are identified. A professional judgement is then made as to the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage asset due to change in setting.

Magnitude of Impact

10.6.18 The changes could potentially include direct change (e.g. ground disturbance) and/or indirect change (including change in views of and from the asset, noise, vibration). Resulting impacts may be beneficial or adverse, and may be short term, long term or permanent. The scale and mass of the Proposed Development would form part of this potential change. Magnitude of impact has been assessed with reference to the criteria set out in Table 10.3.

Table 10.3 Magnitude of Impacts on Heritage Assets

Magnitude/Type	Explanation
High Beneficial	The Proposed Development would considerably enhance the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it .
Medium Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a clearly discernible extent th evalue of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a minor extent the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
Very Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a very minor extent the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
Neutral/Nil	The Proposed Development would not affect or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude on the value of the affected asset or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
Very Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a very minor extent the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.

Magnitude/Type	Explanation
Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a minor extent the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
Medium Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a clearly discernible extent the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.
High Adverse	The Proposed Development would severely erode the value of the affected asset, or the contribution of its setting to the ability to appreciate it.

Significance of Effect

10.6.19 The significance of effect is presented in Table 10.4 below. This provides a matrix that relates the value to the magnitude of impact (incorporating contribution from setting where relevant), in order to establish the likely significance of effect. This assessment is undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects, the latter being principally concerned with effects on setting. Moderate and Substantial effects are considered significant in EIA terms.

Table 10.4 Significance of Effects on Heritage Assets

Impact Magnitude and Type	Heritage Asset Value				
	Highest	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Negligible**
High Beneficial	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight
Medium Beneficial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight	Negligible
Low Beneficial	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight	Very Slight	Negligible
Very Low Beneficial	Slight	Very Slight	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Neutral/Nil	Neutral/None	Neutral/None	Neutral/None	Neutral/None	Neutral/None
Very Low Adverse	Slight	Very Slight	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Low Adverse	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight	Very Slight	Negligible
Medium Adverse	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight	Negligible
High Adverse	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very Slight

Zone of Theoretical Visibility Analysis (Figures 10.3 to 10.9)

10.6.20 Assessment of visual impact has been assisted with the use of a Zone of Theoretical (ZTV) model, prepared principally for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 6; Figure 6.3: ZTV to Hub Height (A3 Size), Volume 3b). The proposed hub height is up to 113 m as stated in Chapter 4: Project Description. The ZTV modelling methodology is set out in detail in Appendix 6.1: Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (Volume 4). In summary, it maps the predicted degree of visibility of the Proposed Development from all points within a study area around the site, as would be seen from an observer's eye level 1.5 m Above Ground Level (AGL).

10.6.21 The ZTVs were modelled using a computer-based visibility analysis package compiled using Ordnance Survey Digital Terrain Model (DTM) data. The ZTV produced is a 'bare ground' scenario, based on landform only, which takes no account of the screening effects of local features such as buildings or vegetation.

10.7 BASELINE CONDITIONS

Designated Heritage Assets

10.7.1 There are no inventoried Battlefields, Conservation Areas, Properties in Care, inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes or World Heritage Sites within the ISA.

10.7.2 Within the ISA there are four Category B Listed Buildings, six Category C Listed Buildings and six Scheduled Monuments (listed in Table 10.5) and shown in Figure 10.1 (Volume 3b).

Table 10.5 Designated Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area

Title	Asset Number	Designation	Index Number	Category
Elibank House	21	Listed Building	LB1906	B
Holylee House	9	Listed Building	LB8324	B
Old Holylee House	4	Listed Building	LB8325	B
Reservoir, Kirnie Law	20	Listed Building	LB49126	B
Juniperbank	28	Listed Building	LB15421	C
Walled Garden, Juniperbank	8, 29	Listed Building	LB15421	C
Holylee Cottages, Holylee Farm	31	Listed Building	LB49123	C
Holylee Cottages, Holylee Farm	32	Listed Building	LB49123	C
Holylee Lodge, Holylee House	30	Listed Building	LB49124	C
Walled Garden, Holylee House	33	Listed Building	LB49125	C
Elibank Castle	16	Scheduled Monument	SM6163	N/A
The Common, settlement 400m SE of	60	Scheduled Monument	SM2861	N/A
Cairn Hill, cairn, Walkerburn	11	Scheduled Monument	SM2758	N/A
Walkerburn, cairn 500m S of summit of Cairn Hill	12	Scheduled Monument	SM2763	N/A

Title	Asset Number	Designation	Index Number	Category
Lee Tower	58	Scheduled Monument	SM10861	N/A
Old Caberston, scooped settlement 310m E of	13	Scheduled Monument	SM3036	N/A

10.7.3 Within the OSA there are no inventoried Battlefields, Properties in Care, or World Heritage Sites. There are three Conservation Areas, four inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes, 28 records of Category A Listed Buildings, 48 Scheduled Monuments within the OSA, and 14 Category B Listed Buildings in the area up to 5 km from the proposed turbine locations. The designated heritage assets within the OSA are listed in Table 10.6 and shown in Figure 10.2 (Volume 3b).

Table 10.6 Nationally Important Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area

Title	Designation	Index Number	Category
Ashiesteel House	Listed Building	LB1902	A
Ashiesteel Bridge	Listed Building	LB1903	A
Peel Hospital	Listed Building	LB1904	A
Home Farm, Peel House	Listed Building	LB1904	A
The Kirna, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB8323	A
Prefabricated Cast Iron Urinal, Galashiels Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB8326	A
Stoneyhill House, Stables and Boundary Walls, Galashiels Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB12930	A
Leithen Lodge with Lochend Arch Outbuildings and Sundial	Listed Building	LB13475	A
Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15429	A
Bear Gates, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Avenue Head Cottages, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Lodge atc Bear Gates, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Outhouse at Bear Gates Lodge, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Avenue Head Cottages, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Lodge at Bear Gates, Traquair House	Listed Building	LB15430	A
Dovecot, Kailzie House	Listed Building	LB15439	A
Summerhouse, Traquair House Policies	Listed Building	LB19391	A
The Glen, House and Service Wing	Listed Building	LB19746	A
Stoneyhill Lodge including Boundary Wall and Gatepier, Galashiels Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB49134	A
Sunnybrae Lodge including Gatepiers, Stables and Boundary Walls, Galasheils Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB49136	A
Garden Features And Terraces To SE of House, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49386	A
Garden Features And Terraces To NE of House, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49386	A
Lion Gateway, Garden, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49386	A
Garden Features And Terraces To SW Of House, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49386	A
Stable, Stable Courtyard, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49393	A
Coach House, Stable Courtyard, The Glen	Listed Building	LB49393	A
Elibank Castle	Scheduled Monument	SM6163	N/A
Horsburgh Castle	Scheduled Monument	SM6284	N/A
Purvishill Tower, cultivation terraces, enclosure and tower	Scheduled Monument	SM2391	N/A
Wallace's Trench, linear earthwork	Scheduled Monument	SM2248	N/A
Cardrona Tower	Scheduled Monument	SM2784	N/A
Caerlee Hill, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM2785	N/A
The Kirna, settlement 270m NW of	Scheduled Monument	SM2937	N/A
Castle Knowe, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM2954	N/A
Chester Hill, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM2961	N/A
Nether Horsburgh, enclosure 620m SE of	Scheduled Monument	SM3034	N/A
Nether Horsburgh, castle	Scheduled Monument	SM3118	N/A
Grieston Hill, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM3169	N/A

Title	Designation	Index Number	Category
Horsburgh Castle Farm, settlement 930m NNW of, Castle Hill	Scheduled Monument	SM2681	N/A
Janet's Brae, fort 750m E of Peebles Hydropathic	Scheduled Monument	SM3028	N/A
Janet's Brae, fort 550m E of Peebles Hydropathic	Scheduled Monument	SM3029	N/A
Glenbield, fort 800m ENE of	Scheduled Monument	SM3040	N/A
Green Hill, settlement	Scheduled Monument	SM3131	N/A
Cardrona Mains, standing stone 180m W of	Scheduled Monument	SM2761	N/A
Charge Law Plantation, fort & settlement	Scheduled Monument	SM2942	N/A
Whitehaugh, fort 1010m SE of	Scheduled Monument	SM2953	N/A
Tor Hill, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM3061	N/A
Glentress, St Leonard's Hospital	Scheduled Monument	SM3126	N/A
Stow, old bridge	Scheduled Monument	SM2855	N/A
Shieldgreen Tower	Scheduled Monument	SM8674	N/A
Our Lady's Chapel, chapel 350m N of Torsonce	Scheduled Monument	SM3942	N/A
Nether Shiels, enclosure 350m NW of	Scheduled Monument	SM1178	N/A
Symington Hillhead, fort 350m S of Fountainhall	Scheduled Monument	SM1179	N/A
Watherston, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM1180	N/A
Ewes Hill, settlement	Scheduled Monument	SM2104	N/A
Pirn Wood, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM1491	N/A
Craigend, fort 360m W of	Scheduled Monument	SM1168	N/A
Cortleferry, scooped settlement 400m NW of	Scheduled Monument	SM1167	N/A
Cauld Face, cultivation terraces	Scheduled Monument	SM2444	N/A

Title	Designation	Index Number	Category
Caddonlee, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM2497	N/A
Hillside Knowe, settlement, Glentress	Scheduled Monument	SM2731	N/A
Glentress Tower, ENE of Glentress	Scheduled Monument	SM3112	N/A
Woolandslee Tower	Scheduled Monument	SM3148	N/A
Orchard Rig, settlements, enclosures, cairn and field system	Scheduled Monument	SM2680	N/A
Young Bush Wood, enclosure NW of	Scheduled Monument	SM3113	N/A
St Mary's Church, Stow	Scheduled Monument	SM8215	N/A
Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels	Scheduled Monument	SM3667	N/A
Windydoors Farm, Bastle	Scheduled Monument	SM13691	N/A
Old Redhead, deserted settlement 15m NE of and 25m ESE of	Scheduled Monument	SM13722	N/A
Whytbank Tower, ancillary buildings and garden	Scheduled Monument	SM13723	N/A
Plora Tower, tower house, garden terraces and associated structures, 335m SW of West Bold Farm Cottages	Scheduled Monument	SM3157	N/A
Prehistoric settlement, 170m SW of West Bold Cottages	Scheduled Monument	SM3026	N/A
Venlaw Castle Hotel, settlement 780m NE of	Scheduled Monument	SM3039	N/A
Hodge Cairn, fort, Shank Wood	Scheduled Monument	SM1171	N/A
Torwoodlee, broch, fort & linear earthworks	Scheduled Monument	SM2448	N/A
Bow Castle, broch 1000m E of Bow	Scheduled Monument	SM1162	N/A
Corsehope Rings, fort	Scheduled Monument	SM1166	N/A
Halltree Rings, settlement, Chapel Hill	Scheduled Monument	SM1170	N/A
Roughsware, enclosure 500m S of	Scheduled Monument	SM2135	N/A

Title	Designation	Index Number	Category
Traquair House	Garden and Designed Landscape	GDL00378	N/A
The Glen	Garden and Designed Landscape	GDL00359	N/A
Kailzie	Garden and Designed Landscape	GDL00229	N/A
Bowland	Garden and Designed Landscape	GDL00066	N/A
Stow	Conservation Area	CA629	N/A
Innerleithen	Conservation Area	CA611	N/A
Peebles	Conservation Area	CA622	N/A
Lodge, Tweedvale House, Galashiels Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB12931	B
Haughhead Railway Viaduct, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB15423	B
Innerleithen Parish Church, Leithen Road, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34966	B
Caerlee Mills, Damside, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34968	B
Boiler House And Chimney, Caerlee Mills, Damside, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34968	B
Ballantyne's Offices, Caerlee Mills, Damside, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34968	B
High Mill, Caerlee Mills, Damside, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34968	B
St Ronan's Well, Well's Brae, Innerleithen	Listed Building	LB34970	B
Former Railway Tunnel, South Park Wood, Peebles	Listed Building	LB48931	B
Surge Tower, Reservoir, Kirnie Law	Listed Building	LB49126	B
Walkerburn Parish Church, Galashiels Road, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB49133	B
Tweed Valley Hotel, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB49137	B
Greenhouses And Garden Walls, Tweed Valley Hotel, Walkerburn	Listed Building	LB49137	B
Boundary Walls Gates And Gatepiers, Ancillary Structures, Steps, The Pines (Formerly Bellenden) Including Garden Walls, St Ronan's Terrace	Listed Building	LB51088	B

Known Heritage Assets Within the Inner Study Area

10.7.4 There are 62 heritage assets (including 15 designated assets) recorded within the local HER and the NHRE, within the ISA, once duplicate records are accounted for. A further three heritage assets (Assets 55, 56 and 57) have been noted during the walkover survey, which are either previously entirely unrecorded or are present on Ordnance Survey maps but not incorporated in the existing archaeological archives, adding to a total of 65 heritage assets within the ISA. This includes the seventeen designated heritage assets within the ISA (see Table 10.5 and Appendix 10.1 Cultural Heritage Gazetteer, Volume 4).

10.7.5 Seven of the recorded heritage assets within the ISA are definitely or tentatively dated to the Prehistoric and/or Romano-British period, though none of them are within the Proposed Development Area. Two of the assets are cairns, located on Cairn Hill (Assets 11, 12, SM2758 and SM2763 respectively). The others are associated with agricultural settlement, consisting a possible unenclosed settlement (Assets 36, 60), a burnt mound (Asset 63)

10.7.6 and an area of possible cultivation terraces (Asset 43). These terraces may be associated with Asset 13 (SM3036), a scooped settlement(s) which may date to the Romano-British period or the Middle Iron Age.

10.7.7 Six of the recorded heritage assets within the ISA are definitely or tentatively dated to the Medieval period. Two of these are within the Proposed Development Area (Assets 6 and 51). All of the assets are associated with agricultural activity or settlement, in the form of cultivation remains (Asset 6), a farmstead (Asset 51) and tower houses or their former locations (Assets 3, 52, 62, 16 (SM6163)), with the latter assets indicating the politically unsettled nature of the region over much of the Medieval period.

10.7.8 Eighteen of the recorded heritage assets within the ISA are dated to the Post-Medieval period. Four of these are within the Proposed Development Area (Assets 55, 56, 57, 4 (LB8325)); one of these (Asset 56) is within the footprint of the Proposed Development infrastructure. The majority of the assets dated to this period relate to agricultural activity, in the form of stock enclosures (Assets 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 56) and sheepfolds (Asset 41, 57) demonstrating the significance of the pastoral element of the economy of the region in this period, with the presence of head dykes (Assets 26, 64) and clearance cairn (Asset 44) suggesting the continuing role of crop raising in the Post-Medieval agricultural economy. Rural dwellings including a farmhouse (Asset 8) and an 18th Century house built on the former site of a tower house (Asset 4, LB8325). Other assets from this period include a tollhouse (Asset 42), two quarries (Assets 38, 39) and a possible peat cutting area (Asset 55).

10.7.9 A further thirteen assets may be dated to the Post-Medieval or Modern (post-1800) period, and thirteen assets are dated to the Modern period. Of these assets five are within the Proposed Development Area but none are within the footprint of the proposed infrastructure. Some of the assets relate to agricultural activity and settlement, in the form of enclosures and field systems (Assets 2, 22, 27), cairn (Asset 37), farmsteads (Assets 24, 25, 28), farm cottages and house (Assets 1, 17, 21, 31, 32,(LB1906, LB49123)) and a barn (Asset 67), and larger houses and associated features such as walled garden and gate piers and lodge (Assets 9, 33, 29, 30, 53, 54, 61 (LB8324, LB49125, LB15421, LB49124)). Other assets include a 19th century railway viaduct and the associated branch railway (assets 34, 35, 65), reservoir (Asset 20 (LB49126), and a small quarry (Asset 46).

10.7.10 Eleven assets recorded assets within the ISA are of unknown date. Four of these assets are within the Proposed Development Area, but are not within the footprint of the Proposed Development (Assets 10, 15, 19, 23). The eleven Assets of unknown date include agricultural terraces (asset 5, 61), a possible quarry (Asset 7), roads

(Assets 10, 18, 19, 66), a cairnfield (Asset 40), enclosure (Asset 23), an earthwork(s) (Asset 66), enclosures (Assets 59, 60 (SM2861)) and a possible holy well (Asset 15).

Historic Mapping

10.7.11 A review of the online historic mapping available at the National Library of Scotland was undertaken. Maps dating back to 1650 covering the ISA were considered.

10.7.12 The Roy Military Survey of Scotland (1755) is the earliest map that covers the Proposed Development area in detail. The settlement of Walkerburn does not exist at this date, Holylee appears to be a single farm, Old Caberston is designated as 'Kaverston'. There is no indication of other settlements or depictions of cultivated land within the ISA other than the settlements previously mentioned. Most other historic mapping that covers the area is too small scale to cover the ISA in detail, though there is some evidence of placename change. The Armstrong map of 1775 gives the modern spelling of Caberston.

10.7.13 The Six Inch First Edition map (1856/9, Peeble-Shire XIV and 1858/63 Selkirkshire Sheet) indicate that the main land boundaries were already established. The ground cover appears to be rough grazing. A variety of sheep folds and stock pens are depicted. These are all either in the NRHE and/or included in the modern mapping. The Six Inch Second Edition map (897/90 Selkirkshire III) depicts minor changes to land boundaries and small enclosures, bringing them closer to the current form. The 1:25,000 map of the area (1962-3/64 NT34SE) demonstrates very little change in terms of boundaries. A very few, small, blocks of forestry are depicted within the ISA, though substantially less than the amount currently within the ISA and the immediately surrounding area.

Historic Landuse Assessment

10.7.14 The Historic Landuse Assessment mapping for the ISA has been reviewed. Most of the mapped landuse areas are modern or recent, with the majority of the ISA classified as rough grazing, with small areas of plantation forestry in the vicinity of Broomy Cleuch Rig and Black Cleuch Rig and an area of improvement era rectilinear fields at Seathorpe. Smaller areas of historic landuse have been characterised within the ISA, including small areas of medieval/post-medieval settlement and agriculture bordering the B709 near Colquhar Brae in the area of the proposed access track, and at Seahope Hill, Pyat Hill and Early Knowe, with a small (non-designated) designed landscape around Holylee. A limited area of later prehistoric settlement and agriculture is mapped in the area of Old Caberston, corresponding to Assets 13 (scooped settlement) and 43 (cultivation terraces (possible)) in the gazetteer (see Appendix 10.1, Volume 4).

Other Sources

10.7.15 Other sources consulted comprise the Old Statistical Account, New Statistical Account and the freely available LiDAR data for the area available from the Scottish Remote Sensing Portal (\https://remotesensingdata.gov.scot/).

10.7.16 The relevant parish in the Old Statistical Account is Innerleithen. The account was compiled in 1797 by the Rev. John Walker, minister of Traquair, as Innerleithen parish had no resident minister, reflecting the relative poverty in the parish at that time. The account gives little information of direct relevance to the development: the number of inhabitants in the parish was relatively low, being approximately 560 people, around half of whom were resident in the village of Innerleithen. The majority of the population was engaged in agricultural occupations, with the main activity being raising sheep, with some cattle. The account notes the road to Lethen has only recently been built (1794), with the main purpose being the transport of coal and lime.

10.7.17 The New Statistical Account report on Innerleithen dates to 1845, contributed by Reverends James Pate and Patrick Booth. This account notes that the best land was on the floodplains of the Tweed and Leithen, indicating that the most intensive contemporary agricultural activity would have been situated outside of the Proposed Development Area. A slate quarry was noted as being present at Holy Lee. Coal burning had by this date largely superseded peat burning, but the cutting of peat for fuel by shepherds on the hills, including Windlestraw Law within the Proposed Development Area was noted to continue.

10.7.18 The Scottish Remote Sensing Portal was accessed in order to check for LiDAR coverage. Approximately half of the Proposed Development Area was covered by the Scottish Public Sector LiDAR (Phase 3), largely flown in 2015-2016. The data examined was the DTM at 50 cm resolution. The following files were reviewed in GIS:

- NT33NE_50cm_DTM_PHASE3;
- NT34SE_50cm_DTM_PHASE3;
- NT34SW_50cm_DTM_PHASE3;
- NT43NW_50cm_DTM_PHASE3;
- NT44SW_50cm_DTM_PHASE3;

10.7.19 The data was reviewed in GIS, using a variety of techniques to enhance potential visual features. The data did not reveal any previously unknown cultural heritage features or provide significant additional information concerning those already recorded within the Proposed Development Area.

Potential for Unrecorded Assets

10.7.20 The potential for unknown heritage assets (archaeological remains) to occur within the area of the Proposed Development has been assessed. The assessment is based on the range of sources employed for the baseline. In addition, the peat depth data for the site compiled for the hydrogeology assessment has also been used to

10.7.21 assess the potential for archaeological remains to be masked or for deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential to be present in the ISA.

10.7.22 The distribution of cultural heritage assets within the ISA tends to be of a higher density and a greater diversity of ages and types on the lower altitude areas. The number of assets in the immediate vicinity of the turbines and the associated infrastructure tends to be lower, and the few assets that are present seem to be mainly of post-medieval date. The depth of peat over the footprint of the Proposed Development is shallow, being generally less than 0.5 m in depth. There are two small areas where the peat is deeper, one at the proposed location for Turbine 6 and one to the southwest where the access track is proposed to connect Turbine 6 and (the compound to the north of Turbine 3) (Figure 9.7, Volume 3a). Given the observed distribution of assets, there would appear to be a moderate probability of unrecorded post-medieval heritage assets being located in the footprint of the Proposed Development. The potential of heritage assets of other periods being so located is considered to be low (Roman, modern) or low to moderate (prehistoric, medieval). The peat depth is not considered to be sufficiently deep to increase the chances of archaeological remains being masked from surface observation. The peat is blanket peat, which has very limited value for palaeoenvironmental investigation.

10.8 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Introduction

10.8.1 The potential types of impacts that could result from the Proposed Development can be divided into direct impacts and indirect impacts. The direct impacts would mainly be associated with the construction activities. The indirect impacts, particularly permanent impacts, would mainly be associated with the operation of the proposed windfarm.

Direct Impact Assessment

10.8.2 Direct impact types would mainly consist of partial or total removal of heritage assets, recorded or unrecorded, through groundworks (permanent or temporary), disturbance and/or compaction of archaeological deposits by construction traffic and structures. The direct, physical, impacts would in general be permanent and irreversible.

Table 10:6 Direct impacts on heritage assets without mitigation.

Title	Asset Number	Description of Impact	Value of Asset	Magnitude of Impact	Predicted Effect
Windlestraw Law, clearance cairn	56	Removal of asset	Low	High Adverse	Slight
Leithen Water/Bught Knowe, Road	66	Partial removal of asset	Negligible	Low Adverse	Negligible

10.8.3 There may be potential direct impacts on unknown heritage assets in the form of archaeological remains. The potential for the occurrence of such remains has been assessed in Section 10.6. As by the nature of such potential assets, neither their value nor the magnitude of any potential impact on them can be assessed no further assessment of such assets has been undertaken.

Indirect Impact Assessment: Inner Study Area

Introduction

10.8.4 Within the Inner Study Area, 25 of the 64 heritage assets are not intervisible with any of the proposed wind turbines. This includes a number of designated heritage assets. The assets that are not intervisible with the proposed wind turbines are: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7,8 (LB15421), 10, 12 (SM2763), 13 (SM3036), 19, 25, 27, 28 (LB15421), 29 (LB15421), 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 52, 65, 66). These assets have not been further assessed for potential setting impacts. Asset 56 would be completely removed by the Proposed Development and is therefore not assessed for setting impacts. One asset does not appear to be extant, and its record is poorly located (Asset 15); one is a poorly located medieval asset under a modern building (Asset 51), and one is no longer extant since the disbanding of the local railway (Asset 34). These assets have not been assessed for potential setting impacts. Eight assets (17, 24, 26, 45, 47, 49, 50, 64) are located within/under permanent woodland, which would both effectively screen them from the proposed turbines and mean that the setting of these assets is already degraded to the point where it makes no contribution to their heritage significance. The potential impacts on the setting of these assets are not assessed further.

Designated Heritage Assets

Old Holylee House and associated designated heritage assets (LB8325, LB8324, LB49124, LB49123, LB49125)

10.8.5 Old Holylee House (Asset 4, LB8325), Holylee House (asset 9, LB8324) and Holylee Lodge (Asset 30, LB49124) and the Holylee Farm Cottages (Assets 31, 32, LB49123) are each domestic dwellings, albeit reflecting different socio-economic levels. Each of these assets is closely surrounded by relatively thick bands of permanent woodland. The effective setting of each of these assets is the immediately surrounding grounds as they have been laid out and subsequently evolved. Such longer distance views as are incorporated into the setting of these assets tends to be to the south or south-east, away from the proposed turbines. The associated walled garden (Asset 33, LB49125) is internally focussed, forming its own setting. It is also closely surrounded by permanent woodland. The limited scale of the settings and the screening provided by woodland means that there would be no impact on these assets due to setting change.

Elibank House (LB1906)

10.8.6 The setting of the architectural fragment (Asset 21, LB1906) incorporated into Elibank House is the modern house itself. The asset is also screened by close-by permanent woodland, which forms the majority of the Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL) (non-inventory) associated with Elibank House (Asset 56). The dense woodland effectively screens itself and the small number open areas within the designed landscape. On this basis it is assessed that there is no potential for setting impacts on either of these assets due to the Proposed Development.

Cairn Hill Cairn (SM2758)

10.8.7 The burial cairn on Cairn Hill (Asset 11, SM2758) is situated just to the south of the peak of the hill. The current setting is complex, consisting of a number of elements potentially relating to different periods. The full extent of the cairn is not readily discerned, with the clearest elements being visible on the southern and eastern sides of the cairn. The highest point of the cairn is surmounted by a more recent walkers' cairn, which incorporates modern materials such as brick. The majority of the prehistoric cairn is covered by vegetation in the form of dense heather, but there are areas where the cairn material can be seen, including directly under the modern cairn, approximately 7 m to the south of the modern cairn and 3 m to the east, with the latter section including a number of courses of built material, which may be the hillwalkers' shelter noted in the scheduling description.

10.8.8 The immediate setting of the cairn includes the current nearby moorland vegetation, and approximately 10 m to the northwest there is a possible walkers' shelter, constructed of concrete blocks on a concrete slab base. As well as the main track, a worn biking track cuts across the northern part of the scheduled area. The cairn is surrounded on most sides by dense forestry; however, the steep sides of the hill mean that the degree to which long distance views from the asset are blocked varies considerably. The dense forestry currently gives the southern side of the asset an enclosed feeling. The open views to the immediate north are to the break of slope approximately 30 m north of the asset. The currently visible longer distance view ranges from the ridge between Kirnie Law to Priesthope Hill in the west to northwest, through to the ridge from Glede Knowe to Windlestraw Law with the subsidiary rides to Scawd Law and Seathope Rig to the north. Although forestry starts to obscure the long-distance views, the peaks of Seathope Law and Stony Knowe to the east are still visible. The forestry currently blocks views to the southeast along the valley of the Tweed, south across the Tweed valley to the southern floodplain and hills beyond, and southwest along the Tweed valley, in particular the bend in the river that is now occupied by Innerleithen. The current immediate setting of the asset makes a negligible contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset, either obscuring the asset or creating minor distractions from it. The asset has a sense of isolation in an open environment within a distant boundary. This is created by current longer distance views from the asset to the hills ranging from the west through to the east, particularly the hills that are higher than Cairn Hill, and the ridges that connect them. This sense is one that is essentially a product of the plantation forestry. The contribution that this element of the setting makes to the understanding and appreciation is low, forming a backdrop, but having little explanatory value.

10.8.9 The location of the cairn is on the southern edge of the peak, facing the Tweed valley, and in a potentially dominant position with respect to views from the much of the valley bottom, as well as down to the valley. The location of burial cairns in such positions in the landscape is a well-recognised phenomenon, potentially relating to legitimation of territorial claims or of high status for individuals or lineages. The current visual severance by the forestry, particularly views from the asset degrades what would otherwise probably be the most important element of the setting of the cairn. The effective contribution of this element of the setting will potentially vary with the felling and planting cycles of the forestry. When this view is open it would make a high contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset and thus its value.

10.8.10 The proposed turbines would form a notable new element in the landscape in the longer distance views northwards from the cairn (Figure 6.38a-f, Volume 3b). One of the key aspects of the landscape in this view is its openness, which the turbines would not affect. They would, however, form eye-catching elements on the horizon over a limited part of the view. The movement of the turbines would form a distracting element in the landscape. The magnitude of this impact, taking account of the scale of the new elements and the proportion of the landscape they would cover, is assessed to be Medium. Taking into account the low contribution this element of the setting makes to the understanding and appreciation of the asset, the significance of effect is assessed to be **Slight**. With respect to the setting in terms of views to and from cairn and the Tweed valley, the proposed turbines would only be visible from limited areas of the bottom of the valley and its north facing slopes, and in these areas would often only be

visible as blade tips. In the limited locations where the turbines were visible they would appear to one side, rather than forming a backdrop to the location of the cairn. The proposed turbines would not impinge in views from the cairn to the south over the Tweed valley. The magnitude of impact on this element of the setting is therefore assessed to be low. Taking into account the high contribution this element of the setting makes to the understanding and appreciation of the asset the effect is assessed to be of **Slight** significance.

Elibank Castle (SM6163)

10.8.11 Elibank Castle (Asset 16, SM6163) is also situated within the GDL, though in a more open area, where most of the nearest woodland appears to be conifer plantation. Much of the closer permanent woodland is downslope of the surviving elements of the tower house, giving partial views to the immediate north and northeast. The location of the castle on the northeast facing slope would have given good views across the bend in the Tweed, where the rivers alignment shifts from the north to the east. In particular the castle would have given views over a mapped ford to the northeast, though these views are to some degree obscured by woodland. Across the river views are dominated by the mass of Thornielee Craigs. These views to the north and northeast, taking in much of the valley of the Tweed relate to the strategic positioning of the tower house, where it could monitor and control travel across the Tweed, whether for security or commercial purposes. Views in the direction of the wind farm are currently dominated by conifer forestry. Although planting and felling cycles would cause some variation in the level of visual dominance over time, map evidence indicates that the plantation areas have been in forestry use since the early 1950s, and this cyclical pattern of usage should be considered permanent. Although the current views to the north and northeast have some degree of visual constraint due to the permanent woodland, this element of the setting makes the greatest contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The views towards the Proposed Development, even in the absence of the current forestry, do not make a significant setting contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. Although the proposed turbines would be periodically visible to the northwest (see Figure 10.3, Volume 3b), dependent on the point in the felling/planting regime of the forestry, they would not form a dominant element of the overall views from the asset, for example they would not challenge the visual dominance of the mass of Thornielee Craigs to the north. Nor would they interfere in the direct line of site in views to the north and northeast, in particular the location of the ford. They would form a limited distraction to these views. The magnitude of this impact on the most important element of the setting is assessed to be low adverse. Although the asset itself is assessed to be of high importance, the contribution of the setting to the value of the asset is assessed to be medium. The significance of effect is therefore assessed to be **Slight**.

Lee Tower (SM10861)

10.8.12 Another designated tower house is recorded within the ISA. Lee Tower (Asset 58, SM10861) is closely surrounded by modern agricultural buildings to the point of being integrated into the complex of structures. These structures form the main setting of the asset, partially screening the tower house from longer distance views and in the case of one of the larger buildings, dominating the setting. The current setting makes a negligible contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. Although modelled as being intervisible with the proposed turbines it is assessed that there would be considerable screening by treelines, topography and in particular the current agricultural buildings. The magnitude of impact would be Nil, and therefore there would be **no significance** of effect.

Kirnie Law Reservoir (LB49126)

10.8.13 The covered reservoir at Kirnie Law (Asset 20, LB49126). The setting of these asset types are generally restricted to the immediate vicinity of the reservoir. The immediate surroundings of the reservoir make little contribution to the understanding or appreciation of the asset, with such potential features as tracks or other infrastructure not being apparent. Although there would be some intervisibility with the asset and the proposed turbines, the intervening distance of at least 2.5 km is well beyond the effective setting of the covered reservoir, it is assessed therefore, that there would be no impact on these assets resulting from setting change and therefore **no significance** of effect.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Asset 55, Windlestraw, possible peat cuttings

10.8.14 The asset closest to the proposed infrastructure is the area of possible peat cuttings (Asset 55), which is approximately 30 m from the tracks and earthworks and 170 m from the nearest turbine (Turbine 8). The asset has been assessed to be of negligible value. The setting of the asset is the immediate landscape of moorland. The setting makes a low contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The construction of the turbine close to the asset would introduce a new and large scale element in the setting. The construction of the track and associated earthworks would introduce another new element, and probably one more immediately dominant in the setting of the asset. The magnitude of impact is assessed as high adverse, resulting in a **Very Slight** significance of effect.

Asset 56, Windlestraw, clearance cairn/sheepfold

10.8.15 The next closest asset to the proposed infrastructure is a clearance cairn/sheepfold (Asset 56), which is approximately 150 m up slope from the proposed access track and 950 m from Turbine 3. The asset has been assessed to be of low value. The setting of this asset is the immediate landscape in which it is situated, which is steeply sloping pasture. The setting makes a low contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The proposed track would form a new element in the immediate landscape, though visibility would be screened in places due to the steep slope the track traverses in places. The impact magnitude of the change in the setting is assessed to be medium adverse, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Asset 62, Colquhar tower house

10.8.16 The tower house at Colquhar (Asset 62) has been assessed as of medium value. It has two main elements to its setting. The first are the sheepfolds into which the remains of the tower house have been incorporated, together with the associated farmstead. The other main element is the views north and south along the valley of the Leithen Water and the confluence of the Leithen Water and Glentress Water. Three fords to the east, northeast and north are currently visible from the asset: although these may have changed in terms of precise location and even number, it is likely that one of the reasons for the original positioning of the tower house was to control crossings of the Leithen Water. Although the asset is positioned near the where the Hope Burn runs into the Leithen Water, views along that valley are restricted. The ZTV model indicates that the hub of a single turbine would be visible from the asset. The main elements of the setting make a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The single visible turbine would potentially create a distraction to the views from the asset south down the Leithen Water valley, and to a lesser degree in looking towards or across the asset with the associated sheepfold structures. The distraction would constitute an impact of a very low adverse magnitude, resulting in an effect of **Negligible** significance.

Asset 59, Common Knowe enclosure and possible settlement

10.8.17 The enclosure and possible settlement (Asset 59) situated on the lower slopes of Common Knowe is located above an area of flat land on the flood plain of the Leithen Water, of the type noted as the main areas used for agriculture in the area in the Statistical Accounts (see Other Sources). The asset has been assessed as being of low value. The location places the asset above the flood plain, close to potential agricultural land and also to the higher land used for grazing. The location of the asset with respect to these land types forms the main setting of the asset, and the contribution of the setting is assessed to be of medium value. The ZTV model indicates that up to four turbines may be visible from the asset itself, though views to the asset from the lower ground would incorporate no more than two turbines, and from most areas no turbines. Where visible, the turbines would form a relatively limited and distant element, and would not directly interfere with views between the asset and the associated agricultural land. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be low adverse, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Asset 63, Lee Pen, burnt mound

10.8.18 On the lower slopes of Lee Pen, to the west of the Leithen Water is a burnt mound (Asset 63). This particular example has been assessed to be of medium value. These sites used heated stones to heat water, most likely for the purposes of cooking, though other potential functions have been suggested. Such sites are generally situated close to water sources, though specific channels may have silted up or changed course over time: the nearest mapped natural water course is the Leithen Water, approximately 450 m away, and 50m lower than the location of the asset. As burnt mounds were located near to water for functional purposes, their main setting is their immediate location. In the absence of a nearby natural watercourse it can be inferred that the local topographic environment has changed since the asset was in use. The current setting of the asset makes a low contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The ZTV model indicates that up to three turbines at hub height would be visible from the asset. These would form a very minor distraction from the main setting, but would not directly impinge on it. The impact magnitude is assessed as low, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Assets 14, 36, 38, 39, quarries, 40, clearance cairns and hay rees, 37, clearance cairn

10.8.19 Four of the heritage assets are the locations of former (possible) quarries (Assets 14, 36, 38, 39). These assets have all been assessed as being of negligible value. The setting of these asset types are generally restricted to the immediate vicinity of the quarry. In the case of these assets, even the immediate surroundings of the quarries make little contribution to the understanding or appreciation of the assets, with such potential features as spoil heaps or quarry tracks not being apparent. Although there would be some intervisibility with these assets and the proposed turbines, as this would be at distances or at least 2.5 km, which is well beyond the effective setting of these assets, it is assessed that there would be no impact on these assets resulting from setting change. A similar situation pertains to the collection of clearance cairns and hay rees at Girthgate (Asset 40), and the clearance cairn at Early Knowe (Asset 37).

Asset 18, possible road

10.8.20 The possible historic road crossing the slopes of Maiden Law (Asset 18) has been assessed as having low value. It is over 2.5 km from the nearest proposed turbine, has intermittent visibility with the proposed turbines, with approximately one third of the mapped course not having any intervisibility according to the ZTV model, and one half being intervisible with the tips of one or two turbines. As a local route, the main setting of the road would be its immediate landscape surroundings. The road approximately parallels the Caddon Water to the east, and this forms the main visual relationship of the road. This relationship would not be affected by the turbines. The wider setting makes a negligible contribution to the value of the asset, and the visual distraction of the turbines would be an impact of a very low magnitude, resulting in a **Negligible** impact on the asset.

Assets 22, 23, enclosures

10.8.21 The two enclosures at Caberston (Assets 22, 23) have been assessed to be of low value. They can be considered to share a setting. As agricultural enclosures the main setting consists of the immediate landscape, which consists of the open rough grazing which has formed the historic landscape of the area since at least the post-medieval period. This landscape pattern has been slightly broken up in relatively recent times with the planting of small blocks of forestry. The setting makes a low contribution to the value of these assets. Although the turbines would constitute a large new element in the landscape, they would not alter this principal aspect of the landscape setting of the assets. The magnitude of the impact on the settings is assessed as being low, which would result in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Indirect Impact Assessment: Outer Study Area

Selection of Heritage Assets for Assessment

10.8.22 In order to identify potential significant setting effects the designated assets of national value within 10km, and the designated assets of regional value within 5km of the proposed turbine locations have been assessed. The initial stage of assessment has been to determine which heritage assets have a realistic prospect of receiving any setting impacts. Using a ZTV model, assets that are not within the ZTV and are unlikely to have important views across them from viewpoints within the ZTV have been removed from consideration. The GDL at Kailzie is entirely outside of the ZTV. Of the 48 Scheduled Monuments within the OSA, 36 are outside of the ZTV. Seventeen of the 28 Category A Listed Buildings and twelve of the Category B Listed Building within the ZTV are either outside of the ZTV or are in areas with low levels of predicted intervisibility and are in built up areas that would further screen the assets from intervisibility with the proposed turbines. These assets therefore are not assessed further. All three of the Conservation Areas are largely outside of the ZTV, and the areas that are also have a low level of predicted intervisibility. In addition to this there is significant screening of streetscapes by the constituent buildings of the Conservation Areas. Moreover, it is considered that for the three Conservation Areas the main setting is in each case the internal views and spatial relationships within the Conservation Area. It is therefore assessed that there would not be a realistic prospect of significant effects on the Conservation Areas due to setting change and no further assessment has been undertaken. More detailed examination of the situation of a number of other designated heritage assets has also led to their removal from further assessment. These include assets at long distance for which long-distance views would not form a significant element of the setting, assets which are closely screened by permanent woodland, buildings or microtopography, which are not included in the ZTV. These considerations remove a further group of assets from further assessment, consisting of thirteen Scheduled Monuments, three Category A Listed Buildings and two Category B Listed Buildings.

Setting Assessments

Settlement at Ewes Hill (SM2104)

10.8.23 The settlement at Ewes Hill (SM2104) is thought to be prehistoric. It comprises the irregular foundations of earth and stone-built structures, enclosed on the three sides by rampart, on the southeast slope of Ewes Hill. The settlement is situated to the west of a small burn. The principal setting of the asset is the immediate landscape, including the burn, the southeast facing slope on which the asset is located, the western facing slope on the other side of the burn and the Lugg Water to the south, with its associate floodplain. Longer distance views to the north and east are restricted by the assets' location on Ewes Hill. To the south and west, longer distance views are dominated by the mass of higher hills such as Hard Law, Shiels Rig and Calfhope Hill. The immediate setting makes a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset, providing some sense of the reason for selecting the location in terms of a relatively sheltered location, the presence of a water source and potential areas of agricultural land. The longer distance views make a negligible contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset: while the views to the north and west give a sense of isolation, this is potentially a misleading impression, given the number of records of human activity in the vicinity in the past that can be found in the HER and NRHE. Between three and five of the proposed turbines would be partially visible from the site. They would occupy a small element in the distant views from the site, and would not have sufficient visual impact to overcome the dominance of the mass of the nearer hills to the north and west of the asset. The magnitude of impact on the immediate setting of the asset would be very low, and on the longer distance views would be low, in both cases resulting in effects of **Negligible** significance.

Leithen Lodge (LB13475)

10.8.24 Leithen Lodge (LB13475 Category A) is a country house, originally constructed in the early nineteenth century, but substantially remodelled in the 1880s in the Arts and Crafts style. The listing includes an arch, taken from Lochend House and added to the house in 1990 during renovations. Also included in the listing are the associated outbuildings and a sundial. The principal setting of the house is the immediately surrounding area. The setting is relatively visually, and to some extent physically restricted. The front of the house faces directly towards a steep wooded slope. The rear of the house faces into the courtyard, which has screen walls on the eastern side that were added at the same time as the Lochend arch. The windows on the eastern wall of the main house and the stable and hayloft block, which also forms a part of the eastern elevation, are relatively small and few in number. The grounds of the house are designed and planted to have shorter range and more constrained views, with thick

screen planting between these grounds and other buildings belonging to the estate further to the east. Isolated trees in an area of grass also form focal points on the eastern side of the grounds (see Image 10.1). The physical topography and surrounding woodland gives the house a self-contained and slightly isolated atmosphere, perhaps fitting the role the house long fulfilled as a hunting lodge, rather than an estate centre with a prominent location. The setting makes a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The ZTV modelling and visualisations (Figure 10.4, Volume 3b) indicate that up to six of the proposed turbines would be mostly or partially visible from the eastern side of the house. The results of the site visit indicate that there would be some degree of screening due to the woodland, leading to the partial obscuring of two of the turbines and complete screening of a further two turbines. The turbines would only be visible from the eastern side of the house and stable and hayloft block and the area of the grounds close to the eastern side of the house. The turbines would form a notable new element in views to the east with the closest turbine being approximately 4km from the asset, and while potentially creating a distraction from the setting would not be a dominant element in the visual environment, even in the small part of the overall setting of the house from which it would be visible,. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be low adverse, resulting in an effect of **Slight** significance.

Image 10.1 View southeast from Leithen Lodge (LB13475)

Hillside Knowe, Settlement (SM2731)

10.8.25 The settlement on Hillside Knowe (SM2731) is an enclosed prehistoric settlement, which seems to have had two phases of construction and use. The settlement occupies approximately two thirds of the length of the plateau that forms the top of the hill, covering the full width of the hilltop in the area it occupies. The hill is very steep sided, such that views to the river valleys to the northwest and southeast are quite restricted, though there are some more distant views from the edges of the asset including along the Glentress Burn valley, where cultivation terraces with a later drystone enclosure area visible. The most open views are along the Leithen Water valley as it bends to the north, terminating at Burntshell Rig. The main longer distance views from the asset are dominated by the mass of the surrounding higher hills, which are particularly steep to the northwest, with slightly shallower gradients giving a more open aspect in other directions. The immediate setting of the asset includes the views down towards cultivation terraces to the southeast. Apart from this element, the immediate setting gives a strong sense of physical separation from the surrounding landscape, reflecting the defensive value of the location. The immediate element of the setting makes a medium contribution to the heritage significance of the asset. The longer distance views create a sense of isolation, though this slightly undercut by the presence modern and historic sheepfolds and the presence of the road along the Leithen Water Valley. The small element of recent conifer plantations also introduces a modern element into these views. This element of the setting makes a low contribution to the value of the asset. Modelling indicates that four of the proposed turbines would be visible at hub height, with the blade tips of a further two also being visible (Figure 10.5). While the proposed turbines would be a new and notable element in the landscape, they would not change the open hillside character in the views southeast from the asset, though they may slightly detract from the partial sense of isolation. The magnitude of impact on this long distance element of the setting is medium, leading to an effect of **Slight** significance Although the presence and movement of the turbines would not visually separate the asset from its immediate setting, including the cultivation terraces, they would create a degree of distraction from that setting. The magnitude of effect on the immediate element of the setting is assessed to be medium, resulting in an effect of **Slight** significance.

Glentress Tower (SM3122)

10.8.26 Glentress Tower (SM3122) is the remains of a medieval tower house. It connects to four sheepfolds, at least one of which appears to have been built in part from the ruined tower house. The asset is situated at the bottom of the narrow and steep sided valley of the Glentress Burn. Views within the valley are constrained. The main views from the asset are east and west along the valley, and these are still constrained by the curvatures of the narrow valley. The view to the east includes the location of the cultivation terraces below Hillside Knowe. Views to the north and south are dominated by the steep slopes of the surrounding hills (Image 10.2). When viewed from the slopes to the north of the asset, the view is still dominated by the mass of the hill opposite. The visually constrained, almost concealed, setting of the asset gives a sense of the tower house as a defended domestic site in an agricultural landscape, with a purpose as a refuge, in contrast with other defensive sites that have more dominant locations. The setting makes a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. Modelling indicates that up to three turbines would be partially visible from the asset. These turbines would not form a dominant element in the landscape in comparison with the mass of the nearby steep sided hills, even when viewed from the slopes immediately to the north of the asset. They would not form an element in the longer distance views along the Glentress Burn, particularly towards the cultivation terraces. The magnitude of impact is therefore assessed to be low adverse, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Image 10.2 View southfrom Glentress Rig across Glentress Tower (SM3122)

Caerlee Hill (SM2785)

10.8.27 The fort at Caerlee Hill (SM2785) is located on a hill which forms one of the southernmost prominences in this section of the Tweed Valley. The location of the asset is visible from a limited number of open spaces within Innerleithen, though the fort itself is not readily discernible at that distance, while a communications mast to the immediate northeast of the asset is. The asset itself is a prehistoric fort, with a later settlement enclosure within it. Parts of the asset has been subject to considerable disturbance through quarrying. Elements of the asset, such as the outer defences, are relatively clear on the ground. The asset is divided by two modern field walls, one crossing the site north to south, the other coming from the southeast. The main views from the site range from the northwest, through the south and to the east, covering the Tweed Valley, taking in the A72 and the town of Innerleithen. Views to the north are dominated by Lee Pen. Views to the northeast are partially constrained by Pirn Craig and dominated by the mass of the ridge formed by Kirnie Law and Priesthope Hill. The site is partially intervisible with the fort at Pirn Wood, (SM1491) though the latter location has some screening of its lower sections due to woodland. The location of the fort, though not the remains of the fort itself, is visible from a limited number of open locations within the Tweed Valley. The main element of the setting are the views along the Tweed Valley, and also to Pirn Wood, which relate to the strategic purpose in locating the fort here to dominate and possibly control this section of the river, and any crossing points and the associated higher quality agricultural land in the valley bottom. This element of the setting is significantly compromised by the presence of the modern settlement of Innerleithen, the modern bridges over the Tweed and the relatively busy A72. The contribution of this element of the setting to the value of the asset is assessed to be low. The wider landscape views, including the hills to the north and northeast, consisting of a mix of open moorland and plantation forestry make a negligible contribution to the value of the asset. Modelling indicates that between four and six turbines would be visible from the site to hub height. These would occupy a limited quadrant of the view, and would be in the same section of the view already occupied by the communications mast. They would not have greater dominance in the view that the mass of the ridge between Kirnie Law and Priesthope Hill. They would not be visible in most of the views over the Tweed Valley, nor would they be visible n views to the fort from the valley bottom. The proposed turbines would form a very small distracting element in views to Pirn Wood. The magnitude of impact on the setting element consisting of views across the Tweed Valley, including to Pirn Wood, is assessed to be very low, leading to an effect of **Negligible** significance. The magnitude of impact on the views over the moorland and forested hills to the north and northeast is assessed to be low, resulting in an effect of **Negligible** significance.

Pirn Wood, Fort (SM1491)

10.8.28 The fort at Pirn Wood (SM1491) is on the lower SW spur of Pirn Craig. The asset is a prehistoric fort, thought to have had a number of phases of occupation. The locations of the base of at least 20 houses are visible. The main views from the site range from the west, through the south and to the east, covering the Tweed Valley, taking in the A72 and the town of Innerleithen. The site is partially intervisible with the fort at Caerlee Hill (SM2785). Views to the northwest are largely constrained by Lee Pen, with partial views north along the valley of the Leithen Water as far as Woolhope Bank and Dod Hill. Views to the northeast are partially constrained by Pirn Craig and dominated by the mass of the ridge formed by Kirnie Law and Priesthope Hill. The main element of the setting are the views along the Tweed Valley, which relate to the strategic purpose in locating the fort close to this section of the river, any crossing points and the higher quality agricultural land in the valley bottom, as well as the confluence with the Leithen Water. The location also made a statement of status, by visually dominating the nearby parts of the valley. This element of the setting is compromised by the presence of the modern settlement of Innerleithen, the modern bridges over the Tweed and the relatively busy A72. The contribution of this element of the setting to the value of the asset is assessed to be low. The element of the setting consisting of views along the valley of the Leithen Water is assessed to make a low contribution to the value of the asset. The views to the northeast make a negligible contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The ZTV modelling indicates that there will be no intervisibility over approximately one third of the site, and over the rest of the asset visibility would be limited to three turbines at hub height. The turbines would not be visible in views over the Tweed Valley and towards Caerlee Hill, and therefore would have no impact or effect on that element of the setting. The turbines would not be sufficiently close to the views along the Leithen Water valley to form a distraction and would therefore have no impact or effect. The turbines would form a new and notable, though distant, element in the views to the northeast, creating a degree of distraction in the view. This impact is assessed to be of low magnitude, resulting in an effect of **Negligible** significance.

Traquair Hour (LB15429)

10.8.29 Traquair House is a complex of heritage assets, which includes the garden and grounds (GDL00378), Traquair House itself (LB15429, Category A), the summer house (LB19391, Category A), and the complex of the Bear Gates, the Avenue Head Cottages, the Lodges and outhouse at the Bear Gates (all included in LB15430, Category A). The formally laid out element of the grounds includes the tree lined Avenue, which runs toward the centre of the south elevation of Traquair House. Other formal elements include the walled garden. The house and its immediate surroundings within the grounds also can be considered as one element in terms of setting.

10.8.30 The views along the avenue, both towards the house, particularly from the Bear Gates and from the house and the gates that permit entry to the formal area immediately in front of the house form complementary elements of the setting. Views along the avenue from the Bear Gates strongly direct the eye to the front elevation of the house, with the combination of the gradient sloping towards the house and the mature trees that line the avenue effectively screening out views to the side, including areas to the sides of the house elevation. The design of the avenue creates an aggrandizing statement of the status of the house, creating a view in which it is the dominant element (see Viewpoint 13, Figures 6.29a-f). Views from the house along the avenue create a clear sense of the boundary of the core of the estate associated with the house by focussing on the gates with the bear statuary being guardian figures. The buildings (cottages and lodges) associated with the gates are less obvious, tending to visually merge with the walls, an effect heightened by the presence of bushes and the trees of the avenue which partially obscure them. The views along the avenue make a high contribution to the understanding and appreciation of Traquair House itself and the GDL. Although the area of the avenue is modelled to have a degree of intervisibility with the

Proposed Development, this is based on a bare earth model (Figure 6.29a-f, Volume 3b). The permanent woodland, in particular the trees of the avenue would effectively screen some of the turbines from the views along the avenue. Traquair House itself, in particular, would screen the potentially most prominent turbines from views along the avenue. The turbines would not be visible in views towards the Bear Gates and associated structures. The magnitude of impact on this element of the setting is assessed to be nil, with no resulting effect. Much of the immediate surroundings of the house and the areas to the north and south of the Avenue are mature policy woodlands, which have a number of paths and tracks through them. The summerhouse is situated in these woodlands and is screened from more distant views. These woodlands form a dominant element of views from the house to the south and north of the house, and to some degree to the northeast. This element of the setting makes a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of Traquair House, and a high contribution to the understanding of the summer house and the GDL itself. The screening of the area means that the magnitude of impact is assessed to be nil, with **no resulting effect** on the summerhouse and on Traquair House and the GDL with respect to this element of the setting. Within the northeastern area of the grounds there is more open ground, including more formal garden elements in this part of the garden, including a maze. The area of the maze and the views from the house towards are intended to be visually self-constrained, evidenced by the use of high screen planting. This element of the setting makes a medium contribution to the understanding and appreciation of this part of the GDL and Traquair House. From the area of the maze further views are somewhat occluded by the permanent woodland, which includes a high proportion of specimen conifers. The ZTV modelling indicates that only the blades of three turbines would be visible from this part of the garden. Taking into account the presence of mature conifers, which would largely screen or break up views of the proposed turbines from the house and the northeastern area of the gardens in the area of the maze, the magnitude of impact is assessed to be low adverse, with a resulting effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Grieston Hill, Fort (SM3169)

10.8.31 The fort on Grieston Hill (SM3169) is prehistoric, and occupies an isolated ridge aligned northeast to southwest. The site has triple ramparts. No internal features have been noted. The immediate surroundings of the asset is a forestry area, currently covered by birch scrub. Views to the northwest are curtailed by the main body of Grieston Hill. To the east the site of the fort at Chester Hill is visible, and to the south the area of prehistoric landscape at Orchard Rig. To the southeast views extend along the Violet Burn to the Quair Water, and to the northeast there are views to the Tweed Valley. The immediate surroundings of the asset make a negligible contribution in terms of understanding and appreciation to its value. Longer distance views to and from the fort, particularly to the river valleys and other nearby prehistoric settlement and defensive sites give a sense of the roles of the asset as a defensive position and as a statement of status in the area. This element of the setting makes a medium contribution to the value of the asset. The proposed turbines would have no effect on the immediate setting of the asset. Modelling indicates that seven to eight of the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset. This would be distant view to the northeast of the site. The proposed turbines would form a new element in the long distance views to the northeast from approximately half the area of the asset, occupying a very small portion of the visible landscape (Figure 10.6, Volume 3b). The turbines would create some distraction from these elements of the setting. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be low, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Chester Hill, Fort (SM2961)

10.8.32 The fort on Chester Hill (SM2961) is visible as the heavily truncated remains of a prehistoric fort. The surviving observable elements lie with a historic plantation wall: the 'plantation' is recorded in the Ordnance Survey Six-Inch First Edition (Selkirkshire, Sheet VI, survey date 1856-1858). The area within the plantation wall is covered by mature conifers. Outside of the area of trees, towards the northern edge of the scheduled area there is intervisibility between the asset and the fort at Caerlee Hill (SM2785) and the fort at Pirn Wood (SM1491), as well as views over the Tweed Valley, particularly the area incorporating the eastern part of Innerleithen and the western edge of Walkerburn as well as areas of the valley to the north of the asset. There would have been views back to the location of the fort from some of these positions, and Chester Hill is locally prominent. Arguably, the location also made a statement of status, by visually dominating the nearby parts of the valley, though the location commands a less dominant position in the wider landscape than other forts in the area. Views in other directions would generally be largely curtailed by the surrounding higher hills such as Wallace's Hill to the northwest and Birks Hill to the southwest. Views ranging through the southwest to the southeast are currently screened by established forestry, though there would be intervisibility between the asset and the lower slopes of Orchard Rig, including the location of the prehistoric settlement on Orchard Rig (SM2680). Views to the north incorporate views of six wind turbines (Image 10.3). These are not easily discernible, and the main element of the setting that currently makes a contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset are the views into and from the Tweed Valley, which reflect the strategic and status function of the asset in terms of its local dominance. The setting makes a low contribution to the heritage significance of the asset. This assessment takes into account that within the main area of the fort much of the longer distance setting is not discernible due to the woodland on the site. The proposed turbines would be visible in a limited section of the horizon from the asset, though only clearly in those areas outside of the historic plantation (Figure 10.7). Taking into account the screening/visual interference of the fort created by the woodland the magnitude of impact is assessed to be low, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Image 10.3 View north from the fort on Chester Hill (SM2961)

Orchard Rig, settlements and associated prehistoric landscape (SM2680)

10.8.33 At Orchard Rig the set of settlements, both enclose and unenclosed, together with a burial cairn, groups of enclosures and field systems are scheduled as a single monument (SM2680). The scheduled area forms an unusually well-preserved area of prehistoric landscape, encompassing a series of settlements and field systems, mainly thought to date to the Iron Age, but probably with Bronze Age origins. Intensive analysis of aerial photography of the area has assisted in the identification of many of the features. The main element of the setting of the asset is the asset itself, as a complex multiphase historic landscape with the spatial and visual relationships within the scheduled area being key to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. The current conditions on the ground, however, are not so amenable to observing the remains, as the vast majority of the site is covered by

bracken. When visible, the contribution of this element of the setting to the value of the asset is assessed to be high. Medium distance views include the fort on Grieston Hill, and the slopes on the opposite sides of the two water courses that bracket the scheduled area, which consist of improved pasture surmounted with plantation forestry to the northeast and permanent woodland, pasture and parkland (Image 10.4). These elements of the setting make a low contribution to the value of the asset. Long distance views cover local hill ranges and partial views along the Tweed Valley and the valley of the Quair Water. These views make a low contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the asset and therefore its heritage significance. Modelling indicates that seven to eight of the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset (Figure 10.8), this would be distant view to the northeast of the site. The turbines would not impinge on, and only very slightly distract from views within the asset. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be very low, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance on this element of the setting. The proposed turbines would form a new element in the medium and long-distance views to the northeast from approximately half the area of the asset, occupying a very small portion of the visible landscape.

10.8.34 The turbines would create some distraction from these elements of the setting. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be low, resulting in an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Image 10.4 View northeast from the central area of the scheduled area Orchard Rig (SM2680)

The Glen Designed Landscape (GDL00359)

10.8.35 The Glen GDL (GDL00359) is a designed landscape, developed in two main phases, one in the early nineteenth century and the other in the second half of the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century. In its current form the GDL forms the main part of a good example of later nineteenth-century estate. The GDL is based around the mid-nineteenth-century country house of the same name. The house and many of the estate buildings are listed buildings. The core of the estate that contains these buildings is beyond the limits of the ZTV, and therefore have not been selected for further assessment. The GDL includes components designed by the eminent architects David Bryce and Sir Robert Lorimer. The GDL has a number of more formal features near the house, including walled gardens and terraced gardens, set within a park and woodland landscape. The boundaries of the GDL are thickly planted with woodland, and woodland belts also divide up the interior of the GDL. The effect of the topographic location and the woodland is to create a secluded effect within the GDL, both with respect to the landscape beyond and within the GDL itself. More distant views to moorland hills also form part of the setting of the park: the visible hills beyond the GDL are mainly the nearest ranges surrounding the GDL. The longer distance element of the setting makes a medium contribution to the value of the GDL. The ZTV model indicates that there would be no intervisibility between the proposed turbines and over 60% of the area of the GDL, including the main formal areas around the house and the approaches to the house. Within the areas where the ZTV indicates intervisibility, approximately half of these are wooded. Within the open areas of the GDL where the proposed turbines would be visible, the number of turbines would vary from two to eight, with the main locations being the slopes north of Larch Wood on the eastern side of the GDL and the eastern slopes below Gentle's Wood on the northern side of the GDL. Both locations are a little over 10km from the nearest turbine. The turbines would be a new, but very small element in the long-distance views from these locations, creating a small distraction in views in the direction of the turbines. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be low adverse, causing an effect of **Very Slight** significance.

Bowhill, Designed Landscape (GDL00065)

10.8.36 The GDL at Bowhill (GDL00065) has been assessed on the basis of scoping input. The majority of the GDL is outside of the ZTV, with the exception of small area of Pernassie Hill, which is under woodland. Views across the GDL from outside its boundary have been considered, specifically from one of the minor roads (see Figure 10.9). Although the GDL is perceptible from this area, its unique character is not clear, as it not distinguishable from the plantation forestry that forms a common element of the local landscapes. The visualisation of the turbines from this view position demonstrates that even without the woodland of the GDL being present, the turbines would be barely perceptible on the skyline (Figure 10.9). The policy woodland of the GDL would completely screen the proposed turbines from this location. It is assessed that the proposed turbines would have **no effect** on the GDL through setting change.

Cumulative Impact Assessment

10.8.37 Cumulative effects have been assessed for assets that have been assessed as receiving an impact from the Proposed Development. Two criteria have been used to select assets and potential cumulative developments. The first is that other wind farm developments must be within 10 km of the affected heritage asset and intervisibile with it. The second is that such a development has been given planning consent, has an active planning application or is undergoing a planning appeal. There are no such intervisible developments within 10 km of any of the heritage assets that would receive impacts due to changes in setting.

Mitigation

10.8.38 Mitigation in relation to direct impact on most heritage assets has been embedded into the design of the proposed infrastructure, in order to avoid direct impacts where possible. Appropriate mitigation would be undertaken in the form of:

- Fencing off assets that may be accidentally damaged, specifically Assets 55 and 57; and
- A watching brief on the elements of the ground works that would have a direct impact on heritage assets, specifically Asset 56.

10.8.39 The precise scope of the watching brief would be negotiated with SBC Archaeology Service and the agreed mitigation programme would be documented in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation.

10.8.40 No mitigation is proposed with respect to the potential indirect impacts on setting.

Residual Effects

10.8.41 The completion of the archaeological mitigation programme outlined above would minimise the loss of the archaeological resource that could occur as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development. No significant residual effects in EIA terms are anticipated in relation to direct effects from the construction of the Proposed Development.

10.8.42 No mitigation has been proposed -in respect of the indirect impacts from the Proposed Development and the effects would be the same as those stated in the assessment of indirect impacts. There would be no significant effects in EIA terms

10.9 SUMMARY OF PREDICTED EFFECTS

10.9.1 Table 10.8 summarises the predicted effects of the Proposed Development on the assessed heritage assets.

Table 10.8 Summary of Predicted Effects

Predicted Effect	Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Effects	Cumulative Effects
Direct effect on known heritage assets within the Proposed Development	Negligible to slight	Watching brief and fending of vulnerable assets	Nil	-
Indirect effect on non-designated heritage assets within the ISA	Negligible to slight	None	Negligible to slight	-
Complex of B and C Category Listed Buildings at Holylee (LB8324, LB8325, LB49123, LB49124, LB49125)	Nil	None	Nil	Nil
Elibank House Category B Listed Building (LB1906)	Nil	None	Nil	Nil
Cairn Hill,Cairn, Scheduled Monument SM2758	Slight	None	Slight	Nil
Elibank Castle, Scheduled Monument SM6163	Slight	None	Slight	Nil
Lee Tower, Scheduled Monument SM10861	Nil	None	Nil	Nil
Reservoir, Kirnie Law, Category C	Nil	None	Nil	Nil
Ewes Hill, settlement, Scheduled Monument SM2104	Negligible	None	Negligible	Nil
Leithen Lodge, Category A Listed Building LB13475	Slight	None	Slight	Nil
Hillside Knowe, settlement, Scheduled Monument, SM2731	Slight	None	Slight	Nil
Glentress Tower, Scheduled Monument, SM3112	Very slight	None	Very Slight	Nil
Caerlee Hill, fort, Scheduled Monument, SM2785	Negligible	None	Negligible	Nil
Pirn Wood, fort, Scheduled Monument, SM1491	Negligible	None	Negligible	Nil
Traquair House, Category A Listed Building, LB15429, and Traquair House GDL (GDL00378), complex of Category A Listed Buildings at gates (LB15430)	Nil to very slight	None	Nil to Very Slight	Nil
Grieston Hill, fort, Scheduled Monument, SM3169	Very slight	None	Very Slight	Nil
Chester Hill, fort, Scheduled Monument, SM2961	Very slight	None	Very Slight	Nil
Orchard Rig, settlements, enclosures, cairn, field system, SM2680	Very slight	None	Very Slight	Nil
The Glen, Garden and Designed Landscape, GDL00359	Very slight	None	Very Slight	Nil
Bowhill, Garden and Designed Landscape, GDL00066	Nil	None	Nil	Nil

10.10 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

10.10.1 This assessment has considered data from a diverse range of sources in order to determine the presence of cultural heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development. The potential effects on the identified assets, mitigation measures for protecting known heritage assets during construction and recording of assets, both known and currently unknown, which could be lost, and the residual effect of the Proposed Development has all been considered.

10.10.2 In summary, the landscape of the Proposed Development and the immediately surrounding area contains many post-medieval and modern agricultural heritage assets and a smaller number of medieval and prehistoric assets, set variously in moorland, pasture and conifer forestry. The potential of unknown assets dating form these periods is considered to vary between low (Roman, modern), low to moderate (prehistoric, medieval) and moderate (post-medieval). For the reasons set out above, there have been found to be no likely significant effects on these heritage assets.

10.10.3 There are no likely significant effects on the setting of heritage assets arising from the construction or operation of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development therefore does not significantly adversely affect the fabric or setting of any Listed Buildings, the integrity of the setting of any Scheduled Monuments or the setting of any GDLs on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes.