I’m very pleased to have been invited to speak at the Europarc 2018 conference, and particularly on this workshop on Changing Landscapes which is, as you’ll find out, close to my heart.

Today I want to share a bit of my journey about Scotland’s landscape:

- starting with the context;
- looking at some of the issues I’ve encountered;
- outlining some of the resources we have at our disposal;
- and concluding with some thoughts on the challenges we face in democratising influences on landscape-scale change.

I’ve deliberately included a few things that I hope will help stimulate – or perhaps even provoke – discussion later in the day.
So, my name is Robin Turner and I work for Historic Environment Scotland, the lead public body for the historic environment. I head up a team of about 35 experts whose job it is to survey and record Scotland’s historic environment – buildings, monuments and landscapes that are the evidence of our predecessors.

We have teams of expert archaeologists, architectural historians, surveyors and photographers who create records, supported by data managers who ensure that the fruits of our labour are put into the record and are discoverable and accessible into the future.

This diagram shows that this is not just about populating Scotland’s National Record of the Historic Environment, which is at the heart of our work, but involves turning knowledge into understanding, and transmitting that to those who can benefit from it, whether it’s people who are employed to manage change, academics and others who create new narratives, or local people or visitors who are just interested in the evidence of the past that surrounds them.
Scotland has the advantage of having a document called *Our Place in Time*, a strategy for the historic environment. This isn’t just another Government strategy: it was produced by and for the whole sector, and HES is playing a central facilitating role in delivering its aspirations.

Here’s the definition of the historic environment; as you’ll see, we recognise it’s not just about the physical remains; the associations with place are an integral part of this environmental capital.
Scotland’s historic environment is the evidence for human activity that connects people with place, and includes the associations we can see, feel and understand.

**OPiT Strategic Priorities**

- **understand** – investigating and recording our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of the past, and how best to conserve, sustain and protect it
- **protect** – caring for and protecting the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it, and to conserve and enhance it for future generations
- **value** – sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment
- **cross-cutting** strategic priorities – ensuring that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to contribute to Scotland’s well-being

The four key priorities of OPiT are:

- **Understanding** – about developing knowledge and understanding
- **Protecting** – caring for historic places
- **Valuing** – sharing and celebrating our heritage; and a fourth, particularly relevant priority:
- **Cross-cutting** – which is about wellbeing, and the importance of looking at things in the round.

These are all picked up in the [HES Corporate Plan](#), and are all very relevant in the work that my team does.

In terms of being joined up in our approach to landscape, at the request of the [Scottish Strategic Historic Environment Forum](#), chaired by the Cabinet Secretary, [Scottish Natural Heritage](#) and HES produced a [joint statement on landscape](#), which establishes our shared approach and activities.
This is the Illustrated Burra Charter, a seminal document in the care of historic places. Its main focus is on the thinking that goes into the planned conservation of places. Of the main steps involved, I’m going to focus on the first three – knowledge, understanding and significance: these are all indispensable. Good decisions are invariably based on a proper knowledge and understanding of all the values associated with a place, whether ‘subject expert’ values, ‘community expert’ values, or others – social, economic, environmental and cultural.

I thought I would name-check the World Heritage Convention here, and its definition of what we mean when we talk about ‘Cultural landscapes’. In the early noughties I had the privilege to take forward a nomination for the extension of World Heritage designation for St Kilda, a tiny archipelago 40 miles off the Western Isles of Scotland.
The landscape values of the site had been recognised in the original nomination in 1985, but had only been considered by the World Heritage Committee in what they saw as ‘natural’ terms. I’m pleased to say that the extension bid was successful, at the time making St Kilda only the second site to be recognised for both its terrestrial and marine natural heritage and its cultural landscape qualities. This is important: almost no matter how pristine it may look, virtually nowhere in Scotland is entirely ‘natural’: the whole country is a cultural landscape, shaped by human actions and, in some cases, by deliberate inaction.

Scotland’s Palaeolithic human landscape was very effectively erased during the last Ice Age, so with only the odd exception our prehistory begins around 12,000 years ago. Rather than go into the details I’ll advertise our newly published book *A History of Scotland’s Landscapes* – available from all good outlets and based on decades of work of my team. Author Fiona Watson makes the point that our landscapes have changed, and morphed, and evolved over time, and that this is a continuing process: ‘the only constant is change’, as they say.
These are some of the pressures for landscape-scale change in Scotland, and it’s a formidable list. (I made it a few years ago, but it’s still pertinent – although today I would add Major Infrastructure Developments to the list.) Of these, climate change may well trump all the rest – as in the past.

One thing that’s certainly changed is woodland cover. In 1955, English ecologist Frank Fraser Darling suggested that “the Highlands and Islands are largely a devastated terrain” through human-induced deforestation and subsequent land-use. That seemed like a good theory at the time, and unfortunately it still tends to be embedded as the received wisdom.
It was only with developments in palaeoecology and radiocarbon dating that this statement could be put to the test. While it may well be true in some places, it is certainly not the rule, as we found (for example) at Mar Lodge Estate near Braemar, in the middle of the Cairngorms National Park.

At Mar Lodge there were moves to replant Scots Pine on the basis that the (assumed) ‘relict Caledonian pinewood’ that developed on the recession of the ice had largely gone because it had been overexploited by people, and that it was therefore only ‘right’ to restore it. The facts, however, as summarised here, told a different story, showing that climate change in the Bronze Age – maybe 2000BC – was likely to have been significantly responsible for pine decline, and that it was only really from the 1600s AD onwards that much of our inherited woodland originates – and we know that had a lot to do with deliberate planting and careful management rather than natural regeneration.
Don’t get me wrong, I really love the pinewoods at Mar Lodge and around the Cairngorms, and I’m not against them being restored – especially through natural regeneration. But it’s wrong to suggest that the blame for the decline in ancient woodland always lies with our predecessors – particularly as we know very clearly and consistently from historic records how carefully people used this precious resource.

But there was, and probably always will be, a romantic notion about the ‘pristine’ and ‘untouched’, and this heavily influenced the debate when Scotland’s first national parks were being discussed.
Had it not been lobbied for hard at the time they really would have been ‘natural parks’, failing to recognise the pivotal and more often than not positive contributions of people.

The current Park Plan for the Cairngorms reflects the legacy of that earlier lobbying for adequate recognition of the historic environment and wider cultural heritage features of the Park. The Cairngorms Partnership Plan does indeed include projects related the historic environment, in partnership with bodies like HES.
This image of a sporting estate in Glen Cluanie in the Highlands, showing the pattern of muirburn, is an example of the extent of human intervention even in places that seem quite remote.

That’s one of the reasons why we had a prolonged debate a few years ago about the difference between ‘wilderness’ and ‘wild land’ in Scotland, opting for the latter term, in recognition that we were talking about IUCN Category V or VI landscapes. (In fact, when you think about it, the idea of ‘wild land’ is a cultural concept in itself, albeit related to feelings of being with nature.) And I think we’ll hear more wild ideas from Simon later in the afternoon.
Now, a few words about how we recognise and protect our special areas as opposed to individual sites. In Scotland there are several cultural landscape designations, from World Heritage Sites like my native Edinburgh...

...to fantastic Gardens and Designed Landscapes like Drummond to the south of here...
...to **Historic Battlefields** like this nearby one at Culloden. Another designation, Conservation Area, can also cover landscapes – usually urban, but also rural, like Culloden battlefield. And designations like **National Parks** and **National Scenic Areas** always have a cultural component, as do Local Landscape Areas in all their guises. So we have a reasonable toolkit for recognising cultural values at landscape scale.

We also have a good set of tools that help us record what’s known. HES curates [Canmore](https://www.historicenvironment.scot/canmore), the online database to the National Record of the Historic Environment, which also serves as a catalogue of Historic Environment Scotland’s archives and collections.
On behalf of the sector, HES also manages PastMap, an online, map-based data hub showing where recorded sites and monuments have been found – this is centred on Aviemore. In this case I’ve used the 1st Edition OS map as the base, showing in dark green records in Canmore, and in light green those that are also noted in the local authority historic environment record.

We also have this online national map of Scotland, HLAmap, which defines the historic land-use represented by the extant landscapes, and which also identifies areas of relict landscape that have survived from the past. This is a split screen of the Aviemore area showing current land-use on the left, and a few areas of relict land on the right.
As well as being useful to monitor landscape change in the present day, we have also used Historic Landuse Assessment data to compare today with the past. This image uses the same colour coding to show the massive increase of forestry since the 1930s (in green) – not to mention the expansion of our towns and cities in orange/red and brown. But using semi-automatic processes to update the HLA data we can look at ongoing landscape-scale change affecting the historic environment, such as attrition of croft land or the expansion of peri-urban areas.

And we are also using our data, in conjunction with Scottish Natural Heritage, to observe landscape change around Scotland, using fixed point photography and aerial photography from the points shown here. (The yellowish areas are National Scenic Areas.) The National Record has been around for a century, and images from 100 years ago are of great interest to us today; in a century from now we’re pretty sure that these fixed-point images from today will be of interest and value to our successors.
As we saw earlier, *Our Place in Time*, our national strategy, recognises that the historic environment often gains its value because of its associations that we can see, feel and understand. This is where Intangible Cultural Heritage comes in, some of which you may already have been in contact with ...

... and you may even get to visit [HESs Dallas Dhu](https://www.hes.org.uk/dallas-duhu) distillery that lies just north of the Cairngorms National Park.
The Scottish Government has expressed support for UNESCO’s [Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention](#), although the UK Government is not minded to ratify it – International matters are not devolved. But in Scotland ICH is being taken increasingly seriously, led by Museums Galleries Scotland, and is something that is now embedded within our thinking about heritage values, whether or not we realise it overtly. In fact, in terms of the relationship between tangible and intangible cultural heritage I would argue that the scope of the ICH Convention doesn’t go far enough, but that’s another discussion.

The stories of the Highland Clearances are, for me, a good example of ICH. A time where people were forcibly moved from their homes and relocated, or dispossessed and with no real option but to emigrate – one of the reason for the extent of Scottish diaspora around the world. But this didn’t happen everywhere, and it wasn’t always a traumatic experience.
So, for example, these fragmentary remains of a deserted township in the heart of the Cairngorms, cleared for deer in this case rather than for sheep, may be fascinating to me because of what it can tell us about how people lived in the past. To others it is a shameful reminder of a shocking episode in our nation’s past, and is a sore that needs to be healed.

Like the moves to reforest Scotland, the idea of repopulating the glens is another community-supported initiative that sometimes can have shaky foundations of knowledge if the idea is related to righting a historical wrong.
This organisation, [Community Land Scotland](#), have joined forces with some free-thinking archaeological/landscape experts who will certainly help with the evidence base. This quote suggests that policy aspirations for engagement are often not being followed through into practice. From my experience I tend to agree.

Turning in more detail to the policy landscape, a few years ago I was closely involved in the [Scottish Landscape Forum](#), and one of the things we produced was [Scotland’s Landscape Charter](#). This was allied to the European Landscape Convention, and we have since established a European Landscape Convention Co-ordination Group of national agencies to try to maintain the momentum and ensure our activities are joined up.
“Landscape” means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. (Principle 4)

(The Convention is of course a product of the Council of Europe rather than the EU, so will not be affected by the current situation in the UK.) One of the Charter’s five principles, as you see here on the left, is, of course, to include people in decisions about their landscapes.

It would surely be better if local communities could record and contextualise their own heritage. That’s what was behind Scotland’s Rural Past, a 5-year Heritage Lottery Funded project that went out to communities and showed them how to investigate their historic landscapes. While the project ended in 2011, several of these groups continue to make excellent records, and they are passionately engaged in what happens to their historic environment. In fact there is a whole session on Community Archaeology in the Landscape at the Landscape Archaeology Conference in Newcastle this week, and a running theme in it is about how the confidence has increased of community groups engaged in researching their historic environment.
Also HLF-funded, like Scotland’s Rural Past, many Landscape Partnership projects, including one at Tomintoul & Glenlivet in the Cairngorms National Park, are showing people how they can record and care for historic places.

Initiatives like the Landscape Partnerships and this, the new Great Place schemes – with a local example at Badenoch within this national park, are obliging public bodies to meaningfully involve local people in thinking about the future – in part helping fulfil the Landscape Quality Objectives aspirations of the ELC.
The Scottish Government are really serious about local engagement, and the consultation on the new Planning Bill includes obligations to produce Local Place Plans, which will effectively be co-created by local communities – albeit potentially subservient to the Establishment-created Local Plans.

And in Scotland we have lots of help and advice to ensure that our community engagement efforts have a good chance of success, including a toolkit that includes this useful reminder of what best practice looks like.
But we actually have a good track record of doing this sort of thing. When the Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park was being created we undertook an inclusive exercise to establish what the **special qualities** of the area were. Historic Landuse Assessment was integral to that. The exercise involved expert knowledge, but also local knowledge, and came up with an interesting and thought-provoking mix of perspectives that have been played out ever since.
And more recently the Scottish Parliament passed the Community Empowerment Act which establishes powerful opportunities for communities to help run or even take control of local heritage assets.

In fact the 2015 Community Empowerment Act requires the creation of Local Outcome Improvement Plans and Community Engagement Plans: the foundations of good practice are therefore already there. And Historic Environment Scotland’s recent What’s Your Heritage initiative as a current example of a concerted effort to elicit views on what people value, to feed into and influence the development of a new Scottish Historic Environment Policy.

Would any of these initiatives satisfy the ELC aspirations for Landscape Quality Objectives? Well SNH and HES are working on an answer to that, looking at examples of good practice and considering how we could do even better in the future. And with SNH we are also looking at a framework for managing Scotland’s landscapes.
So, in Scotland there is a strong move towards the ‘democratisation’ of decision-making related to local and landscape-scale change. The extent to which this is successful can be part of today’s debate, but this is a complex area, with multiple overlapping dimensions of influence.

When it comes down to it, though, I reckon it’s all about what we value

- **Natural/cultural values**: Like almost all landscapes, we need to acknowledge that Scotland’s landscapes are a combination of natural and cultural forces

- **All values**: So both natural and cultural values have to be taken into account and weighed up against each other and against other economic, environmental and social values, consistent with the Brundtland definition of sustainable development

- **Spectrum of values**: People have different understandings and therefore different values that they apply – sometimes based on what happened in the past, sometimes based on a sort of mythology of past occurrences.

- **Informed values**: The community voice in this negotiation is increasingly strong; the more informed it is of the facts we know (or think we know), the better and more balanced decisions are likely to be

- **Transmitting values**: It is our job as experts in our specialist areas to translate our knowledge so that a much broader spread of society can be equipped to engage in decision-making, in an informed way

- **Popular values**: This is perhaps our new biggest challenge. It seems to me that we are not very good at taking into account popular notions of past environmental history. Perhaps sometimes we may have to bite our tongues and not let the facts get in the way of a good story? – as long as the historical and scientific evidence is respected and other values are put into the melting pot when decisions are made.
I hope this whistlestop tour has given you some idea of the context of the care and understanding of Scotland’s historic landscapes, and that it will help put this perspective in the mix of this afternoon’s workshops. I’ve talked a bit about the sort of strategic change that Landscape Quality Objectives are about, but this afternoon I think we’ll be focusing more on specific change, which is actually easier to elicit community reaction and engagement – albeit sometimes opening a Pandora’s box of responses, vested interests and conflicting views.

Community engagement in the management of change is seldom easy, and we’ve all got a lot to learn, but it’s the right thing to do, so it’s good we’re going to spend a bit of time this afternoon to share experiences and ideas.

Thank you.