Technical Appendix 11.2: Settings Assessment

Contents

Introduction

This technical appendix includes the detailed settings assessments which have been undertaken as part of the Cultural Heritage and Archaeology assessment (EIA Chapter 11).

The assessment has been carried out by Lynne Roy and Lisa Bird of AOC Archaeology Group. Lynne Roy is Project Manager (Consultancy) at AOC Archaeology Group with over 19 years of experience working on EIAs across Britain. Lynne has also provided expert witness services for planning appeals and public inquiries. Lisa Bird is a Project Officer with over eight years of experience working on a range of EIAs, desk-based assessments and large walkover survey projects.

Methodology

This technical appendix should be read with reference to the methodology outlined in Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, in particular Tables 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5. Table 11.2.1 outlines the assets considered as part of the detailed settings assessment, their relative sensitivity, the magnitude of impact and the level of effect. The location of designated heritage assets is shown on Figure 11.3. The settings assessment for designated heritage assets identified by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) during scoping (Table 11.1) are detailed in Chapter 11. All plates referenced in the following text are found in Appendix 11.3.

Settings Assessment

The following table identifies all the designated heritage assets which have been scoped into an assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on their settings as discussed during consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Archaeology Officer at Scottish Borders Council (SBC) (see EIA Chapter 11, Table 11.1) and as set out in Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment (EIA Chapter 11, Section 11.8). Table 1 includes a total of 39 assets, 38 of which fall within the 10 km study area and one of which (Stobo Castle Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape) which is outside the 10 km study area but has been scoped in. The table also identifies each assets designation type, the number of turbines theoretically visible from the asset and the measurement to the closest proposed turbine. The table outlines factors affecting visibility, cross references to associated visualisations and details the relative sensitivity, magnitude of impact and predicted level of effect the Proposed Development is judged to have on each asset.

Following the table there are textual discussions for each designated heritage asset, divided by impact. The detailed textual settings assessment for Menzion Farm, enclosed cremation cemetery 600m WSW of (Asset 1), Menzion Farmhouse, two enclosed cremation cemeteries 400m NNW of (Asset 2), Weird Law, platform settlement 550m S of summit (Asset 3), Oliver Castle, fort (Asset 67) and Nether Oliver Crags, fort (Asset 71) are described in Chapter 11 of the EIA.

Table 1 – Settings Assessment

Asset No.	Asset Name	Designation	Number of Turbines Theoretically Visible	Distance to the Nearest Turbine (approximate)	Factors Affecting Visibility	Associated visualisation	Relative Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Level of Effect
1	Menzion Farm, enclosed cremation cemetery 600m WSW of	Scheduled Monument	7	0.625 km north-west (turbine 1)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
2	Menzion Farmhouse, two enclosed cremation cemeteries 400m NNW of	Scheduled Monument	7	0.69 km north (turbine 7)		Figure 11.11a-c	Medium	Low	Minor
3	Weird Law, platform settlement 550m S of summit	Scheduled Monument	7	0.48 km east (turbine 1)		Figure 11.10a-d	Medium	Medium	Moderate
29	Easter Stanhope, homestead 780m NW of	Scheduled Monument	7	6.21 km north-east (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Medium	Negligible	Negligible
33	Hopecarton, settlement 530m SE of	Scheduled Monument	5-6	7.33km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Medium	Negligible	Negligible
34	Dreva Craig, fort, settlements & field system	Scheduled Monument	0	11.10 south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	High	None	No impact
59	Menzion Farm, Giant's Stone, cairn & standing stones 590m NE of	Scheduled Monument	7	1.15 km north (turbine 7)	Woodland	-	Low	Low	Neutral
60	Menzion Farm, three enclosed cremation cemeteries 1550m WSW of	Scheduled Monument	7	0.77 km north (turbine 2)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
61	Menzion Farm, cairn 1280m SW of	Scheduled Monument	7	1.03 km north (turbine 1)		Figure 11.18a-b	Medium	Low	Minor
62	Menzion Farm, palisaded settlement 1550m SW of	Scheduled Monument	7	1.10 km north (turbine 1)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
63	Glenbreck, platform settlements 1100m SW of	Scheduled Monument	7	3.96 km north-west (turbine 2)	Intervening forestry plantation	Figure 11.15a-c	Low	Low	Neutral
64	Hawkshaw Castle	Scheduled Monument	5-6	3.45 km north (turbine 1)		Figure 11.13a-c	Low	Negligible	Neutral
65	Glenkerie Burn,fort	Scheduled Monument	7	2.64 km south (turbine 6)		Figure 11.14a-b	Medium	Low	Minor
67	Oliver Castle, fort	Scheduled Monument	7	1.46 km west (turbine 6)	Intervening forestry plantation	Figure 11.9a-c	Medium	Low	Minor

Asset No.	Asset Name	Designation	Number of Turbines Theoretically Visible	Distance to the Nearest Turbine (approximate)	Factors Affecting Visibility	Associated visualisation	Relative Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Level of Effect
70	The Chester, enclosure 180m NE of Glenrusko	Scheduled Monument	7	2.22 km south-west (turbine 6)	Intervening forestry plantation	Figure 11.16a-c	Medium	Low	Minor
71	Nether Oliver Crags,fort	Scheduled Monument	5-7	1.65 km west (turbine 6)	Intervening forestry plantation	Figure 11.8a-c	Medium	Low	Minor
72	Patervan, fort, settlement & cultivation terraces 1050m NNW of	Scheduled Monument	0-4	2.39 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Medium	Negligible	Negligible
74	Stanhope, scooped settlement and enclosure NNE of	Scheduled Monument	0-6	6.39 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
77	Stanhope, enclosed settlement 800m SW of	Scheduled Monument	3-4	5.56 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
79	White Type-March Burn,Roman road	Scheduled Monument	1-2	10.45 km NNE (turbine 2)	Distance	-	Negligible	None	No Impact
81	Whiteside Rig, fort & enclosure	Scheduled Monument	0-7	2.68 km south-west (turbine 6)	Intervening woodland	Figure 11.7 a & b	High	Low	Minor
82	Norman's Castle, dun 830m SW of Stanhope	Scheduled Monument	3-6	5.36 km south-west (turbine 6)	Intervening forestry plantation	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
88	Glenbreck,platform settlement	Scheduled Monument	7	3.25 km (turbine 2)	Intervening forestry plantation	-	Low	Low	Neutral
89	Grange Hill, platform settlement 1000m ENE of Glenbreck	Scheduled Monument	7	2.00 km North (turbine 2)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
90	Glenwhappen Rig, palisaded enclosure 1450m NE of Glenbreck	Scheduled Monument	7	1.11 km east (turbine 2)	Intervening forestry plantation	Figure 11.17a-c	Low	Medium	Minor
94	Stanhope, settlement 160m N of	Scheduled Monument	0-6	6.28 km south-west (turbine 6)		-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
99	Stanhope, unenclosed platform settlement 850m SW of	Scheduled Monument	3-4	5.37 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral

Asset No.	Asset Name	Designation	Number of Turbines Theoretically Visible	Distance to the Nearest Turbine (approximate)	Factors Affecting Visibility	Associated visualisation	Relative Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Level of Effect
100	Hopecarton, enclosure 410m SSW of	Scheduled Monument	3-4	7.11 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
101	Stanhope Cottage, burial cairn 240m NNE of	Scheduled Monument	3-4	6.62 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	High	Negligible	Minor
102	Hopecarton, buildings 250m SSE of	Scheduled Monument	5-6	7.27 km south-west (turbine 6)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
103	Cardon,fort NW of	Scheduled Monument	1-2	8.65 km south (turbine 6)		-	Medium	Negligible	Negligible
104	Worm Hill,cairn	Scheduled Monument	7	6.43 km south-west (turbine 6)		-	High	Negligible	Minor
108	Glenbreck,two barrows 1280m NE of (Asset 108)	Scheduled Monument	7	1.43 km north-east (turbine 2)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
109	Hawkshaw Farm, unenclosed platform settlement 1240m E of	Scheduled Monument	7	1.35 km NNW (turbine 1)		-	Medium	Low	Minor
110	Menzion Farm, settlement 735m SSW of	Scheduled Monument	7	1.54 km north-west (turbine 1)		Figure 11.12a-d	Medium	Low	Minor
116	Carlows Brig	Listed Building-Category B	7	1.40 km north-west (turbine 6)		-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
117	The Bield	Listed Building-Category B	7	1.51 km West (turbine 6)	Intervening forestry plantation	-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
119	Victoria Lodge, to North of Talla Reservoir	Listed Building-Category B	7	2.81 km West (turbine 1)		-	Low	Negligible	Neutral
206	Stobo Castle	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape	0-7	13.09km north-east (turbine 8)	Distance and intervening landform	-	Medium	Negligible	Negligible

Context

The Tweed Valley, in which the site is located is not a homogenous valley landscape and it is deemed useful to describe the different sections of the valley to provide contextual information for the following detailed settings assessments.

The valley formed by the River Tweed and following the alignment of the A701 south of Broughton, is a relatively open, and wide valley landscape with sloping sides to the east and west terminating at a height of a maximum of 471 m AOD. Where the River Tweed meanders between Worm Hill, 541 m AOD to the east, and the settlement of Stanhope the valley is formed of a wide river valley, dominated by a floodplain. The valley around Tweedsmuir, in the vicinity of the site appears to be formed of a more enclosed, v-shape, with relatively steeper valley sides terminating at 510 m AOD to the east and 487 m AOD to the west, when compared to the hillslopes to the north. From the southern extent of the site, the valley landscape widens around the confluence of the Fruid Water and the River Tweed and the confluence of numerous minor tributaries.

The wind turbines of the Clyde Wind Farm can be seen from the A701 and the valley floor in distant views within 10 km of the site. The turbines of Glenkerie Wind Farm are also visible from the north, when looking south within the Tweed Valley.

Minor Impact

Menzion Farm, three enclosed cremation cemeteries 1550m WSW of (Asset 60)

The Scheduled remains of Menzion Farm, three enclosed cremation cemeteries (Asset 60-Plate 60) consist of a rectangular in plan area on gently sloping land, west of the A701, on one of the upper terraces of the River Tweed. The designation currently extends across an area of mature conifer planation and hummocky grassland and is thought to encompass three probable enclosed cremation cemeteries. When originally constructed the cemeteries may have been intervisible with other cremation cemeteries (Asset 1 & 2) to the north-east, along the same river terrace, and other ritual and funerary remains (Assets 59 & 61) within the near and wider Tweed Valley area. Prehistoric settlement remains (Assets 3 & 62), which may or may not be contemporary have also been recorded in the near landscape, suggesting that the cemeteries may be elements of a prehistoric landscape within the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley (Plate 47). In the modern landscape, there are theoretical visual links between Asset 60 and other cremation cemeteries (Assets 1 & 2), although due to the surviving low form of the remains this is less easily perceptible than it possibly once was and is not readily appreciable without prior knowledge. The extant commercial forestry also currently limits intervisibility although it is acknowledged that the forestry is not necessarily a permanent feature and visibility may change in the future. The Menzion Farm cremation cemeteries are also intervisible with the Scheduled Weird Law platform settlement (Asset 3) to the east and also theoretically intervisible with the Menzion farm cairn (Asset 61) and palisade settlement (Asset 62), although the surviving low form of these two assets, likely lower than when originally constructed, as well as the post-medieval and modern landscaping associated with the A701 has limited intervisibility to some degree. Plate 47 which presents a north-west facing view from the unenclosed platform settlement Hawkshaw Farm, (Asset 109) shows how the assets along the northern side of the valley may have been visible in association with one another. These inter-relationships along the lower lying slopes of the Tweed Valley allow for the setting of Asset 60 to be appreciated, understood and experienced although it must be noted that further understanding is gained from cartographic representations and when viewed from discrete locations to the south-east. The lower slopes of the Tweed Valley contribute to the cultural significance of the three enclosed cremation cemeteries at Menzion Farm and the asset is considered to have a medium relative sensitivity.

The Proposed Development would be located to the north-east of Asset 60, with the closest element being the proposed substation, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and temporary construction compound c. 325 m north-east. The proposed substation, BESS and compound would be constructed within an area currently occupied by conifer plantations. In the short term, the new buildings may be visible however replanting works proposed around the new infrastructure will likely screen them from view and therefore there would be no appreciable change. The closest turbine (turbine 2) would be located c. 770 m north of Asset 60 in the upper slopes of Tweed Valley in an area currently occupied by commercial forestry, but beyond the prehistoric landscape around the River Tweed. Whilst it could be argued that the Proposed Development, specifically the proposed turbines would draw the eye up the valley, the elements which provide contextual information are situated along the lower slopes of the valley. Arguably, the Proposed Development would serve to further highlight the differential modern and historic land use, increasingly the legibility of the upper valley as being different from the lower valley and therefore a better understanding of the setting of some heritage assets. Overall, the Proposed Development would constitute an alteration to the baseline setting which does not diminish the ability to appreciate, understand or experience the three enclosed cremation cemeteries at Menzion Farm or their inter-relationships along or across the Tweed Valley and the magnitude of impact is considered to be low.

The resulting level of effect is **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Menzion Farm, cairn 1280 m SW of (Asset 61) and Menzion Farm, palisaded settlement 1550 m SW of (Asset 62)

Menzion Farm, cairn 1280 m SW of (Asset 61) has been described as a cairn, but also alternatively as the remains of a cremation cemetery of prehistoric date. The Scheduled extent of Menzion Farm, palisaded settlement 1550 m SW of (Asset 62) is located c. 160 m south-west of Asset 61 and encompasses a palisaded settlement of prehistoric date on a low knoll.

The remains of Asset 61 and 62 were not accessible during the site visit due to high deer fences which precluded access. Both assets were identified from the adjacent side of the River Tweed and were observed to be located on a roughly level plateau of ground on the southern side of the River Tweed (Plate 61).

Assets 61 and 62 are located within the floodplain for the Tweed Valley, on land at c. 280 m AOD which extends south-west and north-east, to the confluence of the Tweed and the Fruid Water and around the low summit of Nether Dod and Whiteside Rig to the south. The landform rises on both side of the rivers, relatively more steeply to the west, compared to the east due the Fruid Water. These areas are currently largely occupied by commercial forestry, some of which has been recently felled. Within proximity of these prehistoric funerary (Asset 61) and settlement (Asset 62) remains a number of other similar period and functional assets have been recorded, including multiple probable cremation cemeteries (Assets 1, 2 & 3) and settlement remains (Assets 3 89, 90, 108 & 110) (see example Plate 47). Whilst these assets are unlikely to be contemporary, they reflect the long-term activity within the Tweed Valley, especially on the lower slopes of the valley. As such the setting of Assets 61 and 62 can be defined by the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley, an area which can be considered to contribute to our understanding, appreciation and experience of the monuments and therefore to their cultural significance. Whilst the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley contribute to the legibility of the local landscape and are part of the wider setting, they contribute less to the way on which the assets are understood, appreciated and experienced in regard to their inter-relationships and prehistoric landscape context. The relative sensitivity to change is considered to be medium.

The Proposed Development would be located at its closest point at the start of the proposed access tracks, which are already largely in existence as forestry tracks. The nearest new proposed element would be the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound c. 360 m to the north of Asset 61, an area currently occupied by densely planted commercial plantations. The nearest turbine (turbine 1) would be located 1.03 km and 1.10 km north of the assets respectively. A ZTV and wireline (Figure 11.18b) indicates that all seven turbines would be visible from Asset 61 and Asset 62, and it is likely the substation and compound would also be visible as new buildings in the short term and screened from view by replanting in the longer term. The turbines would be located in the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley, as shown on Figure 11.18b, beyond the lower lying land and either side of the Weird Law, and therefore beyond those elements of setting which have been identified as contributing most to the cultural significance of the assets. While the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound would be located on the lower slopes of the valley, the proposed infrastructure are likely to echo the historic built environment, of smaller post-medieval farmsteads (Assets 20 & 25) recorded in the area, compared to the extant commercial forestry and are unlikely to impact how the assets are understood and appreciated in the context of the valley and proximity to other prehistoric assets. This change is considered to be minor alteration to the baseline setting, which would not impede the way in which the assets are currently understood in the landscape or on cartography and therefore the magnitude of impact is judged to be low. The resulting level of effect is **minor**, a level of effect not considered to be significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Glenkerie Burn, fort (Asset 65)

The Scheduled Monument known as Glenkerie Burn, fort (Asset 65) encompasses the remains of a fort. Three elements of the fort have been identified during previous field surveys and these include the remains of a rubble wall, and external earthen walls and ramparts. A later sheepfold has been built over the fort (Plate 67). The fort occupies a low knoll within improved grassland on the south-east facing slope of Glenkerie Rig. The land to the south and west slopes downwards to the Kingledoors Burn and the Glenkerie Burn respectively, whereupon the land rises on the opposite bank of each burn. The land to the north rises upwards to Glenkerie Rig. Historically, the fort would have been afforded extensive views across a confluence of burns to the south and therefore may have been associated with control and/or the defence of the burn valley as well as being the foci for settlement and having access to fertile land and waterways. Views from the fort are along the valley, north-east and south-west, and tend to draw the eye downslope towards the Tweed Valley (Plate 68). In the modern period a track has been constructed down slope of the fort and Glenkerie Wind Farm has been built to the north, the closest turbine occupying the summit of Glenkerie Rig. Whilst this has had an impact on the near setting of the fort, the topographical elements to the south, east and west still enable a good appreciation of the fort and its historic setting. As a localised defensive and settlement asset, with a setting which already accommodates modern developments, the relative sensitivity of the fort is considered to be medium.

The Proposed Development would be located to the south of the fort, with the closest turbine, turbine 6, being located c. 2.64 km south. A wireline visualisation (Figure 11.14a) indicates that all seven proposed turbines would

be visible from the fort. All eleven turbines of the Glenkerie Wind Farm were visible from the northern extent of the site, north of the proposed location of turbine 6 during the walkover survey in 2023. Turbines 4 and 5 are depicted, on the wireline, just beyond the ridgeline (Figure 11.14b), with the other proposed turbines visible as hubs or blades beyond the ridgeline formed by Nether Oliver Dod, Upper Oliver Dod and Glenmuck Height (Plate 68). The Proposed Development would be located beyond the landscape elements which enable an appreciation of the historic setting of the fort and therefore the Proposed Development would be seen as a new addition to the wider landscape, beyond those elements of setting which best enable us to understand, appreciate and experience the fort. The magnitude of impact is considered to be low. The resulting level of effect would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

The Chester, enclosure 180 m NE of Glenrusko (Asset 70)

The Scheduled enclosure known as The Chester (Asset 70) is a prehistoric oval domestic asset located in an improved area of ground on the eastern floodplain on the River Tweed (Plate 69). Land to the west, north and south of the enclosure is located within the floodplain and fertile plain of the River Tweed, which is dominated by post-medieval and modern field patterning, which likely also reflects the extent of fertile land in use during earlier periods of activity. The land to the west is bound by conifer plantations which mark the extent of productive land and upland slopes. This is exemplified in Figure 11.16a where grassed slopes on the south-east facing side of the Tweed Valley terminate and the commercial forestry begins, which in this location is also identified by a forestry track. The land to the east rises steeply to Whiteside Rig and is currently planted with commercial forestry. When initially constructed The Chester was likely one of several settlement assets within and around the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley (see Plates 51 & 71). Near examples include the Scooped settlement 136 m SW of Glenveg (Asset 111) and two prehistoric forts (Assets 67 & 71), recorded to the east as visible on Figure 11.16a & c. Another fort (Asset 81) is located on the north-western extent of Whiteside Rig to the east of The Chester and on higher land indicating an attempt to control and defend land within the Tweed Valley in the prehistoric period. As a surviving example of prehistoric settlement which derives some of its cultural significance from its setting within a fertile valley near to known areas of prehistoric activity the relative sensitivity to change is considered to be medium.

The Proposed Development would be located to the south-west of The Chester, enclosure, with the nearest proposed turbine, turbine 6, located c. 2.22 km south-east on the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley in an area dominated by commercial forestry (Plate 69). Based on a photomontage (Figure 11.16c) all seven turbines of the Proposed Development would also be located beyond a ridge of land, the slope of Upper Oliver Dod. Turbine 6 would be visible directly behind the southern extent of Oliver Castle, fort (Asset 67) which is identifiable by its tree topped hill location (Figure 11.16c), however the low summit on which the fort is located is easily identified and appreciable as being different to the rising land beyond, in part helped by the slightly differential vegetation. In the case that no vegetation were present, the topography would be more readily appreciable (Figure 11.16b). Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible from The Chester enclosure, it would be located on the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley, beyond the area of settlement and agricultural activities which contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the cultural significance of the enclosure. As such the Proposed Development would be a noticeable modern addition but would not diminish the way in which The Chester enclosure or its inter-relationships with other monuments in the Tweed Valley are understood, appreciated and experienced. The magnitude of impact is considered to be low and the resulting level of effect **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Whiteside Rig, fort & enclosure (Asset 81)

The prehistoric fort at Whiteside Rig (Asset 81) is the second largest fort in the Scottish Borders and occupies the north-eastern side of the summit of Whiteside Rig (Plate 74). The fort is afforded extensive views north along the Tweed Valley (Plate 75), with the position of the fort on the north-eastern side of the summit drawing the eye along the Tweed Valley to the north-east. This may have been an intentional design feature to allow the occupiers of the fort visibility across an extensive area to maintain some form of control or management of activity and movement along the valley. As shown on Plate 75, a number of Scheduled prehistoric settlement remains are located in the land to the north-east, including the cairn atop Worm Hill (Asset 105). The topographical location of the fort is also appreciably defensible. The turbines of Glenkerie Wind Farm are visible from the fort, in adjacent uplands but these turbines do not detract from the long distance views along the valley. Views west and south-west towards the site are currently blocked by woodland. As shown on Plate 76 the woodland that currently blocks the site from view is a mix of deciduous and conifer species and appears in contrast to the surrounding modern commercial conifer plantations. Review of historic mapping indicates that this mixed woodland plantation has been in existence since at least the mid-19th century if not earlier. Whilst this by no means is an indication that the woodland is contemporary with, or connected to the fort, it does highlight that the near historic setting of the fort has been dominated by woodland to the south-west for some time, whilst the view to the north-east has remained open along the valley. Theoretically, there is visibility of the Whiteside Rig fort from Oliver Castle, fort (Asset 67) and The Chester (Asset 71) as shown on Plate 53. However, it is not possible to make out any remains of the fort from this distance. Similarly views towards Oliver Castle, fort (Asset 67) and The Chester (Asset 71) are possible from the south facing slope of Whiteside rig (Plate 77). This suggests that views and relationships with other prehistoric activity to the west and south-west are also focused on the lower valley. The elevated location of

the fort overlooking an extensive landscape featuring numerous prehistoric monuments contributes to our understanding of its cultural significance and it is considered to have a high relative sensitivity to change.

The nearest element of the Proposed Development would be located c. 2.68 km south-west of the fort (Plate 77). A wireline prepared for this assessment from the north-western Scheduled extent (Figure 11.7) indicates that seven turbines would be intervisible with the fort. The ZTV indicates that the hill slope would screen visibility along the north-eastern edge of the Scheduled area with theoretical visibility decreasing in some areas to between zero and three turbines. As shown on Plate 76, the mature trees set to the south-west of the fort would partially screen the Proposed Development from view. Where visible, the proposed turbines would be seen in conifer plantation on the rising, south-facing upper slopes of the Tweed Valley. The Proposed Development would not feature in any designed view lines with other prehistoric settlement and defensive remains therefore be located and would be located in an area which is visible but which does not form a key element of the setting of the fort and therefore would be seen as a peripheral addition to the wider landscape which would not impede how the asset is understood, experienced or appreciated. The magnitude of impact would be low, and the resulting level of effect would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Grange Hill, platform settlement 1000 m ENE of Glenbreck (Asset 89)

Grange Hill, platform settlement (Asset 89) occupies an area of land on the south-west facing slope of Grange Hill (Plate 93). The Scheduled Monument is described as comprising as a group of five unenclosed hut platforms and house stances dating to the Bronze Age. The Scheduled area is located east of the access track to the under-construction Whitelaw Brae Wind Farm and access to the remains was limited by fences, however views across settlement and towards the Proposed Development were obtained. A small modern construction compound associated with the Whitelaw Brae Wind Farm, on the southern side of the A701, is located to the north-west and a number of wind turbines are visible to the west beyond the Tweed Valley ridgeline. The settlement's setting relates to its location on an upper terrace on the eastern side of the River Tweed, overlooking the fertile plain as well as to its proximity to resources including waterways such as the River Tweed to the north and burns to the east and west. The setting also relates to evidence for wider prehistoric activity within the Tweed Valley (see Plate 64), which whilst not necessarily contemporary reflects the long-term use of the valley. Some of these relationships (such as the intervisibility between the settlement and barrows (Asset 108) on the adjacent side of the River Tweed) are readily legible and can be understood and appreciated. However, the presence of mature, dense conifer plantations in the landscape obscures some of these relationships which are best appreciated cartographically. For example, any possible relationship between the settlement and Glenwhappen Rig, palisaded enclosure (Asset 90) is better understood on mapping as conifers block visibility of Asset 90 and of the surrounding landform The settlement is a functional, domestic asset set on an elevated slope allowing wide reaching views along the valley and therefore its setting makes some contribution to its cultural significance and can be judged to have a medium relative sensitivity

The Proposed Development would be located north-east of the settlement on the opposite side of the valley and would be visible as seven turbines, although short-term visibility of the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound cannot be wholly discounted. It is likely that intervening mature conifer plantations on the lower slopes of Glenwhappen Rig are likely to screen the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound. The Proposed Development would be seen extending across the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley (turbines 1 & 2) with turbines 3-7 visible along, and beyond, the ridgelines to the north-east of the settlement. The Proposed Development would be seen on the upper slopes of the valley which provides context for the settlement but would not erode key characteristics of its setting. The magnitude of change is considered to be low and the resulting level of effect **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Glenwhappen Rig, palisaded enclosure 1450 m NE of Glenbreck (Asset 90)

Glenwhappen Rig, palisaded enclosure (Asset 90) is recorded as occupying an isolated knoll on Glenwhappen Rig within a forestry clearing. Access to the enclosure was limited during the site visit by mature forestry and a lack of access along the clearing and therefore the setting of the enclosure was assessed from the same elevation of Glenwhappen to the east along a forestry track.

When constructed the enclosure would have overlooked the fertile river terraces of the Tweed Valley including nearby and aforementioned prehistoric settlement and ritual and funerary remains (Plate 78). When constructed, and theoretically if the intervening conifer plantation or other high vegetation were to be removed, it may have been/be possible to see the settlement at Weird Law (Asset 3) to the east from the enclosure. As such, the setting of the enclosure when constructed related to the Tweed Valley and prehistoric activity along the lower slopes. In the modern era, the enclosure, and indeed a number of nearby prehistoric remains, have been encircled by forestry plantations making the assets difficult to identify without prior knowledge and/or reference to cartography. As such the relative sensitivity to change is deemed to be low.

The Proposed Development would be located to the north-east of the enclosure, with all seven proposed turbines being theoretically visible from the enclosure (Figure 11.17c). The proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound would also likely be visible from the enclosure at least in the in the short term, although this is more difficult to judge to the presence of surrounding mature forestry. The Proposed Development would

be seen on the higher slopes of the Tweed Valley, in an area beyond the extent of known intensive prehistoric activity and therefore beyond the landscape which provides contextual information about the enclosure. The Proposed Development may be seen to backdrop views towards the Weird Law Platform settlement (Asset 3), although such views remain a theoretical concept in the current setting. The Proposed Development would constitute an alteration to the asset's baseline setting beyond those aspects of setting that contribute to the way in which the asset is understood, appreciated and experienced. The magnitude of impact based on the current setting would be low. It is acknowledged, however, that the impact could potentially become greater should the forestry planation be felled as more of the Proposed Development would be visible, potentially increasing to medium magnitude. The level of effect based on a worst-case scenario would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Stanhope Cottage, burial cairn 240 m NNE of (Asset 101)

The Scheduled burial cairn (Asset 101) survives as a sub-circular mound which appears to have been robbed in the past (Plate 80). The cairn is located on the eastern side of the river Tweed, on an upper terrace, between and adjacent to Scheduled prehistoric settlements (see Plates 55 & 57). The cairn is also located nearly in line with a cairn (Asset 105) atop Worm Hill to the west (Plate 81). The historic and modern setting of the cairn relates to its location in the Tweed Valley, its proximity to the River Tweed and to its relationship with other prehistoric assets in the Stanhope area. As a ritual burial monument with sightlines to other ritual monuments the cairn's relative sensitivity to change is considered high.

The nearest turbine of the Proposed Development would be located c. 6.62 km south-west. Theoretically up to four proposed turbines are predicted as being visible in the undulating ground on the northern side of the Tweed Valley from the cairn (Plate 82). The turbines would be seen within an area already occupied by the Glenkerie Wind Farm, and whilst the proposed turbines on the site would be larger than the Glenkerie turbines, due to the greater distance between the Proposed Development and the cairn the Proposed Development is unlikely to be legible as a separate development. As such the Proposed Development would be an appreciable modern addition to the landscape beyond the elements which enable an appreciation, understanding and experience of the cairn and therefore the magnitude of change is judged to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Worm Hill, cairn (Asset 105)

The Scheduled Worm Hill cairn (Asset 105) was found to survive as a roughly circular cairn, on which an OS trig point and a walker's cairn, likely composed of robbed stone from the cairn have been constructed (Plate 83) on the summit (541 m AOD) of Worm Hill. The topographical position of the cairn affords it a 360-degree view of lower lying land in all directions. Views to the west, north and east are relatively more open, as the land in those directions is lower and therefore longer-range views are available in those directions (Plate 84). The land to the south is occupied by relatively higher land, visible as undulating hills although views are available along the Tweed Valley (Plate 85). The turbines of the Glenkerie Wind Farm are visible to the south-west and the turbines of the Clyde/Clyde Extension Wind Farm are visible in the distance to the south and south-west. Distant turbines are also visible along the horizon to the west. A scheduled burial cairn (Asset 101) lies roughly opposite Worm Hill cairn on the lower terrace of the River Tweed (Plate 81) and a number of other prehistoric settlement, defensive and ritual remains have been recorded within the Tweed Valley which runs roughly north-south to the east of the cairn. The cairn, when constructed, would likely have been visible as an upstanding monument on the high ground from the Tweed Valley, as well as from certain locations from the wider landscape and was likely constructed on Worm Hill as the highest topographical location in the area. The setting of the cairn makes a substantial contribution to its cultural significance, and it is therefore considered to have a high relative sensitivity to change.

The Proposed Development would be visible as seven turbines to the south-west of cairn, in the same arc of view of existing turbines (Plate 85) in relatively high undulating land (Plate 86). Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible it would occupy only a small arc of the overall view and would not impact how the topographical prominence of the cairn can be understood from the lower lying ground or indeed from other high points in the landscape or impact the ability to appreciate and experience the wide ranging views from the cairn. The Proposed Development would also not be located in any identified key views or impeded any views from or to the cairn from other designated or non-designated prehistoric assets in the landscape. As such, the Proposed Development would constitute a marginal alteration to the baseline setting which would not change the cultural significance of the cairn and therefore the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Glenbreck, two barrows 1280 m NE of (Asset 108)

Glenbreck two barrows (Asset 108) are designated as one Scheduled Monument formed of two sub-circular areas on a plateau of land on an upper terrace of the Tweed Valley. The barrows were found to survive as overground stoney mounds, located within an area of semi-improved, hummocky grassland, bound to the north-west by conifer plantations (Plate 87) and to the south- east by the A701 which has been cut into the natural terraced slopes of the River Tweed. The land to the north-west of the barrows slopes upwards, although the nuance of the landform is difficult to appreciate due to the existence of conifer plantations. The barrows are one example of

many prehistoric ritual and/or funerary monuments within the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley, in which domestic and settlement remains have also been recorded and whilst these remains may not all be contemporary, they reflect the prehistoric use of the landscape, especially the fertile land and lower slopes of the Tweed Valley over time. Theoretically, the barrows would have once had intervisibility with Glenwhappen Rig, palisaded enclosure (Asset 90) c.660 m north-west, on an upper plateau of Glenwhappen Rig, as well as potentially with Menzion Farm, three enclosed cremation cemeteries (Asset 60), Menzion Farm, cairn (Asset 61), Menzion Farm, palisaded settlement (Asset 62) and Weird Law, platform settlement (Asset 3), and possibly the cremation cemetery centred Asset 1 (depending on the original height of the upstanding elements of that asset (Plate 88)). These relationships are currently obscured by forestry and are best appreciated and experienced with the assistance of modern and historic mapping. The barrows derive the majority of their cultural significance from their surviving upstanding and below ground remains although they derive some significance from their setting on a plateau overlooking the Tweed Valley and their relative sensitivity to change in is considered to be medium.

The Proposed Development would be located on the western side of the Tweed Valley in an area occupied by rising land and conifer plantations north of the barrows. The nearest proposed turbine, turbine 2, would be located c. 1.43 km north-east on the side of Weird Law. The proposed substation, BESS and c temporary construction compound would be located c. 1.45 km north-east, on the lower slopes of Weird Law, in an area currently occupied by high, mature conifer plantations. The proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound would be visible in the short term until screening planting is established. The Proposed Development would be a visual addition to the existing landscape in which the barrows are located, although the topographical location, valley setting and inter-relationships with other prehistoric assets in the near vicinity would remain legible. The Proposed Development would therefore constitute an alteration to the baseline setting which would not affect the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the asset's overall significance. The magnitude of impact is judged to be low. The resulting level of effect would be **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Hawkshaw Farm, unenclosed platform settlement 1240 m E of (Asset 109) and Menzion Farm, settlement 735 m SSW of (Asset 110)

Hawkshaw Farm, unenclosed platform settlement 1240 m E of (Asset 109) comprises the remains of an enclosed Iron Age settlement which has partially been terraced into the hillside (Plate 89). The northern extent of the Scheduled area is currently located within an area of mature conifer plantation, with the rest of the area located in an unplanted clearing occupied by hummocky grassland and what appear to be self-seeded conifers on the eastern side of an unnamed road.

The Scheduled area of Menzion Farm, settlement 735 m SSW of (Asset 110) encompasses the remains of a likely Bronze Age settlement terraced into the hillside, in a plantation forestry clearing occupied by hummocky grassland on the eastern side of an unnamed road (Plate 90).

These two domestic Scheduled Monuments occupy a similar elevation (c. 283 m AOD) on the west facing side of Quarter Hill and are c. 250 m apart. Due to encircling mature forestry around Asset 110 and mixed woodland on the western side of the unnamed road in intervening views between Asset 110 and the Proposed Development, the settings of these assets are comparable and are therefore considered together.

These prehistoric settlement assets (Asset 109 & 110), whist not contemporary, reflect the continuing use of west facing slope of Quarter Hill. The land to the west slopes downwards to the Fruid Water before sloping upwards to Whiteside Hill. The land to the east undulates but slopes upwards to Quarter Hill, Muckle Knowe and The Rig. This landscape is best appreciated on modern OS mapping with dense plantation of conifer trees partially impeding a nuanced view of the land to the east. Views north are towards the confluence of the Fruid Water with the River Tweed as well as its surrounding fertile plain with upward sloping land on the northern side of the Tweed Valley, currently occupied by mature conifer plantations. The Clyde/Clyde Extension Wind Farm (Figure 11.12a-b) is visible along the upper ridgeline to the north (Plate 47). Theoretically, views in this direction would have once included intervisibility with the Scheduled Weird Law, platform settlement (Asset 3), several enclosed cremation cemeteries (Assets 1, 2 & 60), on the western side of the River Tweed as well as a palisade settlement (Asset 62) and cairn or cremation cemetery (Asset 61) in the valley (Plate 47) although these relationships are currently obscured by modern forestry and/or the low lying form of the surviving remains. The elements of the setting which enable an appreciation, experience and understanding of the settlements (Assets 109 & 109) are related to their topographical location and proximity to river valleys, being functionally sited assets, as well as their inter-relationships with nearby evidence of other prehistoric activity focused in the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley. As such, the settlements have a medium relative sensitivity to change.

The Proposed Development would be located to the north and north-west of the settlements (Plate 47), largely in land currently occupied by conifer plantations on the rising slopes of Weird Law, and beyond Ewelaw Rig and the ridgeline of the Tweed Valley in that direction (Figure 11.12a). The proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound would be located on the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley, in an area currently occupied by plantation conifers to the south of the Weird Law platform settlement (Asset 3). In the short term, the construction of buildings and infrastructure may be visible however in the long-term replanting will likely screen the buildings and infrastructure from view. The closest proposed turbines (turbines 1 and 2) are proposed to be located on the south-east and south facing slopes of Weird Law. A photomontage (Figure 11.12d) indicates that

turbines 2 and 3 would be fully visible as modern additions to the upper slopes of the River Tweed, whilst the other proposed turbines would be relatively less visible as turbine hubs and blades beyond existing vegetation from Asset 110, although more of these other proposed turbines may be visible from Asset 109 due to a lack of intervening trees. Based on the wireline, all seven turbines would largely be visible from the settlements (Figure 11.12c), although in reality based on the photomontage due to intervening vegetation immediately west of Asset 100, only five turbine would be visible from Asset 110 (Figure 11.12d). The proposed turbines may draw the eye upwards away from the valley floor however the elements of the landscape which are pertinent to the settlements are not located within the upper slopes of the valley, but either side of the river. Whilst the Proposed Development is anticipated to be visible, it would not alter the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the cultural significance of the two settlements (Assets 109 & 110) and their immediate vicinity would be unchanged. The magnitude of change is considered to be low and the resulting level of effect **minor** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Negligible Impact

Easter Stanhope, homestead 780 m NW of (Asset 29)

Easter Stanhope comprises the remains of a square area containing a wall and house platform recorded in 1960 on the lower, semi-improved slopes of Worm Hill (Plate 54). The homestead is thought to date to the prehistoric period and is one example of several designated and non-designated prehistoric settlements recorded on the fertile plain around Stanhope (Plate 55), above the river terrace immediately adjacent to the River Tweed. Near and adjacent examples include Stanhope, scooped settlement and enclosure (Asset 74), Hopecarton settlement (Asset 33), Stanhope, settlement (Asset 94), Stanhope, enclosed settlement (Asset 77) and Stanhope, unenclosed platform settlement (Asset 99). It appears as though this land, which would have been preferred for agricultural purposes, was actively avoided by settlement. Evidence of land management and defence is also well known along the Tweed Valley, although in general examples of these types of prehistoric sites (Assets 72 & 84), whether designated or non-designated are often not located on the upper slopes of the valley, but rather along similar contours lower down the valley slopes. The legibility of this topographic pattern of settlement contributes to our understanding of the cultural significance of the homestead (Asset 29) and it is considered to have a medium relative sensitivity to change.

The Proposed Development would be located c. 5 km south-west of the homestead (Asset 29), and the nearest turbine (turbine 6) would be located c. 6.21 km south-west. The ZTV indicates that there would visibility of up seven turbines. Due to the meandering nature of the Tweed Valley between the homestead and the Proposed Development, any intervisibility would be limited by the landform, by the slopes of Crook Head and Upper Oliver Dod and therefore only the hubs and blades of the turbines would be seen. The Proposed Development would be visible beyond the area which provides contextual information for the homestead (Asset 29) and it would not impede the way in which the homestead relates to other potentially contemporary prehistoric assets in the Tweed Valley. As such the Proposed Development is anticipated to be a marginal alteration to the wider baseline setting of the homestead, and the magnitude of impact would be negligible. The resulting level of effect is judged to be **negligible** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Hopecarton, settlement 530 m SE of (Asset 33)

Hopecarton settlement (Asset 33) has a square in plan Scheduled extent which encompasses the remains of two house platforms and a scooped yard of later prehistoric date (Plate 56). The settlement (Asset 33) is located on a relatively higher contour, 300 m AOD than some of the other prehistoric settlement assets within the Tweed Valley, although still within the relatively lower slopes of the Valley. Hopecarton settlement is located in semi-improved, east to west downward sloping land on the west facing slope of Hopekist Rig (Plate 55). To the west is a stand of conifer trees, an example of one of the many areas of commercial forestry within the Tweed Valley beyond which is downward sloping land which terminates at the River Tweed before rising again on the opposite bank. The land to the north slopes downwards to the Hopecarton Burn before rising around Drumelzier Law, and to the south, the land continues along a similar contour around the lower slopes of Craig Head. Within this landscape a number of Scheduled prehistoric settlements (Assets 29, 74, 77, 94 & 99) as well as defensive remains (Assets 72 & 84) have been recorded (Plate 55). Whilst all of these assets are not likely to be contemporary, they represent the long durée of prehistoric activity within the Tweed Valley as well as the long history of the management and defence of the Tweed Valley. The setting of Hopecarton settlement (Asset 33) is considered to contribute to the cultural significance of the monument and the relative sensitivity of Hopecarton settlement (asset 33) is judged to be medium.

The nearest turbine (turbine 6) of the Proposed Development would be located c. 7.33 km south-west of Hopecarton settlement (Asset 33) and based on the ZTV five to six turbines would be visible to the south-west. The Proposed Development would be visible beyond Glenkerie Wind Farm and in the vicinity of the Clyde/Clyde Extension Wind Farm. Due to the difference in height between these two existing turbine fields and the proposed height of the turbines on the site, the Proposed Development may look slightly different although due to the distance of separation, they are unlikely to look larger than those of Glenkerie Wind Farm. However, the existing

turbines as visible from the settlement illustrate that although modern features can be seen in the landscape they do not adversely impact how the settlement is viewed or understood within the context of the valley landscape, and whilst it could be argued turbines in the upper slopes can draw the eye, the elements which provide contextual information and allow for an appreciation, understanding and experience of Hopecarton settlement are located downslope and across the valley. The magnitude of impact is therefore considered to be negligible and the resulting level of effect **negligible** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Patervan, fort, settlement & cultivation terraces 1050 m NNW of (Asset 72)

The Scheduled Monument of Patervan, fort, settlement & cultivation terraces (Asset 72) is composed of two areas; the eastern a sub-circular area denoting a multi-phase fort (Plate 70); and the western a polygonal shaped area which encloses settlement and cultivation remains (Plate 71). The fort occupies a knoll on the southern slopes of Worm Hill and is located in improved agricultural land. The land to the north rises gently to the summit of Worm Hill. Logan Burn is located to the south, and the land from Asset 72 slopes downwards to the Burn and rises again on the southern side towards Logan Knowes. The land to the east slopes downwards to the A701 and the River Tweed and then rises upwards to Stanhope on the eastern side of the river. A number of prehistoric domestic (Asset 29, 74, 77, 94 & 99) and defensive sites (Asset 69 & 82) have been recorded within the vicinity of Stanhope, within the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley (Plate 57) and whilst these assets may all not be contemporary, they do represent long term use and control of the fertile plain throughout the prehistoric period. The monument derives much of its cultural significance from its upstanding and below ground remains but as a defensive and domestic settlement set at a strategic location in the landscape it also derives some of its significance from its setting. It is judged to have a medium relative sensitivity.

The Proposed Development would be located at its closest, turbine 6, c. 2.39 km south-west of Asset 72. The ZTV produced for this assessment indicates that only the eastern designated area and small portion of the eastern area of the western designated area would have intervisibility with up to four proposed turbines. Any turbines would appear behind two nearer ridges of land formed by Benhsaw Hill and Crook Head and as such would not impede the way in which the setting of Asset 72 is understood, appreciated and experienced. As such the Proposed Development is considered to be a marginal alteration to the asset's baseline setting which would not impact the significance of Asset 72 and the magnitude of impact is judged, to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **negligible** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Cardon, fort NW of (Asset 103)

Cardon fort (Asset 103) is located on a relatively flat shelf at 360 m AOD to the south of a summit at 402 m AOD. The land immediately west and north and to the east is currently occupied by mature conifer plantations. The land to the south-east slopes downwards to Glenholm and overlooks the Holms Water valley as well as Rachan Hill on which another fort is located. The historic setting of the fort relates to its topographical location and defensible position which allowed for visibility to the west, south and east across lower lying land which was likely occupied by agricultural and settlement activities. Whilst the conifer plantations enclose the fort in three directions, it's topographical prominence can still be understood and appreciated. The turbines of Glenkerie Wind Farm are visible to the south from the fort, beyond ridgelines and are visibly beyond the setting of the fort. The fort has a medium sensitivity to changes to its setting.

The Proposed Development is predicted to be theoretically visible beyond the existing Glenkerie turbines at a distance of 8.65 km. Whilst the proposed turbines may be visible, they would be located beyond the setting of the fort, in the direction of an existing turbine field. The magnitude of change is judged to be a marginal alteration to the asset's baseline setting and therefore negligible. The resulting level of impact would be **negligible** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Stobo Castle Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (centred Asset 206)

The earliest surviving design for the grounds around Stobo Castle Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (centred Asset 206) date from the 18th century, with the parkland noted as being developed from the 19th century onwards. The Japanese Water Gardens were planted in the early 20th century. Large areas of woodland are documented on Dramore and Dreva Wood, within the western extent of the GDL from the late 18th century with conifer plantations being planted on Quarry Hill, also within the western extent of the GDL in the 1960's (HES, 2024). The principal entrance is noted as being the south drive, with the former east and west drive now surviving as tracks, rather than driveways (Plate 95). The internal elements of the GDL, including the Water Garden, and their relationships make a substantial contribution to the cultural significance of the GDL. The wider landscape setting of the GDL makes a moderate contribution to its cultural significance and it is of medium elative sensitivity to change. The GDL as a whole is considered to be of medium relative sensitivity to change.

The ZTV prepared for this assessment indicates that only the western portion of the GDL, within the extent of Dreva Wood would have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development of between one and seven turbines. This area has been occupied by woodland since at least the late 18th century, and whilst the extant woodland appears to be modern forestry plantation, this land use echoes the historic land use and the early design of the GDL. Whilst the Proposed Development is theoretically visible from within the GDL, the extant and indeed the

historically documented woodland precludes intervisibility from within the GDL, limiting visibility to the south-western edge of the GDL. The key elements of the GDL, face north-east along the Tweed Valley, not in the direction of the Proposed Development. As such this is judged to be a marginal alteration to the asset's baseline which would not impact its cultural significance. The magnitude of change is judged to be negligible and the resulting level of effect **negligible**. This level of effect is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

Neutral Impact

Menzion Farm, Giant's Stone, cairn & standing stones 590 m NE of (Asset 59)

The Scheduled extent of Menzion Farm, Giant's Stone, cairn & standing stones (Asset 59) encompasses the remains of a cairn and standing stones, which excludes the road between the assets. The surviving remains of the monument comprise two relatively small, less than 1 m high, standing stones either side of a modern road and it is unclear if the standing stones are in their original locations or if they have been moved to accommodate the routeway at some point in the past. Railton (2001, 59) notes that at one time the extant stones are thought to have formed a stone circle which was impacted when the road was first constructed. No evidence of a cairn was identified, however the land either side of the road has been planted at some point in the past, with mixed woodland upstanding on the western side of the road, whilst the former woodland or conifer plantation on the eastern side of the road had been felled in the recent past. It is noted by a former RCHAMS survey that the cairn had largely been ploughed out by 1972 and any remains which may survive likely consist of below ground archaeology. When originally constructed, the assets would have been located on the floodplain on the eastern side of the River Tweed and would have likely been visible monuments across the local landscape (Plate 45). The assets may have been associated with other contemporary remains in the near Tweed Valley or would have at least been present and visible as upstanding structural remains while later prehistoric activity was ongoing. The modern setting of Asset 59 is dominated by the road and later woodland plantations which limit the ability to understand the physical remains and their relationship to the river and indeed to other prehistoric ritual, funerary and settlement remains within the local area. The current setting of the asset therefore makes only a limited contribution to its cultural significance and its relative sensitivity to change is considered to be low.

The Proposed Development would be located beyond the existing trees to the west of the assets, in upward sloping land on the western side of the River Tweed. The closest proposed elements would be the access track, which is already largely in existence as a forestry track, and the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound. Theoretically, the proposed substation, BESS and temporary construction compound would constitute a new structure between Asset 59 and other funerary (Asset 60) and settlement (Asset 3) remains to the west and indeed, would backdrop any intervisibility between the assets and the Scheduled cremation cemeteries (Assets 1 & 2). However, this relationship is currently unclear and not appreciable in the current landscape due to the presence of dense intervening vegetation. The ZTV indicates that all seven turbines would be visible from the Menzion Farm assets (Asset 59). The Proposed Development would be a new modern addition to their wider setting, however it would not impact how the remains are currently understood, appreciated or experienced nor would it change the way in which the remains interrelate with associated prehistoric remains on the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley (example Plate 54). The magnitude of change is considered to be low. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Glenbreck, platform settlements 1100 m SW of (Asset 63) and Glenbreck, platform settlement 630 m SW of (Asset 88)

Glenbreck, platform settlement (Asset 88) comprises the remains of four hut platforms on the east facing slopes of Peddrie Dod (Plate 62).

Glenbreck platform settlement (Asset 63) encompasses the remains of five hut-circles and at least one cairn on the western side of the A701, in an unplanted area of ground on the east facing slopes of Peddrie Dod (Plate 63).

The settings of these two Scheduled Monuments, located within 275 m of each other and within the same unplanted area are comparable and are therefore assessed together.

The two assets (Assets 63 & 88) are located on a relatively flat area of land between the 330 m AOD and 320 m AOD contour in semi-improved land, on the east facing slope of Peddrie Dod. Two streams are located within the area. The land to the north, west and south is occupied by dense, confer plantations, with the land to the west rising upwards toward Peddrie Dod. The land to the south slopes downwards to the River Tweed. The A701 appears to have been cut into a previously gentler slope, creating a steep slope on the western side of the A701 in this location. The land on the eastern side of the River Tweed slopes upwards to a grassy hill known as Bog Dod. The assets are therefore located on the western side of a river valley and survive as examples of prehistoric settlement activity on the lower slopes of the Tweed Valley, which appears to preferentially avoid the floodplain. These examples are identifiable within the landscape (Plate 64), however due to existing forestry plantations and the intervening landform these relationships are better understood with the assistance of mapping. The setting of

these assets contributes to their significance in so far as it relates to their association with the near Tweed Valley, specifically the fertile floodplain. The relative sensitivity to change is considered to be low.

The nearest proposed turbine (turbine 2) to the assets would be between 3.96 km and 3.25 km north. The ZTV and wirelines (Figure 11.15 a & -c) indicates that there would be intervisibility with all seven proposed turbines. However, the site visit revealed that views north are impeded by mature forestry plantations (Plate 64) and that the proposed turbines would be visible beyond the extant plantations to the north-west. It is acknowledged that these plantations are not static and may be felled in the future, and in that case, it is likely that the Proposed Development would be visible on the upper slopes of the Tweed Valley, as illustrated by Figure 11.15c, in an area of undulating land beyond the narrow valley and adjacent terraces in which contemporary and wider prehistoric activity has been documented. In views north from both assets the Proposed Development would be visible offset from other prehistoric assets along the valley. This would constitute an alteration to the baseline setting which would not affect the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the assets' overall significance and therefore would be a low magnitude of impact. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the assets setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Hawkshaw Castle (Asset 64)

The Scheduled remains of Hawkshaw Castle (Asset 64) include traces of rig field systems (Plate 65) and a trace of sub-rectangular foundations, along the western boundary of a later enclosure on the east facing slope of Glengonnor Hill, between 330 m and 340 m AOD. A memorial to the Porteus family is located within the Scheduled area (Plate 66). The Hawkshaw Burn is located to the east of the Castle and the land beyond rises to Benner Dod and Whiteside Hill. The modern Fruid Reservoir is also located to the east of Castle. To the south the land follows the route of Hawkshaw Burn and rises to Muckle Dod. Historically the location of the Castle above water ways would have been beneficial for settlement although there is no evidence that the Castle was constructed with defence in mind. The Castle does not appear to have been constructed to dominate the wider landscape, with the topographical summit appearing to have been actively avoided. The Castle is considered to have a low relative sensitivity of change, with its cultural significance being predominantly derived from other, physical and historic characteristics.

The Proposed Development would be located to the north with the closest turbine, turbine 1, located c. 3.45 km north. The closest element of the Proposed Development would be the proposed substation, BESS and compound, however based on the intervening topography any intervisibility with this element of the Proposed Development is likely to be screened by Whiteside Hill. A wireline (Figure 11.13b) illustrates that three turbines (turbines 2-4) would theoretically visible as full height structures to the north, with the turbine blades of turbines 1 and 6 being visible beyond the ridge of Whiteside Hill. However, this does not take into account the extant commercial forestry observed during the site visit which will in part screen the base of the proposed turbines in view. Whilst the Proposed Development would be partially visible from the Castle, it would be located beyond those elements of the setting which provide context and cultural significance for the Castle and therefore the magnitude of impact would be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the assets setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Stanhope, scooped settlement and enclosure NNE of (Asset 74) and Stanhope, settlement 160 m N of (Asset 94)

Stanhope, scooped settlement and enclosure (Asset 74) designates an area including an enclosure and scooped settlement of later prehistoric date (Plate 72). The Scheduled extent of Stanhope, settlement (Asset 94) extends within 15 m of Asset 74 and is occupied by a stand of conifer plantation. Both assets (Asset 74 & 94) are located within semi-improved land on the lower slopes of Craig Head, to the west and downslope of rocky outcrops. The land to the west slopes gently to the River Tweed and is occupied by agricultural land divided by post-medieval and modern field patterning, with the land on the western side of the river rising upwards to Worm Hill. The land to the north and south is also occupied improved agricultural land which reflects post-medieval and modern field divisions, which likely echoes the available agricultural land of the prehistoric period. A Scheduled burial cairn (Asset 101) is located in close proximity to the north. A number of other prehistoric Scheduled Monuments are recorded within the Stanhope area (see Plate 55) and are evidence of prehistoric activity on the lower slopes of the wider Tweed Valley. As domestic settlements relating to the local agricultural economy these remains derive the majority of their cultural significance from their surviving above and below ground remains and their proximity to nearby fertile land. Their relative sensitivity to change is judged to be low.

The Proposed Development would be located at its nearest point (turbine 6) between 6.39 km and 6.28 km respectively south-west of Asset 74 and 94. The ZTV indicates that the Proposed Development would not be entirely visible from each of the assets, or from the immediate surroundings, with up to six turbines likely being intervisible from the wider area. The Proposed Development would be located beyond the near setting which enables an appreciation of the near prehistoric landscape around the River Tweed, and beyond the wider prehistoric landscape along the Tweed Valley and would be seen in upland already occupied by turbines. As such the Proposed Development would constitute a marginal alteration to the baseline setting which would not affect its cultural significance and the magnitude of impact would be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be

neutral in each case and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the assets' setting' would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Stanhope, enclosed settlement 800 m SW of (Asset 77), Norman's Castle, dun 830 m SW of Stanhope (Asset 82) and Stanhope, unenclosed platform settlement 850 m SW of (Asset 99)

Stanhope, enclosed settlement (Asset 77) occupies a circular area of land and Stanhope, unenclosed platform settlement (Asset 99) is located c. 17 m south-west on gently upward sloping semi-improved grassland on the western slopes of Laigh Hill. Norman's Castle, dun 830 m (Asset 82) occupies a rocky crag further up the slopes of Laigh Hill, c 300 m AOD, which are relatively steeper. A stand of plantation conifers dominates the near environment of the dun. These three assets are located in close proximity to one another, and their settings are accordingly assessed together (see Plate 55).

The setting of these prehistoric assets relates to the Tweed Valley around Stanhope (as exemplified by Plate 55), to the fertile plain, the location of settlements on the upper terraces and to the control and management of this landscape in the prehistoric period. Whether or not these assets are contemporary they represent the long durée of settlement and anthropogenic management activity in the area. As domestic and defensive settlements the setting of these assets contributes to their cultural significance in so far as they relate to the immediate valley with their wider settings contributing comparatively less. The relative sensitivity to change is considered to be low.

The ZTV indicates that the Proposed Development would be visible as between three to four turbines, with a small section of the dun (Asset 82) potentially having visibility with up to six turbines, if the conifer plantation were removed. The wind turbines of the Glenkerie and Clyde/Clyde Extension Wind Farms already occupy the upper slopes of the adjacent side of the Tweed Valley and do not detract from the ability to understand and appreciate the assets. Whilst the Proposed Development would appear different in scale and form to the existing turbines due to their relatively higher heights, the elements which allow us to appreciate, understand and experience these assets and indeed the wider prehistoric landscape are largely located downslope along the valley to the north-east and south-west. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible and the resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the assets' settings would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Hopecarton, enclosure 410 m SSW of (Asset 100)

The enclosed settlement at Hopecarton (Asset 100- Plate 79) is one of several prehistoric settlements' assets along an upper terrace on the eastern side of the River Tweed floodplain around Stanhope (see Plates 55 & 57). The setting of the enclosure relates to its location on an upper terrace of the river and the fertile plain, with rising land to the east. As a domestic settlement deriving much of its cultural significance from its below ground remains the enclosure is considered to have a low relative sensitivity.

The closest element of the Proposed Development would be located c. 7.11 km south-west of the enclosure on the upper slopes of the western side of the Tweed Valley, in the vicinity of existing distant turbines associated with the Glenkerie and Clyde/Clyde Extension Wind Farms. As such, the Proposed Development would be an appreciable modern addition to the landscape beyond the elements which enable an appreciation, understanding and experience of the enclosure and therefore the magnitude of change is judged to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Hopecarton, buildings 250 m SSE of (Asset 102)

Hopecarton, buildings (Asset 102) comprise the remains of two buildings on a relatively flat, terrace of the River Tweed. The buildings survive as turf covered foundations within an area of improved grassland. The buildings are thought to be "pre-improvement" and therefore likely date to sometime in the post-medieval period and are examples of agricultural and/or residential buildings constructed in the Tweed Valley in that period. The historic setting of the buildings can be understood in their current agricultural context (see Plates 79-82). The relative sensitivity of the buildings to change is judged to be low.

The Proposed Development may be visible as up to six turbines 7.27 km south-west of the buildings, beyond the Tweed Valley and in the vicinity of existing turbines. As such, the Proposed Development would not impact the cultural significance of the buildings, and the magnitude of impact is considered to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

Carlows Brig (Asset 116)

Carlows Brig (Asset 116) is a Category B Listed bridge (Plate 91) which crosses the River Tweed and facilitates transport and communication from the north, along the A701 and Newbigging, to the south, and the hamlet of Tweedsmuir and well as routeways to the east. The bridge is thought to date to 1783 and has been partially reconstructed. The bridge is a functional structure, and its setting relates to the near transport and communication routeways as well as to the ability of engineering to create a bridged crossing point at this location along the River Tweed. Based on the Listed description, the bridge's interest relates to it being only bridge facilitating access to

Tweedsmuir and as such the key elements of setting relate to the near landscape and the settlement. The bridge's relative sensitivity to change is considered low.

The ZTV produced for this assessment indicates that the Proposed Development would be visible from the bridge. However, whilst the Proposed Development may be visible as a new addition to the wider landscape it would not alter the cultural significance of the asset and therefore the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

The Bield (Asset 117)

The Category B Listed The Bield is an early 18th century coaching inn which has been repurposed as a farmhouse and residential dwelling (Plate 92). The Listed description indicates that the elements which relate to the cultural significance of The Bield relate to its historical use, and architectural design. The Bield is located immediately on the northern side of the A701 and therefore its association to the road and historic transport activities is readily appreciable. The relative sensitivity of the Listed Building to change beyond its immediate location is low.

The Proposed Development would be theoretically intervisible with The Bield however it would be located beyond the setting of The Bield and therefore the magnitude of change is judged to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms.

Victoria Lodge, to North of Talla Reservoir (Asset 119)

Victoria Lodge is a Category B Listed 20th century lodge house built as part of the development of Talla Reservoir between 1895 and 1905 (Plate 94). Victoria Lodges' Listing description indicates that the interest of the Listed Building relates to its interior and exterior design as a "*fine Scots Renaissance building*" as well as to its setting and social historical interest, relating to the Talla Reservoir which was constructed to serve Edinburgh. Victoria Lodge is located on the south-east facing slope of Lategillan Rig, in a valley formed by the reservoir and a tributary of the River Tweed roughly aligned north-south. As such the relative sensitivity of Victoria Lodge is judged to be low.

The Proposed Development would be located, at its nearest point, turbine 1, c. 2.81 km to the west of Victoria Lodge. Whilst the Proposed Development would be a visible modern addition to the wider landscape, it would not change the cultural significance of Victoria Lodge and therefore the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. The resulting level of effect would be **neutral** and not significant in EIA terms.

No Impact

Dreva Craig, fort, settlements & field system (Asset 34)

The Scheduled extent of Dreva Craig, fort, settlements & field system (Asset 34- Plate 59) extends within 10 km of the site and encompasses the remains of a fort, three settlements and a field system on the south-western slopes of Dreva hill, bisected by an unnamed road. Dreva Craig (Asset 34) is located in semi-improved grassland, in land which slopes downwards to the south, east and west, to lower lying improved land. A tributary of the River Tweed is closed to the south and the River Tweed is located to the east. The land south of the tributary slopes upwards to a relatively higher summit of Rachan Hill (316 m AOD) upon which another non-designated prehistoric fort (NT13SW 20) is recorded. Due to Dreva Craig's topographical location when constructed it would have been located above the fertile plain, similarly to other prehistoric settlements records within the Tweed Valley and in a defensible location with natural slopes in three directions. The land to the north-east rises to the summit of Dreva Hill, beyond which is further upward sloping land up towards Trahenna Hill. The setting which provides cultural significance for Dreva Crag includes its topographical prominence, defensible position as well as potentially contemporary remains. The relative sensitivity of Asset 34 to change is considered to be high.

The closest turbine (turbine 6) of the Proposed Development would be located c. 11.10 km south-west of Dreva Craig (Asset 34). The ZTV indicates that the Proposed Development would not be visible from within the Scheduled extent. As such the magnitude of change is considered to be none. The resulting level of effect would be **no impact**. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.

White Type-March Burn, Roman road (Asset 79)

A Scheduled section of a Roman Road between White Type-March Burn (centred Asset 79) extends within 10 km of the site. The Road is roughly aligned north-west, south-east and occupies a landscape now dominated by plantation forestry making it difficult to appreciate the Road's location from the surrounding area and even harder to experience the Road in its original form with the plantations blocking linear access and visibility. As a once functional, landscape structure associated with transport and communication the Roads relative sensitivity to change is considered to be low.

ZTV analysis indicates that the nearest section of the Road would have no intervisibility with the Proposed Development, although a section c. 11.16 km south of the site may be able to see up to two turbines of the Proposed Development. Whilst the Proposed Development may be intervisible, it would not have any impact on how the Road is appreciated, understood or experienced in its modern setting and it would be located well

beyond the elements given consideration to construction and use of the Road in the Roman period. **No impact** on the setting of the Road is anticipated. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be significantly adversely impacted.