

RECEIVED 07 JUL 2008

From: Brigadier John Macfarlane
Tighnambarr
Taynuilt
ARGYLL PA351JQ
SCOTLAND
Tel: 01866822615
E Mail: john.m.macfarlane@btinternet.com

SHEP
Historic Battlefields
Historic Scotland
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
EDINBURGH
EH9 1SH

040708

Dear Sir,

Enclosed herewith please find the response of the 1745 Association to the SHEP historic Battlefields Consultation Paper.

We are an Association with considerable objective and academic expertise on the subject of the cultural, political, social and military impact of Jacobitism and the Royal House of Stuart.

We are content that our comments should enter the public domain and would be delighted to be of assistance to Government policy teams who may in future address issues connected with the Consultation.

The above address is the initial point for any future contact.

Yours faithfully,

John Macfarlane
JOHN MACFARLANE

*Response on Behalf of the 1745 Association to the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) Consultation Paper
On Historic Battlefields*

The Association welcomes the paper both as an exercise in public consultation, and as a carefully thought-through exploration of the issues that relate to the conservation of historic battlefields in Scotland. Our responses to the specific questions are as follows:

1. Do you agree that a policy for the protection and sustainable management of historic battlefields is necessary? If not, what alternative course of action would you suggest, and why?

R: Agreed.

2. Do you agree with the scope and definition? If not, what changes would you propose and why?

R: Agreed.

3. Are there any other reasons for valuing battlefields that should be considered?

R: No. These reasons as they stand are comprehensive.

4. Do you consider the proposal to create a non-statutory Inventory of nationally important battlefields? If not, what alternative approaches should be considered?

R: Non-statutory status probably adequate at the present time, but should be kept under review.

5. Should an Inventory of Historic Battlefields be given the same status currently enjoyed by Gardens and Designated Landscapes within the planning system (see Note 6)?

R: Yes, but see also our comments relating to 'Stakeholders' in response to Q. 11.

6. Do you agree with the purpose of the proposed Inventory? If not, what changes would you suggest and why?

R: Broadly agreed. However issues of implementation are vital, and every encouragement should be given to the work of the Centre for Battlefield Archaeology at Glasgow University, which the main repository of the relevant expertise.

7. Do you agree that the criteria set out in Annex A are suitable? If not, what alternative criteria would you suggest and why?

R: Agreed

8. Do you agree with the proposed definition of the area of interest? If not, what changes would you suggest and why?

R: Agreed in general. But:

- a) There is a requirement for active programmes of responsible research to identify the extent of battlefields (those of the pre-gunpower period presenting particular problems), and (if the worst comes to the worst) to undertake rescue archaeology and topographical recording in advance of development.

-b) The definition of an 'area of interest' is too restricting. The importance of 'sense of place' is cited in 4.5 and Annex A. iii) c, and has our full support. It is currently endangered not only by the phenomenon of creeping encroachment, which is familiar enough, but by the increasing pressure to meet the real or supposed requirements of the generation and transmission of power. Nearly half of Britain's proposed wind farms are to be built in Scotland, and it is easy to imagine how, at Culloden for example, the sense of place could be threatened as much by an array of turbines along the ridge to the south of the Nairn, as by high-rise development intruding on the views to the north across the Moray Firth to the mountains of Easter Ross. In wholly exceptional circumstances, therefore, due consideration should be given to extending 'areas of interest' to locations geographically remote from the defined area of a battlefield.

9. Do you agree that policies are needed for both the overall area of the battlefield and specific areas within it? If not, what changes would you suggest and why?

R: Agreed.

10. Do you agree that best practice guidance would be useful? If so, who should lead in developing this? If not, what alternative approaches should be considered?

R: Yes, best practice guidance highly desirable. Best developed jointly by Historic Scotland and the National Trust for Scotland.

11. Do you agree with the roles identified here? If not, what changes would you propose, and why? Are there other key stakeholders who have significant roles to play?

R: The record has on occasion given reason to distrust both the expertise of Historic Scotland (6.2) and the commitment of the planning authorities (6.3) to manage their proposed roles, as well as raising questions as to continuity inside and between the two sets of organizations. The prospect of a third layer of bureaucracy is unpalatable, but there is a need for some small body to hold a watching brief over the whole process of 'protection' and 'sustainable management', and to keep itself readily accessible to the 'stakeholders'. Here it is worth mentioning that the 1745 Association has established a productive relationship with the National Trust for Scotland's Culloden Battlefield Memorial Project, and is ready to assist in any way on issues affecting battlefields of the Jacobite period as a whole (1689-1746).