

## Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage



# Chapter 10

## Cultural Heritage

### Introduction

**10.1** This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment, or, in the terminology of the EIA Regulation, cultural heritage. Cultural heritage comprises "the physical evidence for human activity that connects people with place, linked with the associations we can see, feel and understand."<sup>1</sup> Its constituent parts are known as 'heritage assets'.<sup>2</sup> These can be tangible features, buildings, or places or intangible stories, traditions and concepts<sup>3</sup> that provide physical evidence of past human activity and hold of sufficient value (i.e. cultural significance) to this and future generations to merit consideration in the planning system.<sup>4</sup> This assessment therefore focuses on if, and how, the Proposed Development will change the cultural significance of heritage assets within and around it.

**10.2** Relevant heritage assets are also discussed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) presented in **Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity** of this EIA Report. The LVIA focuses on a development's visibility from a location, such as a heritage asset, and the effect that visibility has on visitors to that location; in other words on visual amenity. In contrast, the cultural heritage assessment focuses on effects to the cultural significance of heritage assets. Each assessment therefore considers different types of receptors (people vs. cultural significance) and effects, and can come to differing conclusions on levels of effect relating to the same receptor.

**10.3** This chapter is supported by two figures which are referenced throughout the text. These figures are as follows:

- **Figure 10.1: The location of heritage assets in the Inner Study Area;** and
- **Figure 10.2: The location of designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area and those beyond the study area whose setting may be affected by the Proposed Development.**

**10.4** The following appendices are also referred to throughout the chapter:

- **Appendix 10.1: Historic Environment Assessment (HEA;** including wireframes and photomontage in **Appendix C).**

**10.5** Planning policies of relevance to this assessment are provided in **Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework.**

**10.6** The cultural heritage assessment was undertaken by LUC. The assessment has been authored by LUC (see **Appendix 1.1: Statement of Expertise).**

**10.7** The following terminology will be referred to throughout this chapter:

- **Heritage asset:** A physical element of the historic environment – a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having cultural significance.
- **Designated heritage asset:** Designation highlights a building, site, monument or area's special interest and value to this and future generations and gives it protection under law or policy. Such heritage assets meet the relevant designation criteria provided in Annexes 1-6 of Historic Environment Policy for Scotland<sup>5</sup> or, in the case of World Heritage Sites, are of outstanding universal value and meet one of the published criteria; their value has therefore been established through the designation process. Designated heritage assets relevant to this assessment comprise:
  - **Scheduled monument:** This is a monument included on the schedule of monuments compiled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, as amended. It is a criminal offence to undertake works affecting a scheduled monument without written consent from Historic Environment Scotland (HES), on behalf of Scottish Ministers.
  - **Listed building:** This is a building of special architectural or historic interest included in the statutory list compiled under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended ('the 1997 Act'). Any building or structure or any part of a building, (or any building or structure falling within the curtilage of a listed building and dating prior to 1948) may be listed. Listed status protects a building (or structure) against unauthorised demolition, alteration or

extension. It ensures that its special interest is taken into account when proposals are put forward which affect its character or appearance.

- **Conservation area:** This is an area of special architectural or historic interest designated by local planning authorities under powers delegated by the 1997 Act, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.
- **Non-designated heritage asset:** These are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of their heritage interest but which do not meet the criteria for designation. These can include those identified by a local planning authority as having 'local interest'.
- **Cultural significance:** The sum of the value(s) of receptors (heritage assets) is referred to in historic environment policy as their 'significance'. To avoid confusion with the EIA concept of the 'Significance of Effect' upon receptors, the significance of heritage assets will be termed their 'cultural significance'.
- **Setting:** Monuments, buildings, gardens and settlements were almost always placed and orientated deliberately, normally with reference to the surrounding topography, resources, landscape and other structures. 'Setting' is the way the current surroundings of a heritage asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced. Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or 'curtilage' of an individual heritage asset into a broader landscape context. Both tangible and less tangible elements can be important in understanding the setting. Less tangible elements may include function, sensory perceptions or the historical, artistic, literary and scenic associations of places or landscapes.
- **Zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV):** This is a computer-generated tool to identify the likely (or theoretical) extent of visibility of a development. The elevation(s) of a development is tested against a bare earth 3D terrain model which does not feature buildings, vegetation or other boundaries which may have a significant effect on the visibility of a development. In open terrain where there are few intervening features, a ZTV provides a reasonable representation of visibility. However, visibility from lowland rural areas is often affected by tree and hedgerow cover; whilst in developed areas, visibility is usually determined by intervening buildings.
- **Sensitivity** is a measure of how likely the cultural significance of a heritage asset is to be affected by a specific proposed change. This can relate to physical change (e.g. change/removal of historic fabric) or setting change (e.g. the introduction of a novel type of development or land use within the setting of a heritage asset that affects the contribution setting makes to the cultural significance of an asset).

### Scope of the Assessment Effects Assessed in Full

#### Study areas

**10.8** The following study areas have been defined in response to the potential for physical change to heritage assets, and to the Proposed Development's ZTV and an understanding of the distance over which significant effects arising from setting change are considered likely:

- A Primary Study Area comprising the footprint of the Proposed Development. All heritage assets located within the Primary Study Area have been considered for direct effects and setting effects where relevant.
- An Inner Study Area consisting of the land lying outwith the Primary Study Area to a distance of 5 kilometres (km). All heritage assets located within this study area have been considered for the potential for effects due to setting change.
- An Outer Study Area consisting of land between 5km and 10km from the Primary Study Area. Within this area all designated heritage assets identified as sensitive to setting change as a result of the Proposed Development have been assessed. Based

<sup>1</sup> HES, 2014. The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland, pp. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 'Heritage assets' are synonymous with the terms 'cultural heritage asset', 'historic asset', 'monument' or 'site'.

<sup>3</sup> SNH and HES, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, p.172, (2018).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p.175.

<sup>5</sup> Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (2019).

on professional judgement non-designated heritage assets beyond the Inner Study Area are not predicted to be sensitive to setting change as a result of the Proposed Development. This approach was agreed at Scoping with statutory consultees.

**10.9** Consideration has also been given to the potential for setting change to designated heritage assets beyond 10km.

#### Effects Scoped In

**10.10** The following effects have been assessed in full:

- Direct effects resulting from physical change to heritage assets within the Primary Study Area. Heritage assets beyond this study area are not at risk of direct physical change as a result of the Proposed Development.
- Direct effects to designated and non-designated heritage assets that are identified as being sensitive to setting change. These effects are considered in relation to different study areas as set out in above.
- Cumulative operational effects as a result of setting change.

#### Effects Scoped Out

**10.11** On the basis of the desk-based and field survey work undertaken, the professional judgement of the EIA team, experience from other relevant projects and policy guidance or standards, and feedback received from consultees, the following potential effects have been 'scoped out' of the assessment:

- Direct physical effects to heritage assets outside of the Primary Study Area;
- Direct effects to non-designated heritage assets beyond the Inner Study Area as a result of setting change;
- Cumulative effects to the cultural significance of heritage assets during construction as a result of setting change. (This is because such effects are temporary);
- Indirect physical effects on heritage assets of national, regional or local cultural heritage value as a consequence of vibration, dewatering or changes in hydrology (since such effects are unlikely, and will not be significant, given the scale and nature of the Proposed Development); and
- Cumulative physical effects (these are considered unlikely given the nature of the Proposed Development).

## Assessment Methodology

### Legislation, policy and Guidance

#### Legislation and policy

**10.12** This assessment is carried out in accordance with the principles contained within the following legislation:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979); and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act (1997).

**10.13** Relevant planning policy is covered in **Chapter 5**.

#### Guidance

**10.14** This assessment is carried out in accordance with the principles contained within the following guidance documents:

- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2022);<sup>6</sup>

- Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment CIfA (2020);<sup>7</sup>
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance Notes – setting (hereafter referred to as the HES setting guidance) (Historic Environment Scotland (HES), 2020);<sup>8</sup>
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance Notes – historic battlefields (hereafter referred to as the HES historic battlefield guidance) (HES, 2020);<sup>9</sup>
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019);<sup>10</sup>
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology;<sup>11</sup>
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (particularly the framework for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment provided in Appendix 1; hereafter this guidance is referred to as the EIA Handbook) (HES and Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), 2018);<sup>12</sup> and
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (PCHIA) in the UK (hereafter referred to as the PCHIA guidance) (CIfA, Institute of Historic Building Conservation and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2021);<sup>13</sup>

### Consultation

**10.15** In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the Scoping Responses and other consultation which has been undertaken as detailed in **Table 10.1**.

**Table 10.1: Consultation Responses**

| Consultee and Date  | Scoping/Other Consultation  | Issue Raised  | Response/Action Taken  |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Team 05/02/21 |                             | No response, beyond the formal Scoping opinion, was received.   |  |
| HES 22/02/21  | Formal Scoping Consultation | HES confirmed they are satisfied with the information presented in the Scoping Report and confirmed the proposed methodology set out in the Scoping Report and the approach to the assessment and are content with the potential impacts to be scoped in and out of the assessment. | Noted.   |
|   |                             | HES recommended that an appropriately detailed ZTV is used to identify potential setting impacts and welcomed that the Scoping Report indicates that a ZTV will be used.  | A ZTV and heritage assets with visibility of the Proposed Development is provided in <b>Figures 10.1</b> and <b>10.2</b> .                               |
|   |                             | HES would welcome further consultation around potential impacts and the requirement for visualisation as the design progresses and as draft visualisations are produced to allow more detailed advice at appropriate stages to be given.  | HES were invited to provide a consultation response to the final list of viewpoints along with draft wireframes (see HES 17/11/22 below).                |
|   |                             | HES recommended that a wireframe is produced to illustrate impacts on Comar Wood, Dun 830 metres (m) south-west of Comar  | Due to the evolution of the design, visibility has been reduced and Comar Wood, Dun 830m south-west of Comar Lodge (SM13578) now lies beyond the area of |

<sup>6</sup> CIfA, 2022. Code of conduct: professional ethics in archaeology. Available on line: <https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2022.pdf> [Accessed November 2022].

<sup>7</sup> CIfA, 2020. Standard and Guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. Available on line: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_4.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_4.pdf) [Accessed November 2022].

<sup>8</sup> HES, 2020. Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting. Available on line: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549> [Accessed November 2020]

<sup>9</sup> HES, 2020. Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Historic Battlefields. Available on line: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=b7a05b45-f2a9-4c71-8450-a60b0094c62e> [Accessed November 2020]

<sup>10</sup> HES, 2019. Designation Policy and Selection Guidance. Available on line: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b> [Accessed November 2022]

<sup>11</sup> Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and archaeology. Available on line: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/> [Accessed November 2022]

<sup>12</sup> HES and SNH, 2018. Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=6ed33b65-9df1-4a2f-acbb-a8e800a592c0> [Accessed November 2022]

<sup>13</sup> CIfA, Institute of Historic Building Conservation and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2021. Available on line: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/j30361\\_iema\\_principlesofchia\\_v8.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/j30361_iema_principlesofchia_v8.pdf). [Accessed November 2022].

| Consultee and Date  | Scoping/Other Consultation                                  | Issue Raised  | Response/Action Taken  |
|---|---|---|--|
| The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Team 05/02/21 |   | No response, beyond the formal Scoping opinion, was received.   |  |
|   |   | Lodge (SM13578) and stated that important views to the south-west appear likely to be affected by the Proposed Development.   | theoretical visibility. Review suggests that there would not be in-combination views that would change the cultural significance of the asset or the way it is experienced. As this asset has been scoped out of the assessment a visualisation has not been prepared. This has been agreed with HES (see below 17/ 11/ 22).   |
|   |   | HES recommended that a photomontage is produced to illustrate impacts on views from the Jacobite cruise ship that transports many visitors to the Urquhart Castle (SM90309) via Loch Ness as there is potential for important views on approach to the castle to be affected.   | Effects on the setting of Urquhart Castle are detailed in <b>Appendix 10.1</b> and supported by in-combination visualisations. For technical reasons a photomontage from the boat is not possible, but photos from the boat capturing the visual experience of the approach are included in <b>Appendix 10.1</b> . This has been agreed with HES (see below 17/ 11/ 22). |
|   |   | HES recommended that in addition to a wireframe being produced for Corrimony Chambered Cairn (SM90081) that this is also illustrated by a photomontage due to the sensitivity of this asset to visual change.   | Design changes mean that setting change to Corrimony Chambered Cairn (SM90081) would no longer affect the cultural significance of the heritage asset. Consequently, the asset has been scoped out of the assessment and no visualisation has been prepared. This was agreed with HES via consultation (see below 17/ 11/ 22).   |
|   |   | Noted that the grid coordinates to illustrate views from Urquhart Castle (SM90309) from the east shore of Loch Ness appear to be in a picnic area and careful consideration and site visits will be required to pick the precise viewpoint that includes Urquhart Castle and would experience the greatest visual impact. Recommended that a photomontage in relation to Urquhart Castle is produced. | The final choice of viewpoint has been undertaken to ensure that views towards Urquhart Castle (SM90309) have been accurately represented. The location of the viewpoints are identified on <b>Figure 10.3</b> . This includes a photomontage (provided in <b>Appendix 10.1</b> ).   |
| HES 17/ 11/ 22  | Loch Liath Environmental Impact Assessment - Visualisations | In response to consultation regarding the revisions to the designated heritage assets to be included for assessment and the proposed visualisations for the Loch Liath wind farm EIA, HES confirm that they were satisfied with the revised list of assets for inclusion and the proposed visualisations.   | Noted  |

#### Desk-Based Assessment and Data Sources

**10.16** A desk-based assessment has been undertaken in line with the ClFA guidance<sup>14</sup> to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment within the study areas and to establish the impact of the Proposed Development on their cultural significance.

**10.17** The following data sources have informed the desk-based assessment:

- HES spatial datasets and database for designated heritage assets comprising:
  - scheduled monuments;

- listed buildings;
- conservation areas;
- Inventoried-listed Garden and Designed Landscapes; and
- Inventoried-listed Battlefields.
- THC Historic Environment Record (HER) data (received 9 November 2022);
- THC conservation area information.
- HES Canmore database;
- Historic Land-use Assessment (HLA) data;
- Historic Ordnance Surve mapping (principally First and Second Edition 25 inch and 6 inch to a mile mapping where available for the Primary Study Area) and other published historic mapping held in the National Library of Scotland (NLS) and available online;
- Aerial photographs (oblique and vertical) held by the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP), Cambridge Aerial Photos and Britain From Above available online;
- Available reports from recent archaeological work undertaken in the area ('grey literature'<sup>15</sup>);
- Relevant archive material held by THC, HES, National Library of Scotland (NLS), Registers of Scotland available online;
- Where available, publicly-accessible LiDAR data;
- Visualisations and 3-D turbines modelled and viewed in Google Earth; and
- Findings of other relevant topics identified in **Chapter 6, Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat** and **Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration** of the EIA Report for the Proposed Development.

**10.18** In addition to the sources identified above, the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (ScARF)<sup>16</sup> and the Highland Archaeological Research Framework (HighARF)<sup>17</sup> were used to inform the assessment of the importance of those heritage assets identified in the baseline.

#### Field Survey

**10.19** A walkover survey of the Primary Study Area and site visits to select heritage assets in the Inner and Outer Study Areas were undertaken in May 2021 and December 2021 to inform this assessment. Weather conditions during this survey were mixed but visibility was sufficient to inform the identification of the setting of heritage assets.

**10.20** The walkover survey was sufficient to enable the verification of all known heritage assets and identify previously unrecorded heritage assets, assess their likely sensitivity to change, and inform the assessment of potential effects on those assets. No previously unrecorded heritage assets were identified within the Primary Study Area during the walkover survey. Selected heritage assets beyond the Primary Study Area were also visited to confirm their current setting and how it contributes to the way they are understood, appreciated and experienced, and inform the assessment of change to that setting.

**10.21** The selection of heritage assets beyond the Primary Study Area was informed by the ZTV and professional judgement in relation to the likely sensitivity to setting change of heritage assets with theoretical visibility or the potential for in-combination views that contribute to their cultural significance. This included the use of a boat tour along Loch Ness to understand potential in-combination effects on the setting of various heritage assets including Urquhart Castle (SM90309) and Craig Mony, fort (SM5808). Due to their locations, some heritage assets were unable to be visited due to limited access or ground conditions. This was not considered a limitation to the assessment.

**10.22** A digital photographic record was made of the walkover survey and site visits and selected photographs are included in **Appendix 10.1**.

<sup>14</sup> ClFA (2020), Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment.

<sup>15</sup> Grey literature is information produced outside of traditional publishing and distribution channels, such as unpublished archaeological excavation reports.

<sup>16</sup> ScARF is an evolving research resource for Scottish archaeology which provides a national overview of the subject by period and identifies relevant national research questions. Available online at: <https://scarf.scot/national/>

<sup>17</sup> HighARF provides a chronological overview of the heritage of the Highland region and identifies key regional research questions. Available online at: <https://scarf.scot/regional/higharf/>



### Assessment Approach

**10.23** The adopted assessment approach follows the six analytical steps set out in the PCHIA guidance for understanding heritage assets and evaluating change:

- Understanding heritage assets:
  - describe the heritage asset;
  - ascribe cultural significance; and
  - attribute importance.
- Evaluating the consequences of change:
  - understand change;
  - assess impact; and
  - weigh the effect.

**10.24** The assessment methodology also draws on that set out in the EIA Handbook, as far as it is compatible with, or complements, the PCHIA guidance.

### Understanding Heritage Assets

#### Heritage Asset Description

**10.25** All heritage assets are described factually and in a manner proportionate to their importance and susceptibility to change. The description includes sufficient detail to understand the potential effect of the Proposed Development on their cultural significance and, consequently, only information that is relevant to understanding how cultural significance might be affected by the Proposed Development has been included. Further information on heritage assets identified in this chapter is presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

#### Heritage Asset Value (cultural significance)

**10.26** Heritage assets are important due to their cultural significance, which can be articulated in various ways. This assessment draws upon the heritage values referenced by HES's Historic Environment Policy for Scotland<sup>18</sup>, which in turn are drawn from International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) The Burra Charter<sup>19</sup> and detailed in Understanding and Assessing Cultural Significance Practice Note.<sup>20</sup> These values comprise:

- **Evidential value:** This refers to the information content of a place and its ability to reveal more about an aspect of the past through examination or investigation of the place, including the use of archaeological techniques. The relative scientific value of a place is likely to depend on the importance of the information or data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and its potential to contribute further important information about the place itself or a type or class of place or to address important research questions.
- **Historic value:** This is typically either illustrative or associative. It is intended to encompass all aspects of history; for example, the history of aesthetics, art and architecture, science, spirituality, and society. It therefore often underlies other values. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic event, phase, movement or activity, person or group of people. It may be the site of an important event. For any place, the significance will be greater where the evidence of the association or event survives at the place, or where the setting is substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of such change or absence of evidence.
- **Aesthetic value:** This refers to the sensory and perceptual experience of a place; that is, how we respond to visual and non-visual aspects such as sounds, smells and other factors having a strong effect on human thoughts, feelings and attitudes. Aesthetic qualities may include the concept of beauty and formal aesthetic ideals. Expressions of aesthetics are culturally influenced.

- **Social/ Spiritual value:** This refers to the associations that a place has for a particular community or cultural group and the social or cultural meanings that it holds for them. Spiritual value refers to the intangible values and meanings embodied in or evoked by a place which give it importance in the spiritual identity, or the traditional knowledge, art and practices of a cultural group. Spiritual value may also be reflected in the intensity of aesthetic and emotional responses or community associations and be expressed through cultural practices and related places.

**10.27** The ICOMOS values are a more consistent and easily understandable way of framing the values encapsulated by the HES designation criteria,<sup>21</sup> which offer an alternative framework for understanding cultural significance.

#### The Contribution of Setting to Cultural Significance

**10.28** The ICOMOS heritage values are a way of transparently and consistently articulating the cultural significance of a heritage asset, including any contribution made by setting to it. The HES (2020) setting guidance explains that setting is the way the current surroundings of a heritage asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced in the present landscape. All heritage assets have a setting, but the contribution that this makes to their cultural significance varies in line with the location, form, function and preservation of the asset and its surroundings. In this assessment, the contribution made by setting to a heritage asset's cultural significance is set out discursively.

**10.29** Setting can be integral to the cultural significance of a heritage asset contributing to one of more of its heritage values or their appreciation. Therefore, a change in an important element of a heritage asset's setting can equate to a direct effect to its cultural significance. Equally, where setting does not contribute to a heritage asset's cultural significance or is not sensitive to change resulting from a Proposed Development, no effect can result from setting change. For this reason, not all heritage assets in the study area need to be subject to detailed assessment. An explanation of how heritage assets are identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development is discussed below in the sensitivity section.

#### Heritage Asset Importance

**10.30** The ICOMOS heritage values (discussed above) can help explain a heritage asset's cultural significance, but they do not explain how important (e.g. high, medium, low) the significance of the asset is. Establishing the importance of a heritage asset is a key stage of the assessment process as it influences the way in which decisions are made during the development of a proposal as well as the weight to be given it by the decision-maker. Importance is determined using professional judgement alongside an understanding of local, regional, and national historic environment research objectives and, where appropriate, the use of the designation criteria for heritage assets. The criteria used to inform the assessment of importance of heritage assets are identified in **Table 10.2**.

**Table 10.2: Heritage asset importance criteria**

| Importance | Criteria   |
|------------|--|
| High       | Designated heritage assets.<br>Non-designated heritage assets that meet the criteria for statutory designation, or an equivalent level of cultural significance. |
| Medium     | Non-designated heritage assets of regional or regional/local value.  |
| Low        | Non-designated heritage assets of local value.   |
| Very low   | Non-designated heritage assets of less than local or other value.  |
| Uncertain  | The heritage value of the heritage asset could not be fully ascertained.   |

#### Evaluating the Consequences of Change

**10.31** A heritage asset's importance is not an automatic indication of how sensitive it is to a Proposed Development. Sensitivity varies depending on the nature of a heritage asset's cultural significance, the contribution that setting makes to that cultural

<sup>18</sup> HES 2020. Designation Policy and Selection Criteria.

<sup>19</sup> Australia ICOMOS, 2013. The Burra Charter. Available online at: <https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/#bc>

<sup>20</sup> Australia ICOMOS, 2013. Understanding and assessing cultural significance practice note. Available online at: [https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Practice-Note\\_Understanding-and-assessing-cultural-significance.pdf](https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Practice-Note_Understanding-and-assessing-cultural-significance.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> Ibid

significance, and the character of the Proposed Development and the way in which it interacts with that cultural significance. Hence, understanding if a heritage asset is sensitive to a particular Proposed Development proposal determines which assets need to be subject to detailed assessment.<sup>22</sup>

**10.32** Unless otherwise stated, all heritage assets within the Primary Study Area have been assumed to be of high sensitivity to physical change. This is because their cultural significance is likely to be derived primarily from their evidential and historic value (form and fabric); and being located within the Primary Study Area, these factors are at risk of being diminished or lost through physical change. Any heritage assets that the Proposed Development could physically interact with have been assessed in detail.

**10.33** In terms of the operation of the Proposed Development, the risk to the cultural significance of heritage assets is one of setting change. Visibility is typically a key factor in setting change and the most far-reaching experiential quality. Therefore, heritage assets sensitive to setting change have been identified via the creation of study areas informed by review of a bare earth ZTV and an understanding of the distance over which significant visual effects were considered likely. Heritage assets within the Inner and Outer Study Areas that were identified as having theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development were subject to a high-level desk-based appraisal of their cultural significance (including the contribution made by setting) and their potential interaction with the Proposed Development. Designated heritage assets lying outside the ZTV were also subject to a high-level review to see if they had the potential for change to their cultural significance because of potential in-combination views. Heritage assets deriving cultural significance from elements of their setting that could be changed by the Proposed Development have been assessed in detail.

**10.34** All heritage assets identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development have been assessed in **Appendix 10.1**.

**10.35** This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of effects of the Proposed Development on those heritage assets considered to have the potential to experience significant effects in EIA terms.

#### Understanding Change

**10.36** In line with the PCHIA guidance and EIA Handbook, the way in which the Proposed Development may change the cultural significance of a heritage asset, and whether that change is temporary or permanent, has been clearly articulated with explicit reference to the heritage value(s) affected.

#### Assessing Impact (Magnitude of Change)

**10.37** Assessment of the effect to a heritage asset's cultural significance as a result of the Proposed Development has been undertaken using professional judgement and an understanding of how the heritage values of that asset that contribute to its cultural significance will be affected. It is not a measure of the reach or extent of the proposal or the importance of the heritage asset. As per the PCHIA guidance a simple scale is used for assessing an effect and, for transparency, the criteria for this are set out below in **Table 10.3**.

Table 10.3: Level of Impact / Magnitude of Change Criteria

| Magnitude of Change | Description  |
|---------------------|--|
| Large               | Substantial, near total, or total loss of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Substantial level of change to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced. |
| Medium              | Medium loss or alteration of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Medium level of change to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.                   |
| Small               | Slight loss or alteration of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Small changes to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.                            |
| None                | No change to the cultural significance of the heritage asset, or how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced  |

<sup>22</sup> SNH & HES, 2018. The EIA Handbook, PP 179, paragraph 31.

#### Level of Effect (Significance of Effect)<sup>23</sup>

**10.38** The level of the effect has been determined using professional judgement to reflect the importance of the heritage asset using the scaled criteria in **Table 10.4** below. The justification for the significance of effect has been reported clearly. This approach accords with the guidelines for assessment set out in the PCHIA guidance (termed 'weighting the effect') and the EIA Handbook.

**10.39** A clear statement has been made as to whether an effect is a significant effect in terms of the EIA Regulations based on professional judgement of the available evidence and guided by the description of significance of effect identified in **Table 10.4**. As standard, **major** and **moderate** effects are considered **significant** in the context of the EIA Regulations.

Table 10.4: Significance of Effect Criteria

| Significance of Effect | Description   |
|------------------------|---|
| Major                  | A large magnitude of change (e.g. total or near total loss) to the cultural significance of a heritage asset of medium or high importance.  |
| Moderate               | A medium magnitude of change (e.g. substantial loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of a heritage asset of medium or high importance; or a large magnitude of change (total or near total loss) to a heritage asset of low importance.  |
| Minor                  | A small magnitude of change (slight loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of a heritage asset of medium or high importance; a medium or small (slight to substantial loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of a heritage asset of low importance; or any change to a heritage asset of very low importance. |
| None                   | No change to the cultural significance of a heritage asset.   |

#### Cumulative Effects

**10.40** Cumulative effects have been considered in relation to the schemes listed in **Table 6.8** of **Chapter 6**. A cut-off date of 6 December 2022 was applied for the inclusion of developments within the cumulative effects assessment. The rationale for this cut-off date is provided **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**.

**10.41** Three of the developments identified in **Chapter 6** (the consented Bhlairaidh Wind Farm Extension, Bhlairaidh Wind Farm and Corrimony) fall within the Inner and Outer Study Areas. The nearest operational or consented developments beyond the Outer Study Area are approximately 17km from the Proposed Development. Given that the potential for setting change to result in a significant effect to a heritage asset's cultural significance diminishes with distance, significant cumulative effects, including those resulting from in-combination views, beyond the Outer Study Area are not predicted.

#### Assessment Assumptions and Limitations

**10.42** The desk-based data collection has utilised a range of sources on the area's historic environment. Much of this is necessarily secondary information compiled from a variety of sources (e.g. HER data and grey literature reports). It has been assumed that this information is reasonably accurate unless otherwise stated.

**10.43** At the time desk-based research was undertaken (January/February 2021), archives and collection centres were closed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Historic Ordnance Survey mapping and aerial photographs were consulted which were readily available online comprising those held by Canmore, the NLS, NCAP, Cambridge Aerial Photos, and Britain From Above.

**10.44** Given the remote location of the Proposed Development and the limited potential for previous landscape change within the Primary Study Area, online sources are sufficient to inform the historic environment baseline, including to inform the assessment of potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets.

**10.45** The potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets, including buried archaeological remains, has been considered in relation to the pattern and significance of known heritage assets (drawn from the THC HER data and a review of historic mapping and available digital aerial imagery) in the vicinity of the Primary Study Area and land use history within it to understand the archaeological potential.

<sup>23</sup> In EIA terms the level of effect is typically referred to as the significance of effect. This terminology has deliberately been avoided to prevent confusion with the discussion of cultural significance. Similarly, the PCHIA term of 'weighting the effect' has been avoided to remove any sense of conflation with weighing of effects in the planning balance – a matter solely for the decision-maker.

**10.46** While non-intrusive or intrusive archaeological investigations<sup>24</sup> have not been undertaken to inform the baseline, the sources identified above are sufficient to identify the potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets, including the potential for buried archaeological remains within the Primary Study Area and the assessment of any likely significant effects.

**10.47** Whilst some information gaps are inevitable, given the buried nature of archaeological remains, it is considered that there is sufficient information to enable an informed decision to be taken in relation to the identification and assessment of likely significant environmental effects on cultural heritage. A precautionary approach has been applied, based on the available information and the professional experience and judgment of the project team, to ensure that all likely significant effects have been assessed and reported. For the avoidance of doubt, when any asset is identified as being of 'uncertain' importance, a precautionary approach would be applied, and the effect reported as potentially significant. However, this has not been necessary in this instance.

## Existing Conditions

**10.48** A summary of the existing conditions is presented below. Further information on the archaeological and historical context for the assessment and individual heritage assets forming the baseline is presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

### Primary Study Area

**10.49** No designated or non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Primary Study Area.

### Archaeological Potential

**10.50** While there is evidence of prehistoric activity, including settlement, within the surrounding straths and glens and on the lower slopes running up to the edge of the upland plateau, no evidence of activity before the post-medieval period has been identified within the landscape immediately surrounding the Primary Study Area.

**10.51** Evidence of historic land use of the upland plateau suggests seasonal exploitation for summer grazing and sporting activities. The limited evidence of past activity, in combination with the exposed, wet and unproductive environment, suggests there is a **low** to **negligible** potential for previously unrecorded buried archaeological remains within the Primary Study Area.

**10.52** There are extensive areas of peat across the upland plateau, including within the Primary Study Area (please refer to **Chapter 7** for further information). It can take over 1,000 years for a metre of peat to form, with the varying depths having the potential to preserve any previously unrecorded archaeological remains which predate, or coincide with, the peat formation. As peat is formed by anaerobic conditions, which prevent the micro-biological activity needed for the chemical breakdown of organic materials, there is the potential for the survival of organic archaeological remains, and a **high** potential for paleoenvironmental evidence.

### Inner Study Area

**10.53** The location of heritage assets identified within the Inner Study Area are shown on **Figure 10.1**.

**10.54** Two designated heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area. These comprise:

- Loch Ashlaich shooting box and bothy (a category C listed building; LB19486; **high** importance); and
- Leviskie Cottage, fort and earthwork (a scheduled monument; SM4567; **high** importance).

**10.55** Loch Ashlaich shooting box and bothy were constructed c.1855 for the 7th Earl of Seafield. The shooting box comprises a single storey, timber lathed building located on an island at the centre of Loch Ashlaich and a bothy (basic shelters provided in remote mountainous areas) located on the shore of the loch. The elements of the setting of this heritage asset which contribute to its cultural significance are the functional relationships with the loch and the surrounding remote upland plateau, enabling the shooting of wildfowl, and the spatial, visual and functional relationship between the shooting box and bothy. While these elements of the shooting box and bothy's setting contribute to how the heritage asset's chosen location and the functional relationship between the shooting box and bothy are understood and appreciated, and how the asset is experienced, the heritage asset's cultural significance is largely derived from the evidential and historical (illustrative) value of its physical remains.

**10.56** Leviskie Cottage, fort and earthwork (SM4567) comprises a small fortified prehistoric enclosure constructed on a trapezoidal promontory overlooking the eastern end of strath Moriston. There is no theoretical visibility between this heritage asset and the Proposed Development or in-combination views.

**10.57** A further 28 non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are located on lower slopes below the upland plateau and are characterised by evidence of prehistoric settlement, post-medieval pre-Clearance farmsteads, townships and shieling sites, and Improvement era farmsteads and a shooting lodge.

**10.58** The earliest non-designated heritage assets comprise groups of Bronze Age and Iron Age hut circles (MHG2768, MHG2769 and MHG2770), with associated field systems and clearance cairns (circular piles of stone the result of field clearance; MHG41450 and MHG41449). These heritage assets are located on the lower north-facing slopes to the north and west of the Inner Study Area, and their cultural significance is largely derived from the evidential value of their upstanding physical remains, and the potential for any buried archaeological remains to contribute to the understanding of settlement, occupation and land use from the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age.

**10.59** While not uncommon in the Highland region, the evidential value (their physical remains) of these heritage assets has the potential to contribute to regional research questions relating to Bronze Age and Iron Age settlement and daily life. The spatial and visual relationship between the hut circles and their associated field system and clearance cairns contribute to the understanding of their functional relationship. The importance of these heritage assets has been assessed to be **medium**.

**10.60** Located to the west of the Site, Possible Shieling Hut, Loch Na Leirisdein (MHG22969) would have been used during the summer months as temporary accommodation by people tending cattle grazing on the open hill. Other evidence of pre-Clearance agricultural activity within the Inner Study Area includes the remains of farmsteads and associated field systems (MHG53613) and Shewglie Wood Township (MHG23290). Evidence of later Improvement era agricultural activity includes the remains of a post-medieval farmstead on the western bank of the River Enrick comprising a single storey building with a corrugated iron roof (MHG22970).

**10.61** The cultural significance of these heritage assets is derived from the evidential value of their surviving physical remains and the potential of any buried archaeological remains to contribute to the understanding of pre-Clearance and Improvement-era settlement and changing land use from the 1750s to the mid-19th century. In addition, their upland fringe setting in sheltered locations with ready access to water, and the spatial and visual relationship between the remains of contemporary buildings and associated field systems, contribute to the understanding and appreciation of them as upland fringe subsistence farming settlements, and how they are experienced as such.

**10.62** Shieling huts, pre-Clearance farmsteads and the remains of post-medieval farmsteads, and the field systems that accompanied them, are common and well-understood heritage assets found throughout the Scottish uplands. These and similar heritage assets within the Inner Study Area are assessed as being of **low** importance.

**10.63** Performing a similar function to the listed shooting box and bothy at Loch Ashlaich, the shooting lodge on Loch Ma Stac (MHG55927) is a substantial two-storey rubble stone building forming part of the Corrimony Estate. Located on a small island linked to the loch side by a causeway, and the remains of a bothy associated with the lodge located on the loch shore. While the cultural significance of the lodge is largely derived from its evidential and historical value encapsulated in its historic fabric and historical relationship with the Corrimony Estate, its isolated upland setting on the loch contributes to the understanding and appreciation of its function as temporary accommodation for shooting parties and the way it is experienced as such. In consideration of the contribution made to its evidential and historical (illustrative) value and setting to the understanding of the working of 19th century shooting estate, this historic asset is assessed as being of **medium** importance.

**10.64** Three modern memorials comprising stone cairns with memorial plaques were recorded during the walkover survey. These include the cairn erected in 1996 in remembrance of the 17th century battle of Carn Mharbh Dhaoine (MHG2703).

**10.65** While these memorials are modern, they have some cultural significance derived from their social value and community associations. Their locations are important in relation to the people and events they commemorate, and their isolated upland setting makes some contribution to how they are experienced. As modern examples of a common form of memorial structure, these heritage assets are of limited cultural significance, and as such are assessed as being of **low** importance.

**10.66** Carn Mharbh Dhaoine is reputed to be the location of a late 17th century battle between the men of Lochaber and the men of Glen Urquhart located on a small rocky plateau south of Corribuy (MHG14103). After the battle, the Glen Urquhart dead were buried

<sup>24</sup> Non-intrusive and intrusive archaeological investigations can include geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching.



and six small cairns raised over their graves, which gives the area its name, the 'Carn Mharbh Dhaonie' or the 'Rock (or Cairn) of the Dead Men'.

**10.67** The evidential value of the battlefield is derived from the physical remains of the cairns and any surviving buried archaeological remains, including human remains, associated with them and the battle, such as musket balls and other lost material culture. Given the waterlogged nature of the area of the supposed battlefield, the preservation of organic remains (e.g. in dubh lochans) cannot be discounted. The historical value of the battlefield is derived from the understanding of the battle drawn from contemporary and later accounts, the historical relationship to known participants and the feuding clan culture, and the role of raiding in the contemporary economy, that persisted in the Highlands at the time. The site of the battlefield has some social value derived from its relationship with the local community expressed in the construction of the modern memorial cairn.

**10.68** Given that the potential for any surviving archaeological remains associated with the battle to contribute to an understanding of small-scale inter-clan conflicts is limited, but in recognition of how its historical and social value contributes to its cultural significance, the importance of this heritage asset has been assessed to be **medium**.

#### Designated Heritage Assets Within the Outer Study Area

**10.69** The following designated heritage assets are located within the Outer Study Area (see **Figure 10.2**):

- Five scheduled monuments;
- 76 listed buildings; and
- One conservation area.

**10.70** An additional five scheduled monuments beyond the Outer Study Area have been identified as being sensitive to setting change and included in the baseline.

**10.71** Most of the scheduled monuments relate to prehistoric domestic and defensive settlement sites, including rare examples of particular local or period monument types. These include oval hut foundations dating from the Iron Age or early medieval period that deviate from prehistoric round hut circle traditions common elsewhere in Scotland (SM11437 and SM11438).

**10.72** The listed buildings identified within the Outer Study Area tend to be associated with the main settlements within or at the heads of Glen Affric, Glen Urquhart and Glen Moriston, including those forming the villages of Tomich, Corrimony and Invermoriston. The listed buildings within these settlements are characterised by post-medieval places of worship, houses and cottages, commercial buildings such as hotels, as well as buildings and structures associated with large estate including their main houses and ancillary buildings.

**10.73** Outside of these settlements, listed buildings are concentrated along Glen Affric to the north-west of the Outer Study Area and Glen Urquhart to the north. These buildings are characterised by farmsteads, former agricultural works cottages, former mills and historic road bridges.

**10.74** Tomich Conservation Area (CON23) encompasses areas of the settlement either side of the road that passes through the village and includes those parts of Tomich which were established for the estate village serving Guisachan House.

**10.75** None of the 76 listed buildings identified within the Outer Study Area, or Tomich Conservation Area, have theoretical intervisibility with the Proposed Development. Given their distance from the Proposed Development any in-combination views are not predicted to affect their cultural significance, which is largely derived from their architectural (evidential and aesthetic value) or historic (illustrative) interest. In consideration of their designations, these heritage assets are assessed as being of **high** importance.

**10.76** Baseline analysis undertaken for this assessment indicated that the following designated heritage assets of **high** importance may be affected by setting change as a result of the Proposed Development:

- Garbeg, settlement 1160m NNW of Garbeg Cottage (SM11437);
- Garbeg Cottage, settlement 1250m N of (SM11438);
- Garbeg Cottage, burial mounds 920m NNE of (SM4635);
- Loch nam Faolieag, hut circles 730m NNW of Wester Balnagrach (SM11455);
- Achratagan, hut circle and cairnfield 790m NNE of (SM11456); and
- Urquhart Castle (SM90309).

**10.77** Further information as to why designated heritage assets within the Inner and Outer Study Area have been scoped in or out of the assessment of effects is presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

**10.78** Garbeg and Garbeg Cottage settlements (SM11437; SM11438) comprise two distinct groups of sub-rectangular or oval hut foundations forming the footings for houses believed to be late Iron Age or early medieval in date. Surrounding, and in between, the huts of the eastern cluster there are numerous clearance cairns and portions of field dykes which may be contemporary. Loch nam Faolieag, hut circles (SM11455) is of a similar origin and includes three hut circles scooped into the hillside and clearance cairns surrounded by an enclosure bank.

**10.79** Garbeg Cottage, burial mounds (SM4635) comprises a Pictish cemetery which includes at least 14 square to trapezoidal mounds, 10 round mounds and what is probably an earlier roundhouse. Four of the cairns within the cemetery have been partially excavated, one producing a fragment of a Pictish symbol stone. This heritage asset is only one of a small number of identified Pictish cemeteries unique to Scotland, and one of only four known upstanding examples, and its relationship to a possible rare example of the early medieval settlements at Garbeg is unparalleled.

**10.80** Achratagan, hut circle and cairnfield (SM11456) is a late prehistoric hut circle and associated field system located on the edge of a terrace. There are numerous possibly contemporary, clearance cairns covering the terrace, and on the slope below the hut circle.

**10.81** The setting of these heritage assets is characterised by rough moorland pasture, overlooking a wide plain at the top of a larger valley, their spatial and functional relationship with their associated field systems and clearance cairns contributes to their cultural significance. The historical and functional relationship with contemporary heritage assets in the landscape allows for a better understanding of the monument types and demonstrates that dwellings and ritual sites such as these were not in isolation within the landscape.

**10.82** Strategically situated on Strone Point, a promontory on the shore of Loch Ness, Urquhart Castle (SM90309) comprises the remains of a complex multi-phase medieval castle. Occupied for at least 500 years, the castle had fallen out of use by the late 17th century. While excavations in the 1980s hinted at early medieval origins for the site, with radiocarbon dates supporting earlier finds of vitrified stone, the hypothesis remains largely untested.

**10.83** As well as the defensive advantages of its location on the promontory extending into the loch, direct access to the castle from the loch via the water gate enabled the castle to be reached and supplied by boat, at a time when road transport was slow and vulnerable to interception during periods of unrest. During the Jacobite siege of 1689-90 the castle garrison was re-supplied by boat, prolonging the siege.

**10.84** The landward side of the castle was protected by a moat and ditch that was formerly crossed by a wooden drawbridge before being replaced by a stone causeway. Excavations have shown the castle was constructed on the site of an earlier fort alongside evidence of a small settlement beyond the castle's walls and ditch. Artefact remains recovered from the castle and its environs are typical of those associated with a castle site including medieval iron objects, pottery fragments, a crucible fragment and burnt bone.

**10.85** The castle's location on a natural rocky promontory on the edge of Loch Ness halfway down the Great Glen, and at the entrance to Glen Urquhart, contributes to the understanding and appreciation of its chosen defensive location controlling access to Glen Urquhart and movement along and down Loch Ness and the Great Glen.

**10.86** While the castle is a dominant and striking feature in the landscape when approached by boat from Loch Ness, views of the castle are somewhat diminished by the prominence of the modern red sandstone Historic Scotland (HS) visitors centre. Views of the castle from the loch, including those of the water gate, are at their most arresting and informative when experienced in relatively close proximity from the castle. The castle is less perceptible and subsequently not dominant in longer views when approaching from the loch and in views towards the castle from the eastern shore. This is largely as a result of the scale and form of the castle, with its squat profile and the muted palette of the castle walls and towers in combination with the natural exposed bedrock of the promontory and intervening vegetation blending with the high steep-sided wooded hillside to the west forming the castle's backdrop. When approaching from the north (the direction from which commercial cruise boats approach), the castle is not generally perceptible until around 1km from the asset, due to the factors noted above and the fact that the castle and surrounding landscape is backlit or in shadow for much of the day.

**10.87** The water gate is best experienced when approaching the castle by boat from the south, or from it in views looking out over the loch towards the south-east. Views from the water gate, the modern pier and footpath leading to it and views to the north-west towards the castle from the loch contribute to how its function as the principal access to the castle by boat is understood, appreciated, and experienced.

## Implications of Climate Change

**10.88** The UK Climate Change Projections 2018 (UKCP18) indicate that in the future:

- Temperatures are projected to increase, particularly in summer;
- Winter rainfall is projected to increase and summer rainfall is most likely to decrease;
- Heavy rain days (rainfall greater than 25mm) are projected to increase, particularly in winter;
- Near surface wind speeds are expected to increase in the second half of the 21st century with winter months experiencing more significant effects of winds; however, the increase in wind speeds is projected to be modest; and
- An increase in frequency of winter storms over the UK.

**10.89** Increase in rainfall will change groundwater and soil conditions, potentially affecting the preservation of buried archaeology and eroding/ flooding above ground assets.

## Future Baseline in the Absence of the Proposed Development

**10.90** In the 'do nothing' scenario, there will be little physical change to the cultural significance of any previously unrecorded buried archaeological remains within the Primary Study Area. The Site comprises upland plateaux with rocky outcrops, bog, watercourses, lochs and open moorland. Subsequently, land use is limited and there is very limited potential for physical disturbance to heritage assets<sup>25</sup>.

**10.91** It is not possible to accurately quantify, the risk of setting change in a do-nothing scenario as it primarily rests on whether new proposals for development are brought forward elsewhere within the area.

## Design Considerations

**10.92** The design of the Proposed Development has sought to avoid or minimise effects to heritage assets. Each iteration of the design has been reviewed to ensure that direct physical effects to known heritage assets are avoided. Similarly, how turbines will appear within the setting of heritage assets has been a key consideration in design refinements, including the number and location of turbines. Care has been taken to reduce the prominence of turbines in in-combination views toward heritage assets or being located on key lines of sight to and between heritage assets. These considerations have been central to the reduction in turbine numbers and the finalised layout.

**10.93** Further detailed information on the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development is presented in **Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy**.

## Micrositing

**10.94** Prior to construction, micrositing may take place to allow adjustment within a defined radius of the proposed turbine locations, and a similar tolerance either side of the access track locations. The micrositing allowance for turbines and associated infrastructure is 50m, as set out in **Chapter 4: Project Description**. A review of these areas has identified that no heritage assets would be physically affected as a result of the micrositing. In addition, due to the scale of the micrositing allowance, changes to the location of turbines would not increase the significance of effect resulting from setting change identified in **Appendix 10.1**.

## Good Practice Measures

**10.95** No heritage assets have been identified within the Primary Study Area and the potential for previously unrecorded buried archaeological remains has been assessed to be **low to negligible**, as such no specific mitigation for potential physical effects during construction have been identified. The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the Proposed Development will identify construction best practice mitigation for the historic environment.

**10.96** Measures which may be adopted include the implementation of a working protocol should previously unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.

## Assessment of Significant Effects

**10.97** The assessment of effects is based on the project description as outlined in **Chapter 4**. Further details of the assessment of effects are presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

### Construction Effects (Direct Physical)

**10.98** No significant effects on designated or non-designated heritage assets have been identified as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development.

**10.99** While construction activities for the Proposed Development have the potential to remove or truncate any previously unrecorded buried archaeological remains that may be present within the footprint of the Proposed Development, the potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains has been assessed to be **low to negligible**. The construction of the Proposed Development is not anticipated to result in a significant effect to the paleoenvironmental potential of areas of deep peat (0.5m or more) within the Site.

### Operational Effects (Direct Due to Setting Change)

**10.100** No significant effects on designated or non-designated heritage assets have been identified as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development.

**10.101** Non-significant effects due to setting change as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development have been identified for one designated heritage asset, Loch Ashlaich shooting box and bothy (LB19486: a category C listed building; **high** importance) and one non-designated heritage asset (Shooting Lodge on Loch Ma Stac (MHG55927); **medium** importance). For both heritage assets a minor effect in EIA terms has been identified. Further information on non-significant effects are presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

### Cumulative Effects

**10.102** No cumulative effects to heritage assets have been identified resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development. Further information on cumulative effects is presented in **Appendix 10.1**.

## Mitigation

**10.103** No additional mitigation for potential physical effects during construction on previously unrecorded archaeological remains, the potential for which has been assessed to be **low to negligible**, have been identified. The CEMP for the Proposed Development will identify construction best practice mitigation for the historic environment.

**10.104** Measures which will be adopted include the implementation of a working protocol should previously unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.

**10.105** Measures to avoid and reduce effects on heritage assets resulting from setting change have been implemented as embedded mitigation through the design process. No additional mitigation to reduce the potential effects to heritage assets as been identified.

## Interrelationship between Effects

**10.106** Heritage assets are also discussed in **Chapter 6**. As detailed above, however, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and LVIA consider different kinds of receptors and effects, and hence can come to differing conclusions on levels of effect relating to the same heritage asset without this indicating an error in either assessment.

## Further Survey Requirements and Monitoring

**10.107** No further survey requirements or monitoring have been identified for cultural heritage.

<sup>25</sup> This assumes that land and forest management will be undertaken in line with the UK Forestry Standards and appropriate archaeological mitigation measures required under relevant Felling Licence applications.

### Summary of Significant Effects

**10.108** No significant effects on cultural heritage have been identified as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.