9 ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of likely significant effects with respect to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

9.1.2 A heritage asset is any element of the historic environment which has cultural significance. Both discrete features, and extensive landscapes defined by a specific historic event, process or theme, can be defined as heritage assets; assets may overlap or be nested within one another. Designated assets include Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, World Heritage Properties, Conservation Areas, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields and Historic Marine Protected Areas. Other assets may also be locally designated through policies in the Local Development Plan.

9.1.3 The majority of heritage assets are not designated. Some non-designated assets are recorded in Historic Environment Records (HERs) maintained by local authorities and other agencies. Many heritage assets are currently unrecorded, and the information contained in HERs is not definitive, since they may include features which, for instance, have been entirely removed, or are of uncertain location, dubious identification, or negligible importance. The identification of non-designated heritage assets is therefore to some extent a matter of professional judgement.

9.1.4 Some heritage assets may coincide with visual receptors or landscape character areas in terms of the potential for effects of the Proposed Development on visual experiences. In such cases, it is important to recognise the difference in approach between these two topics. The cultural heritage assessment addresses effects on the cultural heritage significance of heritage assets, which may result from, but are not equivalent to, visual impacts. **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** (LVIA) focuses more on subjective present experience and amenity, while cultural heritage has a focus on understanding of cultural significance, both intellectually and emotionally, across past, present, and future generations. An effect on a landscape character area does not therefore equate to an effect on the cultural significance of heritage assets within it.

9.1.5 The objectives of the chapter are to:

- Describe the baseline; the location, nature and extent of any known heritage assets or areas of archaeological potential which may be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the assessment;
- Describe the potential effects, including cumulative effects;
- Describe the mitigation measures proposed to address likely significant effects (if required); and

- Assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation (if required).

9.1.6 This chapter is supported by the following figures and visualisations, presented in **Volumes 2a, 2b,** and **2d** of the EIA Report:

- EIA Report **Volume 2a: Figures**
  - **Figure 9.1**: Known Heritage Assets within the Site.
  - **Figure 9.2**: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the Outer Study Area (OSA) and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Development.
- EIA Report **Volume 2b: NatureScot Visualisations**
  - **Viewpoint 12**: Old Military Road north of the A87. (Photomontage from centre of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge)
  - **Viewpoint 17**: Loch Cluanie. (Photomontage from Loch Cluanie car park on A87 to the west of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge)
- EIA Report **Volume 2d: Cultural Heritage Visualisations**
  - **CHVP01 Figure 9.3**: Photomontage from Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus
  - **CHVP02 Figure 9.4**: Photomontage from valley of the River Oich looking north-west towards Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus
  - **CHVP03 Figure 9.5**: Photomontage from eastern end of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge

9.1.7 This chapter is also supported by the following technical appendix, presented in **Volume 3** of the EIA Report:

- **Technical Appendix 9.1**: Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (including Annex 1: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer).

9.2 Statutory and Planning Context

Legislation

9.2.1 Relevant legislation and guidance documents have been taken into account as part of this Cultural Heritage assessment.

9.2.2 The regulatory basis for the assessment presented in this chapter is The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

9.2.3 The chapter is also prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Electricity Act 1989. Paragraph 1 (1) of Schedule 9 of this Act states:

"In formulating any relevant proposals, a licence holder or a person authorised by exemption to generate, distribute, supply or participate in the transmission of electricity -

(a) shall have regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites, buildings and objects of architectural, historic or archaeological interest; and

(b) shall do what he reasonably can to mitigate any effect which the proposals would have on the natural beauty of the countryside or on any such flora, fauna, features, sites, buildings or objects."

9.2.4 As the Applicant is not a licence holder or person so authorised, and where consent is required under section 36 of the Electricity Act, per paragraph 3 (2) of Schedule 9, the Scottish Ministers shall have regard to –

(a) the desirability of the matters mentioned in paragraph (a) of subparagraph (1) above; and

(b) the extent to which the person by whom the proposals were formulated has complied with his duty under paragraph (b) of that sub-paragraph".

9.2.5 Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings are protected by statute:

- Legislation regarding Scheduled Monuments is contained within *The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*.
- Legislation regarding Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas is contained in *The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997*.

9.2.6 The 1979 Act makes no reference to the settings of Scheduled Monuments.

9.2.7 The 1997 Act places a duty on the consenting authority with respect to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and their settings. Section 59 of the 1997 Act states:

"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, a planning authority or the Scottish Ministers, as the case may be, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Planning Policy

9.2.8 The historic environment is defined as *"…the physical evidence for past human activity. It connects people with place, and with the traditions, stories, and memories associated with places and landscapes*' in 'Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment' (2023, 10) and in National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) as "*the physical evidence for human activity that connects people with place, linked with the associations we can see, feel and understand*" (Annex F – Glossary of definitions). These documents present the Scottish Government's strategy for the protection and promotion of the historic environment.

9.2.9 National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) Part 1 A National Spatial Strategy for Scotland 2045 (Scottish Government, 2023) describes how the future spatial development of Scotland can contribute to planning outcomes. It shows where there will be opportunities for growth and

regeneration, investment in the low carbon economy, environmental enhancement, and improved connections across the country.

9.2.10 Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, HES, 2019a) defines the Historic Environment and Scottish Government Policy. It sets out the vision and key principles on how to care for and protect Scotland's historic environment including designations of ancient monuments, principles for scheduling and listing, contexts for conservation areas, marine protected areas, gardens and designated landscapes, historic battlefields and consents and advice.

NPF4 – Part 2: Historic Assets and Places Policy 7

9.2.11 The Scottish Government's planning policies in relation to the historic environment are set out in NPF4 Part 2 National Planning Policy (The Scottish Government, February 2023). Policy 7: Historic assets and places states:

"Policy Intent: To protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places."

9.2.12 NPF4 Policy 7 applies its principles to designated and non-designated assets. Those relevant to the current assessment are as follows:

"a) Development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places will be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change.

Proposals should also be informed by national policy and guidance on managing change in the historic environment, and information held within Historic Environment Records.

h) Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:

i. direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;
ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided; or
iii. exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.

o) Non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible. Where there is potential for non-designated buried archaeological remains to exist below a site, developers will provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource at an early stage so that planning authorities can assess impacts. Historic buildings may also have archaeological significance which is not understood and may require assessment.

Where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised. Where it has been demonstrated that avoidance or retention is not possible, excavation, recording, analysis,

archiving, publication and activities to provide public benefit may be required through the use of conditions or legal/planning obligations.

When new archaeological discoveries are made during the course of development works, they must be reported to the planning authority to enable agreement on appropriate inspection, recording and mitigation measures."

Local Planning Policy

9.2.13 The Highland Council adopted their Local Development Plan (LDP) in April 2012. Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage of the LDP 2012 relates to the historic environment. This Policy is set out in Table 2 of **Appendix 9.1**.

9.2.14 Due to the date of adoption of the HwLDP which predates NPF4, planning legislation notes that where there is policy conflict between the HwLDP and NPF4, NPF4 will take precedence. Whilst there is no clear conflict between HwLDP and NPF4, both of which seek to protect the historic environment, due to the planning legislation notes NPF4 forms the main reference policies for the assessment in this chapter.

Guidance

9.2.15 The methodology for this cultural heritage impact assessment is consistent with the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (v5 NatureScot & HES 2018), guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland, Appendix 1.

9.2.16 HES also provides guidance in a series of documents entitled 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' (MCHE). These provide guidance to planning authorities and stakeholders regarding key issues relating to development, the planning process, and key issues pertaining to the historic environment. Most relevant to this assessment are the guidance notes covering Setting (June 2016 updated 2020), and Works on Scheduled Monuments (2016 updated 2020).

9.2.17 HES published Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (DPSG, 2019b) to accompany HEPS. DPSG outlines the policy and selection guidance used by HES when designating sites and places of national importance.

9.2.18 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology provides technical advice to planning authorities and developers on dealing with archaeological remains. Among other issues it considers the balance in planning decisions between the preservation in situ of archaeological remains and the benefits of development; setting; the circumstances under which developers can be required to provide further information, in the form of a field evaluation to allow planning authorities to reach a decision; and measures that can be taken to mitigate adverse impacts.

9.2.19 Standards and Guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) have been followed in preparing this assessment, in particular the 'Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment' (2014, updated 2020) and the 'Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment' (2014, updated 2017 & 2020).

9.2.20 This assessment has also been prepared with reference to IEMA, IHBC and CIfA's July 2021 publication 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK'. This document presents good practice for assessment of the impact of a development proposal on cultural heritage assets.

9.2.21 The cultural heritage visualisations supporting this chapter have been produced by the Landscape and Visual team according to NatureScot's 2017 guidance 'Visual Representations of Wind Farms'; the methodology for preparing these is described in **Appendix 5.1: LVIA Visualisation Methodology**.

9.3 Consultation Undertaken

9.3.1 Throughout the scoping process, and subsequently during the ongoing EIA process, relevant organisations were contacted with regards to the Proposed Development. **Table 9.1** outlines the consultation responses received in relation to Cultural Heritage.

Table 9.1: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Consultation Summary

Consultee and Date received	Summary of key comments	Action Taken
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Scoping Response 04 March 2024 Case ID 300070840	HES confirmed that parts of turbines may appear in the distance on the skyline from stretches of Fort Augustus-Bernera military road (SM11484) and from Dundreggan Farm motte (SM11875). However, they concluded that *'the turbines would not be in any key views for either monument, and would be at such a distance that the integrity of setting for each asset would not be affected*'.	Discussed further through subsequent consultation documented in rows below and noted in assessment results
	HES are content that detailed assessment of listed buildings within towns and villages can be scoped out as there are unlikely to be significant impacts on the setting of these assets.	The Stage 1 Assessment concurs, and no Listed Buildings are identified as likely to be affected by the Proposed Development
	Assets to be included within the EIA assessment will be agreed with consultees after Stage 1 Setting Assessment.	HES was consulted on the heritage assets proposed for detailed assessment in the EIAR through submission of **Appendix 9.1** (23 October 2024) in which only Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus was proposed for detailed assessment in this chapter. They were also consulted regarding the suitability of proposals for supporting visualisations.
The Highland Council Scoping Response 13 March 2024 Ref: 24/00359/SCOP	Our Archaeologists note that there are two areas of cairns recorded on the HER. Upstanding remains should be identified by survey and the potential for buried features or deposits to be present should be stated in the report.	The EIAR chapter is supported with a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Appendix 9.1**). This includes an up-to-date HER search which identifies both heritage assets mentioned in the scoping report (MHG53256 & MHG53757), as well as seven further known heritage assets. Follow-up consultation with the Council's Historic Environment Team (HET) HER has confirmed that point data provided by the HER (which identifies

Consultee and Date received	Summary of key comments	Action Taken
		MHG14088 within the Site boundary) in fact, represents a linear feature outwith the Site (by email 03 June 2024).
	Where impacts are unavoidable, HET expect methods to mitigate this impact to be discussed in detail.	No direct physical impacts are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development and no mitigation is proposed. See **Section 9.7** of this chapter.
	The EIAR needs to identify all designated sites which may be affected by the development either directly or indirectly. We would expect any assessment to contain a full appreciation of the setting of these historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings. Where the assessment finds that significant impacts are likely, appropriate visualisations such as photomontage and wireframe views of the development in relation to the sites and their settings should be provided. Visualisations illustrating views both from the asset towards the proposed development and views towards the asset with the development in the background would be helpful.	The Council was approached for comment on the heritage assets proposed for detailed assessment in the EIA Report through submission of **Appendix 9.1** (23 October 2024) also regarding the suitability of proposals for supporting visualisations. The Council HET confirmed that they would defer to HES regarding CHVPs and setting assessments. (Pers Comm, by email 18 December 2024)
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Visualisations Consultation 27 November 2024 Case ID 300070840	HES confirmed they are content that the following assets can be scoped out of further detailed assessment: • Tir nan Og, cairn 445m SSW of (SM1149) • Torgyle Bridge (LB14996) • Fort Augustus Monastery, Abbey and School (LB1861) • Fort Augustus Abbey Church (LB1862) • Dundreggan Farm, motte 35m SW of (SM11875)	Noted. These assets are considered proportionately in Stage 1 Assessments and are not considered further in this chapter.
	We disagree with the proposals to scope out Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge (SM11484), based on the draft visualisations supplied. We would request that this asset is also taken forward for detailed assessment within the EIA report. The assessment should focus	Based on HES's Scoping Response, as a significant adverse effect is not considered likely, clarification was sought in relation to SM11484.

Consultee and Date received	Summary of key comments	Action Taken
	on any impacts when traversing along the asset, understand the importance of those views and not focus on one single viewpoint. Photomontages should be produced to support this assessment.	Sequential wirelines and draft photomontages were provided to HES to support their response.
	We support the inclusion of Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus (SM794), for detailed assessment based on the draft wirelines supplied. We welcome that visualisations in the form of two photomontages are to be produced.	See **Section 9.6** of this chapter for detailed assessment of SM794; supporting visualisations are provided at **Volume 2d**: **CHVP01 Figure 9.3 & CHVP02 Figure 9.4.**
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Consultation regarding SM11484 19 December 2024 Case ID 300070840	HES confirmed that detailed assessment of Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge (SM11484) is required in the EIA, to be supported with a set of sequential visualisations.	See **Section 9.6** of this chapter for detailed assessment of SM11484; supporting visualisations are provided at **Volume 2b: LVIA Viewpoints 12 & 17** and **Volume 2d**: **CHVP03 Figure 9.5.**

9.4 Scope and Methodology

Scope of Assessment

9.4.1 The scope of this assessment has been established through an ongoing scoping process. Further information can be found in **Chapter 2: Proposed Development**.

9.4.2 The following matters are scoped into the assessment in this chapter:

- Groundworks for construction have the potential to disturb archaeological remains and cultural heritage assets. Construction phase direct and indirect physical effects is therefore scoped into the assessment for heritage assets within the Site, including currently unknown remains (archaeological potential). Assessment will also include the potential for accidental damage and will account for micro-siting tolerances.
- Change within the setting of heritage assets has the potential to impact upon understanding, appreciation or experience of their cultural significance. Operational phase effects upon the setting of all heritage assets is therefore scoped into the assessment.
- Cumulative change within the setting of heritage assets has the potential for increased impact upon understanding, appreciation or experience of their cultural significance as compared with the Proposed Development in isolation. Cumulative setting effects is therefore scoped into the assessment for heritage assets identified as with 'minor' or higher setting effect significance as a result of the Proposed Development.

9.4.3 The approach to assessment in this chapter, described in detail below, is in with relevant guidance on cultural heritage impact assessment provided by: 'Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook' (NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland, 2018), 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020), and the 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK' (IEMA, IHBC and CIfA, 2021).

9.4.4 The cultural heritage assessment has been carried out in the following stages:

- Definition of baseline conditions, comprising desk-based study and visits to heritage assets, leading to the identification of the cultural significance and importance of heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development;
- Assessment of the magnitude of impacts (physical, indirect, setting and cumulative) during construction and operation of the Proposed Development on the cultural significance of heritage assets, informed by baseline information, field visits, Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping, wireframes and photomontages;
- Assessment of the significance of effects, broadly a product of the asset's importance and the magnitude of the impact;
- Proposal of mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or offset significant adverse effects where necessary; and
- Presentation of residual effects and any monitoring proposals.

9.4.5 This assessment is concerned with impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets. It identifies assets that may be affected by the Proposed Development by considering cultural significance including the contribution made by its setting. If an asset's setting is found to make a substantive contribution to its cultural significance, and this contribution is likely to be affected as a result of the Proposed Development, the asset is considered to be 'sensitive'. Assets that are found to be sensitive to the predicted changes in their setting may experience a higher magnitude of impact than an asset that is less sensitive to changes in its setting.

9.4.6 The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of an asset is diminished or enhanced by a proposed development. This definition of magnitude of impact, and the assessment methodology as a whole, apply to likely effects resulting from changes to the setting of heritage assets as well as likely physical effects. The EIA significance of this effect is determined by comparing the predicted magnitude of impact with the level of importance assigned to the specific asset (reflecting the greater protection in policy afforded to assets of higher importance).

Baseline Methodology

Desk Study and Field Surveys

Study Areas

9.4.7 The Application Boundary ('the Site') has been used to gather baseline data on the known and potential archaeological resource to inform the EIA (**Figure 9.1**). Within the Site all heritage assets are considered for construction and operational effects. Heritage assets within 2 km of the Site have been identified and considered to inform the assessment of archaeological potential.

9.4.8 Heritage assets have been included in the assessment for nested Outer Study Areas (OSA) based on their level of importance (see **Figure 9.2**) to ensure that likely significant effects are identified. The OSA reflects the fact that the more important the asset, the more likely significant effects could be generated over greater distances. Therefore, the following study area boundaries have been applied:

- Up to 2 km from proposed turbines: Category C Listed Buildings, and non-designated heritage assets;
- Up to 5 km from proposed turbines: Inventory Historic Battlefields, Conservation Areas, and Category B Listed Buildings;
- Up to 20 km from proposed turbines: World Heritage Properties, Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

9.4.9 In addition, beyond the OSA as defined above, any other designated assets which are within the ZTV are included in the assessment where a significant impact is considered possible as a result of the Proposed Development i.e. an asset is considered exceptionally important and/or sensitive to visual change within its setting, and/or where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to contribute to cultural significance in the opinion of the assessor or consultees. This screening exercise is based on the approach set out in

Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2016 updated 2020) and supplemented through scoping and further consultation with statutory consultees. In the case of the Proposed Development, no assets have been identified beyond the defined OSAs and in the ZTV requiring consideration in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment.

Data Sources

9.4.10 The baseline for the assessment has been informed by a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Appendix 9.1**) based on all readily available documentary sources, following the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) 'Standard and Guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment'. The following sources of information were referred to:

- Designation data downloaded from the Historic Environment Scotland website in October 2024;
- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), including the Canmore database and associated photographs, prints/drawings and manuscripts held by HES;
- Historic Environment Record (HER) data, digital extract received from the Council's HET in May 2024;
- Historic Landscape Assessment (HLA) data, viewed through the HLA Map website (https://hlamap.org.uk/);
- The National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP);
- Geological data available online from the British Geological Survey (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html);
- Historic maps held by the National Library of Scotland (https://maps.nls.uk/);
- Unpublished maps and plans held by the National Records of Scotland;
- Relevant internet resources, including Google Maps, Google Earth, Bing satellite imagery and PastMap;
- Readily available published sources and unpublished archaeological reports;
- Findings of other environmental topics (LVIA, peat depth, ground conditions, noise and vibration);
- A zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) and photomontage and wireline visualisations; and
- Field surveys.

9.4.11 A field visit was undertaken on the 30th October 2024 in clear weather conditions. Notes were made regarding site characteristics, any visible archaeology and geographical/geological features which may have a bearing on previous land use and archaeological survival, as well as those which may constrain subsequent archaeological investigation. Records were made regarding extant archaeological features, such as earthworks or structural remains, any negative features, local topography and aspect, exposed geology, soils, watercourses, health and safety considerations, surface finds, and any other relevant information.

9.4.12 Field visits for the purposes of setting assessment were undertaken on 30th October 2024 in clear weather conditions with long-distance visibility sufficient for the assessment of the settings of the selected heritage assets.

9.4.13 Designated heritage assets are discussed in this EIA Report chapter with the designation reference number assigned by HES. Non-designated assets are discussed with their reference number assigned by the HER. Previously unrecorded heritage assets within the site have been assigned a number (prefixed HA for Heritage Asset). A single asset number can, for convenience, refer to a group of related features, which may be recorded separately in the HER and other data sources.

9.4.14 The full list of known heritage assets within these study areas is presented in the Gazetteer (**Appendix 9.1**, Annex 1). Known heritage assets within the Site are shown on **Figure 9.1** with detailed descriptions in **Appendix 9.1**. Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the OSA are shown on **Figure 9.2** along with the Proposed Development Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV).

Potential for Unknown Heritage Assets in the Site

9.4.15 The likelihood that undiscovered heritage assets may be present within the Site is referred to as archaeological potential. Overall levels of potential can be assigned to different areas of the Site, while recognising that the archaeological potential of any area will relate to particular historical periods and types of evidence. The following factors are considered in assessing archaeological potential:

- The distribution and character of known archaeological remains in the vicinity, based principally on an appraisal of data in the HER;
- The history of archaeological fieldwork and research in the surrounding area, which may give an indication of the reliability and completeness of existing records;
- Environmental factors such as geology, topography and soil quality, which would have influenced land-use in the past and can therefore be used to predict the distribution of archaeological remains;
- Land-use factors affecting the survival of archaeological remains, such as ploughing or commercial forestry planting; and
- Factors affecting the visibility of archaeological remains, which may relate to both environment and land-use, such as soils and geology (which may be more or less conducive to formation of cropmarks), arable cultivation (which has potential to show cropmarks and create surface artefact scatters), vegetation, which can conceal upstanding features, and superficial deposits such as peat and alluvium which can mask archaeological features.

9.4.16 In the Archaeological Potential section of this assessment, the likelihood that the Site may contain undiscovered heritage assets, their likely location and potential density, and their likely level of importance is assessed, described, and justified.

Cultural Significance

9.4.17 Cultural heritage impact assessment is concerned with effects on cultural significance, which is a quality that applies to all heritage assets, and as defined by Historic Environment

Scotland (Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, NatureScot & HES 2018, v5 Appendix 1 page 175), relates to the ways in which a heritage asset is valued both by specialists and the public. The cultural significance of a heritage asset will derive from factors including the asset's fabric, setting, context and associations. This use of the word 'significance' as part of 'cultural significance', referring to the range of values attached to an asset, should not be confused with the unrelated usage in terms of the conclusions reached on the significance of likely environmental effects in accordance with the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

9.4.18 Cultural significance is assessed in relation to the criteria in DPSG Annexes 1-6, which are intended primarily to inform decisions regarding heritage designations but may also be applied more generally in identifying the 'special characteristics' of a heritage asset, which contribute to its cultural significance (intrinsic, associative, or contextual as outlined below). DPSG Annex 1 is widely applicable in assessing the cultural significance of archaeological sites and monuments, for instance, while the criteria in Annex 2 can be used in defining the architectural or historic interest of buildings, whether listed or not. Cultural significance of assets is considered in terms described in DPSG Annex 1:

- Intrinsic Characteristics- those inherent in the monument i.e., "*how the physical remains of a site or place contribute to our knowledge of the past*";
- Associative Characteristics – subjective associations, including those with current or past aesthetic preferences i.e., "*how a site or place relates to people, practices, events and/or historic and social movements*"; and
- Contextual Characteristics – those relating to the monument's place in the landscape or in the body of existing knowledge i.e., "*how a site or place relates to its surroundings and/or to our existing knowledge of the past*".

Contribution of Setting to Cultural Significance

9.4.19 The characteristics which contribute to an asset's cultural significance may include elements of its setting. Setting is defined in 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES 2016 updated 2020, Section 1) as "the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced". The setting of a heritage asset is defined and analysed according to Stage 2 of the three-stage approach promoted in 'MCHE: Setting', with reference to factors listed on pages 9-10, as follows:

- *"Current landscape or townscape context;*
- *Views to, from and across or beyond the historic asset or place;*
- *Key vistas: for instance, a 'frame' of trees, buildings or natural features that give the historic asset or place a context, whether intentional or not);*
- *The prominence of the historic asset or place in views throughout the surrounding area, bearing in mind that sites need not be visually prominent to have a setting;*
- *Aesthetic qualities;*
- *Character of the surrounding landscape;*
- *General and specific views including foregrounds and backdrops;*

- *Views from within an asset outwards over key elements in the surrounding landscape, such as the view from the principal room of a house, or from a roof terrace;*
- *Relationships with other features, both built and natural;*
- *Non-visual factors such as historical, artistic, literary, place name, or scenic associations, intellectual relationships (e.g. to a theory, plan, or design), or sensory factors; and*
- *A 'sense of place': the overall experience of an asset which may combine some of the above factors."*

9.4.20 The relevance of these factors to the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset determines how, and to what extent, an asset's cultural significance derives from its setting. All heritage assets have settings; however, in some cases, setting may contribute very little to the asset's significance, or only certain elements of the setting may be relevant. The above range of factors were taken into consideration when determining which assets are sensitive to change within their setting and thus may be impacted by the Proposed Development.

9.4.21 Operational and/or under-construction wind energy developments (and any other existing developments that may also be relevant) are described as part of the existing baseline in the impact assessment section.

Integrity

9.4.22 In relation scheduled monuments, NPF4 Policy 7(h) states that:

'Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where: ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided.'

9.4.23 NPF4 does not define 'integrity' in the context of Policy 7(h), therefore for the purposes of the assessment, HES recommend that the following shared definition (which emerged from the Rigghill Wind Farm Public Inquiry (DPEA Reference: PPA-310-2034) for the concept of integrity of setting is used:

'*changes to factors of setting that contribute to cultural significance such that the understanding, appreciation and experience of an asset are not adequately retained will affect the integrity of setting.'*

Importance of Heritage Assets

9.4.24 The importance of a heritage asset is the overall value assigned to it based on its cultural significance, reflecting its statutory designation or, in the case of non-designated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (**Table 9.2**).

9.4.25 Heritage Assets are defined as "*Features, buildings or places that provide physical evidence of past human activity identified as being of sufficient value to this and future generations to merit consideration in the planning system*" (NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5, p.122). Thus, any feature which does not merit consideration in planning decisions due to its cultural significance may be said to have negligible (cultural heritage) importance; in general, such features are not considered as heritage assets and

are excluded from the assessment (see **Appendix 9.1** for features and remains of negligible importance that have been excluded from the impact assessment in this chapter as significant effects are not possible).

Table 9.2: Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance	Criteria
Very High	Assets valued at an international level, e.g. World Heritage Properties and other assets of equal international importance that contribute to international research objectives.
High	Assets valued at a national level, e.g. Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Battlefields, Historic Marine Protected Areas, some conservation areas and non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designation in the opinion of the assessor. Category B or C Listed Buildings where the existing designation does not adequately reflect their value, in the opinion of the assessor.
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, e.g. Category B Listed Buildings, some conservation areas and non-designated assets of similar value in the opinion of the assessor. Category C Listed Buildings where the existing designation does not adequately reflect their value, in the opinion of the assessor.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, e.g. Category C Listed Buildings, some conservation areas and non-designated assets of similar value in the opinion of the assessor.

Source: NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, Figure 2

Assessment Methodology

Effects of the Proposed Development

9.4.26 Effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment can arise through direct or indirect physical impacts, or impacts on setting:

- Direct physical impacts describe those activities of the Proposed Development that directly cause damage to the fabric of a heritage asset. Typically, these activities are related to construction works and will only occur within the Application Boundary.
- Indirect physical impacts describe secondary processes, triggered by the Proposed Development, that lead to the degradation or preservation of heritage assets. For example, changes to hydrology may affect archaeological preservation; or changes to the setting of a building may affect the viability of its current use and thus lead to dereliction.
- An impact on the setting of a heritage asset occurs when the presence of the Proposed Development changes the surroundings of a heritage asset in such a way that it affects (beneficially or adversely) the cultural significance of that asset. Visual

impacts are most commonly encountered but other environmental factors such as noise, light or air quality can be relevant in some cases. Impacts may be encountered at all stages in the life cycle of a development from construction to decommissioning but they are only likely to lead to significant effects during the prolonged operational stage of the Proposed Development.

9.4.27 Likely significant direct or indirect effects on known and unknown heritage assets are discussed in terms of the risk that a significant effect could occur. The level of risk depends on the level of archaeological potential combined with the nature and scale of disturbance associated with construction activities and may vary between high and negligible for different elements or activities associated with a development, or for the Proposed Development as a whole.

9.4.28 Likely significant effects on the settings of heritage assets are identified from an initial desk-based appraisal of data from HES and the HER, and consideration of current maps and aerial images. Photomontage and wireline visualisations have been prepared to illustrate changes to key views, and to aid assessment where potential setting effects have been identified (**Figures 9.3** to **9.15**). The visualisations have been produced by the Landscape and Visual team and the methodology for preparing these is described in **Appendix 5.1**.

Cumulative Effects

9.4.29 A cumulative effect occurs where the magnitude of the combined effect of two or more developments is greater than that of the developments considered individually.

9.4.30 The impact assessment for the Proposed Development on its own merits, identifies the impact of that development alone upon cultural significance of heritage assets relative to a baseline scenario that includes all operational and under-construction wind farms. The cumulative impact assessment, using the same criteria of impact magnitude (as defined in **Table** 9.3), assesses the impact of the Proposed Development combined with the impact of wind farm developments that are consented but not yet built and those that are currently at application stage (for which sufficient detail is known) relative to the baseline scenario.

9.4.31 Cumulative effects are considered in this chapter for heritage assets where an effect of 'minor' or greater significance has been identified as a result of the Proposed Development. The purpose of this threshold is to ensure that the assessment remains proportionate and focused on those cases where there is potential for a significant effect (in EIA terms) to arise were the Proposed Development to be consented.

9.4.32 Developments considered as part of the cumulative assessment are identified from the agreed list presented in **Chapter 5**. Visualisations supporting this chapter from a suite of cultural heritage viewpoints (CHVPs) and LVIA Viewpoints, agreed with HES and the Council, include cumulative developments (**Volume 2d: Figures 9.3** to **9.5** and **Volume 2b: LVIA Viewpoints 12 & 17**).

Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Significance

9.4.33 The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of a heritage asset will potentially change as a result of the Proposed Development (following

the methodology defined in NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, para 42).

9.4.34 Conclusions of the assessed magnitude of impacts are a product of the consideration of the elements of an asset and its setting that contribute to its cultural significance and the degree to which the Proposed Development would change these contributing elements. The assessment therefore reflects the varying degrees of sensitivity of different assets to change brought about by different types or scale of possible developments. The extent to which a heritage asset is sensitive to change within its setting, and thus the extent to which its cultural significance may be impacted through change to this setting, will be reflected in findings regarding the magnitude of impact.

9.4.35 This definition of magnitude and assessment methodology applies to likely impacts resulting from change in the setting as well as likely physical impacts on the fabric of an asset.

9.4.36 The methodology adopted for the identification and assessment of potential impacts resulting from change in setting follows the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2016 updated 2020) and the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (NatureScot & HES, 2018, v5 Appendix 1). The guidance sets out three stages in assessing the impact of development on the setting of a heritage asset or place as follows:

- *"Stage 1: Identify the historic assets that might be affected by a development;*
- *Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated and experienced; and*
- *Stage 3: evaluate potential effect of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative effects can be mitigated."*

9.4.37 The 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment methodology considers each heritage asset in turn to identify those assets in the ZTV which have a wider landscape setting that contributes to their cultural significance and whether it is likely that cultural significance could be materially harmed by the Proposed Development (**Figure 9.2**). Where heritage assets are located outwith the ZTV, viewpoints located within the ZTV which may provide a culturally significant view towards the heritage asset and the Proposed Development were considered.

9.4.38 It is important to draw a distinction between Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and assessment of the setting of a heritage asset. In LVIA, magnitude of impact would be directly related to the level of visual change, whereas cultural heritage assessment is concerned with visual change only where it affects the contribution that setting makes to an asset's cultural significance. As a result, there is no simple relationship between change and impact on setting and this is reflected in the advice given in Stages 2 and 3 in HES's 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' guidance (2020, pages 9-10). It is necessary to understand how setting contributes to cultural significance (Stage 2) before assessing how change would impact on setting (Stage 3). Therefore, the magnitude of an impact resulting from change within setting is not a direct measure of the visual prominence, scale, proximity or other attributes of the Proposed Development itself, or of the extent to which the setting itself is changed. Moreover, it is necessary to consider whether, and to what extent, the characteristics of the setting which would be changed contribute to the asset's cultural

significance. This methodology is in accordance with NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, paras 42 and 43.

9.4.39 Magnitude of impact on cultural significance of heritage assets is assessed as High, Medium, Low, Negligible, or No Impact, and adverse or beneficial, using the criteria in **Table** 9.3 as a guide to professional judgement. In assessing the likely effects of a development, it is often necessary to take into account various impacts which affect an asset's cultural significance in different ways. For instance, there may be adverse effects on an asset's fabric and beneficial effects on cultural significance resulting from change in setting arising from a development which would not otherwise occur in a 'do-nothing' scenario; a heritage asset that might otherwise degrade over time could be preserved or consolidated as a consequence of a development. The impact assessment identifies beneficial and adverse impacts for consideration separately.

Table 9.3: Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impacts on Cultural Significance

Magnitude	Summary
High Beneficial	Preservation of the asset *in situ* where it would be completely or almost completely lost in the do-nothing scenario.
Medium Beneficial	Changes to key elements of the asset's fabric or setting that result in its cultural significance being preserved, where they would otherwise be lost, or restored.
Low Beneficial	Changes that result in elements of the asset's fabric or setting that detract from its cultural significance being removed.
Negligible / No Impact	Changes to fabric or setting that leave significance unchanged.
Low Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of the heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this is slightly altered
Medium Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of the heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this is substantially altered
High Adverse	Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of its cultural significance, such that it may no longer be considered a heritage asset

Source: NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, Figure 1

Mitigation

9.4.40 Assessment of impacts is an iterative part of the design process. For any identified effect the preferred mitigation option is always to avoid or reduce effects through design (embedded mitigation), or through precautionary measures such as fencing off heritage assets during construction works to avoid accidental direct effects (additional mitigation). Details of the design iteration process are contained within **Chapter 2: Proposed Development**.

9.4.41 Effects which cannot be mitigated by design may lead to adverse direct or indirect physical effects which may be mitigated by an appropriate level of survey, excavation, recording, analysis and publication of the results, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (NPF4 Policy 7(o) and PAN2/2011 sections 25-27) (additional mitigation).

Determination of Effect Significance

9.4.42 The significance of an effect ('EIA significance') on the cultural significance of a heritage asset, resulting from a direct or indirect physical effect or an effect on its setting, is assessed by weighting the magnitude of the impact and the importance of the heritage asset.

9.4.43 EIA significance may be described on a continuous scale from None to Major. The matrix in **Table 9.4** provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the asset importance or effect magnitude levels are not clear or are borderline between categories.

Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effect

9.4.44 The predicted significance of effect is determined through a standard method of assessment, moderated by professional judgement. It considers the assessed importance of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact upon cultural significance as detailed in **Table 9.4**.

9.4.45 Following the Importance of Heritage Assets methodology presented above, any feature of negligible importance is excluded from the assessment of effect, as a significant effect in EIA terms is not possible.

Table 9.4: Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects

Heritage Asset Importance	Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Significance			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible/ No Impact
Very High	Major	Major	Moderate	Negligible/None
High	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible/None
Medium	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible/None
Low	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible/None

9.4.46 In this assessment Major and Moderate effects are considered 'Significant' in EIA terms, while Minor and Negligible effects are regarded as 'Not Significant'. Effect significance conclusions are expressed in the assessment as 'beneficial' or 'adverse', following from the impact magnitude, and are expressed separately.

9.4.47 Conclusions are also expressed in terms of NPF4 Policy 7 tests.

Assessment Limitations

9.4.48 Information held by public data sources is generally considered to be reliable; however, the following general points are noted:

- There is no freely available LiDAR data available for cultural heritage analysis for this Site. This is addressed by field survey;
- Documentary sources are rare before the medieval period;
- Wherever such documentary sources are used in assessing archaeological potential professional judgment is used in their interpretation;
- HER records can be limited because opportunities for research, fieldwork and discovery depend on the volume and frequency of commercial development and occasional research projects, rather than the result of a more structured research framework. A lack of data within the HER records does not necessarily equal an absence of archaeology;
- Where archaeological assets have been identified solely from aerial imagery without confirmation from archaeological excavation or supporting evidence in the form of find-spots for example, it is possible the interpretation may be revised in the light of further investigation;
- The significance of heritage assets can be difficult to identify from HER records, depending on the accuracy and reliability of the original source;
- There can often be a lack of dating evidence for archaeological assets; and
- Any archaeological field visit has inherent limitations, primarily because archaeological remains below ground level may have no surface indicators.

Receptors/Matters Scoped Out of Further Assessment

9.4.49 The following matters are scoped out of this chapter:

- The assessment of construction phase setting effects is scoped out of the assessment in this chapter as would be temporary and are not considered to be significant due to their very short duration.
- Decommissioning effects are scoped out of the assessment in this chapter as the extent of ground disturbance associated with decommissioning will not extend beyond the construction footprint, which would be mitigated during construction. Any residual operational phase setting effects will be reversed and the current baseline would be restored with no potential for significant effects.

9.5 Existing Environment

Existing Baseline

9.5.1 The full list of known heritage assets within the Study Areas is presented in the Gazetteer (**Appendix 9.1**, Annex 1). The cultural significance of these assets is discussed by period in the Statement of Significance and Importance section of **Appendix 9.1**.

Geology and Geomorphology

9.5.2 The Site, which covers an area of 1911.74 hectares (ha), is located on the slopes of the higher summits of Ceann a Mhaim (671 m AOD) and Mam a Chroisg (714 m AOD), which

includes the sub-peak of Carn nan Mhic Raonuill (550m AOD) and the ridges and slopes of Druim a' Chathair and Meall Damh. The northern part of the Site slopes steeply down towards the A887, whilst the eastern aspect is more gently sloping with occasional plateaus.

9.5.3 The bedrock geology across the Site comprises Metamorphic Tarvie Psammite Formation – Psammite (BGS). Superficial deposits are recorded by the BGS as Till, Devensian – Diamicton formed during the Quaternary period to the north east, and peat in the central parts of the Site.

9.5.4 The National Soils Map of Scotland variously records soils within the Site as:

- Peaty gleys with peaty rankers with dystrophic semi-confined peat;
- Peaty gleyed podzols with dystrophic semi-confined peat with peaty gleys;
- Subalpine podzols with dystrophic blanket peat; and
- Dystrophic blanket peat.

9.5.5 The geomorphology of the Site primarily consists of upland hillside with exposed bedrock hillocks crossed by watercourses and covered with moorland and bog.

Overview of the Historic Environment

Site Boundary

9.5.6 There are 10 features of heritage interest identified within the Site in **Appendix 9.1**. Of these, one is discounted from further assessment as it is of Negligible importance; nine known heritage assets within the Site are therefore assessed for direct and indirect physical impacts as a result of the Proposed Development.

9.5.7 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site.

9.5.8 The Highland Council HER records eight non-designated assets within the Site.

9.5.9 One asset is of uncertain date:

- MHG53256 Four stone boxes, interpreted as possible Prehistoric cists, which may be modern shooting butts.

9.5.10 Seven assets are of post-medieval origin:

- MHG53757 cairn rows built by mourners to rest a coffin on their journey from Glen Garry to the graveyard near Achlain;
- MHG56580 possible shieling hut;
- MHG10488/14310 Military road, the route of which partially overlaps with the Site boundary;
- MHG23081 Possible township, comprising four unroofed buildings, one of which is shown on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (OS) map (1:2500, surveyed 1871 published 1874);
- MHG34949 Military road bridge over the Allt an Eoin burn;
- MHG54904 a turf and stone enclosure; and
- MHG54905 a possible rectangular building.

9.5.11 In the course of this assessment one further feature has been identified within the Site from the study of modern OS mapping: HA2 17x sheep pens on the flood plain of the River Moriston (**Appendix 9.1**).

Outer Study Area

9.5.12 Within the 2 km OSA (from the proposed turbine locations), including the Site boundary, there are two non-designated heritage assets.

9.5.13 Within the 2-5 km OSA (from the proposed turbine locations) there are seven Scheduled Monuments, one Category A Listed Building and one Category B Listed Building.

9.5.14 Within the 5-10 km OSA (from the proposed turbine locations) there are 12 Scheduled Monuments and three Category A Listed Buildings (one of which is a Property in Care).

9.5.15 Within the 10-20 km OSA (from the proposed turbine locations) there are six Scheduled Monuments, and three Category A Listed Buildings.

9.5.16 No heritage assets have been identified beyond the defined OSA requiring Stage 1 assessment.

9.5.17 See **Appendix 9.1** (Section 6.2 and Annex 1) for detailed consideration of heritage assets within the OSA.

Archaeological Potential

9.5.18 Most of the known heritage assets of all periods in the study area are concentrated in the valleys of Glen Moriston and Glen Garry. Settlement and domestic remains are concentrated on the sheltered lower ground and associated with the resources of the rivers, including the more fertile floodplains. The remainder of the known heritage assets relate to the Government works associated with the Jacobite uprisings in the 18th century, specifically General Wade's military road (MHG14088/143130) (**Figure 9.1**), the route of which borders the Site to the north-west, and part of which may meander into and out of the Site boundary at two discrete locations, one of which includes a contemporary arched bridge (MHG34949). These lower elevations of the Site are therefore of potential for further and hitherto unknown archaeological remains.

9.5.19 There is no evidence that the Site has ever been enclosed or improved and the proposed turbines are located across hills that are unsuitable for settlement due to thin soils and exposure to the elements. In addition, the area is crossed by numerous watercourses and characterised as bog which is unsuitable even for shieling activity due to its inaccessibility. Accordingly, the area is currently suitable for grazing and shooting. Given the steep topography and thin soils, indicated by outcropping bedrock, it is assumed that this would have been the case throughout prehistory and the historical periods also, and the area has never been suitable for settlement. The Site has been subject (in full or in part) to five previous walkover surveys by Headland Archaeology, in 2003, 2007, 2008, 2014, and again in 2024 for this assessment. No evidence for human habitation has been discovered. The absence of settlement suggests there would be an absence of hitherto unknown (subsurface) Prehistoric funerary remains, which tend to be intervisible with settlements. In the absence of later/modern activity (such as ploughing or forestry etc), any important preserved archaeological remains would be expected to remain visible, surviving as upstanding

features. Past human activity on the Site may not be entirely discounted, perhaps taking the form of transient activities (hunting, herding) that have not left any physical evidence.

9.5.20 The archaeological potential of the turbine area is therefore considered to be negligible for previously unrecorded sites of cultural heritage interest of all periods. This is reflected in the implemented programme of mitigation that was agreed with the Council during construction of the operational Millennium Wind Farm, which concentrated on groundworks in the lower elevations only – nevertheless, the watching brief, maintained in eight discrete areas during the wind farm construction, identified no archaeological remains.

9.5.21 It is considered that any previously unrecorded remains of any period, if present within the Site preserved beneath peat, are likely to be of no more than Low (Local) importance; most likely to relate only to upland grazing or hunting activity. Any intrinsic evidence of previously unknown activity would be unlikely to contribute to the Highland Archaeological Research Framework objectives.

Heritage Assets Considered for Setting Effects

9.5.22 A 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment has been carried out to consider whether further detailed assessment is required for heritage assets within the Site and OSA, based on whether it is likely that their cultural significance could be harmed through development within their setting. Results are presented in **Appendix 9.1** (Section 6.2 and Annex 1).

9.5.23 Following consultation, the 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment found the potential for effects through changes within their setting on the cultural significance of two Scheduled Monuments (see **Figure 9.2**):

- Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus
- Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge

9.5.24 These assets are assessed in detail in this chapter, supported with photomontage and wireline visualisations in:

- **Volume 2b:**
  - **LVIA Viewpoint 12**: Old Military Road north of the A87. (Photomontage from centre of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890 m W of Ceannacroc Lodge); and
  - **LVIA Viewpoint 17**: Loch Cluanie. (Photomontage from Loch Cluanie car park on A87 to the west of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890 m W of Ceannacroc Lodge).
- **Volume 2d:**
  - **CHVP01 Figure 9.3**: Photomontage from Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus;
  - **CHVP02 Figure 9.4**: Photomontage from valley of the River Oich looking north-west towards Scheduled Monument SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus; and

- **CHVP03 Figure 9.5**: Photomontage from eastern end of Scheduled Monument SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890 m W of Ceannacroc Lodge.

9.6 Assessment of Effects

Potential Construction Effects

9.6.1 Development activities within the Site have the potential to truncate or remove buried archaeological remains, resulting in a direct impact on these assets. Direct physical impacts may occur during construction as a result of intrusive groundworks, comprising enabling works including habitat management, any areas of cut and fill, bulk excavation and topsoil stripping, site compound establishment, and excavations for turbine and crane footings, access tracks and utilities.

9.6.2 Accidental direct physical impacts within the Site may arise should activities such as, but not limited to, ancillary drainage works and uncontrolled plant movement take place in the vicinity of heritage assets. The micrositing tolerance of 50 m for the Proposed Development infrastructure is also used as a proportionate study area/proximity for the assessment of possible accidental impacts upon heritage assets during the construction phase.

9.6.3 Indirect impacts describe secondary processes, triggered by the Proposed Development, that lead to the degradation or preservation of heritage assets. For example, changes to hydrology may affect archaeological preservation.

Direct and Indirect Physical Impacts within the Site

Known Heritage Assets

9.6.4 There are nine known heritage assets (of a minimum **Low** importance) located within the Site boundary (**Table 9.5**).

Table 9.5: Known Heritage Assets Within the Site

Ref	Name	Description	E	N	Status	Period	Impor-tance
MHG53256	Cists - Carn Mhic Raonuill	Four 'cist-like' stone box structures. Poss shooting butts	229350	807901	Non-designated	Uncertain	Low
MHG53757	Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows	25 cairns set out in rows, up to four wide. Local tradition suggests that the site was a resting place for coffins being brought for burial at the old cemetery near Achlain.	228117	809093	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low

Ref	Name	Description	E	N	Status	Period	Importance
MHG56580	Possible shieling hut	The remains of a sub-rectangular building	225374	811499	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low
143130 / MHG14088	Military Road	Route mapped from 1st edition OS, where precursor to modern road meanders in and out of the Site boundary	225903	811860	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Medium
MHG23081	Creagan Na H-Atha	Four unroofed buildings and one enclosure depicted on the current edition of the OS map	225590	811760	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low
MHG34949	Military road bridge over Allt an Eoin	Arched bridge associated with MHG14088	225000	811446	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low
MHG54904	Enclosure, Creag an Fheoir	Turf and stone enclosure associated with MHG54905	225081	811355	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low
MHG54905	Possible building, Creag an Fheoir	Rectangular building footings	225122	811344	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low
HA2	Sheep pens	17 sheep pens on the flood plain of the River Moriston on modern OS	225020	811637	Non-designated	Post Medieval	Low

9.6.5 No heritage assets within the Site would be subject to a direct or indirect physical impact during the construction phase as a result of Proposed Development infrastructure (**Figure 9.1**).

9.6.6 The location of known heritage assets is considered in the outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (oBEMP) proposals (**Appendix 6.7**), which has the potential for physical impacts upon above- and below-ground cultural heritage remains. All known extents of heritage assets considered in the EIA are avoided in oBEMP proposals. The only coincidence of known heritage assets and oBEMP proposals are at MHG34949 Military road bridge over Allt an Eoin, where riparian woodland planting is proposed. It would not be practical for trees to be planted on a stone-built bridge over a watercourse, and no direct or indirect physical impact is anticipated.

Accidental Impacts and Micrositing

9.6.7 There are two known heritage assets within the Site that lie within the 50 m micrositing tolerance for the Proposed Development (**Figure 9.1**):

- MHG56580 Possible shieling hut - S of Glenmoriston; and
- MHG53757 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows.

9.6.8 Possible shieling hut MHG56580 is located *c*.7 m west of the existing Millennium Wind Farm access track which would be used during construction for the Proposed Development. As the track is already established, micrositing in this area is not anticipated; however, through accidental impact the Proposed Development could potentially result in a High adverse magnitude impact on the building remains MHG56580, an asset of Low importance, resulting in an adverse effect of **Minor** significance, which is **Not Significant**.

9.6.9 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows MHG53757 are located *c*.35 m north of Turbine 3 and its hardstanding. Depending on the extent of micrositing or accidental damage, it is concluded that the Proposed Development could potentially result in a High adverse magnitude impact on MHG53757, an asset of Low importance, resulting in an adverse effect of M**inor** significance, which is **Not Significant**.

Archaeological Potential

9.6.10 Effect significance cannot be fully assessed for unknown heritage assets, as neither the cultural significance of the asset, importance, nor the magnitude of the impact is known. This assessment uses the precautionary principle and assumes an occurrence of unexpected archaeological remains in a reasonable worst-case scenario. Therefore, this section assesses construction effects on archaeological potential.

9.6.11 In the lower elevations of the Site, construction for the Proposed Development will utilise existing infrastructure of the operational Millennium Wind Farm, with no required works that would be likely to result in physical impacts upon hitherto unknown archaeological remains.

9.6.12 The higher elevations are considered to hold negligible archaeological potential for hitherto unknown subsurface archaeological remains of all periods.

9.6.13 The assessment of archaeological potential has identified that any remains may be of up to Low importance. If such unexpected remains are present and discovered during construction phase groundworks, this may result in a construction-phase physical impact of up to High adverse magnitude. An adverse effect resulting from a physical impact upon unexpected archaeological remains discovered during construction-phase may therefore be of up to **Minor** significance, which is **Not Significant**.

Potential Operational Effects

9.6.14 As agreed with the Council and HES through submission of **Appendix 9.1**, potential operational effects of the Proposed Development upon the settings of two Scheduled Monuments is assessed in detail in this section.

9.6.15 Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs), also agreed with the Council and HES and illustrative of views towards, across or from heritage assets considered for setting effects, are shown on **Figure 9.2**. Assessments are supported with photomontages and wirelines from the CHVPs (**Volume 2d: Figures 9.3** to **9.5** and **Volume 2b: LVIA Viewpoints 12 & 17**).

9.6.16 All other heritage assets within the OSA are proportionately considered for potential operational effects in **Appendix 9.1** (Annex 1). No likely significant effects are anticipated, and these assets are not considered further in this chapter.

SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus

9.6.17 The form and size of the Scheduled Monument suggests it represents the remains of a small fort, probably of Iron Age date.

9.6.18 As a Scheduled Monument the fort is of high (national) importance.

9.6.19 The Atlas of Hillforts of Britain and Ireland (2016) describes the physical preserved remains as follows:

"Occupying a rocky knoll above a precipitous crag that falls away abruptly into the valley of the River Oich on the [east], this small fortification displays three roughly concentric lines of defence. The inner encloses the very summit of the knoll and measures 19 m from NNE to SSW by about 10 m transversely (0.02ha) within a heavily-vitrified wall reduced to a mound of rubble in excess of 3.5 m in thickness where it is best preserved on the [north] and [west] flanks. The entrance is not visible, though probably on the [south-west] and the only feature that can be seen within the heavily overgrown interior is an old excavation trench transecting the northern end. The second line of defence is a wall that extends around the shoulder of the summit area to enclose a larger area measuring about 38 m along the same axis by a maximum of 18 m transversely (0.06ha). Though reduced to a scarp everywhere except the [north], in 1974 the OS surveyors were still able to trace the line of the outer face discontinuously round the whole circuit, but the only vitrified stones visible appeared to have tumbled from the innermost wall above. The entrance is on the [south-west], where a gully drops down the slope to the rear of the third line, yet another wall, extending around the foot of the knoll on the [north-west] and [south]. Again, the OS observed a run of the inner face and a few outer facing-stones on the [north-west]; here this third wall is about 1.7 m in thickness, possibly increasing to about 3 m adjacent to the entrance on the [south]. The sequence of construction is uncertain, though on the grounds that the middle wall seemed to be more heavily reduced than the inner, and that none of the pieces of vitrified stone they found on the lower walls appeared to be in situ, the OS were of the opinion that the inner enclosure on the summit had been inserted into an earlier fort."

9.6.20 Intrinsically, therefore, the fort has the potential to reveal information about variations in architecture and use, as well as the character of late prehistoric fortifications.

9.6.21 Associatively it can be compared and contrasted to other small forts in elevated locations in Inverness-shire, such as SM4567 Levishie Cottage fort and earthwork which overlooks Glenmoriston only 13 km north of SM764, and to the many others occurring all over the Highland zone of Scotland to create an understanding of regional identity and society. No other contemporary monuments which may have been intervisible with the fort have been identified.

9.6.22 Contextually, the fort would probably have been the stronghold of a relatively small group, who monitored and controlled the agricultural land overlooked by the fort. Its commanding views over the valley of the River Oich (part of the "Great Glen") to the east, south and south-west would have comprised the fort's hinterland. Reciprocally, the fort may have been placed

to be readily visible on approach along this valley by way of claiming visible ownership/control of its resources. Access to the fort is from the south-west, overlooked by an area of bare rock flanked by near-vertical cliffs.

9.6.23 It is therefore the Great Glen and the south-eastern approach, and views over these areas, that contribute contextually to the fort's cultural significance.

9.6.24 From the fort itself, **Photomontage CHVP01 (Volume 2d: Figure 9.3)** shows that the hubs of two turbines and the blade tips of three further turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible, albeit currently largely screened by intervening plantation (thus subject to felling). No turbine bases would be visible. The nearest visible turbine of the Proposed Development, Turbine 7, would be located 4.9 km to the west-northwest of the monument. At present, the hubs of five turbines along with the blade tips of a further eight turbines of the operational Millennium Wind Farm are visible from this viewpoint, located to the south of the Proposed Development. The high-point of the monument itself is visible in the foreground in **Figure 9.3b** and this visualisation sequence illustrates the prominent position that the fort occupies, overlooking the valley of the River Oich (**Figure 9.3b-d**). The Proposed Development would be visible in the opposite direction to these important views (**Figure 9.3a & f**).

9.6.25 From the Great Glen, alongside the River Oich which would have been exploited by the inhabitants of the fort, as well as controlling access along the travel corridor and to its resources, **Photomontage CHVP02 (Volume 2d: Figure 9.4)** shows that the fort is visible on the horizon, albeit largely currently obscured by intervening trees in the valley bottom. N.B. this is the only accessible location identified where the Proposed Development and the fort would be visible in combination. There is no location from the more readily accessible tow path of the Caledonian Canal where this would be possible. The hubs of two turbines and the blade tips of one further turbine of the Proposed Development would theoretically be visible over the horizon to the north of the monument, were they not obscured by intervening trees in the valley bottom. No turbine bases would be visible. At present, the hubs of three turbines of the operational Millennium Wind Farm are visible from this viewpoint. As illustrated by the visualisation, the Proposed Development would be offset from the position of the fort on the horizon and the tip of Turbine 7 would appear lower than the fort, thus the prominent position of the monument would not be challenged.

9.6.26 As summarised above, the context of the fort is provided through invisibility with the River Oich valley. Modern development would be identified as adversely impacting the monument's cultural significance should it obscure the relationship that is apparent in views from the fort; i.e. overlooking and monitoring this fertile valley and its resources, as well the reciprocal views from the valley; in which the fort would be prominently visible and clearly intentionally positioned to control these resources. As is demonstrated in **Photomontage CHVP01 (Volume 2d: Figure 9.3)**, this would not be the case. The Proposed Development would appear in a different part of the landscape that is not related to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the fort's cultural significance.

9.6.27 With the modern public access from the north, and fort's entrance to the south-west, there is no suggestion that views would be guided in the direction of the Proposed Development at any point such that these may be considered important.

9.6.28 It would remain possible to understand how the fort functioned in relation to this valley and its resources. The Proposed Development would not interfere in the relationship between the monument and the surrounding landscape which comprise the fort's sphere of influence. The prominence of the fort's earthworks would be preserved, and the intentionally prominent landscape position would be remain evident to be understood, appreciated and experienced.

9.6.29 It is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM794 Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **Not Significant**.

9.6.30 In terms of NPF4 Policy 7(h), the understanding, appreciation and experience of the Scheduled Monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected. Whilst the Proposed Development would change views from the monument, it would remain possible to understand, appreciate and experience factors of its setting that contribute to its cultural significance.

SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, 1890m W of Ceannacroc Lodge

9.6.31 The monument is a stretch of military road along and near to the base of the valley of Glenmoriston. Originally a drove route from Skye and Glenelg, this routeway was utilised and metalled for General Wade's troops, carts and artillery. Orientated east-northeast to west-southwest, it continues (unscheduled) to bound the west and pass north of the Site and continues onwards to Fort Augustus. Thomas Telford chose to bypass the section above Loch Cluanie as it was too steep for carriages; his 1808-11 route now carries the A87/A877.

9.6.32 The scheduled stretch of road is of high (national) importance. The area identified for scheduling includes the longest, best-surviving contiguous stretch of the road, and an area in which evidence for its construction and use may survive. The unscheduled sections nearer to the Site are of according low (local) importance as they are less well preserved or readily appreciable.

9.6.33 The preserved scheduled remains comprise a grass and heather-covered trackway, however water erosion has washed out much of the original road fabric. The stretch of road is about 6 km long and averages 5.3 m in width, with occasional stretches of revetment on the lower side. A number of early drainage features survive; principally well-made cobbled and paved fords in differing states of preservation. The 1962 Garry-Moriston Hydro-Electric Power Scheme dammed the loch, and part of the military road near Ceannacroc Bridge was damaged when converted into an access road.

9.6.34 While around 1800 km of military roads were built in Scotland between 1724 and 1780, very few stretches survive with any original features intact as most were later reused as public roads. Only two other significantly long stretches are presently preserved as scheduled monuments. The HES description for SM11484 identifies that in the vicinity, a further short stretch of the Fort Augustus-Bernera military road which preserves two bridges is also proposed for scheduling.

9.6.35 Major William Caulfeild built the Fort Augustus-Bernera military road in 1748-53 to link the Hanoverian garrison at Fort Augustus to the barracks in Glenelg 70 km to the west. Caulfeild's road appears on Roy's military survey of 1747-55. The road ceased to be maintained after 1784 as the Jacobite threat dissipated. Two historical elements can be understood through

the preserved intrinsic qualities of the military road: its original use as a drovers' route, highlighting the importance of agriculture to the Highlands; and its relationship with the Jacobite uprisings and means by which the Crown sought to exert control over the Highlands. Intrinsically, therefore, its significance lies primarily in its physical remains and its historical function. The physical remains have the potential to enhance our understanding of the construction and development of 18th-century military roads. The better-preserved sections are of national importance because of the potential to add to understanding of the Jacobite-Hanoverian era in Scotland. It retains characteristics which continue to impact on the modern landscape, the loss of or damage to the which would diminish the capacity of the class of military roads to contribute to our understanding of 18th-century Scotland.

9.6.36 Associatively, the road was built as part of a wider strategy of arteries for use by an army of occupation to control the Scottish Highlands. General Wade devised the form and materials used by Major Caulfeild in the first programme of road building (1724-5), such as standardised width and particular construction technique. The intended use of the monument would have had a significant effect on the people who used the road and those people they intended to subjugate. The literary pair Dr Johnson and Mr Boswell followed the route in 1773, and its association with these popular historical figures is remembered today.

9.6.37 The requirement to link two of the Hanoverian barracks (position decided in 1717) determined the location of the stretch of road through Glenmoriston. It is considered that the glen therefore contributes to the significance of the road. Contextually, as a former drove road, the military road would not appear to have been specifically strategically routed, but instead followed a viable and accessible topographical line, and met the requirements of General Wade's preference for the most direct routes. The unscheduled part of the road that bounds the Site (now preserved as the A887) is located on lower ground just above the River Moriston floodplain, with no visual, strategic or historical relationship to the uplands comprising the Site contributing to its significance. The route demonstrates the need for the movement of livestock through the glen and, later, troops that would have traversed the glen in the 18th century. Fort Augustus, served by the military road, is not visible from the scheduled section of road SM11484, nor from the unscheduled section which bounds the Site; this relationship is thus not experienced in the landscape, but is evident from the study of mapping and historical records.

9.6.38 Three sequential photomontages are provided to illustrate the assessment understanding, appreciation and experience of the linear nature of the road, described on approach towards Fort Augustus/the Proposed Development site, from west to east, along Glenmoriston.

9.6.39 **Photomontage LVIA Viewpoint 17: Loch Cluanie (Volume 2b)** is not located on the scheduled section of the military road, but on the modern A87 which follows its route, 1.9 km to the west of the scheduled section where Telford's A87 diverts from utilising the route of the earlier road. The visualisation shows that on approach from the west, initially the hubs of three turbines and the blade tips of one further turbine of the Proposed Development would be visible over the distant horizon beyond Loch Clunie. No turbine bases would be visible. The nearest visible turbine of the Proposed Development, the blade tips of Turbine 1, would be located 12.9 km to the east-southeast from this viewpoint. In this visualisation, the continuation of the military road is on an east-northeast alignment. At present, two turbines

of the operational Millennium Wind Farm are visible to hub height from this viewpoint, to the south of the Proposed Development.

9.6.40 **Photomontage LVIA Viewpoint 12: Old Military Road (Volume 2b)** is positioned halfway along the eastern half of the scheduled section of the military road. The visualisation shows that on onward travel along the military road towards the east from the A87, the hubs of five turbines and the blade tips of one further turbine of the Proposed Development would come into view over the horizon. No turbine bases would be visible. The nearest visible turbine of the Proposed Development, Turbine 1, would be located 7.5 km to the south-east of the monument. In this visualisation, the military road is visible as a metalled surface which meanders over the hillside towards the horizon on a north-easterly alignment. At present, two turbines of the operational Millennium Wind Farm are visible to hub height from this viewpoint, to the south of the Proposed Development.

9.6.41 **Photomontage CHVP03 (Volume 2d, Figure 9.5)** is positioned at the eastern end of the scheduled section of the military road, where is descends into Glenmoriston, at a relative topographical high-point and with views unobstructed by trees. The visualisation shows that at this point whilst traversing the road, the hubs of five turbines and the blade tips of two further turbines of the Proposed Development would come into view. One turbine base (Turbine 8) would potentially be visible at a distance of 7.3 km. The nearest visible turbine of the Proposed Development, Turbine 1, would be located 6.5 km to the south-east of the monument. In this visualisation, the military road is faintly visible on the ground surface as it continues down the slope into Glenmoriston on an easterly alignment. At present, four turbines of the operational Millennium Wind Farm are visible to hub height from this viewpoint, to the south of the Proposed Development.

9.6.42 SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road follows a natural travel corridor through the landscape provided by the valley of the River Moriston. The position of the road is defined by the topography of the valley, providing the least arduous route, above the water line of Loch Cluanie, and enabling passage from the west coast towards Fort Augustus. Historically, the route was first used for driving stock, later for military purposes, and is today followed by the A87, which reflects the fact that the setting of the route is an entirely practical one; views of the wider upland landscape do not therefore contribute to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the monument. Although utilised for military function in the 18th century, no ‘strategic’/defensive key views are identified as contributing to the military road’s cultural significance which may be affected.

9.6.43 The Proposed Development would not interrupt or divert the route of the droveway/military road. With all of the proposed turbines located above the 500 m contour, the Proposed Development would clearly be located in a differentiated and distinct upland landscape from the parts of its setting that contribute to its significance, with no contextual relationship with the road. The Proposed Development would appear over the horizon, located on a part of the landscape that is not intervisible with the military road. Although there would be visibility of the Proposed Development from it, this would not impact on the monument’s cultural significance, or an understanding, appreciation and experience of a travel corridor along Glenmoriston.

9.6.44 It is considered that visibility of the operational Millennium Wind Farm has no impact on an understanding, appreciation or experience of the cultural significance the Scheduled

Monument, and similarly the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM11484 Fort Augustus-Bernera Military Road, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **Not Significant**.

9.6.45 In terms of NPF4 Policy 7(h), the understanding, appreciation and experience of the Scheduled Monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected. Whilst the Proposed Development would change views from the monument, it would remain possible to understand, appreciate and experience factors of its setting that contribute to its cultural significance.

9.6.46 This was confirmed by HES at Scoping: *"Parts of turbines may appear in the distance on the skyline, particularly from stretches of the Fort Augustus-Bernera military road [SM11484]. However, the turbines would not be in any key views for [the] monument, and would be at such a distance that the integrity of setting ... would not be affected."* HES has since confirmed that their position on this has not changed.

Potential Decommissioning Effects

9.6.47 The assessment of decommissioning effects of the Proposed Development is scoped out of this chapter with the agreement of consultees.

9.7 Mitigation

Design Considerations

9.7.1 The preferred mitigation option in respect of direct, physical impacts is always to avoid or reduce impacts through design.

9.7.2 See design evolution and the embedded mitigation measures by design in **Chapter 2: Proposed Development**. The proposed infrastructure layout has been designed to avoid impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site identified through **Appendix 9.1**.

Best Practice Measures

9.7.3 An Outline CEMP has been prepared and is included in **Appendix 2.1**. The oCEMP includes best-practice measures to mitigate any direct physical impacts upon hitherto unknown heritage assets, or accidental impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site during construction.

9.7.4 Good practice guidance in Part 6 (Historic Environment/Archaeology) of NatureScot's Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction (NatureScot, 2019) is also adhered to in the CEMP.

Additional Construction Mitigation

9.7.5 The preferred mitigation option in respect of direct physical impacts is always to avoid or reduce impacts through design (embedded mitigation), or through precautionary measures such as fencing off of heritage assets during construction works. Impacts which cannot be eliminated in these ways would lead to residual effects.

9.7.6 Where construction impacts are unavoidable, these would be offset by excavation and recording of the remains in accordance with NPF4 Policy 7(o) and PAN2/2011, sections 25-27, and the Council's HwLDP Policy 57.

9.7.7 The scope and nature of additional mitigation would be outlined in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and agreed with the Council in advance of construction.

9.7.8 Further guidance on appropriate mitigation can be found at Part 6 (Historic Environment/Archaeology) of NatureScot's Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction (NatureScot, 2019).

Direct and Indirect Physical Impacts within the Site

Known Heritage Assets

9.7.9 No direct or indirect physical impacts upon any known heritage assets are identified.

Micrositing

9.7.10 Should micrositing be required, proposed amendments to the development layout would be reviewed by a professional and experienced archaeological consultant in relation to the baseline information presented in this chapter. Micrositing would be designed to avoid direct or indirect physical impacts to the following heritage assets:

- MHG56580 Possible shieling hut - S of Glenmoriston
- MHG53757 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows

9.7.11 No direct or indirect physical impacts are therefore anticipated as a result of micrositing. However, any unavoidable construction impacts as a result of micrositing would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological fieldwork. Further consultation with the Council would be required in this event.

Accidental Impacts

9.7.12 Risk of accidental physical impacts would be minimised through fencing-off the following heritage assets throughout construction:

- MHG56580 Possible shieling hut - S of Glenmoriston; and
- MHG53757 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows.

Archaeological Potential

9.7.13 The archaeological potential of the turbine area is considered to be negligible for previously unrecorded sites of cultural heritage interest of all periods. It is considered that any previously unrecorded remains of any period, if present within the Site preserved beneath peat, are likely to be of no more than Low (Local) importance; most likely to relate only to upland grazing or shooting activity, which is therefore considered 'worst case' for the impact assessment of archaeological potential.

9.7.14 Direct physical impacts on unexpected archaeological remains may be of up to M**inor** adverse significance, which is **Not Significant**. No mitigation is proposed. This is reflected in the implemented programme of mitigation that was agreed with the Council during construction of the operational Millennium Wind Farm, which concentrated on groundworks

in the lower elevations only – nevertheless, the watching brief, maintained in eight discrete areas during the wind farm construction, identified no archaeological remains.

Additional Operation Mitigation

9.7.15 No significant adverse operational effects are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development and no additional mitigation beyond the applied mitigation embedded in the design to minimise effects upon the historic environment is proposed.

9.8 Residual Effects

Residual Construction Effects

9.8.1 Following the implementation of proposed mitigation, by protection with fencing of MHG56580 Possible shieling hut - S of Glenmoriston and MHG53757 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows throughout construction, there would be **no residual physical construction phase effects** which is **Not Significant**.

Residual Operational Effects

9.8.2 In respect of the setting of heritage assets, **no significant residual operational effects** are anticipated which is **Not Significant**.

9.9 Cumulative Effects

Cumulative Construction Effects

9.9.1 There is no potential for cumulative construction effects on any known or unknown and previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets. Any effects would be contained within the Site boundary, and none will be further directly impacted by any other developments outside this area.

Cumulative Operational Effects

9.9.2 Cumulative operational effects can occur when the contribution made to the cultural significance of a heritage asset by its setting is directly altered by the Proposed Development in combination with other developments. The assessment of effects uses the same methodology applied in considering the likely effects of Proposed Development alone. All analysis of asset significance and the contribution made by setting remains unchanged. All that is altered is the nature of change predicted for the one or more scenarios under consideration.

9.9.3 Cumulative operational effects are considered in cases where an effect of minor or greater operational significance has been predicted as a result of the Proposed Development. In terms of operational impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets in the study area through development within their setting, no adverse effects are anticipated, therefore **no cumulative effects** are therefore possible.

9.10 Summary of Effects

9.10.1 **Table 9.6** provides a summary of the conclusions of the impact assessment with respect to cultural heritage taking into consideration embedded and any additional mitigation measures.

Table 9.6: Summary of Effects

Effect	Phase	Assessment Consequence	Effect Significance
Direct and indirect (physical) impact upon known heritage assets within the Site	Construction	None identified. No additional mitigation proposed.	Not Significant
Potential micro-siting/accidental direct and indirect (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site	Construction	Any unavoidable construction impacts as a result of micrositing would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological fieldwork. Further consultation with the Council would be required in this event. It is proposed that the risk of accidental physical impacts is minimised through the fencing off of the following heritage assets throughout the construction phase for the Proposed Development: • MHG56580 Possible shieling hut - S of Glenmoriston • MHG53757 Ceann a' Mhaim Cairn Rows Fencing would be in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and agreed with the Council in advance of construction, a matter which the Applicant agrees can be secured as a condition of consent. Following implementation of additional mitigation - None identified	Not Significant
Direct (physical) impact upon unexpected archaeological remains within the Site (archaeological potential)	Construction	None identified. No additional mitigation proposed.	Not Significant
Operational effects on cultural significance of heritage assets through	Operation	None identified. No additional mitigation proposed.	Not Significant

Effect	Phase	Assessment Consequence	Effect Significance
development within their setting			
Cumulative Effects	Construction	None identified	Not Significant
	Operation	None identified	Not Significant

9.11 References

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2019). Code of Conduct

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020a). Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020b). Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment

Highland Council (2012). Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP)

Historic Environment Scotland (2023). Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment

Historic Environment Scotland (2016). Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting

Historic Environment Scotland (2019a). Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS)

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b). Designation Policy and Selection Guidance

IEMA, IHBC and CIfA (2021). Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK

NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland (2018). Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook

NatureScot (2019). Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction

Scottish Government (1979). The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act

Scottish Government (1997). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act

Scottish Government (2011). Planning Advice Note (PAN) 02/2011: Planning and Archaeology

Scottish Government (2014). The Historic Environment Scotland Act

Scottish Government (2023). National Planning Framework NPF4

UK Government (1989). The Electricity Act

UK Government (2017). The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations