Chapter 11 Cultural Heritage

Contents

11.1. Executive Summary 2
11.2. Introduction 2
11.3. Legislation, Policy and Guidelines 3
11.4. Consultation 5
11.5. Assessment Methods and Significance Criteria 7
11.6. Baseline Conditions 15
11.7. Potential Effects 19
11.8. Mitigation 23
11.9. Residual Effects 24
11.10. Cumulative Effects 24
11.11. Summary 26
11.12. References 29

List of Abbreviations

This page is intentionally blank

Abbreviation	Description
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
HER	Historic Environment Record
HES	Historic Environment Scotland
HEPS	Historic Environment Policy Scotland
HLA	Historic Landscape Assessment
ibid	*ibidem*
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IGDL	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
NRHE	National Record of the Historic Environment
SPAD	The Scottish Palaeoecological Database
SPP	Scottish Planning Policy
THC	The Highland Council
THCHET	The Highland Council Historic Environment Team
THwLDP	The Highland wide Local Development Plan
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

11. Cultural Heritage

11.1. Executive Summary

11.1.1. This chapter identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the Site and assesses the likely significant effects on archaeological features and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. This chapter also identifies measures that should be taken to mitigate predicted likely significant adverse effects and reports on the residual effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets.

11.1.2. Impacts upon the setting of designated heritage assets have generally been mitigated through the iterative design process. A significant effect has been identified on the setting of Allt Laoigh (Asset 3), Lochindorb (Asset 17) and Dunearn hill fort (Asset 20). However, it is concluded that these assets' key landscape relationships would still be appreciable and that there would not be an adverse effect upon the integrity of the assets' setting.

11.1.3. This assessment has identified a total of 45 known non-designated heritage assets (Assets 2, 4-5, 43-44, and 47-86) within the site, all of which date to the post-medieval period and later. Two of the non-designated assets (Assets 65 and 66) could potentially be directly impacted by the construction of the Proposed Development. Both assets are considered to be of Negligible importance and impacts would at worst be of negligible effect. This is because the assets are of a common type with local interest only and there would not be a loss of information. As such, no mitigation is required.

11.1.4. The possibility of cumulative effects has been assessed. No significant cumulative effects were identified.

11.2. Introduction

11.2.1. This chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage and archaeology associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

11.2.2. The specific objectives of the chapter are to:

- describe the cultural heritage and archaeology baseline;
- describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the impact assessment;
- describe the potential effects, including direct, settings and cumulative effects;
- describe the mitigation measures proposed to address likely significant effects; and
- assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation.

11.2.3. This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists (CIfA) Code of Conduct and Professional Conduct, as well as the CIfA Standard and guidance for commissioning work on, or providing consultancy advice on, archaeology and the historic environment; desk- based assessment; field evaluations; and other relevant guidance.

11.2.4. This chapter is supported by the following figures and technical appendices:

- Figure 11.1: Non-designated Assets Within 1 km Study Area
- Figure 11.2: Designated Assets Within 5 km and 10 km Study Area
- Figure 11.3: Extract from the 1871 Ordnance Survey Map showing the Scheduled Monument Allt Laoigh (Asset 3)
- Figure 6.56: Heritage Viewpoint 1
- Figure 6.57: Heritage Viewpoint 2
- Figure 6.58: Heritage Viewpoint 3

- Figure 6.59: Heritage Viewpoint 4
- Figures 6.60 to 6.64: Heritage Viewpoint 5
- Figure 6.65: Heritage Viewpoint 6
- Figure 6.66: Heritage Viewpoint 7
- Figure 6.67: Heritage Viewpoint 8
- Figure 6.68: Heritage Viewpoint 9
- Appendix 11.1: Heritage Assets Gazetteer
- Appendix 11.2: Settings Assessment.

11.3. Legislation, Policy and Guidelines

11.3.1. Relevant legislation, policy and guidance have been taken into consideration as part of this assessment.

Legislation

11.3.2. The statutory framework for heritage in Scotland is outlined in:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended);
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended);
  ;
- National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000
- Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011;
- Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014; and
- The Electricity Works (Environment Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Planning Policy

11.3.3. Planning policy relevant to this chapter is contained within:

- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (Scottish Government 2014);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES 2019a);
- The adopted Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (The Highland Council (THC), 2012).
- Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan 2017-2022 (Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA), 2017)

11.3.4. SPP expresses the following policy principles:

"*The planning system should*:

- *promote the care and protection of the designated and non-designated historic environment (including individual assets, related settings and the wider cultural landscapes) and its contribution to sense of place, cultural identity, social well-being, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning; and*
- *enable positive change in the historic environment which is informed by a clear understanding of the importance of the heritage assets affected and ensure their future use. Change should be sensitively managed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the fabric and setting of the asset, and ensure that its special characteristics are protected, conserved or enhanced" (Scottish Government 2014, Para 137).*

11.3.5. HEPS (HES, 2019a) sets out the Scottish Government's policy for decision making that affects the historic environment. It contains six policies for managing the historic environment, all of which favour protection, understanding and promotion of the historic environment as well as the preservation of the benefits of the historic environment for future generations. Historic environment *policies 3* and *4* both state '*if detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be in place'* (HES, 2019b). The following historic environment policies are relevant to this assessment:

- HEP1

  Decisions affecting any part of the historic environment should be informed by an inclusive understanding of its breadth and cultural significance.
- HEP2

  Decisions affecting the historic environment should ensure that its understanding and enjoyment as well as its benefits are secured for present and future generations.
- HEP3

  Plans, programmes, policies and strategies, and the allocation of resources should be approached in a way that protects and promotes the historic environment.

  If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored and mitigation measures should be put in place.
- HEP4

  Changes to specific assets and their context should be managed in a way that protects the historic environment. Opportunities for enhancement should be identified where appropriate.

  If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be put in place.

11.3.6. THC's approach to proposals that affect the historic environment is set out in *Policy 57* of the HwLDP which states that:

"development proposals will be assessed taking into account the level of importance and type of heritage features, the form and scale of the development, and any impact on the feature and its setting".

Guidance

11.3.7. The following best practice guidelines/guidance have been used in preparing this assessment:

- THC Supplementary Guidance: Historic Environment Strategy (2013);
- PAN2/2011 'Planning and Archaeology' (Scottish Government 2011);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CIfA 2017) and Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment (CIfA 2014);
- HES "Managing Change in the Historic Environment" guidance note series, particularly Historic Environment Scotland's Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2020);
- NatureScot's published guidance for 'Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments' (SNH 2012) as updated by NatureScot in 2021; and
- NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland's Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5 (SNH & HES 2018).

11.3.8. HES's setting guidance defines setting as '*the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced*' (HES 2020). The guidance further notes that 'planning authorities must take into account the setting of historic assets or places when drawing up development plans and guidance, when considering various types of environmental and design assessments/statements, and in determining planning applications' (ibid). It advocates a three-stage approach to assessing potential impacts upon setting:

- Stage 1: identify the historic asset.
- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting.
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes.

11.3.9. THC's Supplementary Guidance on the historic environment (2013) supports the policy on the historic environment and provides a definition of THC's approach to the protection of the historic environment through the planning process. This strategy is implemented through strategic aims. Those of particular relevance to this assessment are:

- Strategic Aim 6: That listed buildings within Highland are protected from harmful developments…which may affect their special architectural and historic interest or their setting.
- Strategic Aim 13: That scheduled monuments – and their setting – within Highland are protected from harmful developments that may affect their national importance.
- Strategic Aim 17: To ensure no asset or its setting is lost or altered without adequate consideration of its significance and of the means available to preserve, record and interpret it in line with national and local policy.

11.4. Consultation

11.4.1. Pre-application advice was received from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) on 17 December 2020 and correspondence regarding visualisations on 01 February 2021. A Scoping Response was received from HES on 26 February 2021, The Highland Council Historic Environment Team on 26 February 2021 and Energy Consents Unit on 24 March 2021. Detail regarding consultation responses and how points raised by consultees are addressed is presented in **Table 11.1**.

Table 11.1 – List of Consultee Responses

Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Pre-Application Advice (17 December 2020)	HES noted that the proposal as of December 2020 would give rise to significant and detrimental impacts of the settings of two Scheduled monuments: • Alltlaoigh, farmstead 1,990 m NE of Cnapan a' Choire Odhair Bhig (Site 3) • Lochindorb Castle (Site 17)	The two Scheduled Monuments have been noted. Eight cultural heritage visualisations have been commissioned. The cultural heritage visualisations will be assessed as part of the settings assessment detailed in **Section 11.7.**
HES email regarding visualisations (01 February 2021)	In response to a letter from AOC (08 January 2021) requesting an opinion on a proposed list of viewpoints, HES noted that they were content with the selected viewpoints that AOC Archaeology suggest. HES note that the viewpoints would be representative and would illustrate impacts on the most important view of Lochindorb Castle (Site 17).	An assessment of the settings impacts of the Proposed Development, informed by site visits, ZTV and visualisations is contained in **Section 11.7.**

Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
HES Scoping Response (26 February 2021)	HES generally agreed with the outlined scope. HES noted that a step "relative sensitivity of setting" within the methodology is deemed to be unnecessary.	The methodology to be used in this assessment is outlined in **Section 11.5**. Previous consultation with HES in regard to the methodology outlined in **Section 11.5** has noted that they are largely content with this methodology and its application in AOC's cultural heritage assessments for EIA developments. **Table 11.3** outlines the "Criteria for Establishing Relative Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to Changes to its Setting" and has been created in line with professional judgement, and guidance outlined in HESP (HES, 2019b) and in the EIA Handbook (SNH & HES 2018: 185).
	HES noted that there was the potential for a significant effect on the settings of: • Alltlaoigh, farmstead 1990m NE of Cnapan a' Choire Odhair Bhig (Site 3) • Lochindorb Castle (Site 17) HES welcomed their inclusion at on-going consultation with the Applicant	A detailed and in depth settings assessment of these two highlighted designated heritage assets, informed by site visits, a ZTV and agreed visualisations has been undertaken as part of the assessment (**Section 11.7**) A list of cultural heritage visualisations to be included in the EIA Report was agreed with HES. Copies of draft visualisations were issued to HES for review.
Historic Environment Team (HET) (Archaeology) The Highland Council Scoping Response (10 March 2021)	HET (Archaeology) are generally satisfied with the information presented in the Scoping Report and with the outlined impact assessment. HET (Archaeology) did not identify any further assets that need to be scoped in	The assessment has been undertaken in line with the information and impact assessment outlined in the scoping report
Energy Consents Unit Scoping Response in regard to Cultural Heritage (24 March 2021)	The EIA Report chapter to identify all designated heritage assets which may be impacted by the Proposed Development. An assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on the settings of designated heritage assets should be undertaken as part of the EIA Report chapter informed by visualisations. HES to be consulted on the assessment methodology and the designated heritage assets to be included in the assessment.	All heritage assets have been identified within 1 km; all designated heritage assets have been identified within 5 km; and all nationally designated heritage assets have been identified within 10 km of the site. An assessment of impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets has been undertaken and was informed by site visits, ZTV analysis and visualisations. HES have been consulted on the assessment and visualisations (see above) throughout the EIA process.

Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
Design Team meeting 04 May 2021	A meeting to discuss the draft visualisations was held between the Applicant, AOC and HES on 04 May 2021. HES expressed concern regarding impacts on the setting of Lochindorb Castle but noted that in HES's opinion there were minimal changes that could be made to lessen this impact.	Further revisions to layout were made to reduce spread of turbines visible in the same view as Lochindorb when viewed from east side of loch. Copies of updated visualisation showing design chill layout were issued to HES on 21 May 2021.
HES Response to Design Chill 24 June 2021	Visualisations provide sufficient information to conclude that adverse impacts on both Alltlaoigh, Farmstead 1,990 m NE of Cnapan A'Choire Odhair Bhig (SM 1187) and Dunearn Fort (SM 2470) are unlikely to reach levels where HES would consider objecting to the proposed scheme in response. The design changes have reduced impacts on these monuments.	Visualisations from these assets included in the assessment.
	Design changes have reduced, to a very minor degree, the spread of turbines in important views to the castle from the minor road down the east shore of Lochindorb. However, impact remains significant and HES would object to a development brought forward on the current layout. Further mitigation to reduce impacts would require major alterations to design.	Changes to design that would further reduce impacts considered by project team.
	A further photomontage visualisation that shows a view where the turbines appear directly behind and either side of the castle is required to present a 'worst-case' scenario.	Additional photomontage location agreed by HES via email 16 September 2021
HES - Meeting east shore of Lochindorb 29 July 2021	Approaches along the road from east of the castle are key to understanding its setting.	A series of wirelines produced from along the road to demonstrate changing views of Lochindorb Castle in conjunction with Proposed Development.

11.5. Assessment Methods and Significance Criteria

Method of Baseline Characterisation

Study Area

11.5.1. Three study areas were identified for this assessment:

- A 1 km Study Area around the site boundary identifying all previously recorded designated and non-designated assets and previous archaeological investigations (events) to allow for assessment of the potential for direct effect on known heritage assets and to assess the potential for hitherto unknown buried assets to survive on-site and thus potentially be impacted upon (refer to **Figure 11.1**).

- A 5 km Study Area for assessment of potential effects on the settings of all designated heritage assets including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes; Inventoried Battlefields and Conservation Areas (refer to **Figure 11.2**)
- A 10 km Study Area for the assessment of potential effects on the settings of all nationally important designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventoried Battlefields and World Heritage Sites (refer to **Figure 11.2**).

11.5.2. Each heritage asset referred to in the text is listed in the Gazetteer in **Appendix 11.1**. Each has been assigned an 'Asset No.' unique to this assessment, and the Gazetteer includes information regarding the type, period, grid reference, National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) number, THC Historic Environment Record (HER) number, statutory protective designation, and other descriptive information, as derived from the consulted sources.

Desk Study

11.5.3. The following sources were consulted for the collation of data:

- The NRHE as held by HES downloaded in November 2021.
- Spatial data and descriptive information for designated assets held on the HES data website Downloaded November 2021.
- The Highland Council HER extract received April 2021.
- National Library for Scotland (NLS) for Ordnance Survey maps and pre-Ordnance Survey historical maps.
- National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) held by HES.

11.5.4. LiDAR data held on the Scottish Remote Sensing Portal by the Scottish Government is not available for the site.

Field Survey

11.5.5. A walkover survey of the site was undertaken on 27 April 2021, and 17 and 18 May 2021 with the aim of identifying any previously unknown archaeological remains. All known and accessible heritage assets were assessed in the field to establish their survival, extent, significance, and relationship to other sites. Weather and any other conditions affecting the visibility during the survey were also recorded. Photographs of the general site terrain and land use were taken, and archaeological remains were also recorded via photography and written records. These are detailed in the Gazetteer (**Appendix 11.1**).

11.5.6. Visits were made to designated heritage assets to inform the setting assessment on 26 and 28 April 2021. Weather conditions consisted of intermittent rain showers giving variable visibility.

Assessment of Likely Effect Significance

11.5.7. This assessment distinguishes between the term 'impact' and 'effect'. An impact is defined as a physical change to a heritage asset or its setting, whereas an effect refers to the significance of this impact. The first stage of the assessment involves establishing the significance and importance of the heritage assets and assessing the sensitivity of those assets to change (impact). Using the proposed design for the Proposed Development, an assessment of the impact magnitude is made and a judgement regarding the level and significance of effect is arrived at.

Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

11.5.8. The definition of cultural significance is readily accepted by heritage professionals both in the UK and internationally and was first fully outlined in the Burra Charter, which states in article one that 'cultural significance' or 'cultural heritage value' means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations (ICOMOS 2013, Article 1.2). This definition has since been adopted by heritage organisations around the world, including HES. HEPS notes that to have cultural significance an asset must have a particular *"aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations*" (HES 2019a). Heritage assets also have value in the sense that they "...*contribute to sense of place, cultural identity, social wellbeing, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning*" (Scottish Government 2020, 33).

11.5.9. All heritage assets have significance; however, some heritage assets are judged to be more important than others. The level of that importance is, from a cultural resource management perspective, determined by establishing the asset's capacity to contribute to our understanding or appreciation of the past (HES 2019b). In the case of many heritage assets their importance has already been established through the designation (i.e., Scheduling, Listing and Inventory) processes applied by HES. The rating of importance of heritage assets is first and foremost made in reference to their designation. For non-designated assets importance will be assigned based on professional judgement and guided by the criteria presented in **Table 11.2**, which itself relates to the criteria for designations as set out in HES's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b) and Scotland's Listed Buildings (HES 2019c).

Table 11.2 – Impact Criteria for Establishing Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance	Receptors
Very High	World Heritage Sites (As protected by SPP, 2014); Other designated or non-designated assets with demonstrable Outstanding Universal Value.
High	Scheduled Monuments (as protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (the "1979 Act"); Category A Listed Buildings (as protected by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997) (the "1997 Act"); Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011); Inventory Battlefields (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the 2011 Act); Outstanding examples of some period, style or type; Non-designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, 2014).
Medium	Category B and C Listed Buildings (as protected by the 1997 Act); Conservation Areas (as protected by the 1997 Act); Major or representative examples of some period, style or type; or Non-designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, (2014);
Low	Locally Listed assets; Examples of any period, style or type which contribute to our understanding of the historic environment at the local level.
Negligible	Relatively numerous types of assets;

Importance	Receptors
	Findspots of artefacts that have no definite archaeological remains known in their context;
	The above non-designated features are protected by Paragraph 137 of SPP, 2014.

11.5.10. Determining cultural heritage significance can be made with reference to the intrinsic, contextual and associative characteristics of an asset as set out in HEPS (HES 2019a) and its accompanying Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b). HEPS Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019b) indicates that the relationship of an asset to its setting or the landscape makes up part of its contextual characteristics. The Xi'an Declaration (ICOMOS 2005) set out the first internationally accepted definition of setting with regard to heritage assets, indicating that setting is important where it forms part of or contributes to the significance of a heritage asset. While SPP does not differentiate between the importance of the asset itself and the importance of the asset's setting, HES's Managing Change Guidance, in defining what factors need to be considered in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place, states that the magnitude of the proposed change should be considered "*relative to the sensitivity of the setting of an asset*" (HES 2020, 11); thereby making clear that assets vary in their sensitivity to changes in setting and thus have a relative sensitivity.

11.5.11. The EIA Handbook suggests that cultural significance aligns with sensitivity but also states that "*the relationship between value and sensitivity should be clearly articulated in the assessment*" (HES and SNH 2018, 184). It is therefore recognised (ibid) that the importance of an asset is not the same as its sensitivity to changes to its setting. Elements of setting may make a positive, neutral, or negative contribution to the significance of an asset. Thus, in determining the nature and level of effects upon assets and their settings by the development, the contribution that setting makes to an asset's significance and thus its sensitivity to changes to setting need to be considered.

11.5.12. This approach recognises the importance of preserving the integrity of the setting of an asset in the context of the contribution that setting makes to the understanding, appreciation and experience of a given asset. It recognises that setting is a key characteristic in understanding and appreciating some, but by no means all, assets. Indeed, assets of High or Very High importance do not necessarily have high sensitivity to changes to their settings (e.g. do not necessarily have a high relative sensitivity). An asset's relative sensitivity to alterations to its setting refers to its capacity to retain its ability to contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past in the face of changes to its setting. The ability of an asset's setting to contribute to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it and its significance also has a bearing on the sensitivity of that asset to changes to its setting. While heritage assets of High or Very High importance are likely to be sensitive to direct effects, not all will have a similar sensitivity to effects on their setting; this would be true where setting does not appreciably contribute to their significance. HES's guidance on setting makes clear that the level of effect may relate to "*the ability of the setting [of an asset] to absorb new development without eroding its key characteristics*" (2020, 11). Assets with Very High or High relative sensitivity to settings effects may be vulnerable to any changes that affect their settings, and even slight changes may erode their key characteristics or the ability of their settings to contribute to the understanding, appreciation and experience of them. Assets whose relative sensitivity to changes to their setting is lower, may be able to accommodate greater changes to their settings without having key characteristics eroded.

11.5.13. The criteria used for establishing an asset's relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is detailed in **Table 11.3**. This table has been developed based on AOC's professional judgement and experience in assessing setting effects. It has been developed with reference to the policy and guidance noted above including SPP (Scottish Government 2014), HEPS (HES 2019a) and its Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b), the Xi'an Declaration

(ICOMOS 2005), the EIA Handbook (SNH & HES 2018) and HES's guidance on the setting of heritage assets (HES 2020).

Table 11.3- Criteria for Establishing Relative Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to Changes to its Setting.

Relative Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	An asset, the setting of which, is critical to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having Very High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, make an essential direct contribution to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES 2019b, Annex 1).
High	An asset, the setting, of which, makes a major contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, contribute directly to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES 2019b, Annex 1).
Medium	An asset, the setting of which, makes a moderate contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having Medium Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset for which setting makes a contribution to significance but whereby its value is derived mainly from its other characteristics (HES 2019b).
Low	An asset, the setting of which, makes some contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Low Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This may be an asset whose value is predominantly derived from its other characteristics.
Marginal	An asset whose setting makes minimal contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Negligible Sensitivity to changes to its setting.

11.5.14. The determination of a heritage asset's relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is first and foremost reliant upon the determination of its setting and the key characteristics of setting which contribute to its cultural significance and an understanding and appreciation of that cultural significance. This aligns with *Stage 2* of the HES guidance on setting (2020, 9). The criteria set out in **Table 11.3** are intended as a guide. Assessment of individual heritage assets is informed by knowledge of the asset itself; of the asset type if applicable and by site visits to establish the current setting of the assets. This will allow for the use of professional judgement and each asset is assessed on an individual basis.

Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Change

11.5.15. Potential impacts, that is the physical change to known heritage assets, and unknown buried archaeological remains, or changes to asset settings, in the case of the Proposed Development relate to the possibility of disturbing, removing or destroying in situ remains and artefacts during the construction phase or the placement of new features within their setting during the operational phase.

11.5.16. The magnitude of the impacts upon heritage assets caused by the Proposed Development is rated using the classifications and criteria outlined in **Table 11.4**.

Table 11.4 – Criteria for Classifying Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
High	Substantial loss of information content resulting from total removal of an asset or large-scale removal of deposits from an asset; Major alteration of an asset's baseline setting, which materially compromises the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset and erodes the key characteristics (HES 2020) of the setting.
Medium	Loss of information content resulting from material alteration of the baseline conditions by removal of part of an asset; Alteration of an asset's baseline setting that effects the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset to a degree but whereby the cultural significance of the monument in its current setting remains legible. The key characteristics of the setting (HES 2020) are not eroded.
Low	Detectable impacts leading to minor loss of information content. Alterations to the asset's baseline setting, which do not affect the observer's ability to understand, appreciate or experience the contribution that setting makes to the asset's overall significance.
Negligible	Loss of a small percentage of the area of an asset's peripheral deposits; A reversible alteration to the fabric of the asset; A marginal alteration to the asset's baseline setting.
None	No effect predicted

Criteria for Assessing Significance

11.5.17. The predicted level of effect on each heritage asset is then determined by considering the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity in conjunction with the predicted magnitude of the impact. The method of deriving the level of effect is provided in **Table 11.5**.

Table 11.5 – Level of Effects based on Inter-Relationship between the Importance and/or Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset and/or its setting and the Magnitude of Impact.

Magnitude of Impact	Importance and/or Sensitivity				
	Negligible	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very High**
High	minor	moderate	moderate	major	major
Medium	negligible	minor	moderate	moderate	major
Low	negligible	negligible	minor	minor	moderate
Negligible	negligible	negligible	negligible	minor	minor

Levels of effects shaded in grey and in **bold** denote levels of effect which are considered to be Significant in EIA terms.

11.5.18. The level of effect is judged to be the interaction of the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity (**Tables 11.2** and/or **11.3**) and the magnitude of the impact (**Table 11.4**). In order to provide a level of consistency, the assessment of importance and relative sensitivity, the magnitude of impact and the assessment of level of effect are guided by pre-defined criteria. However, a qualitative descriptive narrative is also provided for each asset to summarise and

explain each of the professional value judgements that have been made in establishing importance and/or sensitivity and magnitude of impact for each individual asset.

11.5.19. Using professional judgment and with reference to the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment* (as updated) (IEMA 2017), and the *EIA Handbook* (2018), the assessment considers moderate and greater effects to be significant (shaded dark grey in **Table 11.5**), while minor and lesser effects are considered not significant.

Integrity of Setting

11.5.20. SPP notes that where there is potential for a proposed development to have an adverse effect on a Scheduled Monument or on the integrity of its setting, permission should only be granted where there are *'exceptional circumstances'* (Scottish Government 2014, para 145).

11.5.21. HES recommends an approach to impact assessment based on the concept of cultural significance as defined in HEPS (HES, 2019a, 5):

> *'Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance can be embodied in a place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.'*

11.5.22. HES provides further guidance on the assessment of impacts in the context of EIA in *Appendix 1* of the SNH and HES EIA Handbook (2018). However neither the EIA Handbook nor the HES Guidance on setting (HES 2020) address the Scheduled Monument policy test at paragraph 145 of SPP and therefore there is no published guidance on assessment of adverse effects on the integrity of the setting of a Scheduled Monument. For the purposes of this assessment, adverse effects on integrity of setting are judged to relate to whether a change would seriously adversely affect the asset's key attributes or elements of setting which contribute to an asset's significance to the extent that the setting of the asset can no longer be understood or appreciated and thus the cultural significance of the asset is reduced.

11.5.23. In terms of effects upon the setting of heritage assets, it is considered that only those effects identified as 'significant' in the assessment will have the potential to adversely affect integrity of setting. Where no significant effect is found, it is considered that the integrity of an asset's setting will remain intact. This is because for many assets, setting may make a limited contribution to their significance and as such changes would not affect the integrity of their settings. Additionally, as set out in **Table 11.4**, lower ratings of magnitude of change relate to changes that would not obscure or erode key characteristics of setting.

11.5.24. Where significant effects are found, a detailed assessment of adverse effects upon integrity of setting is made. Whilst non-significant effects are unlikely to affect integrity of setting, the reverse is not always true. That is, the assessment of an effect as being 'significant' does not necessarily mean that the adverse effect to the asset's setting will harm its integrity. Effects on integrity relate to the magnitude of impact on cultural significance (as defined by HES 2019a, 5) and not to EIA significance.

11.5.25. The assessment of adverse effect upon the integrity of an asset's setting, where required, is a qualitative one, and largely depends upon whether the effect predicted would result in a major impediment to the ability to understand or appreciate the heritage asset and therefore reduce its cultural significance.

Cumulative Effect Assessment

11.5.26. It is necessary to consider whether the effects of other schemes in conjunction with the Proposed Development would result in an additional cumulative change upon heritage assets, beyond the levels predicted for the Proposed Development alone. The in- combination effect also needs to be considered. However, only those assets which are judged to have the potential to be subject to significant cumulative effects are included in the detailed cumulative assessment provided.

11.5.27. The cumulative assessment has regard to the guidance on cumulative effects upon heritage assets as set out in *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook V5* (SNH & HES 2018) and utilises the criteria used in determining effects from the Proposed Development as outlined in **Tables 11.2** to **11.5** above. The assessment of cumulative effects considers whether there would be an increased impact, either additive or synergistic, upon the setting of heritage assets as a result of adding the Proposed Development to a baseline, which may include operational, under construction, consented or proposed developments as agreed with THC.

11.5.28. In determining the degree to which a cumulative effect may occur as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline a number of factors are taken into consideration including:

- the distance between wind farms;
- the interrelationship between their Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV);
- the overall character of the asset and its sensitivity to wind farms;
- the siting, scale and design of the wind farms themselves;
- the way in which the asset is experienced;
- the placing of the cumulative wind farm(s) in relation to both the individual proposal being assessed and the heritage asset under consideration; and
- the contribution of the cumulative baseline schemes to the significance of the effect, excluding the individual proposal being assessed, upon the setting of the heritage asset under consideration.

11.5.29. This assessment is based upon a list of operational or consented developments along with developments where planning permission has been applied for. Cumulative developments are shown within **Figure 6.26** and **6.27**. While all have been considered, only those which contribute to, or have the possibility to contribute to cumulative effects on specific heritage assets, are discussed in detail in the text. Additionally, given the emphasis NatureScot place on significant effects, cumulative effects have only been considered in detail for those assets where the effect on setting from the Proposed Development alone, has been judged to be minor or greater. The setting of assets which would have a magnitude of impact of negligible or less are judged to be unlikely to reach the threshold of significance as defined in **Table 11.5**.

Requirements for Mitigation

11.5.30. National and local planning policies and planning guidance outlined in **Section 11.3** of this report, require a mitigation response that is designed to take cognisance of the possible impacts upon heritage assets by a proposed development and avoid, minimise, or offset any such impacts as appropriate. The planning policies and guidance express a general presumption in favour of preserving heritage remains in situ [wherever possible]. Their 'preservation by record' (i.e., through excavation and recording, followed by analysis and publication by qualified archaeologists) is a less desirable alternative (SPP 2014, paras 137, 150).

Assessment of Residual Effect Significance

11.5.31. The residual effect is what remains following the application of mitigation and management measures, and construction has been completed and is thus the final level of impact associated with the Proposed Development. The level of residual effect is defined using criteria outlined in **Tables 11.2** to **11.5**. No direct mitigation is possible for setting effects (beyond embedded mitigation by design) and therefore residual effects on the setting of heritage assets would be the same as predicted for the operational phase. The predicted level of effect on each heritage asset is determined by considering the asset's sensitivity in conjunction with the predicted magnitude of the impact.

Limitations to Assessment

11.5.32. This assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives as described in the Data Sources in **Section 11.5.3**. HER data was received from THC in April 2021 and

NRHE data and HES Designation data was downloaded from HES in November 2021. This assessment does not include any records added or altered after these dates.

11.5.33. Given the limitations of Covid-19 restrictions historical and archival research was undertaken with reference to online and in-house resources.

11.6. Baseline Conditions

Context

11.6.1. Desk-based assessment and walkover survey have identified 46 heritage assets within the site, including Alltlaoigh, a Scheduled farmstead (Asset 3), together with 45 non-designated assets (Assets 2, 4-5, 43-44, and 47-86). These include 32 shooting butts, a further five possible shooting butts, and a boundary dyke (refer to **Figure 11.1**).

11.6.2. Within 5 km of the site boundary, there are a further seven Scheduled Monuments (Assets 17 to 23), which include Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17), Aitnoch cairn hut circle and field system (Asset 18), the 18th century Burnside Bridge (Asset 20), the prehistoric fort at Dunearn (Asset 20), a farmstead at Little Banchor (Asset 21), hut circles and field systems at Balnught (Asset 22) and a Pictish cross slab at Glenferness House (Asset 23) (refer to **Figure 11.2**).

11.6.3. There are six Listed Buildings within 5 km of the site boundary. These include the Category A Listed 18th century Dulsie Bridge (Asset 28) and Glenferness House (Asset 29), the Category B Listed Stables (Asset 35), Walled Garden and Gardener's House (Asset 36), and Gate Lodge, Gate Piers and Gates (Asset 37) at Glenferness House, and the Category C Listed mid-18th century farmhouse at Dulsie (Asset 34) (refer to **Figure 11.2**).

11.6.4. Between 5 km and 10 km from the site boundary, there are a further four Scheduled Monuments (Assets 24 to 27), which include Levrattich Cairn (Asset 24), the depopulated township at Ruthven (Asset 25), Edinchat cairn (Asset 26), and the chapel and enclosure at Finlarig (Asset 27). There are four Listed Buildings of Category A status between 5 km and 10km from the site boundary: the Ardclach Bell Tower (Asset 30), Logie Bridge, Ferness (Asset 31), Muckrach Castle (Asset 32), and the East Lodge, railway bridge on the A939 and entrance arch, Castle Grant (Asset 33). The north-west portion of the Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape of Castle Grant (Asset 38) is also within 5 km and 10 km from the site boundary (refer to **Figure 11.2**).

Archaeological and Historical Background

Undated Archaeological Remains

11.6.5. A cairn field (Asset 2) is recorded along the southern boundary of the site, south of the post-medieval Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3). Another cairn field (Asset 15) is recorded along the south-western site boundary. Later site visits have not identified either of these assets. Hummocky glacial deposits are recorded in this area and, as such, Assets 2 and 15 are possibly of geological origin.

Prehistoric (8000 BC – AD 43) and Roman (AD 43 – 410)

11.6.6. There are no heritage assets of prehistoric or Roman date within the site.

11.6.7. Within 1 km of the site is a small burial cairn (Asset 7). Five prehistoric Scheduled Monuments (Assets 18, 20, 22, 24 and 26) are located within 10 km of the site and include cairns, hut circles, field systems and a fort.

11.6.8. On the basis of current evidence, there is judged to be low potential for archaeological remains of prehistoric or Roman date to survive within the site.

Early Historic and Medieval (AD 410-AD 1600)

11.6.9. There are no heritage assets of Early Historic date within the site or the 1 km study area. One Scheduled Monument, a Pictish Cross Slab (Asset 23), is located within 10 km of the site.

11.6.10. There are no heritage assets of clearly medieval date within the site, though it is possible that the post-medieval farmsteads in the area may date to this period or have earlier antecedents.

11.6.11. Within 10 km of the site are two Scheduled Monuments: Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) and Finlarig Chapel (Asset 27). Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17), dating from the 13th century and home to Alexander Stewart, Earl of Buchan in the 14th century, is located on an island in the loch of the same name. Muckrach Castle (Asset 32), a Category A Listed Building, is also located within the 10 km study area.

11.6.12. On the basis of current evidence, there is judged to be low potential for archaeological remains of Early Historic or medieval date to survive on the site.

Post-medieval (AD1600-AD1900)

11.6.13. There are four previously recorded heritage assets of post-medieval date within the site (Assets 3, 4, 43 and 44) (refer to **Figure 11.1**). These include the Scheduled Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3) which comprises at least five structures and a kiln, and three smaller post-medieval settlements. Both Assets 3 and 5 are depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of 1868 – 1871 (refer to **Figure 11.3**).

11.6.14. A total of 40 individual heritage assets were recorded during the walkover survey (Assets 47- 85), which included a possible marker stone and shooting butts.

11.6.15. Within the 1 km study area are a number of non-designated post-medieval assets associated with agricultural activity, together with the old military road.

11.6.16. There are three post-medieval Scheduled Monuments (Assets 19, 21 and 25) within 10 km of the site, which include a bridge and two deserted settlements. There are also ten 19th century Listed Buildings within 10 km of the site, which include bridges (Assets 28, 31 and 33), houses and associated buildings (Assets 29, 34 – 37), a castle (Asset 32) and a bell tower (Asset 30).

11.6.17. The Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape of Castle Grant (centre Asset 38) extends to within c. 9.5 km of the site, and within the 10 km study area includes the Category A Listed East Lodge, railway bridge on the A939 and entrance arch (Asset 33).

11.6.18. On the basis of current evidence, there is judged to be low potential for archaeological remains of post-medieval date to survive on the site.

Modern (AD1900-Present)

11.6.19. The OS map published in 1906 depicts Badnonan (Asset 5) as consisting of a roofed building within a within an L-shaped in plan enclosure and second building, most likely a field barn within the western site boundary. To the west, Knockdhu is depicted as consisting of at least two buildings and a large enclosure.

11.6.20. A plan dated 1974 records “Grouse Butts” aligned roughly east-west across the northern portion of the site. Given the condition of most of the butts seen during the walkover survey, they possibly date to the late post-medieval period. A track, roughly aligned north-south, is depicted within the north-western area of the site. Another track which forks from this is depicted as extending into the central area of the site. A stone quarry is depicted in the eastern site boundary. The quarry appears to be accessed from a roughly aligned east-west track which originates at the B0097 and extends across the site.

11.6.21. A modern bridge over a burn (Asset 1) is recorded along the eastern site boundary.

11.6.22. On the basis of current evidence, there is judged to be low potential for archaeological remains of modern date to survive on the site.

Aerial Photography

11.6.23. Digitised arial photographs held by the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) were consulted online via AOC Archaeology's subscription to NCAP. No non-digitised aerial photographs showing the site were identified within the NCAP catalogue. Photographs dated 26 August 1946 and 14 May 1988 were consulted.

11.6.24. In general, the aerial photography consulted from 1946 and 1988 was very dark and shaded in appearance.

11.6.25. Aerial photography from 1988 (ASS/61188 Frame 0039; 0068) shows extensive drainage channels in the northern area of the site and in the surrounding landscape. The aerial photography also documents the changing river channel along the western boundary of the site.

11.6.26. The start of a track, which runs south-west from the B9007 within the eastern site boundary is visible on photograph dated 1988. The track is either depicted as being in construction or stopped at an area of modern disturbance within the site.

Previous Archaeological Works

11.6.27. Previous archaeological works are recorded to the north of the site. A desk based assessment which included a walkover survey of a small area proposed for a borrow pit was undertaken in 2015 (Asset 39). No archaeological remains were identified within the area surveyed. It was judged that no significant direct effects would be a consequence of works in that area.

11.6.28. A thin, linear area, which lies roughly parallel to the northern site boundary was subject to a desk based assessment which included a walkover survey in 2009 (Asset 41). The walkover survey recorded over 30 previously unrecorded or inaccurate locations of structures within the Rhilean Burn Valley over 1 km to the west of the site.

11.6.29. A polygonal area (Asset 40) within the north-west 1 km study area was subject to a watching brief in 2015. No previously unrecorded archaeological features were identified by archaeological monitoring and known archaeological features were avoided through design mitigation.

Walkover Survey

11.6.30. A systematic walkover survey of the site was undertaken between 27 April and 18 May 2021 to investigate the condition and significance of known archaeology on the site and identify any previously unknown remains. All assets recorded during this survey have been included in this assessment and are detailed in the post-medieval and modern sections above.

11.6.31. The walkover survey was undertaken in predominantly dry weather with good visibility. The nature of the site is predominantly heath land, the topography slopes down into a valley from the east. Few finds of an archaeological nature were recorded within the site.

11.6.32. Shooting butts were present within the site varying from stone construction with encompassing grass embankments to simple timber barricades. It was noticeable that some of these timber shooting butts were in a poor state of repair while other timber barricades looked well maintained and are probably still in use.

11.6.33. Remains of farmsteads at Assets 5, 43 and 44 were visited during the walkover survey. These farmsteads are located within the valley on roughly flay ground. The Scheduled Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3) was also visited during the walkover survey.

Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment

Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment of Direct Effects

11.6.34. A total of 46 cultural heritage assets have been identified within the site. Their relative importance has been classified according to the method shown in **Table 11.2** and is discussed below. A summary is provided in **Table 11.6**.

Table 11.6 – Assets Brought Forward for Assessment of Direct Effects

Asset Number	Asset Name	Designation	Description	Importance
2	Alltlaoigh	Non-designated	Cairnfield	Negligible
3	Alltlaoigh	Scheduled Monument	Farmstead	High
4	Carn Nan Clach Garbha	Non-designated	Farmstead	Low
5	Badnonan	Non-designated	Farmstead	Low
15	Cairnfield	Non-designated	Cairnfield	Negligible
43	E of Carn Nan Clach Garbha	Non-designated	Farmstead	Low
44	E of Carn Nan Clach Garbha	Non-designated	Building	Low
47 to 66 and 68 to 83	Shooting Butt	Walkover Survey Asset	Shooting Butt	Negligible
67	Boundary Dyke	Walkover Survey Asset	Boundary Dyke	Low
84	Boundary Marker	Walkover Survey Asset	Boundary Marker (Possible)	Low

11.6.35. The farmstead at Alltlaoigh (Asset 3) is a Scheduled Monument representing a well-preserved later historic rural settlement with many of its architectural features intact. It is judged to be of High importance.

11.6.36. The farmsteads and buildings at Badnonan (Asset 5) and Carn Nan Clach Garbha (Assets 4, 43 and 44), the boundary dyke (Asset 67) and possible boundary marker stone (Asset 84) also represent later historic rural activity in the area. On the basis that they contribute to an understanding of the historic environment at a local level they are judged to be of Low importance.

11.6.37. The shooting butts (Assets 47 to 66 and 68 to 83) are representative of sporting activity in the area. They represent extremely common remains and are unlikely to provide any further information. The cairnfields (Assets 2 and 15) are suggested to be natural hummocks and unlikely to provide any information further to that currently recorded. As such, these assets are judged to be of Negligible importance.

Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment of Setting Effects

11.6.38. There are eight Scheduled Monuments and six Listed Buildings lying within the ZTV and, as all are designated heritage assets of high or medium importance, have been carried forward for detailed assessment. These assets are indicated in **Table 11.7**.

Table 11.7 – Assets Brought Forward for Assessment

Asset Number & Name	Designation	Distance to Nearest Proposed Turbine
Asset 3 Alltlaoigh, farmstead 1990m NE of Cnapan a' Choire Odhair Bhig	Scheduled Monument	1.16 km north
Asset 17 Lochindorb castle	Scheduled Monument	3.97 km west-south-west
Asset 18 Aitnoch, cairn, hut circle & field system	Scheduled Monument	5.06 km west-south-west
Asset 19 Burnside, Bridge 300m W of	Scheduled Monument	2.82 km south-south-west
Asset 20 Dunearn, Fort 510m S of	Scheduled Monument	2.92 km south-south-west
Asset 22 Balnught, hut circle 1225m ENE of	Scheduled Monument	4.25 km south-east
Asset 23 Princess Stone, cross-slab 250m SSW of Glenferness House	Scheduled Monument	4.90 km south-south-west
Asset 24 Levrattich, cairn 340m W of	Scheduled Monument	8.09 km south-south-west
Asset 29 Glenferness House	Listed Building - Category A	5.14 km south-south-west
Asset 30 Ardclach Bell Tower	Listed Building - Category A	8.01 km south-south-west
Asset 34 Dulsie Farmhouse, Dulsie Bridge	Listed Building - Category C	3.75 km south-south-west
Asset 35 Stables, Glenferness House	Listed Building - Category B	5.25 km south-south-west
Asset 36 Glenferness House Walled Garden and Gardener's House	Listed Building - Category B	5.31 km south-south-west
Asset 37 Gate Lodge, Gatepiers & Gates, Glenferness House	Listed Building - Category B	5.74k m south-south-west

11.7. Potential Effects

Construction

11.7.1. During construction, direct physical impacts could occur from site vegetation clearance, earthmoving operations, creation of the substation, track construction, and construction of all associated infrastructure (turbine bases, compounds, drainage etc.). Setting impacts may occur due to the introduction of construction machinery on-site, additional construction traffic and construction of compounds.

11.7.2. Given the nature of the above construction impacts, setting impacts are only likely to occur in close proximity to the proposed works. The closest designated asset to the site, Alltlaoigh (Asset 3), lies 1.16 km south of the nearest turbine; no significant construction effects on its setting are anticipated. Any effects of construction activities upon setting would be temporary, short-term and reversible.

11.7.3. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid direct impacts on known heritage assets where possible. Two of the 45 non-designated assets that have been identified on the site could potentially be directly impacted by the Proposed Development (Assets 65 and 66)

(**Figure 11.1**). These assets both represent shooting butts and could be compromised by the upgrade of the existing track and creation of borrow pits.

11.7.4. Both assets are considered to be of Negligible importance and any impacts would be of negligible magnitude with no measurable loss of information content. These impacts would represent **negligible** level effects, which are **not significant**. As such, no mitigation is recommended.

Operation

11.7.5. Operational phase effects have the potential to impact upon the settings of assets such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Inventory Battlefields. There are no Conservation Areas or World Heritage Sites within the Study Areas. ZTV analysis and mapping have been used to identify those assets that could potentially be affected by changes to their settings during the operational phase of the Proposed Development (refer to **Figure 11.2**) and the assets that have been carried forward for detailed assessment have been outlined in **Table 11.7**. The detailed assessments have included a review of the contextual characteristics of each asset using information drawn from their designation documentation, supplemented by observations on the morphology, condition and character of each asset and the nature of their settings made during site visits undertaken in April 2021.

11.7.6. With the exception of Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3), Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) and Dunearn fort (Asset 20), on which the settings assessment found the Proposed Development would have a **moderate**, and therefore **significant**, effect, it was found that the effect of the Proposed Development upon the setting of the designated assets would range from **minor** to **negligible** and **not significant**. A summary of the effects is presented in **Table 11.8** in **Appendix 11.3**, which is followed by a detailed qualitative assessment for each asset. Given the potential significant effect upon Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3), Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) and Dunearn fort (Asset 20) they are discussed below.

Alltlaoigh, farmstead 1990m NE of (Asset 3)

11.7.7. The Scheduled post-medieval farmstead complex of Alltlaoigh (Asset 3) is visible as upstanding remains in remote, open moorland on the west bank of the Allt Laoigh. The operational turbines of Tom Nan Clach Repowering are visible to the west of the farmstead complex. Although such remote locations often accommodate only temporary, summer settlement, the complexity of these remains, which include a kiln barn, is indicative of permanent residence. The setting of this monument relates to the surrounding moorland, the remoteness of which, at least in part, contributes to an understanding of the way most of the rural population lived and worked in the late-18th and early-19th century. It shows a type of settlement associated with upland dwelling, in a location that today would be considered unsustainable. The farmstead is judged to be of high sensitivity to change in its setting.

11.7.8. The nearest turbine of the Proposed Development would be 1.16 km to the north, with the ZTV indicating that 13-17 turbines would be visible from the asset within its main viewshed. The Proposed Development turbines would be seen offset form the Tom Nan Clach turbines currently visible from the monument and due to their proximity would appear as much larger features within the wider open moorland setting of the farmstead (Heritage Viewpoint 1; refer to **Figure 6.56**). Although the turbines would be located within the elements that contribute to an understanding of the settlement's location, the Proposed Development would not materially impact the setting of the asset to such an extent that an understanding and appreciation of the monument, its cultural significance and its relationship to that setting would be diminished and, as such, it is judged that there would be a medium magnitude of setting impact from the Proposed Development. This would lead to a **moderate** level of effect, which is considered to be **significant** in EIA terms.

11.7.9. The Proposed Development would not adversely affect the ability to understand the strategic positioning of the farmstead adjacent to the Allt Laoigh burn within an upland setting. The key

relationship between the farmstead and adjacent land would remain appreciable and thus the integrity of its setting would not be affected.

Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17)

11.7.10. Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) comprises the Scheduled remains of a 13th century castle set on an island in the middle of Lochindorb Loch, located 290 m from its eastern shore. The castle was a key stronghold in the north of Scotland and is associated with several key historical figures; the Comyns of Badenoch and Edward I of England, and later Alexander Stewart (The Wolf of Badenoch) and the Black Douglases. Following the death of Archibald Douglas at the Battle of Arkinholm in 1455, a decision was made to dismantle the castle and it has lain ruinous and largely unaltered since. The castle survives as a stone built quadrilateral enclosure with round towers at its corners. The entrance gateway to the castle is placed within the east wall and gives access to a landing stage on the loch shore. The castle thus has a high associative value with numerous historical figures and is also of great importance to the study of medieval military and domestic architecture. The castle is depicted in numerous paintings from the late 19th and early 20th century. These paintings show varying views of the castle from a range of locations across the landscape and demonstrate that the castle has long been recognised for its scenic qualities. The castle thus also has a high aesthetic value.

11.7.11. Lochindorb Castle is located within a topographic bowl in the landscape, and its setting comprises the island, loch and gently sloping sides of the loch shore. The castle is a prominent feature within the loch and is highly visible when viewed across the landscape. The wider context of the castle comprises open moorland hills which rise most steeply to the west. Coniferous forest plantation is also located to the west of the loch and features in views of the castle in this direction. The operational turbines of Tom Nan Clach wind farm are visible to the west of the castle. To the north-east, the views include operational turbines at Berry Burn and Paul's Hill Wind Farm seen against a backdrop of moorland hills and, occasionally, skyline.

11.7.12. The setting of Lochindorb Castle, given its highly visible location within the loch and below much of the surrounding landform, contributes directly to an understanding and appreciation of the heritage asset as a high status strategic and defensive structure. The position of the island in the loch afforded the castle's occupants uninterrupted views of approaches across the loch from all directions, and its island setting allows for an appreciation of how the castle's position allowed its occupants to exert control over the adjacent land. The moorland hills in the wider landscape make some contribution to an understanding of the locational context of Lochindorb Castle and use of natural terrain in enhancing its defensibility. Lochindorb Castle is judged to be of high sensitivity to changes to its setting.

11.7.13. The nearest turbine of the Proposed Development would be approximately 3.97 km to the west-south-west, with the ZTV indicating that 13-17 turbines would be visible from the asset (Heritage Viewpoint 2; refer to **Figure 6.57**). Views of both the castle and the Proposed Development would be possible from various locations along the minor road which runs along the eastern shore of Lochindorb, connecting the A939 to the B9007. This road affords a range of sequential views towards the castle, dropping down to the northern shore of the loch, along the eastern shore and up onto higher land to the south-west of the loch. Heritage Viewpoint 4 (refer to **Figure 6.59**) from the north-eastern shore of the loch shows the turbines off set from views towards the castle with the turbines set clearly behind the low hills which slope down towards the loch shore. The clearest and closest view of the castle are afforded from the section of road on the loch side, approximately 290 m south-east of the Scheduled Monument. There are several passing places and informal laybys along this section. Visualisations produced from three of these locations (Heritage Viewpoints 3, 5 and 9 refer to **Figures 6.58, 6.60 – 6.64 and 6.68**) show that the Proposed Development would be visible in the same view as the castle from the loch shore but would be seen offset from the castle and would appear beyond the topographic bowl in which it is set. From these locations, the Proposed Development would be seen within a view already featuring wind turbine development against the skyline but would increase the spread of turbines visible in views towards the castle from the loch shore. The lower portions of the Proposed Development turbines would be hidden or partially backdropped

by hills. Depending upon the exact location on the shore from which the castle is viewed the tips of several turbines and some hubs would be visible against the skyline.

11.7.14. As the road continues south and then west it turns away from the loch shore, and the castle is lost from view behind trees and topography. Heritage Viewpoint 6 (refer to **Figure 6.65**) taken from the B9007, when the castle comes into view on approach from the south-west, shows that the Proposed Development is offset in views towards the castle from this approach and that it would also largely be hidden by the intervening landform. The Proposed Development would thus be visible in numerous views towards Lochindorb Castle from the loch shore. However, the turbines would be seen within the open moorland beyond the core setting of the castle, defined as the island, loch and sloping ground surrounding the loch. The Proposed Development would also be seen in a direction of view which already features wind turbine development. The existing views of turbines backdropping the castle do not currently affect the ability to understand or appreciate the castle in its setting. The Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to understand and appreciate the location of the castle within a topographic bowl in the landscape, nor would it impede the ability of the viewer to understand its defensive advantages. Key views towards the castle from the loch shore, up and down the length of the road, would still be understandable and remain appreciable. However, there may be some effect on the current experience of the asset, as the Proposed Development would introduce relatively large modern features on the moorland hills, where previously development has been of a smaller scale. There is judged to be a medium magnitude of setting impact from the Proposed Development. Overall, this would lead to a **moderate** level of effect, which is considered to be **significant** in EIA terms.

11.7.15. The Proposed Development would not materially impact the setting of the asset such that an understanding and appreciation of the monument, its cultural significance and its relationship to that setting would be diminished. As such the integrity of the setting would not be impacted.

Dunearn, fort 510m S of (Asset 20)

11.7.16. The Scheduled Dunearn hill fort (Asset 20) is located on the summit of a prominent rocky outcrop east of the River Findhorn. The outcrop commands a strategic prominent position owing to its relatively isolated elevated location above the lower lying fertile land along the Findhorn valley and lends an associated prominence and strategic importance to the fort. The remains of two lines of defence around the perimeter of the fort can be traced although the interior is now featureless as a consequence of later ploughing. Although somewhat damaged by the ploughing of its interior, the monument is clearly legible within its current setting and its command of panoramic views across the surrounding landscape contributes to the understanding of its strategic placement. Its location allows clear views over the rich agricultural land in the Findhorn valley, contemporary settlement and key communication routes. Numerous operational turbines are also currently visible. The fort is of high relative sensitivity to changes in its setting.

11.7.17. The nearest turbine of the Proposed Development would be located approximately 2.92 km to the south-south-west, with the ZTV indicating that 13-17 turbines would be visible from the asset. The turbines would occupy a considerable proportion of the wider setting of the fort (refer to **Figure 6.66**), although views of the turbines would be impeded to a degree in the summer months when deciduous trees would provide some screening. The magnitude of impact on the setting is judged to be medium. This would give a **moderate** level of effect, which is considered **significant** in EIA terms.

11.7.18. The strategic location of the fort on the summit of an outcrop which commands wide reaching views across the landscape would remain legible as would the core relationship between the fort and the Findhorn Valley. Existing views of turbines do not detract from an ability to understand and appreciate the setting of the fort. The Proposed Development would not reduce the ability to understand and appreciate the core setting relationships with the Findhorn valley and wider landscape and as such the integrity of the setting of the fort would not be affected by the Proposed Development.

Decommissioning

11.7.19. Detailed assessment of impacts on cultural heritage assets arising from the decommissioning phase have been scoped out of this assessment. A detailed assessment of the cultural heritage impacts of decommissioning the Proposed Development has not been undertaken as part of the EIA because: (i) the future baseline conditions (environmental and other developments) cannot be predicted accurately at this stage; (ii) the detailed proposals for decommissioning are not known at this stage, and (iii) the best practice decommissioning guidance methods will likely change during the lifetime of the Proposed Development.

11.7.20. In general, is anticipated that direct impacts during the decommissioning phase would be limited and would only occur if new ground works are required beyond the areas disturbed during the original construction works and as such no significant direct effects are expected to arise from the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. All indirect operational effects upon the settings of designated assets would be reversed with the removal of the turbines following decommissioning, leading to a neutral and not significant effect.

11.8. Mitigation

11.8.1. National planning policies and planning guidance as well as the local planning policies require that account be taken of potential effects upon heritage assets by proposed developments and that where possible such effects are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible effects should be minimised or offset.

Development Design

11.8.2. The Landscape and Visual Assessment (**Chapter 6**) discusses the measures taken to reduce the appearance or visual presence of the turbines within the wider landscape. The Proposed Development has been designed to present a clearly structured, balanced arrangement which responds positively to key landscape features and local topography. Steps have been taken to promote a simple balanced composition that minimises overlapping turbines, skyline effects and back-grounding (see **Chapter 2**: **Site Selection and Design** for further details). Consideration has also been given to other design issues, including turbine colour, size and siting; the design and form of the substation building; and the alignment of access tracks to ensure these proposed features relate to the key characteristics of the landscape. As setting effects largely result from the visual presence of the turbines within the landscape the same mitigation measures apply to setting effects on cultural heritage assets.

Additional Mitigation and Enhancement

11.8.3. The known archaeological remains within the site are mostly of negligible or local cultural value, and furthermore, direct impacts of only negligible level effects are predicted on two heritage assets. However, given the presence of large zones of (generally shallow) peat moorland within the site there is a low probability that currently unknown buried remains might be disturbed by ground-breaking works on the site during construction. Accordingly, it is recommended that a representative proportion of these works, in areas of relatively greater archaeological potential, are subject to an archaeological watching brief during these works. The extent and location of such works would be agreed with THC Historic Environment Team. The purpose of such a watching brief would be to determine the presence, character, extent and significance of any currently unknown archaeological features or artefacts that may be disturbed by ground-breaking works.

11.8.4. The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland aims to ‘enhance participation through encouraging greater access to and interpretation and understanding of the significance of the historic environment’ (2014, 24). Accepting the significant impacts predicted upon the setting of Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) as a result of the Proposed Development; proposals for increasing access and interpretation to this asset are explored within the Outline Outdoor Access Plan for the Proposed Development (**Appendix 3.2**). This plan proposes to create a new public path, Dunearn Footpath, leading to a viewpoint from which there will be a view of

Lochindorb Castle from the north western side of Lochindorb (see **Figure 3.10**). There is currently no access to the loch or a view of the castle from the north western side and thus the construction of this path will create an opportunity to better understand and appreciate the wider setting of the castle and its relationships with the shores of loch. A stopping place will be constructed along the B9007 road which runs between the Proposed Development site and the adjacent woodland area and will be the starting point for the Dunearn Footpath. The Proposed Development would be set west of the path and the viewpoint and thus would not be visible in any views towards the castle from here. The new path will be sign posted / way marked and an interpretation panel will be provided at the viewpoint to give visitors information on Lochindorb and the history of Lochindorb Castle. The Outline Outdoor Access Plan will thus present an opportunity for people to 'enjoy, appreciate, learn from and understand Scotland's historic environment' as outlined in HEPS (HES 2019a; HEP2).

11.9. Residual Effects

Construction

11.9.1. As stated in **Paragraphs 11.7.1-11.7.3**, the Proposed Development has been designed to avoid direct impacts on known heritage assets where possible. Two non-designated assets (Assets 65 and 66) could potentially be directly impacted by the construction of Proposed Development, however at worst, these impacts would be **negligible**, and no mitigation is recommended. The residual impacts on known heritage assets during construction are therefore considered to be **not significant**.

Operation

11.9.2. As the mitigation measures taken to reduce setting impacts on designated cultural heritage assets have largely been implemented through the development design (as described in **Paragraphs 11.7.4-11.7.15**) and offset compensatory enhancement (**Paragraph 11.8.4**) the predicted residual impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets will be the same as assessed for the operational and cumulative effects.

Decommissioning

11.9.3. No significant residual impacts are anticipated.

11.10. Cumulative Effects

11.10.1. Cumulative effects relating to cultural heritage are for the most part limited to operational effects upon the settings of heritage assets. While there can in some rare cases, be cumulative direct effects, none are anticipated to result from the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. As such this assessment will consider the potential for cumulative effects upon the setting of heritage assets which have the potential to occur during the operational phase.

11.10.2. With regard to potential cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets, the assessment considers operational, consented and within-planning developments at distances up to 20 km from the Proposed Development. The locations of the cumulative developments are shown on **Figure 3.2** and **Figures 6.56** to **6.62** and **6.65** to **6.68**. Developments at the scoping stage, including Tom nan Clach Extension and Ourack, are not considered. Cumulative effects from the operational developments at Farr, Moy, Tom nan Clach Repowering, Hill of Glaschyle, Berry Burn and Paul's Hill I; consented/under construction developments at Glen Kyllachy, Cairn Dhuie and Paul's Hill II; and in planning developments at Cairn Dhuie and Clash Gour are included. While all have been considered, only those which contribute to, or have the possibility to contribute to, cumulative effects on specific heritage assets are discussed in detail in the text.

11.10.3. Cumulative effects have been considered for those assets where the effect upon setting from the Proposed Development alone has been judged to be of minor level or greater and/or for

assets which have been identified by consultees as requiring further assessment. This is because it is judged to be unlikely that cumulative effects upon the setting of those monuments which would be subject to low level effects (based on the Proposed Development itself) are unlikely to reach the EIA Regulation significance threshold. The assets considered for cumulative effects are detailed in **Table 11.9**.

Table 11.9 – Summary of Cumulative Effects

Asset Number	Receptor Name	Receptor Sensitivity	Cumulative Impact Magnitude (Adverse unless stated)	Level of Effect
3	Alltlaoigh, farmstead 1990m NE of Cnapan a' Choire Odhair Bhig	High	Low	Minor
17	Lochindorb Castle	High	Low	Minor
18	Aitnoch, cairn, hut circle and field system 1400m SSE of	Medium	Low	Minor
20	Dunearn, fort 510m S of	High	Low	Minor
24	Levrattich, cairn 340m W of	Medium	Low	Minor
30	Ardclach Bell Tower	High	Low	Minor

11.10.4. The setting of the Alltlaoigh farmstead (Asset 3) relates to the surrounding moorland, which was used for agricultural purposes. The farmstead has open views towards the Proposed Development. The operational development at Tom Nan Clach to the west is currently visible. Blade tips of the operational development at Cairn Duhie to the north are also visible (refer to **Figure 6.56**). Although the Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by a relatively large scale wind farm development, it would not materially impact the setting of the asset to such an extent that an understanding and appreciation of the monument, its cultural significance and its relationship to that setting would be diminished. The magnitude of cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of the cumulative impact would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.10.5. Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17) is located within a topographic bowl in the landscape, and its setting comprises the island, loch and gently sloping sides of the loch shore. The castle is a prominent feature within the loch and is highly visible when viewed across the landscape. The wider context of the castle comprises open moorland hills which rise most steeply to the west. Coniferous forest plantation is also located to the west of the loch and features in views of the castle in this direction. The operational turbines of Tom Nan Clach wind farm are visible to the west of the castle (refer to **Figures 6.57 – 6.61 and 6.68**). To the north and north-east, the views over the castle from the B9007 include operational turbines at Cairn Duhie, Hill of Glaschyle, Berry Burn and Clash Gour seen against a backdrop of moorland hills and, occasionally, skyline (refer to **Figure 6.65**). The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the relationship between the monument and its position in the landscape. The magnitude of the cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of the cumulative impact would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.10.6. The setting of Aitnoch, cairn, hut circle and field system (Asset 18) is principally that of Dorback Burn and Lochindorb. The operational developments of Tom nan Clach to the west, and Berry Burn and Paul's Hill I and II to the north-east are currently visible. The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the relationship between the monument and its position in the landscape. The magnitude of

cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.10.7. The setting of Dunearn hill fort (Asset 20) relates to its strategic prominent position of a relatively isolated elevated location above the lower lying fertile land along the Findhorn valley lending an associated prominence and strategic importance to the fort. Its location allows clear views over the rich agricultural land in the Findhorn valley, contemporary settlement and key communication routes. The operational turbines of Tom nan Clach are visible to the south-west (refer to **Figure 6.66**) and those of Hill of Glaschyle, Berry Burn and Paul's Hill I and II to the north-east and east. The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the relationship between the monument and its position in the landscape. The magnitude of cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.10.8. The setting of Levrattich, cairn 340m W of (Asset 24) relates to its elevated position with extensive views across, and from, the wider landscape. The operational turbines of Berry Burn are visible to the east. The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the relationship between the monument and its position in the landscape. The magnitude of cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.10.9. The setting of Ardclach Tower (Asset 30) relates to its relatively isolated and elevated position with views over the surrounding landscape. The operational turbines of Moy, and Tom nan Clach (refer to **Figure 6.67**), to the south-west, and Hill of Glaschyle, Berry Burn and Paul's Hill I and II to the east are currently visible. The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the relationship between the monument and its position in the landscape. The magnitude of cumulative impact is judged to be low. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and **not significant**.

11.11. Summary

11.11.1. This chapter assesses the potential for direct and indirect effects on archaeological features and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

11.11.2. A total of 45 known non-designated heritage assets (Assets 2, 4-5, 43-44, and 47-86) and one Scheduled Monument (Asset 3) are situated within the site, all of which date to the post-medieval period and later. Two of the non-designated assets (Assets 65 and 66) could potentially be directly impacted by the construction of the Proposed Development. Both assets are considered to be of Negligible importance and impacts would at worst be of **negligible** effect. This is because the assets are of a common type with local interest only and there would not be a loss of information. As such, no mitigation is required.

11.11.3. Potential operational effects on settings of designated heritage assets within the 5 km and 10 km Study Areas have been considered in detail as part of this assessment. **Moderate** and **significant** effects have been predicted upon the settings of Allt Laoigh (Asset 3), Lochindorb (Asset 17) and Dunearn hill fort (Asset 20). **Minor** and **not significant** effects have been predicted upon the setting of the cairns at Aitnoch (Asset 18) and Levrattich (Asset 24), and Ardclach Bell Tower (Asset 30). **Negligible** and **not significant** effects have been predicted upon the settings of Burnside Bridge (Asset 19), Balnught hut circle (Asset 22), the Princess Stone (Asset 23), Glenferness House, Stables, Walled Garden and Gardener's House, and Gate Lodge, Gate Piers and Entrance Gates (Assets 29 and 35-37), and Dulsie Farmhouse (Asset 34).

11.11.4. The design of the Proposed Development has considered the presence and setting of the Scheduled Allt Laoigh (Asset 3) and Lochindorb (Asset 17) and sought to reduce impacts upon them through the proposed turbine placements. The possibility of cumulative effects has been considered and assessed and **no significant cumulative effects** have been identified.

Table 11.10 – Summary of Effects

Description of Effect	Significance of Potential Effect		Mitigation Measure	Significance of Residual Effect	
	Significance	Beneficial/Adverse		Significance	Beneficial/Adverse
Construction/Decommissioning					
Potential direct impact on Assets 65 and 66	Negligible	Adverse	Toolbox talks; archaeological watching brief, if required by HET	Negligible	Adverse
Operation					
Effects of the setting of Lochindorb Castle (Asset 17)	Moderate level effect and significant	Adverse	Compensatory offset mitigation to improve access understanding and enjoyment through establishment of Dunearn Footpath.	Moderate level effect and significant	Adverse
Effects on the settings of designated assets (Assets 3and 20)	Moderate level effect and significant	Adverse	N/A	Moderate level effect and significant	Adverse
Effects on the settings of designated assets (Assets 18-19, 22-24, 29-30 and 34-37)	Negligible to minor level effect and not significant	Adverse	N/A	Negligible to minor level effect and not significant	Adverse
Cumulative					
On all assets	Minor	Adverse	N/A	Minor	Adverse

11.12. References

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 (c46). [Online]. London. The Stationery Office. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46/pdfs/ukpga_19790046_en.pdf

British Geological Survey (BGS). (2021). Map viewer. Available at: https://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA). (2019 (Updated 2020)). *Code of Conduct* Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CodesofConduct.pdf

CIfA. (2019). *Regulations for professional conduct*. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Regulations%20for%20professional%20conduct%20May%202019.pdf

CIfA. (2017 (Updated 2020)). *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment* Available at: http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf

CIfA. (2014 (Updated 2020)). *Standard and guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment*. Available at: http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf

CNPA. (2017) Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan 2017-2022 Available at: https://cairngorms.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/170707CNPPP17-22FINAL_SinglePage.pdf

Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act, 2011 (Full) [Online]. London. The Stationery Office. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/pdfs/asp_20110003_en.pdf

HES. (2020). *Managing Change in the Historic Environment*. Available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549

HES. (2019a). *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland. Available* at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/historic-environment-policy-for-scotland-heps/

HES. (2019b) *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance*. Available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b

HES (2019c). *Scotland's Listed Buildings.* Available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=34c90cb9-5ff3-45c3-8bc3-a58400fcbc44

ICOMOS (2013) *The Burra Charter 2013: Article 1.2.* Available at: https://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/

ICOMOS (2005). *Xi'an Declaration.* Available at: https://www.icomos.org/xian2005/xian-declaration.

IEMA (2017) Environmental Impact Assessment Guide Available at: https://www.iema.net/document-download/7014

National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2000/10/pdfs/asp_20000010_en.pdf

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act 1997, (c9). [Online]. London. The Stationery Office. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/pdfs/ukpga_19970009_en.pdf

Ordnance Survey (OS) Name Book (1869). *Scotlands Places- OS1/22/1/86.* Available at: https://scotlandsplaces.gov.uk/digital-volumes/ordnance-survey-name-books/nairnshire-os-name-books-1869/nairnshire-volume-01/86

The Highland Council (THC). (2016). *Onshore Wind Energy: supplementary guidance.* Available at: https://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/file/18793/onshore_wind_energy_supplementary_guidance_november_2016

THC. (2015). *Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.* Available at:

file:///C:/Users/lisa.bird/Downloads/NEW_IMFLDP_web.pdf

THC. (2013). *Supplementary Guidance/ Historic Environment Strategy*. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/factsheet/2018/06/highland-council-planning-authority-core-documents/documents/highland-historic-environment-strategy-pdf/highland-historic-environment-strategy-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/Highland%2BHistoric%2BEnvironment%2BStrategy.pdf

THC. (2012). *Highland*-Wide *Local Development Plan*. Available at: file:///C:/Users/lisa.bird/Downloads/Highland_wide_Local_Development_Plan%20(2).pdf

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, (c8). [Online]. London. The Stationery Office. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/8/pdfs/ukpga_19970008_en.pdf

Scotland's Soils (N.d). National soil map of Scotland. Available at: https://map.environment.gov.scot/Soil_maps/?layer=1

Scottish Government (2014a) *Scottish Planning Policy*. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-planning-policy/

Scottish Government (2014b) *Our Place In Time - The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland* Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2014/03/place-time-historic-environment-strategy-scotland/documents/00445046-pdf/00445046-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00445046.pdf?forceDownload=true

Scottish Government (2011) *PAN2/2011 Planning and Archaeology*. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/

Scottish Natural Heritage (2012). Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/guidance-assessing-cumulative-impact-onshore-wind-energy-developments (*as updated by NatureScot in 2021)*

Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES). (2018). Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf.