

## HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR SCOTLAND

### SHEP 3: GARDENS AND DESIGNED LANDSCAPES

1. HEACS welcomes the opportunity to comment upon SHEP 3 on Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
2. HEACS was represented at the BEFS seminar on SHEP 3, and is in broad agreement with the points highlighted there, and with the resulting submission from BEFS.
3. HEACS considers that gardens, the human-influenced country house policies and the countryside beyond comprise an essential component of our heritage, but that their relationship to the broader historic environment has been inadequately appreciated. In particular, recent scholarship has studied the extent to which the pre-1760s Scottish landscape was modified to create enclosed microclimates for growing trees, fruit, or food – or for pleasure. HEACS believes, therefore, that a more holistic approach to the heritage would embrace this new understanding, leading to a review of the definition in para 2.2, and the consequent broadening of identification and analysis.
4. Furthermore, HEACS believes it important that the *essential dynamism* of the natural environment be central to any consideration of its protection.
5. HEACS doubts, therefore, whether the historical background outlined in para. 2.3 is sufficient. It omits the two key stages in the evolution of the human-influenced environment in Scotland: first, the early Renaissance phase, up to 1640, where the country house policies encompassed not just the privy garden, but the inner and outer courts, and a number of walled yards and parks according to status all of which were integral to the culture of the time; and the second phase c. 1650 – 1760 prior to its sweeping away by the landscape movement. This latter phase removed the outer court into a back court, and was characterised by straight tree-lined walled avenues often separating the business side of the house from the more ornamental side.
6. Question 1: HEACS considers that Scottish Ministers *should* have a statutory duty to compile and maintain an Inventory.
7. Question 2: HEACS does not agree that Section 2.10 are sufficient as the criteria, since they give primacy to those landscapes in terms of works of art, and omit the historical importance of a site in terms of self-sufficiency and human ecology.
8. Question 3: HEACS considers that a distinction should be made between the constructed environment (walls, steps, balustrades etc) and the natural environment in any protection regime; and that it should be extended to

the natural environment only where something ( eg tree or plant ) has been identified as having particular rarity.

9. Question 4: HEACS is concerned lest attempts to protect the physical aspects of such landscapes through Listing or Scheduling could have the effect of stultifying the natural evolution.
10. Question 5: HEACS considers that the list of organisations involved in promoting understanding in para 3.3 is too narrow. A Stakeholder Advisory Group would be a welcome development, but it should be broad in composition and deep in scholarship.

HEACS  
June 2006