

6 Cultural Heritage

6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 The ‘cultural heritage’ of an area comprises archaeological sites, historic buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs), Inventoried Battlefields and other historic environment features. Alongside its inherent values, the ‘setting’ of an asset may also contribute to its cultural heritage significance.
- 6.1.2 The cultural heritage impact assessment will: identify cultural heritage assets that may be subject to significant effects, both within the limits of the Proposed Development and within a surrounding radius of 10 km; establish the potential for currently unknown archaeological assets to survive buried within the Site; assess the predicted effects on these assets; and propose a programme of mitigation where appropriate. It will consider direct effects (such as physical disturbance or effects through setting change), indirect effects (such as might result from dewatering), and cumulative effects (where assets affected by the Proposed Development are also likely to be affected by other related development proposals).
- 6.1.3 The proposed approach to the assessment of effects on cultural heritage is set out below. The assessment has been undertaken by Erin Ashby MSc PCIfA, Senior Heritage Consultant at SLR Consulting Ltd and has been approved by Beth Gray MA (Hons) ACIfA, Principal Heritage Consultant, SLR Consulting Ltd.
- 6.1.4 The chapter is supported by:
- **Technical Appendix 6.1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets**
 - **Technical Appendix 6.2: Cultural Heritage Appraisal**
- 6.1.5 Figures 6.1 - 6.10 are referenced in the text where relevant.

6.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislation

- 6.2.1 The assessment will be undertaken in accordance with the following principal relevant legislation:
- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
 - The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997;
 - The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011; and

- Scottish Statutory Instrument No. 101 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

Policy

- 6.2.2 The Scottish Government and HES have issued a number of statements of policy with respect to dealing with the historic environment in the planning system:
- National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4; 2023);
 - Onshore Wind Policy Statement (2022).
 - Historic Environment Scotland: Designation Policy and Selection guidance (2020);
 - Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS; 2019);and
 - Highland-wide Local Development Plan (2012).

Guidance

- 6.2.3 Relevant guidance and technical standard documents comprise:
- Our Past, Our Future: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (2023)¹;
 - Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (2020);
 - A Guide to Climate Change Impact: On Scotland’s Historic Environment (2019);
 - NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland (2019);
 - Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (2014, updated 2020); and
 - Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.

6.3 Consultation

- 6.3.1 In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the scoping responses and other consultation undertaken as detailed in **Table 6.1**.

¹Supersedes Our Place in Time (2014), Historic Environment Scotland.

Table 6.1: Consultation with Stakeholders

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issues Raised	Response/Action
The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (THCHET) 14 th May 2024	Scoping	<p>The response laid out expectation for the EIAR, highlighting the need to identify any designated sites which may be affected by the development either directly or indirectly.</p> <p>The response states that it would be helpful if, where the assessment finds that significant impacts are likely, appropriate visualisations such as photomontage and wireframe views of the development in relation to the sites and their settings could be provided.</p> <p>The Council's Archaeology team were satisfied that the information presented in the Scoping Report will adequately address an impact assessment for this proposal. The methodology, mitigation measures, scope of assessment and study area was deemed acceptable. Where impacts are unavoidable, the Historic Environment Team expect methods to mitigate impacts to be discussed in detail.</p> <p>LiDAR data should be included in the study to enable identification of upstanding remains within the application boundary.</p>	<p>All Noted.</p> <p>Publicly available LiDAR data is not available for the Site. The baseline assessment has been supported by historic mapping, aerial photography and the agreed upon walkover survey.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) 14 th May 2024	Scoping	<p>HES noted inaccuracies in the methodology presented within the Scoping Report and referred the applicant to the EIA handbook.</p> <p>HES noted that no information regarding infrastructure had been provided as part of the Scoping Report and raised concerns about potential direct impacts on Scheduled Monuments within the site.</p> <p>HES requested that photomontages be provided for Dalarossie Cottage, cairn and Banchor, cairn. They were content that wireframes can be produced for Drumbain Cottage, hut circles and Soilsean, deserted township and hut circles, and content with photomontages from Woodend, cairn and Edinchat, cairn.</p> <p>HES sought further clarification on elements of the proposed mitigation.</p>	<p>The methodology was updated and provided to HES in a letter dated 2nd May 2024.</p> <p>A draft infrastructure layout was provided to HES in a letter dated 2nd May 2024. Infrastructure has been included within the figures associated with this report.</p> <p>An updated visualisations list was provided to HES in a letter dated 2nd May 2024.</p> <p>Clarification was provided to HES on aspects of mitigation in a letter dated 2nd May 2024.</p>
HES 3 rd June 2024	Further Consultation	HES acknowledge that appropriate mitigation has been presented which has taken into account the potential for direct	Noted

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issues Raised	Response/Action
		<p>physical impacts on Dalarossie Cottage, cairn and Banchor, cairn.</p> <p>HES commented on the updated list of visualisations. HES agree with the visualisations proposed for Edinchat, Banchor, Dalarossie Cottage, and Woodend cairns. HES note that the visualisation from Dalarossie Cottage Cairn should show the Banchor cairn.</p> <p>HES note that photomontages are proposed for Drumbain cottage hut circles and Soilsean township. HES proposed an alternate location for Drumbain Cottage hut circle (281859E 826967N).</p> <p>HES proposed an alternate location for visualisation within Soilsean township, to allow upstanding parts of the asset to be within the photomontage.</p>	<p>Advice on visualisations is noted. Banchor cairn is not visible from Dalarossie cairn due to the surrounding topography and as such has not been included in the photomontage.</p> <p>Photomontages were not proposed for Drumbain Cottage hut circles and Soilsean township in any previous correspondence. Wirelines from both assets will accompany this report.</p> <p>We note a discrepancy between the type of visualisation agreed. A wireline was previously agreed at an alternate location. As per the letter on the 3rd of June, an alternate location was agreed for Drumbain cottage, hut circles. This has been accepted as a wireline visualisation.</p> <p>As a photomontage is not being produced for Soilsean township, the proposed location of the visualisation has not been changed from that proposed in the letter dated 2nd May 2024.</p>
HES 6 th September 2024	Gatecheck Response	<p>HES reviewed the proposed visualisations within the gatecheck report and are broadly content that the proposed visualisation locations represent what was agreed in their responses at both scoping and pre-application stages.</p> <p>HES noticed a discrepancy between the location proposed in the Gatecheck report and that in the letter dated 3rd June 2024 for Drumbain Cottage hut circles. They note that the correct location should be 281859E 826967N.</p>	<p>Noted. Location for Drumbain Cottage hut circles visualisation has been corrected.</p>

6.4 Methodology

Study Area

6.4.1 There is no guidance from HES that defines a required study area for the archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of wind farms. Two study areas are therefore proposed on the grounds of professional experience:

- A 1km radius to ascertain the predictability of unknown buried remains was applied to the boundary of the Site **Figure 6.1**.
- For purposes of the assessment of effects on the settings of assets a Study Area was defined extending 10km from the turbines of the Proposed Development (**Figure 6.2**).

Information and Data Sources

6.4.2 **Table 6.2** sets out the main data sources used in this study.

Table 6.2: Historic Environment Data Sources

Subject	Source	Location
Designated heritage assets (except conservation areas)	Historic Environment Scotland	HES digital data download
Conservation areas	Highland Council Historic Environment Team Archaeological Service.	HES digital data download
Non-Designated heritage assets	The database of Historic Environment Scotland (HES), 'Canmore'	Digital data supplied as download
Non-Designated heritage assets	Historic Environment Record (HER) data held by Highland Council	Digital data supplied as download
Historic maps	National Library of Scotland	Online
Aerial photography	HES	HES database Canmore and National Collection of Aerial Photograph (NCAP) (online)
Historic Land-Use Assessment	HES	On-line
Historic environment	Unpublished reports	Various
	Published synthetic works	Various
Current OS maps	Ordnance Survey	License acquired for project
Condition of recorded heritage assets within Site	Field inspection	Inspected by SLR Consulting in April 2024.
Setting of heritage assets	Field inspection within study areas and other specified assets from areas of public access.	Inspected by SLR Consulting in May and July 2024.

6.4.3 Non-designated heritage assets within the 1km Study Area are numbered in the following text as set out in the gazetteer in **Technical Appendix 6.1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets**. As this gazetteer is composed of records from a number of sources these have been combined into a single sequence with each assigned an SLR Number. References to other coding systems, e.g. Canmore, are also included in **Technical Appendix 6.1**. The designated assets are listed separately within this Chapter, identified by the number by which they are designated on the relevant statutory register or index.

6.4.4 Non-designated and designated heritage assets assessed are mapped in **Figure 6.1** and **Figure 6.2**.

Scope of Assessment

Assets within the Site

6.4.5 Designated and non-designated assets within the Site were assessed in order to determine any direct (physical) and indirect (non-physical) impacts. Impacts upon setting and any cumulative impacts have also been included where the criteria set out below have been met. Heritage assets within the Site and within 1km of the Site boundary are noted within **Technical Appendix 6.1**.

Assets outwith the Site

6.4.6 Nationally significant designated assets (**Technical Appendix 6.2**) within the Site and outwith the Site but within the Study Area have been subject to setting assessments in accordance with stakeholder responses in order to determine any setting impacts.

Effects Scoped Out

6.4.7 The following effects have been scoped out:

- heritage assets more than 10km from the Proposed Development unless identified as being particularly sensitive to change to their setting at this distance;
- heritage assets for which there is clear justification for their being scoped out, as outlined in **Technical Appendix 6.2: Cultural Heritage Appraisal**; and
- heritage assets within the study area shown by the ZTV not to be intervisible with the Proposed Development

Consultation

6.4.8 Based on the results of the baseline study, constraint mapping has been generated using GIS software to show mapped heritage assets in relation to a Zone of Theoretical

Visibility (ZTV). This has filtered out those assets that do not require further assessment. It has also been used to identify and agree the most potentially sensitive assets; these may then require computer-generated visualisations to be produced as part of their assessment, in liaison with consultees.

6.4.9 Consultation has been undertaken with HES in relation to the method of assessment employed in assessing those heritage assets within their remit; these included: Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs), and Inventoried Battlefields. THCHET were consulted in relation to designated heritage assets of regional and local significance, and any non-designated assets they consider to be of higher significance.

6.4.10 **Table 6.1 above** sets out the consultation undertaken to date.

Field Surveys

6.4.11 A targeted Site inspection was carried out in relation to those recorded assets likely to be impacted by the Proposed Development; the aim of this was to establish the condition of any recorded assets and identify the potential for any additional presently unrecorded assets. The targeted walkover was carried out between the 15th and 19th of April 2024. The results of this inspection are summarised in the baseline.

6.4.12 Targeted field inspection of other assets was also undertaken following a desk-based comparison of asset mapping with ZTV and satellite imagery; the aim of this was to identify and inspect any designated heritage assets potentially susceptible to impact as a result of change to setting as a result of the Proposed Development. An initial visit to these assets was carried out at the design chill stage, on the 2nd of May 2024. A further visit to assess any impact to setting was carried out after design freeze on the 24th of July 2024. All assets taken forward to detailed assessment were visited.

Assessment of Impact

6.4.13 The Proposed Development has the potential to result in impacts upon the significance of heritage assets where it changes their baseline condition and/or their setting.

6.4.14 In accordance with EIA Regulations, this assessment will identify impacts and effects as either direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial, and short-term, long-term or permanent and cumulative effect. The definition of impact is described below:

- **Direct** (physical) impacts: occur where the physical fabric of the asset is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as a direct result of the Proposed Development. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- **Indirect** (physical) impacts: occur where the fabric of an asset, or buried archaeological remains, is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or

conserved, as an indirect result of the proposal, even though the asset may lie some distance from the proposal. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.

- **Setting** impacts: result from the proposal causing change within the setting of a heritage asset that affects its cultural significance or the way in which it is understood, appreciated, and experienced. Such impacts are generally, but not exclusively, visual, occurring directly as a result of the appearance of the proposal in the surroundings of the asset. Setting impacts may also relate to other senses or factors, such as noise, odour or emissions, or historical relationships that do not relate entirely to intervisibility, such as historic patterns of land-use and related historic features. Such impacts may occur at any stage of a proposal's lifespan and may be permanent, reversible, or temporary.
- **Cumulative** impacts: can relate to the physical fabric or setting of assets. They may arise as a result of impact interactions, either of different impacts of the proposal itself, or additive impacts resulting from incremental changes caused by the proposal together with other projects already in the planning system or allocated in a Local Development Plan.

6.4.15 Direct impacts upon the significance of heritage assets have taken into account the level of their heritage significance (where known) and the magnitude (extent) of the identified impacts.

6.4.16 Setting impacts on the significance of heritage assets have been identified and assessed with reference to *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (HES 2020) and the guidance set out by NatureScot and HES (2019). Assessment was carried out in the following stages:

- initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the cultural heritage significance of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the contribution of setting to the cultural heritage significance of those assets;
- assessment of the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development on the contribution of settings to the cultural significance of assets (by causing change within those settings); and
- determination of the significance of any identified effects.

6.4.17 Assessment was undertaken separately for direct impact, indirect, settings and cumulative impact. The magnitude of both beneficial and adverse impact will be assessed according to scale of impact, from high to neutral/none.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

6.4.18 The settings assessments have been assisted by a ZTV calculation, presented in **Figure 6.2**. A ZTV calculation maps the predicted degree of visibility of a Proposed Development from all points within a proportionate, defined study area around the Site, as would be seen from an average observer’s eye level (two metres above ground level). The ZTV model presented in **Figure 6.2** is based upon the maximum level of theoretical visibility, i.e., the maximum height of the wind turbine blade tips (refer to Table 3.1 in **Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description** for maximum wind turbine heights).

Cultural Heritage Significance

6.4.19 The categories of cultural heritage significance to be referred to are presented in **Table 6.3**, which will act as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provide a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions drawn.

6.4.20 The significance categories take into account factors such as: designation, status and grading. For non-designated assets, consideration has been given to their inherent heritage interests, intrinsic, contextual, and associative characteristics as defined in *Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (HES, 2020). In relation to these assets, the assessment focusses on their inherent capability to contribute to our understanding of the past; the character of their structural, decorative and field characteristics as informed by the HER and Canmore records and/or Site visit observations; the contribution of an asset to their class of monument, or the diminution of that class should an asset be lost; and how a site relates to people, practices, events, and/or historical or social movements. Assessments of the cultural significance of specific assets, where recorded within the HER, have been taken into account where appropriate.

6.4.21 **Table 6.3** shows the potential levels of heritage significance of an asset related to designation, status and grading, and where non-designated, to a scale of Highest to No importance. This table will act as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provides a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions that could be reached during assessment.

Table 6.3: Cultural Heritage Significance

Cultural Heritage Significance	Criteria
Highest	Sites of international importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Heritage Sites.
High	Site of National importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory; Designated Battlefields; and Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
Medium	Sites of Regional/local importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category B and C Listed Buildings; Some Conservation Areas; and Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
Low	Sites of minor importance or with little of the asset remaining to justify a higher importance.
None	Sites that are of no heritage significance
Unknown	Further information is required to assess the significance of these assets.

Sensitivity of Setting

6.4.22 In addition to identifying the significance of a heritage asset, it is essential, where changes to setting are being assessed, to understand the contribution that setting makes towards the significance of an asset. 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 effect upon an asset and their setting by the development, the contribution that setting makes to an asset’s significance, and thus its sensitivity to changes to its setting need to be considered.

6.4.23 This approach recognises the importance of avoiding significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of an asset in the context of the contribution that setting makes to the understanding, appreciation and experience of an asset. It recognises that setting may be key in characterising, understanding and appreciating some, but not necessarily all, assets. Indeed, assets of high or very high significance do not necessarily have high sensitivity to changes to their settings.

6.4.24 An asset’s relative sensitivity to alterations to its setting refers to its capacity to retain its ability to contribute to an understanding, experience 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.

6.4.25 While certain cultural heritage assets of high or very high importance are likely to be sensitive to direct impacts, not all will have a similar sensitivity to impacts on their setting; this would be true where setting does not appreciably contribute to their significance. HES' 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). Assets with Very High or High relative sensitivity to setting impacts may be vulnerable to any changes that effect their settings and even slight changes may erode their key characteristics or the ability of their settings to contribute to the understanding, appreciation or experience of them. Assets where relative sensitivity to changes to their setting is lower may be able to accommodate greater changes to their settings without key characteristics being eroded.

6.4.26 The key criteria used for establishing an asset's relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is detailed in **Table 6.4** This table has been developed based on SLR's professional judgement and experience of setting effects. It has been developed in line with relevant policy and guidance throughout this chapter.

Table 6.4: Sensitivity of Setting

Relative Sensitivity	Explanatory Criteria
Very High	An asset, the setting of which is crucial to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it, should be regarded as having very high sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant where setting, or elements of, make a crucial and essential direct contribution to significance.
High	An asset, the setting of which is major to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it, should be regarded as having high sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant where setting, or elements of, contribute substantially to their cultural significance.
Medium	An asset, the setting of which makes a moderate contribution to the understanding, appreciation and experience of it, should be regarded 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 equally from its other characteristics.
Low	An asset, the setting of which makes some contribution to the understanding, appreciation and experience of it, should be regarded as having low sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset where its significance is derived mainly from other characteristics.
Negligible	An asset where setting makes a minimal contribution to the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset and it should be thought of having a negligible sensitivity to changes to its setting.

6.4.27 The determination of an asset's relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is first and foremost reliant upon the determination of its setting and how setting aligns with other key characteristics which contribute to cultural significance. The criteria set out in **Table 6.4** is a guide and assessment of individual assets is informed by

knowledge of the asset itself, its type and by a site visit conducted by the author of this report to establish the current setting of an asset. This allows for use of professional judgement on an individual basis.

Magnitude of Impact

6.4.28 Determining the magnitude of any likely impacts includes consideration of the nature of the activities proposed during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development.

6.4.29 Changes could potentially include ground disturbance and changes to setting. The latter might include visual change, as well as noise, vibration, smell, dust, traffic movements etc. Effects may be beneficial or adverse, and may be short term, long term or permanent.

6.4.30 Where adverse effects on cultural heritage assets are possible, the magnitude of impact can be reduced through measures to prevent, reduce and/or, where possible, offset these effects.

6.4.31 Suitable measures for minimising impacts through ground disturbance might include:

- the micrositing of Proposed Development infrastructure away from sensitive locations;
- the fencing off or marking out of heritage assets or features in proximity to construction activity in order to avoid disturbance where possible;
- a programme of archaeological work where required, such as an archaeological watching brief during construction activities in or in proximity to areas of archaeological sensitivity, or excavation and recording where impact is unavoidable; and/or
- a working protocol to be implemented should unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.

6.4.32 Suitable measures for mitigating any setting impacts might include:

- alteration of the proposed wind turbine layout;
- reduction of proposed wind turbine heights; and/or
- changing the proposed colour of select turbines.

6.4.33 Taking into account all embedded mitigation measures, the magnitude of any impact has been assessed using professional judgment, with reference to the criteria set out in **Table 6.5**.

Table 6.5: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Explanatory Criteria
High Beneficial	The Proposed Development would considerably enhance the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Medium Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance, to a clearly discernible extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance, to a minor extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance, to a very minor extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Neutral/None	The Proposed Development would not affect the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode, to a very minor extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. This level of indirect effect would not be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.
Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode, to a minor extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. This level of indirect effect would rarely be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.
Medium Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode, to a clearly discernible extent, the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. This level of indirect effect might or might not be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.
High Adverse	The Proposed Development would considerably erode the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. This level of indirect effect would probably be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.

Significance of Effect

6.4.34 **Table 6.6** provides a matrix that relates the cultural heritage significance of the asset to the magnitude of impact on its significance, to produce an overall anticipated level of impact ('significance of effect').

Table 6.6: Significance of Effect

Magnitude of Impact	Cultural Significance (Excluding Unknown)			
	Highest	High	Medium	Low
High beneficial	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium beneficial	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor
Low beneficial	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor
Very low beneficial	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible

Magnitude of Impact	Cultural Significance (Excluding Unknown)			
	Highest	High	Medium	Low
Neutral/None	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil
Very low adverse	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Low adverse	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor
Medium adverse	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor
High adverse	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor

Cumulative Effect

6.4.35 A cumulative effect is considered to occur when there is a combination of:

- an effect on an asset or group of assets due to changes resulting from the development subject of assessment; and
- an effect on the same asset or group of assets resulting from another development or developments (consented or proposed) within the surrounding landscape.

6.4.36 Consideration of other developments has been limited to:

- wind farm planning applications that have been submitted and have a decision pending; and
- wind farm planning applications that have been granted permission but not yet constructed.

6.4.37 Any effect resulting from operational wind farms has been considered as part of the baseline impact assessment.

6.4.38 Cumulative effect has been considered in two stages:

- assessment of the combined effects of the developments, including the Proposed Development; and
- assessment of the extent to which the Proposed Development contributes to the combined effect.

Significance and Integrity

Significance

6.4.39 Once the anticipated effects of the Proposed Development upon cultural heritage assets are defined, professional judgment is used to determine whether those impacts would be either 'Significant' or 'Not Significant' in terms of the EIA Regulations. As part of this determination process, regard was given to any relevant guidance.

6.4.40 With reference to the matrix presented in **Table 6.6**:

- any impacts identified as ‘Major’ would most probably be considered ‘Significant’;
- any impacts identified as ‘Moderate’ might also be considered ‘Significant’, though professional judgment may determine otherwise on the basis of the associated site-/asset-specific detail; and
- any impacts identified as ‘Minor’ or less are unlikely to be considered ‘Significant’, though again, professional judgment has been exercised.

6.4.41 A clear statement has been made in relation to all affected assets as to whether the identified impacts upon them are ‘Significant’ or ‘Not Significant’ for purposes of EIA.

Integrity

6.4.42 NPF4 Policy 7(h)(ii) states that development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where; “*significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided*”.

6.4.43 A significant effect in EIA terms does not necessarily equate to a significant impact upon the integrity of setting. Where EIA significant effects are found, a detailed assessment of adverse impacts upon the integrity of the setting is made. Whilst non-significant effects are unlikely to significantly impact the integrity of the setting, the reverse is not always true. That is, the assessment of an effect as being Significant in EIA terms does not necessarily mean that the adverse effect on the setting of the asset will significantly impact its integrity. The assessment of adverse impact upon the integrity of an asset’s setting, where required, is a qualitative one and largely dependent upon whether the impact predicted would result in a major impediment to the ability to understand, appreciate or experience a cultural heritage asset.

6.4.44 This is most likely to occur where the sensitivity of setting as set out in **Table 6.4** is high or very high. It should also be noted that the NPF4 test under Policy 7(h)(ii) specifies setting and not the cultural significance of an asset. While the policy test must be addressed it must be borne in mind that, in cases where setting makes little contribution to cultural significance, the cultural significance of the asset is unlikely to be compromised.

6.4.45 It is considered that a Significant impact upon the integrity of the setting of an asset will only occur where the degree of change that will be represented by the Proposed Development would adversely alter those factors of the monument’s setting that contribute to cultural significance such that the understanding, appreciation and experience of an asset are not adequately retained only in relation to its setting.

Presentation of Assessment of Effects

6.4.46 The presentation of the assessment of effects in this chapter differs from other chapters in this EIA Report. Due to the large number of individual receptors to be assessed and to avoid fragmentation of the assessment of each receptor, each receptor is considered in turn in terms of potential effects, proposed mitigation measures and resultant residual effects. For the assessment of effects to cultural heritage and archaeology, this is a more efficient and appropriate chapter structure compared to the ‘standard’ structure adopted for most other technical chapters in this EIA Report.

Limitations of Assessment

6.4.47 The assessment is based on the sources outlined in **Table 6.2** and, therefore, shares the same range of limitations in terms of comprehensiveness and completeness of those sources.

Residual Impact

6.4.48 Further (secondary) mitigation, not referenced above, such as archaeological fieldwork undertaken as a condition of consent or other post-consent measures associated with public benefits, do not inform on the identification of Significant or Not Significant impacts but are presented in order to demonstrate how additional mitigation could offset Significant impacts.

6.5 Baseline

6.5.1 A full description of the site and environs is given in **Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description**. All heritage assets within the Site and 1km of this area are shown on **Figure 6.1**. Nationally designated assets within the study areas are shown in relation to the ZTV on **Figure 6.2**.

6.5.2 All recorded non-designated heritage assets within the Site and 1km of the Site are listed in the gazetteer that is contained within **Technical Appendix 6.1**. Where designated assets are tabulated in this Chapter, they are identified by the index number (i.e., Scheduled Monuments) or reference number (i.e. Listed Buildings) under which they are registered by HES.

Current Baseline

Nationally Important Designated Heritage Assets

6.5.3 There are two designated heritage assets within the Site, Banchor cairn (**SM11814**), and Dalarossie Cottage cairn (**SM11815**). Non-designated assets can be found discussed in the below Baseline and in **Technical Appendix 6.1**.

6.5.4 There are 15 heritage assets of national importance within 10km, consisting of 13 Scheduled Monuments and 2 Category A Listed Buildings. There are 7 assets of Regional Importance within 5km, all being Category B Listed Buildings. As per correspondence with HES and THCHET, it was agreed through a heritage appraisal that the assets to be considered are in **Table 6.7**.

Table 6.7: Designated Heritage Assets to be assessed in agreement with HES.

Reference	Name	Type	Distance to nearest turbine
SM11734	Edinchat, cairn 415m NNW of	Scheduled Monument	8.9km
SM11814	Banchor, cairn 315m SE of	Scheduled Monument	1.8km
SM11815	Dalarossie Cottage, cairn 375m SSE of	Scheduled Monument	2km
SM11739	Woodend, cairn 760m NW of	Scheduled Monument	4.2km
SM11673	Drumbain Cottage, hut circles 725m, 845m and 975m ESE of	Scheduled Monument	5.0km
SM11806	Soilsean, deserted township and hut circle 745m ESE of	Scheduled Monument	5.6km

6.5.5 All other relevant assets within 10km were included in the appraisal (**Technical Appendix 6.2**), with their reason for being scoped out of further assessment being stated accordingly.

Known Heritage Assets within the Site

Prehistoric and Romano-British Context

6.5.6 There are six prehistoric heritage assets within the Site boundary. As shown in **Figure 6.1**, three of these assets are hut circles (**SLR36, SLR42, and SLR76**). **SLR36** is located towards the north of the Site, with the closest turbine being Turbine 18, c.4.4km to the south-west of the asset. **SLR42** is located near the north-west of the Site, c. 2.3km to the north-east of Turbine 18. The third hut circle, **SLR76**, is located near the centre of the Site, c.1.5km north-east of Turbine 12. The presence of hut circles within the Site boundary suggests that parts of the Site were used for agricultural purposes in the prehistoric period. All three groups of hut circles are close to sources of fresh water, which would have allowed them to use these watercourses for domestic and agricultural purposes.

6.5.7 There is also a concentration of cairns near the north-western boundary of the Site, namely **SLR43, SLR44 and SLR45**. **SLR43** and **SLR44** are located c.1.7km and 1.8km

north-west of Turbine 25 respectively, and **SLR45** located c.2km north-west of the same turbine.

6.5.8 Both **SLR44** and **SLR45** are Scheduled Monuments (**SM11814, SM11815**). All three cairns are located on the northern slope of Cárn Bad an Daimh, overlooking the River Findhorn.

6.5.9 The concentration of cairns in this area of the Site indicates a more funerary focus within this area. However, it must be noted that the cairns sit within an undated field system (**SLR46**), which may be contemporary in date and indicate a dual usage of the area, both funerary and agricultural.

6.5.10 There are a further 11 recorded heritage assets dating to the prehistoric period within 1km of the Site boundary. Of these, five relate to hut circles (**SM11673, SLR25, SLR26, SLR35, SLR39, and SLR56**), of which two have an associated field system (**SLR26, SLR39**). **SLR26** is located c.0.3km to the north of the Site boundary, on a gentle slope overlooking the River Findhorn. **SLR39** is located c.0.6km to the north of the Site boundary and is part of Soilsean Scheduled Monument (**SM11806**), the scheduled area of which also covers an abandoned post medieval township. It lies on the north-western slope of Creag an Tuim Bhig, on rough and open pasture land overlooking the River Findhorn. A further hut circle (**SLR25**) lies to its east c.0.96km to the north-east of the Site boundary. The Scheduled Monument **SM11673**, a group of three hut circles, lies just south of these assets, along the course of the A9, c.0.17km north-east of the Site boundary on a south-west facing slope above the Allt Cosach watercourse. **SLR35** represents the location of an un-scheduled fourth hut circles, located within the same grouping as the Scheduled Monuments. **SLR56** records the location of two small areas of stone clearance, usually found near hut circles, situated c.4.5km northeast of T5 and 0.6km southeast of the site boundary.

6.5.11 Two further assets, **SLR33** and **SLR65**, are recorded as cairns, with **SLR33** recorded as a clearance cairn, located c.0.25km to the north-east of the Site boundary. **SLR65** concerns the suggested location of a cairn from which cremated human remains were excavated in 1906, c.0.9km to the north-west of the Site boundary.

6.5.12 **SLR6** is recorded c.0.7km to the east of the Site boundary and concerns the remains of a rectangular building suggested to date from the Neolithic, alongside undated cultivation remains. **SLR62** concerns a hut platform located c. 75m to the north of the Site boundary.

6.5.13 The final prehistoric record, **SLR30**, marks the findspot of an arrowhead approximately 0.2km from the northern extent of the Site, c.4.9km northeast of Turbine 18.

6.5.14 There are no recorded Romano-British heritage assets within the Site or within 1km of the Site. There is currently no evidence for a Roman presence within the Strathdearn area, nor the surrounding landscape, and it is believed that the Romans did not enter this part of the country.

Early-medieval and medieval Context

6.5.15 There are no early-medieval or medieval heritage assets recorded within the Site.

6.5.16 Within 1km of the Site boundary, there is one asset recorded as being of an early-medieval date. **SLR37** is recorded as a crude incised St Andrew's cross, discovered in 1898 located at the bottom of an old quarry at the foot of the old Gallowhill in Tomatin, c.0.8km to the north-east of the Site boundary.

6.5.17 Whilst there are no specifically medieval assets located within 1km of the Site boundary, **SLR41** and **SLR50** concern Dalarossie Church and its associated cemetery, both listed together as a Category B Listed Building (**LB14884**). Though the current church was constructed in 1790 AD, dating it to the post-medieval period, it occupies the site of an earlier church dedicated to St Fergus, which was first mentioned in 1224 AD, and as a place of worship is suggested to date back to the time of its namesake in the 8th century. Both assets are located c.100m to the north of the Site boundary.

Post-medieval Context

6.5.18 There are seven recorded post-medieval heritage assets recorded within the Site, all of which are domestic or agricultural in nature, with most being concentrated toward the north-eastern boundary of the Site along the banks of the Findhorn River. These comprise the remains of three townships, two buildings and one farmstead. **SLR92** relates to the remains of Balnagordonach township and its associated lime kiln, with a separate entry for the former horse engine house (**SLR54**), both located in the north of the Site, c.4.5km to the north-east of Turbine 18.

6.5.19 Two further assets relate to townships, namely **SLR2**, which notes the site of Banchor township with its associated field system, which lies in the north-west of Site, c.1.9km to the north-west of Turbine 25. **SLR74** also lies in the north-west of the Site, c.1.6km north of Turbine 24, and is likely part of the same township as **SLR3**, which borders the Site boundary across the burn to the north-east and has an associated limekiln (**SLR73**). **SLR16**, which relates to a building on the banks of the River Findhorn, also lies in close proximity to these assets, towards the north-western boundary of the Site, c.2km to the north-west of Turbine 24.

6.5.20 **SLR68**, a settlement surrounded by a number of clearance cairns, is recorded c.1.7km to the north-east of Turbine 12. The final asset of post-medieval date within the Site

concerns **SLR87**, a farmstead with associated enclosures located c.2.5km to the north-east of Turbine 18, on the Site's north-western boundary.

6.5.21 There are a further 39 post-medieval heritage assets recorded within 1km of the Site boundary. A full list of these assets can be found in **Technical Appendix 6.1**.

6.5.22 Two of these assets (**SLR23** and **SLR55**) are scheduled as part of Soilsean deserted township (**SM11806**). **SLR23** concerns the township itself, as well as its associated head dyke, lazy beds, and enclosure, whilst **SLR55** relates to the corn drying kiln. These assets are located c.0.58km and 0.7km to the north-east of the Site boundary respectively. A second township, **SLR4**, is recorded to the south of these assets, comprising eight buildings, a corn drying kiln, a horse engine platform and a large field, c.0.44km to the north-east of the Site boundary.

6.5.23 A further four assets are Category C Listed Buildings. **SLR7/LB14895** relates to Moy Free Church, constructed in the mid-19th century, located c.0.3km to the north- of the Site boundary, with its associated manse, **SLR95/LB41896**, located just to its west, c.0.31km to the north of the Site boundary. **SLR8/LB14897** concerns Garbole Bridge, which crosses the Kyllachy Burn, c.430m to the north-west of the Site boundary. Kyllachy House (**SLR13/LB14886**), is dated to 1886 with an earlier core, and is located c.855m to the north of the Site boundary.

6.5.24 Domestic structures from this period are well documented in the HER, with there being ten townships recorded within 1km of the Site boundary². Most of these townships are focused along the banks of the River Findhorn, towards the northern boundary of the Site, with the exception of **SLR23** and **SLR4**, located towards the north-east of the Site, and **SLR81**, which lies c.0.73km to the east of the Site boundary. This asset consists of two clusters of buildings, suggested to represent two farmsteads, dykes, a small enclosure, and a small area of rig and furrow. The depopulation of these townships is suggested to have been due to changing agricultural practices following the agricultural revolution, replacing cooperative townships with single-tenant enclosed farms, effected by enforced clearances and depopulation for the creation of sheepwalks³. Local tradition also attributes this shift towards towns to the increased industrialisation of the area around Tomatin with the arrival of the distillery and railway, drawing people towards towns with better employment opportunities.

6.5.25 Agricultural heritage assets from the post-medieval period are also well represented in the HER, with nine agricultural assets recorded within 1km of the Site boundary.

²SLR1, SLR3, SLR4, SLR17, SLR20, SLR69, SLR70, SLR81, SLR82 and SLR91

³Worth (2023)

Most of these comprise of farmsteads⁴, once again concentrated along the northern edge of the Site boundary, towards the River Findhorn, likely due to the more fertile soil in this area. **SLR77** lies c.0.17km to the south-east of the Site, and is a farmstead consisting of two buildings, surrounded by a dyke which also encloses an undated farmstead to the north (**SLR80**), as well as an associated limekiln (**SLR78**), which is located c.0.16km to the south-east of the Site boundary.

- 6.5.26 Further post-medieval assets recorded within 1km of the Site boundary include a number of industrial assets in the form of limekilns and mills with associated lades. There are two singular limekilns recorded within 1km of the Site boundary, namely **SLR71** and **SLR90**. **SLR71** is located c.0.55km to the north of the Site boundary, just north of the Findhorn River, whilst **SLR90** is located c.0.7km to the north-west of the Site boundary. Two mills with lades are also recorded (**SLR72** and **SLR85**), with **SLR72** located c.0.59km to the north-west of the Site boundary, on the Kyllachy Burn and functioned as a corn mill. **SLR85**, also a corn mill, is located on the edge of Site's northern boundary, along the course of the Clune Burn.
- 6.5.27 There are also two roads from the post-medieval period recorded within 1km of the Site boundary. One of these concerns the remains of General Wade's Military Road (**SLR98**, **SLR99**, **SLR100**, **SLR101**, **SLR102**, **SLR103**). The Military Road was constructed between 1728 and 1730 and runs between Dunkeld and Inverness. The Military Roads in Scotland were primarily built in order to control the parts of the country that had participated in the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715. The sections of the road highlighted by the HER traverses from c.3km to the east of the Site boundary to c.1.6km to the north of the Site, at its closest point (**SLR100** and **SLR101**) running c.24m to the northeast of the Site boundary, along the course of the modern A9 road. One section of the road is recorded as being upstanding (**SLR101**), with three other sections (**SLR102**, **SLR98** and **SLR99**) now on the line of an unnamed modern road, with another section recorded as being the suggested course of the road (**SLR103**), with the final section recorded in the HER as having no surface remains existent (**SLR100**).
- 6.5.28 The second concerns a section of the Old Coach Road (**SLR12**), located c.26m to the north of the Site boundary, excavated in 1974. The road ran from Perth to Inverness and was abandoned around 1897, as the use of coaches declined in favour of the railway, with the Perth to Inverness line opening in 1863⁵.

Modern Context

- 6.5.29 There are no heritage assets of a modern date recorded within the Site boundary.
- 6.5.30 Within 1km of the Site there are five recorded heritage assets from this period. The first of these assets concerns the Grade B Listed Building Findhorn Bridge (**SLR94/LB14885**), located c.0.5km to the north of the Site boundary. This bridge was constructed in 1926, along the route of the old A9, and crosses the River Findhorn.
- 6.5.31 **SLR86** relates to the country house Clune Lodge, located c.0.33km to the north of the Site boundary, just south of the Findhorn River, which now appears to be in use as a hunting lodge.
- 6.5.32 A further three assets are of a recreational nature, with **SLR63** and **SLR64** both concerning shooting butts. Both assets lie to the north-east of the Site boundary, with **SLR63** lying c.0.23km from the Site boundary, and **SLR64** lying c.0.92km from the Site boundary. The third asset, **SLR67**, is recorded as the location of a former Shinty pitch.
- 6.5.33 The evidence from the modern period shows that intensive agricultural and domestic activity within the Site has declined. There is no evidence of modern settlements within the HER, with settlement patterns within the study area taking the form of more specific individual buildings such as the aforementioned lodge. Current land use of the site includes use of the site as a shooting estate and rough grazing, which is significantly less intensive than usage of the land by the prior townships.

Undated Context

- 6.5.34 There are six undated heritage assets recorded within the Site boundary on the HER, of which the majority are primarily of an agricultural nature. Of these, four relate to field systems (**SLR27**, **SLR28**, **SLR46** and **SLR75**). **SLR75** has a record of an associated farmstead. This asset is located c.1.8km to the north-west of Turbine 25. Whilst undated in the HER, the asset appears on the 1st Edition of the OS mapping, dating to 1874, as a series of one roofed and three unroofed structures. This determines that the farmstead was in use during the post-medieval period but does not determine when it was first constructed.
- 6.5.35 It lies in close proximity to **SLR46**, which is located just to the east, c.1.6km to the north-west of Turbine 25. It is recorded as containing a field system with stone clearance heaps, ruinous walls and occasional lynchets, with a likely contemporary circular hut platform towards its north-western edge. Both **SLR27** and **SLR28** are located near the centre of the Site, with **SLR27** lying c.2km to the north-east of

⁴ **SLR18**, **SLR19**, **SLR51**, **SLR52**, **SLR77**, **SLR79**, **SLR83** and **SLR84**

⁵ Curtis (1981)

- Turbine 18, and **SLR28** lying c.2.4km to the north-east of Turbine 12. **SLR27** is recorded as containing two circular stone walled huts with a contemporary field system, whilst **SLR28** is recorded as contained one circular stone walled hut with a small area of contemporary fields.
- 6.5.36 The final two undated assets within the Site boundary (**SLR29** and **SLR93**) are both recorded as lying towards the north-western edge of the Site, c.4.8km north-east of Turbine 18. The HER record for **SLR29** suggests that there may have been a prehistoric burial ground here but notes there is no archaeological evidence to support this. The record for **SLR93** suggests the circular enclosure may instead relate to a settlement and is described as a circular enclosure on top of a small, wooded knoll, around which are traces of walling and ruined buildings.
- 6.5.37 There are 21 undated heritage assets recorded within 1km of the Site boundary, predominantly agricultural in nature. A full list of these assets can be found in **Technical Appendix 6.1** and **Figure 6.1**. Five of these assets (**SLR24**, **SLR34**, **SLR40**, **SLR47** and **SLR57**) relate to field systems. **SLR24**, **SLR34** and **SLR40** are all concentrated along the north-eastern boundary of the Site, with **SLR24** c.0.83km to the north-east, **SLR34** c.0.3km to the north-east and **SLR40** lying c.0.22km to the north-east of the Site boundary. A further three assets (**SLR21**, **SLR22** and **SLR80**) relate to farmsteads. **SLR21** and **SLR22** lie in close proximity to one another to the east of the Site, with **SLR21** located c.0.68km and **SLR22** c.0.89km to the south-east of the Site boundary.
- 6.5.38 There are also seven bridges of an unrecorded date recorded within 1km of the Site boundary (**SLR9**, **SLR10**, **SLR11**, **SLR14**, **SLR15** and **SLR32**). **SLR9** and **SLR10** are both located toward the north-east of the Site, with **SLR9** being recorded as lying on the Site boundary, with **SLR10** lying to its north-west, c.0.2km north-east of the Site boundary. Just to its south-west lies **SLR11**, the bridge Slochd Two, located c.0.1km to the north-east of the Site boundary. **SLR14** and **SLR15** both lie east of the Site, with **SLR14** crossing the Allt Ruigh an t-Sabhail c.0.87km to the south-east of the Site boundary, while **SLR15** crosses the Slochd Mhuic c.1km to the south-east of the Site. **SLR32** relates to Drumbain Bridge, which crosses over the Allt Cosach, c.30m to the north-east of the Site's north-eastern boundary. Whilst their date of construction is unrecorded, these bridges are likely post-medieval and modern in date. Their existence all related to the improvement of infrastructure throughout the highlands in these periods, enhancing the accessibility of these areas.
- 6.5.39 A full list of undated assets within 1km of the Proposed Development can be found in **Technical Appendix 6.1**.
- 6.5.40 During the walkover survey carried out in April 2024, an additional five undated heritage assets were identified. The majority of these assets appeared to be agricultural in nature and are likely related to the farmsteads and settlements identified within the HER. These assets are considered undated until further investigation into their function is made, but potential dating has been suggested where applicable. The newly recorded assets comprised of a potentially modern marker cairn (**SLR301**) located c.0.14km to the north-east of Turbine 23, a post-medieval or modern extraction pit (**SLR302**) located c.0.33km to the north-east of Turbine 10, the remains of a possible headland (**SLR303**) c.0.12km to the north-west of Turbines 12, a series of drainage ditches (**SLR304**) located next to **SLR302** and an upright stone, potentially a sheep rubbing stone/clawin post (**SLR305**) which lies just downslope from **SLR301**, c.0.15km to the north-east of Turbine 23.
- Previous Archaeological Investigations*
- 6.5.41 An archaeological walkover survey carried out by AOC Archaeology (EHG5284) through the north-eastern part of the Site identified a number of unrecorded heritage assets within the Study Area, with the majority being domestic or agriculture in nature, and dated to the post-medieval period. Within the Site boundary, AOC recorded an area of unroofed structures and a lime kiln, likely associated with **SLR92** and **SLR54**. They recorded a further area of activity, located c.0.5km east of **SLR92**. This area included the remains of two shielings, a boundary dyke, a potential limekiln, and prehistoric clearance cairns. The clearance cairns have the potential to be associated with **SLR36**, a hut circle which lies in the general area.
- Historic Mapping and Historic Land-Use Assessment*
- 6.5.42 Analysis of the Historic Land Use Assessment (HLA) map indicates that the land within the proposed Site boundary was primarily used as an area of rough grazing. The entry for this category of land use notes that areas of rough grazing were associated with pre-19th century agriculture and settlement and may contain remains dating back to the prehistoric period. The description states that 'Archaeological landscapes are most likely to survive in this type of modern land use. Nevertheless, there will be extensive areas with little sign of historic use'.
- 6.5.43 Smaller sections of the land within the Study Area are also recorded as managed woodland (to the north-east of the Site) and rectilinear fields and farms (towards the north-west of the Site). The areas of the latter are primarily concentrated along the banks of the River Findhorn, reflecting the high concentration of agricultural assets in this area. The description of this entry states that these types of features tend to date to the post-medieval period, after agricultural improvement.

- 6.5.44 A review of the online historic mapping available from the National Library of Scotland was undertaken. The area around the Site is first recorded on the 1636-1652 Gordon Map, though this mainly shows the settlements along the course of the River Findhorn, with the hills the Site is proposed to occupy remaining unnamed. The *Roy Military Survey of Scotland* map from 1747-1755 shows the landscape in more detail, and outlines some of the field systems along the River Findhorn that are recorded in the HER, as well as General Wade's Military Road.
- 6.5.45 The first detailed map of the Site is the Six-inch 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of Inverness-shire (Sheet XLIV and XXXII) from 1874 and 1875. This map shows a number of the heritage assets discussed above, including many settlements and townships that were abandoned after the publishing of the map. The site in general is depicted as open moorland, with a small number of tracks running from the settlements along the Findhorn to the south. A single asset was identified through historic mapping that did not have a corresponding HER reference, a sheepfold located at the site of proposed T25. The sheepfold was not identified during the walkover survey but due to its presence on historic mapping it is recorded as **SLR306**.
- 6.5.46 No further heritage assets were identified through the review of historic mapping.
- Aerial Photography and LIDAR*
- 6.5.47 The online aerial imagery of NCAP was examined for evidence of archaeological sites. No oblique aerial imagery in the HES archives on Canmore was found. No further archaeological sites were identified.
- 6.5.48 There is no publicly available LIDAR data for the site and as such, it was not used to form the conclusions of this desk-based assessment.
- Discussion of the Site and Archaeological Potential*
- 6.5.49 There is evidence of prehistoric domestic activity within the Site due to the presence of hut circles (**SLR30, SLR36, SLR42, SLR76**) and funerary activity within the site due to the presence of cairns (**SM11814, SLR43**). The recorded prehistoric archaeology within the site is concentrated along the land closest to the Findhorn. The association between prehistoric assets and nearby watercourses or natural routeways through the landscape continues into the 1km Study Area. This indicates that any unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets are likely to be concentrated in similar areas, most likely along the same area of the valley, closer to the watercourse. The prehistoric assets in the surrounding landscape do not sit in isolation, indicating that in areas where a single prehistoric asset is recorded (e.g., **SLR36**), there is a higher potential for further activity in the immediate vicinity.
- 6.5.50 Whilst the potential for prehistoric remains is higher in proximity to the watercourses, this does not negate the possibility of as of yet unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets within the rest of the site. The surrounding landscape has a high level of prehistoric activity, and whilst less common in the surrounding upland areas, there is the potential that there was prehistoric activity in the upland areas of the site.
- 6.5.51 As such, there is a moderate potential for unknown prehistoric heritage assets within the Site, with a higher potential for unknown heritage assets along the land closest to the river in the north of the Site.
- 6.5.52 There is no evidence of Romano-British activity within the Site, within 1km of the Site and within the surrounding valleys and landscape. As discussed in Section 6.5.14, there is no evidence that there was Roman activity in this part of Scotland. As such, there is a very low potential for unknown Roman heritage assets within the Site.
- 6.5.53 There is a single early-medieval asset within 1km of the Site, and no evidence of medieval heritage assets within the Site or 1km of the Site. As was the case with Dalarossie Church (**SLR41, SLR50, LB14884**), where a post-medieval asset overlies an earlier asset, it is likely that any medieval activity within the Site has been overlain by later activity of a similar nature. Any medieval activity within the Site is likely to be agricultural in nature. As such, there is a very low potential for unknown medieval heritage assets within the Site.
- 6.5.54 There is a high amount of post-medieval activity within the Site and within 1km of the Site. The majority of the assets within the Site are of an agricultural or domestic nature, with many appearing in close proximity to one another, and the Historic Land Use assessment showing that most of the Site has been used for rough grazing. The majority of the post-medieval heritage assets within 1km of the Site are agricultural in nature, with further evidence of domestic settlement and small-scale industrial works such as limekilns and corn mills. As with previous periods, intensive activity from this period does appear to have been concentrated closer to the rivers and the lowlands, rather than within the upland areas. However, agricultural assets such as sheepfolds are identified as being located in the upland areas.
- 6.5.55 As such, there is a moderate to high potential for unrecorded post-medieval heritage assets within the Site, with the possibility for agricultural archaeological remains being the highest. The site walkover identified a number of assets believed to be agricultural in nature, which would appear to confirm this.
- 6.5.56 There is no evidence of modern heritage assets within the Site, and limited evidence from this period in the HER record within 1km from the Site. As this period is well

documented in the area, there is considered to be a low potential for unknown heritage assets within the Site of this date.

Future Baseline

- 6.5.57 If the Proposed Development was not to proceed, there would likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets and features that presently survive within the Site.

Implications of Climate Change

- 6.5.58 As per the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers' (ALGAO) *Guidance for Peatland Restoration and the Historic Environment in Scotland*⁶, peat is classed as a cultural heritage resource due to its unique ability to preserve organic and inorganic archaeological remains. Formed after the ice-age, the peatlands provide a waterlogged and anaerobic environment which leads to a much slower rate of decay for archaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains compared to other soil types⁷.
- 6.5.59 The presence of peat across the Site, as detailed in **Chapter 9: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology**, means there is a high potential for environmental or organic deposits to survive. Climate change could affect naturally formed peat deposits leading to the destruction of paleoenvironmental evidence. This might result in the loss of previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets.
- 6.5.60 Other impacts of climate change on buried remains might result from increased rainfall and fluctuating temperatures, with the sequence and frequency of natural soil saturation and desiccation changing the preservative conditions. This might result in damage or loss of organic artefacts. For upstanding remains, such change has the potential to result in increased water penetration, which may then cause/accelerate erosion/decay of historic fabric.
- 6.5.61 Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the description of the baseline conditions remains robust for purposes of this assessment, and that it allows for a robust assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage.

6.6 Assessment of Potential Effects

Construction Effects

Embedded Mitigation Measures

- 6.6.1 The assessment of potential direct impacts on heritage assets is based on the maximum likely impact that could be caused by the Proposed Development. The

layout design of the Proposed Development has undergone a number of revisions to avoid direct impacts on known heritage assets. Impacts are considered with due regard to embedded mitigation measures.

- 6.6.2 Direct impacts would comprise any groundworks or other ground disturbance undertaken as part of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Specific activities which have the potential to cause impacts through the construction phase of the Proposed Development include the excavation of wind turbine foundations, substation compounds, crane hardstands, borrow pits and cable trenches. This will also include the construction and maintenance of access tracks, laydown areas and working compounds. Refer to Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description for a more detailed description of the proposed construction activities.
- 6.6.3 Where ground disturbance takes place, these activities would remove, truncate or change any heritage assets located within the area of ground disturbance. Damage to heritage assets caused in this way would be permanent and irreversible. Throughout the design process the scheduled monuments within the site have had a 250m buffer placed around them to embed the mitigation through design and to ensure no direct physical impacts would occur to these assets. Refer also to **Chapter 2: Site Description and Design Evolution** for a more in-depth discussion of avoidance measures implemented and changes made to the design and layout of the Proposed Development to eliminate, minimise or otherwise reduce the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the identified sensitive cultural heritage receptors.

Predicted Construction Effects

- 6.6.4 Assessment of potential direct impacts on cultural heritage assets is based on the maximum likely impact that could be caused by the Proposed Development.
- 6.6.5 Direct impacts would derive from any groundworks or other ground disturbance undertaken as part of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Specific activities which have the potential to cause impacts in this way include:
- excavation of turbine bases, substation foundations, crane hardstandings, borrow pits and cable trenches; and
 - construction and upgrading of access tracks, working compounds and laydown areas.
- 6.6.6 Where significant ground disturbance takes place, these activities would remove or change any cultural heritage assets within the area of ground disturbance. This damage would be irreversible and permanent.

⁶ Mann (2022)

⁷ Gearey et al. (2010)

- 6.6.7 Taking into account the embedded design mitigation measures, the following effects are predicted.
- 6.6.8 With reference to **Figure 6.1**, the Proposed Development has the potential for a direct impact on the cultural heritage assets listed in **Table 6.8**.
- 6.6.9 With regard to as yet unknown remains, the presence of remains of prehistoric date within the footprint of disturbance cannot be ruled out. Furthermore, there is the potential for unrecorded post-medieval pastoral or agricultural remains to be within the footprint of disturbance.

Table 6.8: Potential Direct Impacts and Proposed Mitigation

Asset	Infrastructure	Cultural Heritage Significance	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Proposed Mitigation
Field System, Carn Na Loinee (SLR27)	New Site Track	Medium	Low Adverse - key aspects, such as hut circles within the field system have been avoided.	Very Minor	Fencing off of Hut Circles, to avoid any unintended impacts; Watching Brief on areas not fenced off.
Hut circle and/or shielings (SLR76)	Borrow Pit	Medium	Low Adverse	Very Minor	Watching Brief
Potential Headland (SLR303)	T12 and related infrastructure	Low	Low Adverse	Very Minor	Watching Brief
Shieling Location (SLR306)	T25 and related infrastructure	Low	Low Adverse	Very Minor	Watching Brief
Unknown buried remains	All	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor	Watching brief on all ground-breaking works on previously undisturbed ground.

Proposed Mitigation

- 6.6.10 In respect to **SLR27, SLR76, SLR303 and SLR306** the following mitigation is proposed:
- A targeted watching brief on **SLR27, SLR76, SLR303 and SLR306**; and
 - Fencing off and avoidance of the hut circles present within **SLR27**.
- 6.6.11 The precise scope of the programme of mitigation would be negotiated with THCHET, on behalf of the Applicant. The agreed mitigation programme would be documented in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation prior to any works being implemented.

Residual Construction Effects

- 6.6.12 The completion of the archaeological mitigation programme outlined above would acknowledge direct adverse impact upon archaeological remains. Any adverse effect caused to buried remains as a result of ground disturbance during construction would be offset to some degree by the benefits provided through the information gained during the archaeological investigation and reporting process. Any significant impacts identified in relation to buried archaeological remains should be considered in this context.

Operational Effects

Dalarossie Cottage, cairn 375m SSE of (SM11815)

- 6.6.13 Dalarossie Cottage, cairn is described as a ring cairn, consisting of a subcircular stony bank measuring 18m in diameter which encircle a central stony mound approximately 8m in diameter. No kerbstones are evident, and there is a possible break in the bank in the eastern arc which could indicate an entrance point. The survival is such that it cannot be definitively determined whether this is an intentional entrance break or the result of stone robbing. The cairn is only visible as very slight heather covered banks, which disguise the composition and form of the cairn so that it is not discernible from a distance. Ring cairns are typically enclosed rings of stone, without breaks or entrances, typically attributed to the Bronze Age or late Neolithic. Some instances have found that the central cairn can predate or postdate the ring the function of which does not always indicate a burial. This particular cairn has been suggested to be a rarer ‘saucer’ type cairn, based on its preserved form. There is no depiction of this asset on historic mapping and the area does not seem to have been developed beyond its use as grazing land.
- 6.6.14 The cairn is situated on north-sloping rough pastureland on the south side of the Strathdearn Glen (350m aOD), overlooking the River Findhorn and Kyllachy Burn to the north. Due to the slope of the hill, the cairn has natural views to the north and northwest which take in the valley created by River Findhorn. Its natural approach is likely the base of the glen from along the River Findhorn to the north of the asset where the main route in and out of the Strathdearn would have been. The cairn and its associated nearby assets were likely accessed predominantly by travelling south from the River Findhorn and following the gentle slope up to the flatter area of the cairn. This approach would keep the cairn more prominent in the views looking up the slope.
- 6.6.15 The nearest Bronze Age heritage asset is Banchor cairn (**SM11814**), situated 0.35km to the southwest of Dalarossie Cottage cairn. Though not visible, both Banchor cairn

and Dalarossie Cottage cairn sit within a likely prehistoric field system (Canmore ID 14096), which consists of additional non-designated cairns (MHG2847) and a hut circle. Their proximity to one another indicates their connection as they would have been easily accessed from one another. This cluster composes the local setting of Dalarossie Cottage, cairn.

- 6.6.16 Kyllachy Hill, Cairn (MHG61450), a likely Bronze Age burial cairn, sits on Torr na Gorbale (469m aOD) to the northwest of Dalarossie Cottage, cairn and within the key views of the asset. Given the Kyllachy Hill, Cairn's location within the key views of the cairn, there is a visual relationship between these two heritage assets, which is common for prehistoric funerary assets. The views from Kyllachy Hill, Cairn also show Dalarossie Cottage, cairn near the associated Banchor cairn (**SM11814**), which is not visible from Dalarossie Cottage, cairn itself. The visual relationship, then, from Kyllachy Hill Cairn towards these two bronze age cairns on prominent positions contributes to the appreciation of this type of heritage asset, as they can be seen from one another and were likely connected in purpose. As such, the views from Kyllachy Hill Cairn to Dalarossie Cottage, cairn are key aspects of its setting.
- 6.6.17 The significance of the cairn is derived from its intrinsic characteristics including its preservation, archaeological potential, and survival as a possible rare 'saucer' cairn. Its significance is also derived from its contextual characteristics as a visible component of the Bronze Age landscape with relationships to other prehistoric and associated heritage assets, such as the visual relationship to Kyllachy Hill, Cairn and proximity relationship to Banchor, Cairn (**SM11814**) and the non-designated Bronze Age assets within the field system. Its location in relation to the River Findhorn and the views accessible from its position are also part of its setting where it derives significance. Bronze Age cairns are often placed near watercourses or natural routeways, and in elevated positions to have a visual connection with these. The current setting of the cairn has retained these views along the River Findhorn and along the Glen.
- 6.6.18 The Proposed Development would introduce turbines in the landscape to the south and southeast of the cairn, with the nearest turbine (T25) being 2km to the south at 530m aOD. The ZTV (**Figure 6.2**) indicates that eight turbines would be visible in southeastern views from the cairn. This is confirmed by the photomontage from **Figure 6.3: VP3** which indicates that six hubs and the tips of two additional turbines would be visible in the southern and south-eastern views. According to the wireline from Kyllachy Hill Cairn, proposed to be a third point of appreciation (**Figure 6.8: CHVP5**), Dalarossie Cottage, cairn is visible on the lower slopes of the opposite side of the glen. The turbines, visible on the horizon to the west, are disconnected enough from the background views of this visual relationship that it is determined to be no impact on

the ability to understand and experience this relationship. However, the distant views of the proposed turbines have the potential to distract the viewer from the ability to appreciate the relationship between Kyllachy Hill Cairn and the asset.

- 6.6.19 The visible turbines would be in the south and southeastern views from the asset. These are not considered to be key views from the heritage asset, and therefore the addition of turbines in the landscape would not affect the cultural heritage significance of the asset or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
- 6.6.20 The key views toward the valley and the watercourses will be unaffected and preserved. There will be no impact to the assets or relationships within the cairn's local setting of Banchor Cairn and the field system. The addition of the turbines in views towards the asset from Kyllachy Hill cairn would cause a distraction to the ability to appreciate the relationship between the asset's, however, the ability to understand and experience this relationship would be retained.
- 6.6.21 As such, the magnitude of impact has been assessed as **very low adverse** to an asset of **High** value as per **Table 6.3**, resulting in a **very minor** significance of effect which is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Banchor, cairn 315m SE of (SM11814)

- 6.6.22 Banchor, cairn is described as a burial cairn, consisting of a subcircular convex, stone mound measuring 11.8m east to west and 10.5m north to south, with a surviving height of 0.9m. No kerbstones are evidence and given its convex circular nature, it is thought to be a round cairn. The cairn is discernible only as a circular break in the rough pastoral land as a slight turf covered mound with few visible stones. Round cairns typically contained human remains and were the burial markers for these remains. They were typically placed with connection to the landscape, on points of prominence and/or within views of other prominent points and other prehistoric assets. Burial monuments, such as this, are also found to have a connection to waterbodies and rivers, most commonly where they have a position overlooking these. There is no depiction of this asset on historic mapping and the area does not seem to have been developed being its use as grazing land. A modern fence is found directly to the north of the cairn, that separates the cairn from the land down slope.
- 6.6.23 Banchor cairn is on a false crest on the north-facing slope overlooking the River Findhorn to the north at 380m aOD. The cairn is within a prehistoric field system (Canmore ID 14096) with the designated Dalarossie Cottage cairn (**SM11815**), approximately 0.35km to the northeast, and non-designated heritage assets, including a hut circle and an addition cairn (MHG2847). Though Dalarossie Cottage cairn is not visible, it still forms a part of its setting alongside the non-designated Bronze Age assets within the field system. Its wider views are guided by the topography, where

the southern views are partially blocked by higher ground. Therefore, the asset's key views are shifted more towards the north and western views down the valley along the River Findhorn. Its natural approach is likely the base of the glen from along the River Findhorn to the north of the asset where the main route in and out of Strathdearn would have been. The cairn and its associated nearby assets were likely accessed predominantly by travelling south from the River Findhorn and following the gentle slope up to area of the cairn and its surrounding field system. This approach would keep the cairn more prominent in the views looking up the slope.

- 6.6.24 Banchor cairn shares visibility with Kyllachy Hill Cairn, located 1.6km to the north-west on Torr na Gorbole (469m aOD), a prominent hill on the other side of the glen. This cairn, a likely Bronze Age burial cairn, sits within the key views of the asset which overlook the glen and the River Findhorn. Given the Kyllachy Hill Cairn's location within the key views of Banchor cairn, there is a visual relationship between these two heritage assets, which is common for prehistoric funerary assets. The views from Kyllachy Hill Cairn also show Banchor cairn near the associated Dalarossie Cottage, cairn (SM11815), which isn't visible from Banchor cairn itself. The visual relationship, then, from this third cairn towards these two bronze age cairns on prominent positions contributes to the appreciation of this type of heritage asset, as they can be seen from one another and were likely connected in purpose. As such, the views from Kyllachy Hill Cairn to Banchor cairn are considered key aspects of its setting.
- 6.6.25 The significance of the cairn is derived from its intrinsic characteristics including its preservation and archaeological potential, as well as its contextual characteristics as a visible component of the Bronze Age landscape with relationships to other prehistoric and associated heritage assets, such as the visual relationship to Kyllachy Hill Cairn (MHG61450) and proximity relationship to Dalarossie Cottage, cairn (SM11815) and the Bronze Age non-designated assets within the field system. Kyllachy Hill Cairn is considered to be a third point of appreciation for Banchor, cairn and Dalarossie Cottage, cairn, where it possesses views of both cairns are likely contemporary. Its location in relation to the River Findhorn and the views accessible from its position are also part of its setting where it derives significance. Bronze Age cairns are often placed near watercourses or natural routeways, and in elevated positions to have a visual connection with these. The current setting of the cairn has retained these views along the River Findhorn and along the strath.
- 6.6.26 The Proposed Development would introduce turbines in the landscape to the south and southeast of the cairn, with the nearest turbine (T25) being 1.7km to the southeast at 530m aOD. The ZTV (Figure 6.2) indicates that 11 turbines would be visible in southern and southeastern views from the cairn. This is confirmed by the

photomontage from Figure 6.5: VP2 which indicates that six hubs and the tips of five additional turbines would be visible in the southern and south-eastern views. According to the wireline from Kyllachy Hill Cairn, proposed to be a third point of appreciation (Figure 6.8: VP5), Banchor, cairn is visible on the lower slopes of the opposite side of the strath. The turbines, visible on the horizon to the west, are disconnected enough from the background views of this visual relationship that it is determined to be no impact on the ability to understand and experience this relationship. However, the distant views of the proposed turbines have the potential to distract the viewer from the ability to appreciate the relationship between Kyllachy Hill Cairn and the asset.

- 6.6.27 The proposed turbines are not considered to be located within key views from the heritage asset, being located behind the asset in views towards the Findhorn, and therefore the addition of turbines in the landscape would not affect the cultural heritage significance of the asset or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. It is not anticipated that indirect effects, such as noise, would affect the asset's significance.
- 6.6.28 The key views from its location of the key aspects of its setting, including the River Findhorn and along the strath to the west, and towards Kyllachy Hill Cairn will be unaffected and preserved. Views from Kyllachy Hill Cairn back to Banchor will contain visibility of turbines but will not degrade the visual relationship to the cairn due to the lack of intervisibility due to intervening forestry, with the ability to understand and experience the relationship being retained. There will be no impact to the assets or relationships within the cairn's local setting with Dalarossie Cottage, cairn and the field system.
- 6.6.29 As such, the magnitude of impact has been assessed as **very low adverse** to an asset of **High** value as per Table 6.3, resulting in a **minor** significance of effect which is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Woodend, cairn 760m NW of (SM11739)

Description

- 6.6.30 Woodend cairn is a prehistoric cairn with a central cist, recorded as being well preserved and likely dating to the Bronze Age (between 3500 to 4000 years ago). The cairn measures roughly 6.5m in diameter and approximately 0.5m in height, with nine intermittent kerb stones and a central cist, oriented east to west. At present, the cairn has not been recorded as being excavated, resulting in a high potential for the presence of archaeological remains. The cairn is recorded as having a good level of preservation, due to a lack of modern intrusion on the moorland that it is situated

within, and archaeological remains and environmental deposits may be present both within, and beneath the cairn.

Setting

- 6.6.31 The asset is located within MHG2899, noted as a hut circle settlement, as well as a prehistoric field system (MHG43665), with the boggy ground of the source of an unnamed burn to the immediate west of the asset. The asset is situated on the southeast facing false crest of Tom na Mòine Hill. Views northwards are screened by Tom na Mòine Hill and to the northwest and southeast by Craig Morile and Creag a' Bhealaidh hills respectively. The three hills provide a feeling of enclosure and guide a visitor to views southwards over the substantial watercourse of the River Findhorn and Strathdearn. The Findhorn runs northeast to southwest through the strath. Equally, the asset overlooks a number of burns feeding into the River Findhorn, primarily Allt Phris and Clune Burn which are located to the southeast of the asset. These burns and their associated valleys are a focal point of the concentrated view from the cairn and are framed by the surrounding hills.
- 6.6.32 The surrounding hills provide a feeling of enclosure in three directions when standing at the asset. The placement of the asset on a southeast facing hill frames and provides a focussed view southwards from the cairn, towards the River Findhorn, the associated burns, and the Strathdearn itself. The framing of this view from the cairn indicates that this was a significant view to those that constructed the cairn. Bronze Age cairns are often found associated with watercourses or natural routeways through the landscape, indicating that the proximity and view over the strath and along the Findhorn may have held significance.
- 6.6.33 Several hut circles and field systems are located along the banks of the Clune Burn, located on the opposite bank of the River Findhorn (MHG2846, MHG2795, MHG2796). As previously noted, Clune Burn runs almost directly opposite Woodend Cairn and as such, the locations of these hut circles would have been directly in view of the cairn and would have had a direct view of the cairn on the opposite bank of the river. The placement of the hut circles may have informed the cairn's placement, or vice versa. Whilst the hut circles are no longer visible from the asset due to their erosion, the continued visual connection with their location on the opposing hills to the asset contribute to the asset's significance. The proximity and visual connection have the potential to further our understanding about the intersection between prehistoric funerary and domestic practices.
- 6.6.34 There are further prehistoric assets in the wider landscape, including Banchor cairn (SM11814) and Dalarossie cairn (SM11815), located c.3.4km to the southwest, and a further area of hut circles and field systems on the southern slopes of a series of hills

c.1.6km to the southwest (MHG2902). However, due to the intervening topography of Craig Morile hill, there is no visibility between these assets and Woodend Cairn. Their spatial proximity contributes to the asset's significance, as further analysis would allow for a more in-depth understanding of prehistoric society along the River Findhorn.

- 6.6.35 The valley and hillside that the cairn sits within, whilst relatively rural, is not without elements of modernisation. The cairn currently sits within an area of moorland nature reserve, which is encircled by a large wire fence. The fence is visible on the edge of the reserve, c.0.25km south. Commercial forestry is located to the south and southeast of the cairn, presenting an element of screening in views in these directions. However, Strathdearn can still be seen beyond the commercial forestry. An unnamed single track road runs on the northern bank of the Findhorn and various farmsteads and lodges are scattered throughout the strath floor. Whilst obviously present in views, the modern aspects of the landscape are spread out in a way that allows for the continued appreciation of the rural character of the area.

Contribution of Setting to Significance

- 6.6.36 Not all aspects of an asset's setting can contribute to its cultural significance. As such some aspects may be neutral where others detract and in other cases positively contribute to significance.
- 6.6.37 The following aspects are considered to contribute to the setting of Woodend Cairn and as such contribute to its cultural significance:
- The placement of the cairn on a false crest of Tom na Mòine hill, enclosed on the north, northwest and southeast by the surrounding hill tops. The three surrounding hills provide a feeling of enclosure and focus views southwards.
 - The placement of the cairn overlooking the River Findhorn and the associated strath, over which views are focused. The placement of cairns in proximity to watercourses is typical of this period and suggests that the river had significance to the asset.
 - Focussed views over the Clune Burn and Allt Phris, which converge with the River Findhorn to the south of the asset and are lined by potentially contemporaneous assets.
 - The visibility of the cairn along its approach, both along Strathdearn and the River Findhorn, which acts as a natural routeway or corridor through the landscape.

Development Effects

- 6.6.38 The ZTV (Figure 6.2) indicates that all 26 turbine tips would be visible from the asset. This is confirmed by the photomontage (Figure 6.7: CHVP4), which demonstrates that

26 turbine tips and 24 turbine hubs would be visible. The nearest proposed turbine would be T18, located c.4.1km to the south, with the rest of the proposed turbines oriented to the south and southwest. Whilst not shown on the visualisations, it is likely that additional infrastructure (e.g., access tracks, BESS) would be visible within the Proposed Development from the asset. However, the turbines of the Proposed Development are the most visually prominent aspect of the development and would cause the most impact.

- 6.6.39 The location of the cairn is currently not visible when moving through the Strath due to the commercial forestry along the northern bank of the river. If this was to be felled, the location of the cairn would likely be visible. The ZTV (Figure 6.2) shows that in a bare earth scenario, visibility of the proposed turbines is limited along the river itself. In a bare-earth scenario, the turbines would be more visible along the unnamed modern track that runs along the north bank of the river. The location of the cairn on the opposite riverbank to the proposed turbines means that both the cairn and the proposed turbines would not be present within the same field of view whilst approaching through the strath. If the proposed turbines feature in any peripheral views whilst approaching along the strath, whilst visible, they would not detract from the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the connection between the cairn and this aspect of its setting.
- 6.6.40 The turbines would be present in the framed views from the cairn into the Strathdearn valley and would be fully visible when looking to the southwest. Views to the south would have a view of the Proposed Development, whilst views along the river to the northeast would not include the Proposed Development. When looking along the river towards the south and southwest, the eye of the viewer would no longer be immediately drawn to the strath itself, but instead to the Proposed Development. The ability to understand and experience the connection between the asset and the framed view over the strath would remain intact. However, the presence of the proposed turbines and other associated infrastructure in views would distract from the ability to appreciate the framed view.
- 6.6.41 The proposed turbines would be peripheral in views towards the nearby hut circles and field systems, as well as in views towards Clune Burn and Allt Phris. The placement of the proposed turbines on the periphery of views towards Clune Burn and Allt Phris and the nearby contemporaneous assets, means that the relationship between the asset and this aspect of its setting could still be understood and experienced. Whilst they would not be directly present within views towards these aspects of the assets setting, the turbines would present a distraction when viewing the burn and location of the hut circles and the eye would be drawn away from the burns towards the

turbines. As such, the proposed turbines would be a distraction to the ability to appreciate the relationship between the asset and this aspect of its setting.

- 6.6.42 As set out above, the asset's cultural significance is equally composed of its intrinsic (archaeological), contextual and associative characteristics. As such, the asset is considered to have a **medium** sensitivity of setting. The Proposed Development would not have an impact on the intrinsic characteristics of the asset, with its archaeological value remaining intact.
- 6.6.43 The introduction of the Proposed Development would distract from the ability to appreciate the wider setting of the monument, particularly in outward views from Woodend Cairn along Strathdearn. However, the ability to understand and experience the reasoning for these views would be retained.
- 6.6.44 In addition, the ability to understand and experience Woodend cairn's association with the contemporaneous assets and the burns on the opposite bank of the river, would be retained. The placement of the proposed turbines to the southwest would cause a minor distraction to the ability to appreciate this aspect of its setting, due to their placement within peripheral views.
- 6.6.45 Furthermore, the ability to appreciate the monument when moving through the valley itself would remain intact, due to the separation of the cairn from the Proposed Development by the River Findhorn.
- 6.6.46 With this in mind, as a monument of high significance and with a medium sensitivity of change to its setting, the magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development would be medium. This would result in a moderate significance of effect. While this impact is considered **significant** in EIA terms, it is not considered to impact the integrity of the setting of the asset for the purposes of the test under Policy 7 h) ii of NPF4. Many contributing factors to the setting of the asset would be retained such as the ability to understand and experience the placement of the asset along the watercourses and valleys that the cairn overlooks, as well as its contemporaneous assets to which it relates both in the wider valley and in close proximity. The Proposed Development has the potential to distract from the ability to appreciate the wider views over the River Findhorn and the strath, as well as presenting a minor distraction to the ability to appreciate the asset's connection with nearby contemporaneous assets.
- 6.6.47 However, the elements of setting which contribute to significance are retained. As such, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Woodend Cairn, whilst significant in EIA terms, does not significantly adversely impact the integrity of the monument.

Edinchat, cairn 415m NNW of (SM11734)

- 6.6.48 Edinchat Cairn is a Bronze Age burial cairn, measuring approximately 9m in diameter and standing at approximately 0.4m in height. The cairn is mostly grass covered and turfed over and visually indistinguishable from the surrounding hillside, especially when the grass is long. There is a smaller and more modern cairn built at its centre, potentially from material that was used in the original cairn. The centre of the cairn is recorded as being undisturbed. The cairn's significance derives in part from its intrinsic characteristics, as the undisturbed centre of the cairn has the potential for preserved archaeological remains and environmental deposits from buried soil. Further archaeological investigation into the cairn has the potential to enhance our understanding of Bronze Age funerary practices.
- 6.6.49 The cairn is located at the top of a small hill, named as Druim an Tuirc, located at c.340m AOD. The hill slopes gently in all directions, with the summit plateau stretching southwards for c.0.23km before sloping down towards the Allt Bruachaig burn c.0.47km south of the asset. Due to the plateau extending towards the south, the burn itself is not visible from the asset and the asset is not visible when travelling along the burn.
- 6.6.50 The River Findhorn runs at the base of the slope c.1.5km to the northwest and runs around the set of hills that the cairn sits on to the west, before turning southwards c.1km south of the asset. Due to the commercial forestry that is located to the north, west and southwest of the asset (Plates 6-1-6-3), the river is unable to be seen from the cairn in the present day. Even in a bare-earth scenario, it is unlikely that the cairn would have views of the Findhorn to the north and west due to the placement of the cairn on the wide plateau and the gentle slopes forming a visual barrier to viewing the lower ground. There are long distance views of Strathdearn, the valley containing the River Findhorn, towards the southwest (**Figure 6.4b**). However, the river itself is not visible from the cairn. Watercourses encircle the cairn and its related hill on three sides, with the Findhorn to the north and west, Allt Bruachaig running along its south and the east side remaining open. The northeast side of the cairn is an area of low ground, made up of superficial deposits of peat⁸, and this is the only area of the immediate low ground surrounding the cairn that can be seen. This area of peatland is the only lowland area bridging the land between Allt Bruachaig and the River Findhorn and as such may have been a routeway used to traverse this part of the landscape. As such, the asset may have been placed to have views over the peatland or be visible to those travelling through it.



Plate 6- 1: View from asset (SM11734) to the north



Plate 6- 2: View from asset (SM11734) to the west

⁸ British Geological Survey (2024)



Plate 6- 3: View from asset (SM11734) to the southwest

6.6.51 The cairn sits within a wider prehistoric landscape, which stretches along the Strathdearn valley. Whilst there are Bronze Age burial cairns located along the River Findhorn (e.g., SM11739, SM11815, SM11814), they do not share intervisibility with the asset due to the intervening topography, including Craig Morile Hill. The cairn sits within an undated field system (MHG2810), that encircles the hilltop that the cairn sits upon. Whilst the field system is undated, the asset description mentions the presence of lynchets, which are associated with prehistoric agricultural practices and may indicate a roughly contemporaneous date to the cairn. Whilst the cairn does not have clear views of the surrounding lowlands, it does have views across the valley of Allt Bruachaig towards the northwest slopes of Tom nan Cliath and these views would be extensive after felling of the intervening commercial forestry. There are a series of potentially contemporaneous field systems, hut circles and clearance cairns (MHG2793, MHG2794) on these northwestern slopes, and whilst not currently visually distinguishable, may have informed the placement of the cairn or their placement may have been influenced by the proximity to the cairn. There are further prehistoric agricultural assets further south of Tom nan Cliath (SM11673, MHG2792), however, due to intervening topography and modern additions to the landscape, these assets are not visible.

- 6.6.52 Whilst there is no visual connection between the surrounding watercourses and the asset, its placement with three sides enclosed with water was likely of importance. Cairns are often found associated with watercourses and whilst there isn't a visual connection with the watercourses, it is likely that this is still the case. The association may have been acoustic, with a visitor able to hear the Findhorn River and Allt Bruachaig when standing at the cairn. If this connection was significant, it is no longer perceivable, due to the noise of the modern landscape, including the A9, located c.2.2km to the southeast. During the site visit in July 2024, the sound of the watercourses could not be perceived, instead the noise of the A9 was prominent.
- 6.6.53 The cairn is visible from and has views to the low peatland to the northeast, which may have had significance in regard to its placement. This area would have provided the only lowland crossing between the Allt Bruachaig and the Findhorn River and visibility of the cairn whilst moving through this area of the landscape may have had significance.
- 6.6.54 Whilst cairns are often prominent and visible monuments of remembrance and are often able to be viewed when moving along natural routeways, the large plateau that the cairn sits upon prevents the majority of views from the bases of the river valleys towards the cairn. This was likely deliberate and as such, the absence of visibility of the cairn from the valleys and the absence of views of the valleys from the cairn were likely of significance.
- 6.6.55 The assets intervisibility with and proximity to contemporaneous agricultural assets has the potential to enhance our understanding regarding the relationship between prehistoric funerary assets and surrounding agricultural communities, as well as enhancing our understanding of Bronze Age society in general. The placement of the cairn both within a field system and with visibility of a series of field systems likely had significance. Whilst currently not visible due to the placement of commercial forestry, the contemporaneous assets on the opposing hillside to the southeast (MHG2793, MHG2794) would have contributed to this significance.
- 6.6.56 **Figure 6.2** and **Figure 6.4: CHVP1** indicate that all 26 turbines would be visible from Edinchat Cairn, with the closest turbine would be Turbine 18, located c.8.9km to the southwest. Whilst not shown on the visualisations, it is possible that certain parts of the infrastructure of the Proposed Development would be visible from the asset (e.g., access tracks, BESS), however due to the distance of the Proposed Development from the asset and the size of these aspects of the development they would likely be imperceptible within the landscape.

- 6.6.57 The cairn currently sits in rough grazing land, within a series of large uncultivated fields. An access track is located c.0.13km to the east and a boundary fence is located c.0.1km to the north. These aspects of the landscape aren't visible from the cairn due to surrounding commercial forestry. There are plantations of commercial forestry c.65m to the west, c.0.12km to the southeast and c.0.16km to the north. As commercial forestry plantations will be felled, they are not considered as permanent screening as part of this assessment.
- 6.6.58 Whilst standing at the asset, the noise from the A9 road causes a distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the potential acoustic connection with the surrounding watercourses. The addition of the Proposed Development in long distance views would not further distract from the ability to understand, appreciate or experience this contributing aspect to the asset's significance.
- 6.6.59 Due to the current baseline noise conditions from the A9, the proposed turbines would not further impact any ability to understand, appreciate, or experience the potential acoustic connection between the asset and the surrounding river and burn.
- 6.6.60 The turbines are also not present in views between the asset and the nearby visible contemporaneous assets, due to the placement of the Proposed Development to the southwest away from the viewshed. The Proposed Development would not impact the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the connection between the asset and this aspect of its setting.
- 6.6.61 As previously stated, the cairn is not visible when moving along the watercourses and their associated valleys, nor are the watercourses or valleys visible from the cairn itself.
- 6.6.62 The addition of the proposed turbines to the baseline environment would not intrude upon any views to the cairn from the surrounding valleys, nor any visual connections with the watercourses, as the cairn is not visible from these areas, nor does it have any visual relationship with them.
- 6.6.63 The ZTV (**Figure 6.2**) indicates that between zero and 26 turbine tips would be visible from the lower lying peatland to the northeast of the cairn. In some instances, the proposed turbine tips would be visible from the peatland, within views towards the cairn. The distance of the proposed turbines from the cairn and their orientation to the southeast, means that they would not become the main focus of views in this direction and would cause a minor distraction at most to the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the asset and this aspect of its setting.
- 6.6.64 As such, whilst visible, the turbines only impact a singular aspect of the parts of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance. The ability to appreciate, understand, and experience the potential acoustic connection to the surrounding watercourses, the asset's lack of visibility of the watercourses, and the connection between contemporaneous assets would remain intact.
- 6.6.65 With this in mind, as a monument of high significance, the magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development would be **very low adverse**, which would result in a very **minor** significance of effect. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.
- Soilsean, deserted township and hut circle 745m ESE of (SM11806)**
- 6.6.66 The asset is a prehistoric hut circle, along with associated lynchets, and an abandoned post-medieval settlement, named Sheanevall. The hut circle is located to the north of the settlement. The settlement comprises a series of upstanding structures, mainly buildings but also stone courses, earthen banks, dykes, and a corn-drying kiln. There are seven buildings with upstanding remains, and the remains of agricultural enclosures and earthworks are located to the west and north of these buildings.
- 6.6.67 The assets significance derives in part from its intrinsic characteristics. Both the hut circle and the township are well preserved, with the potential for further archaeological investigation to be taken place. These remains have the potential to further our understanding of rural settlement and small-scale rural economy in both the prehistoric period and the post-medieval period.
- 6.6.68 The asset is placed in rough grazing land, on a flat plateau at the base of Creag an Tuim Bhig to the southeast. The flat ground overlooks the modern A9 and the Highland Mainline railway c.0.35km to the west and the River Findhorn and associated valley c.1km to the west. The historic route of General Wade's Military Road is located c.0.4km to the north.
- 6.6.69 The Allt a' Choire Mhòir burn is located c.0.5km to the north of the asset, within a small valley between the plateau and an unnamed hill to the north. A tributary of the burn is located c.40m to the east of the asset and runs downhill towards the burn at the north.
- 6.6.70 Both aspects of the asset, prehistoric and post-medieval, sit within wider contemporaneous landscapes. There are multiple other prehistoric domestic/agricultural assets located within the vicinity, mainly identifiable through hut circles. These include a large area of hut circles c.0.4km to the east of the asset (MHG2789) and the Drumbain Cottage hut circles located c.0.8km to the southeast. Some of these assets may have had intervisibility with each other and due to their proximity may have formed part of a wider community, but there is no current visual relationship between Soilsean and these assets. The spatial relationship between the hut circles has the potential to further our understanding of prehistoric agricultural practices and communities.

- 6.6.71 The deserted township is located within a landscape of other post-medieval agricultural assets and deserted townships. This includes the Creag an Tuim Bhig deserted settlement (MHG14321) located c.0.2km south and Burnton township (MHG26451) located c.1.2km northeast. A survey between 2012 and 2013⁹ shows that these townships were once part of the Corrybrough Estate, which was cleared in 1836 by the landowners and the inhabitants removed from their homes. Their proximity and placement within the lands of this estate enables our understanding of post-medieval agricultural communities and their treatment during the clearances.
- 6.6.72 For both the prehistoric and post-medieval landscapes, there is no discernible visual connection between the nearby contemporaneous assets due to the topography. Any connection is spatial, and a visual connection is not needed to understand their connection in the landscape.
- 6.6.73 The agricultural land that the asset sits within has been in use from the prehistoric period to the post-medieval period. As such, the archaeological remains in the site enable us to understand land use and settlement over an extensive timeframe.
- 6.6.74 The ZTV (**Figure 6.2**) indicates that between eight and 26 proposed turbine tips would be visible from the asset. The wireline (**Figure 6.10: CHVP7**) shows that 14 turbine tips and 11 hubs would be visible from the chosen viewpoint. The highest number of turbine tips would be visible in the west and the lowest in the east. The closest proposed turbine is T18, located c.5.6km to the southwest.
- 6.6.75 Whilst the proposed turbines would be visible to the southwest, they would not impact the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the asset in its prehistoric and post-medieval agricultural context. The turbines would not distract from the ability to understand and appreciate the connection between the asset and the roughly south-facing land, the proximity to watercourses and its elevated position above any flood plains. As the asset still sits within rough grazing land, the ability to experience its rural position would remain intact and the placement of turbines in distant views would not cause any distraction.
- 6.6.76 Furthermore, the placement of the asset within both wider prehistoric and post-medieval landscapes would not be impacted by the Proposed Development. The connections between contemporaneous assets are not visual and as such, the placement of any turbines in long-distance views to the southwest would not impact the ability to understand, appreciate or experience their connection.
- 6.6.77 As such, whilst visible, the turbines are not placed within an aspect of the assets setting that contributes to its significance. With this in mind, as a monument of high significance, the magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development would be **neutral**, which would result in a **Neutral** significance of effect which is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.
- Drumbain Cottage, hut circles 725m, 845m and 975m ESE of (SM11673)**
- 6.6.78 The asset comprises the remains of three hut circles, visible as low circular stone and earth banks with entrance gaps in the southeast quadrant. Each hut circle measures approximately 10m in diameter and they have been terraced into the slope. The assets derive their significance in part from their intrinsic characteristics, as well-preserved prehistoric hut circles, dating to the first or second millennium BC. From a past watching brief on the wider prehistoric landscape (EHG242), c.0.3km to the northwest, there is evidence of surviving prehistoric archaeological material in the wider landscape. There is the potential for further surviving archaeological remains associated with the hut circles and this has the potential to further our understanding of prehistoric agricultural and domestic activity.
- 6.6.79 The asset derives its significance in part from its contextual characteristics, both its placement within an agricultural landscape and its placement within a wider prehistoric landscape.
- 6.6.80 The asset is located on a south facing slope at approximately 400m AOD, above the Allt Cosach burn c.0.26km to the southwest. The Allt Cosach burn which is a tributary of the River Findhorn. The Findhorn is located c.1km to the southwest. The asset is located in heather in an open field system, which is used for rough grazing. A dirt path runs through the centre of the three hut circles, running east to west. The modern A9 road and the Highland Mainline Railway run through the valley of the Allt Cosach burn to the south of the asset. A small modern plantation runs between the assets and the road, in order to act as visual and acoustic screening. However, when standing at the assets, the noise and smell of the A9 is distinct distraction within the landscape.
- 6.6.81 The asset was likely placed on the south facing slope due to the potential for longer instances of sunlight during the day, which is key for agricultural practices. The proximity to Allt Cosach would have provided a water source. In general, the assets are placed within good agricultural land and would have taken advantage of this position.

⁹ North of Scotland Archaeology Society (2013)

- 6.6.82 The ability to understand, appreciate and experience this connection to the agricultural land is diminished to a discernible extent due to its proximity to the A9. The screening plantation ensures that there is no visual connection to the burn to the south or the wider Strathdearn and the ability to experience this connection is further diminished by the noise of the A9.
- 6.6.83 The asset is situated within a wider prehistoric agricultural and domestic landscape. There are three further hut circles (MHG2822), albeit in a poorly preserved nature, located within the same field system as the scheduled hut circles.
- 6.6.84 There are multiple hut circles in the wider landscape, with a large set of them located c.0.6km to the north (MHG2789). The relatively steep slope that the asset is situated upon and the general undulating landscape surrounding the asset means that there is no current visual connection between the asset and the hut circles to the north. There are also hut circles on the south side of the Allt Cosach burn, including MHG2823 located c.0.65km to the southwest. However, due to the A9 and the forestry screening, there is no longer any discernible visual connection with the assets to the southwest. Whilst the connection between the nearby contemporaneous assets is not visual, due to the natural landscape and the more modern intrusions of the A9 and forestry screening, their spatial relationship has the potential to further our understanding of later prehistoric domestic arrangements, the relationship between structures and their place in the agricultural landscape
- 6.6.85 The ZTV indicates that between 22 and 24 turbine tips would be present from the asset in a bare earth scenario. The wireline (**Figure 6.9: CHVP6**) indicates that 24 turbine tips and 12 hubs would be visible in a bare earth scenario. The wireline does not take into account the permanent forestry screening along the length of the A9, which does form a visual barrier in views towards the Proposed Development.
- 6.6.86 Whilst the Proposed Development would be present in long distance views to the southwest, these long-distance views do not contribute to the ability to understand, appreciate, or experience the assets positioning within the landscape and its use as an agricultural and domestic dwelling. Views in this direction are limited due to the permanent screening and when they are open, the A9 acts as a distraction within the landscape.
- 6.6.87 The Proposed Development would not act as a distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the relationship between the immediate group of hut circles surrounding the asset, due to its distance and placement outside of the immediate landscape. As noted, the relationship between the asset and the contemporaneous hut circles to the north is purely spatial and the Proposed Development would not impact this. The ability to understand, appreciate and experience the relationship

between the asset and the hut circles on the south side of the All Cosach burn has already been eroded due to the presence of the A9 and the permanent screening. The Proposed Development would not further impact this relationship.

- 6.6.88 As such, whilst visible, the turbines are not placed within an aspect of the assets setting that contributes to its significance and, when viewed in conjunction with the surrounding baseline environment, would not cause an impact to the assets significance. With this in mind, as a monument of high significance, the magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development would be **neutral**, which would result in a **Neutral** significance of effect which is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Decommissioning Effects

Embedded Measures

- 6.6.89 It is assumed that the decommissioning of the Proposed Development would return the landscape to its current state after the length of life that the Proposed Development has been in effect.

Potential Effects

- 6.6.90 There would be no negative effects upon the setting or significance of any assets within 10km, as the landscape would be returned to its original state. There would be no direct effects on any assets on the assumption there would be no new ground works taking place during decommissioning, above that already disturbed during construction.

Residual Post-Operation Effects

- 6.6.91 There would be no residual effects resulting from the decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

6.7 Mitigation

Direct Construction

- 6.7.1 As outlined in Section 6.6, mitigation as shown in **Table 6.9** is proposed, subject to the agreement with THCHET.

Operational Effects

- 6.7.2 Design mitigation measures are outlined in **Chapter 2: Site Description and Design Evolution** and summarised below.
- 6.7.3 A feasibility study was undertaken, to identify potential sensitive cultural heritage receptors. Woodend Cairn (**SM11739**) was identified as a sensitive receptor, and the setting of the asset was outlined. The setting of the asset was taken into account

when reducing the number of turbines and limited to the southwest of the Site, in part to limit the impact on the cairn.

- 6.7.4 Furthermore, the Proposed Development was designed to reduce the potential for impact on the setting of Banchor Cairn (SM11814) and Dalarossie Cottage cairn (SM11815), due to their placement within the Site boundary. The asset's immediate vicinity was avoided for the placement of infrastructure and the proposed turbines are placed behind the closest hills in order to provide visual and physical separation from assets. These elements of the design were implemented on the advice of the cultural heritage consultant and maintained throughout the design process.

6.8 Assessment of Residual Effects

Direct Effects

- 6.8.1 Mitigation in various forms is proposed in **Table 6.9**.
- 6.8.2 Any residual effects would be in accordance with those outlined in **Table 6.9**. Adverse effects would be offset to some degree by the positive effect that archaeological recording would have in respect to the wider benefit to the archaeological and local community. As noted previously, all mitigation would be agreed with THCHET.

Operational Effects

- 6.8.3 Residual Operational effects are summarised in **Table 6.9**.

Decommissioning Effects

- 6.8.4 As outlined in Section 6.6, decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not result in any adverse effects and thus there would be no decommissioning effects.

6.9 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

- 6.9.1 Cumulative effects have been considered with regard to any wind farm developments that are:
- Consented or the subject of valid but currently undetermined planning or s36 applications;
 - within 15 km of assets of any nationally important assets anticipated to be subject to a Moderate adverse effect (or above) as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 6.9.2 Furthermore, as the duelling of the A9 road is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project the potential cumulative impacts arising from the development have been considered.

- 6.9.3 At the request of The Highland Council, Highland Wind Farm (currently at scoping stage) has been included in the cumulative assessment. Operational Wind Farms are considered as a baseline consideration in individual assessments above.

Woodend, cairn 760m NW of (SM11739)

- 6.9.4 The asset, its setting and the potential impact as a result of the Proposed Development is discussed in Paragraphs 6.6.32 and 6.6.43. Visualisations from the asset can be found in **Figure 6.7: CHVP4**.
- 6.9.5 There is a single consented wind farm within 15km of the asset, Tom nan Clach Extension is located c.10km to the northeast. Views to the northeast are screened by the topography, namely Craig Morile Hill. As such, Tom nan Clach Extension would not be visible from the asset and would not contribute to a cumulative impact upon the significance of Woodend Cairn.
- 6.9.6 There is a single wind farm that is currently under construction within 15km of the asset, with Aberarder Wind Farm located c.14km to the northwest. Views to the southwest and west are screened by Creag a' Bhealaidh hill, which dominates all views in this direction. As such, Tom nan Clach Extension would not be visible from the asset and would not contribute to a cumulative impact upon the significance of Woodend Cairn.
- 6.9.7 Highland Wind Farm is located c.10km southwest of Woodend Cairn. As shown in **Figure 6.7c**, there would be a singular turbine visible from Woodend Cairn, located to the southwest, along the background of views across the River Findhorn and the hills to the south. This view would also include the Proposed Development itself. When viewed in conjunction with the vegetation and landscape, the singular turbine tip would be indistinguishable from the hilltop due to its distance and size. As such, the addition of Highland Wind Farm, when viewed cumulatively with the Proposed Development, would not contribute to a cumulative impact upon the significance of Woodend Cairn.
- 6.9.8 The Tomatin to Moy section of the A9 duelling project is located along the section of the A9 c.2.7km to the east of the asset. The works would likely be visible in views along the River Findhorn, towards the east, from the asset. The project would not be the addition of a new road, as the A9 already runs through the landscape, but would add additional infrastructure surrounding it. The additional infrastructure has the potential to be a minor distraction in views along the strath towards the east, but the road is not situated within the main setting focus which is the views to the south across the valley. The addition of the A9 infrastructure, when viewed in conjunction

with the Proposed Development, would not add any additional impact to the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the asset and its setting.

6.9.9 As such, no increase to the assessed impact magnitude concluded for the Proposed Development in isolation is predicted. The magnitude of impact as a result of the cumulative impact of the A9 dualling and the Proposed Development would be **medium**, which would result in a **moderate** significance of effect. This is significant in EIA terms.

6.9.10 Whilst this is considered **Significant** in EIA terms, it is not considered to breach the test of adverse impact upon the integrity of setting under Policy 7 h) ii. The aspects of the asset's integrity have been identified and the conclusions remain the same as discussed in Section 6.6.47.

6.10 Summary

6.10.1 This assessment has considered data from a diverse range of sources in order to determine the presence of heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development. The potential direct, indirect and setting effects of the Proposed Development on the identified assets, mitigation measures for protecting known assets during construction or recording of currently unknown features which could be lost due to groundworks during construction, and the residual effects of the Proposed Development have also been assessed.

6.10.2 The assessment has considered the potential direct, indirect and setting impacts on the designated heritage assets outlined in **Table 6.9**, which provides a summary of the identified significance of effect upon them.

6.10.3 Mitigation through design has been embedded throughout the design process, as outlined in **Chapter 2: Site Description and Design Evolution**. This has ensured that any designated heritage assets within the Site boundary would not be directly impacted as a result of the Proposed Development. Where non-designated heritage assets would be or would have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development, further mitigation has been suggested in Section 6.6. A full scheme of mitigation should be agreed with THCHET.

6.10.4 Of the assets listed in **Table 6.9**, a moderate significance of effect has been identified upon the setting of Woodend Cairn (**SM11739**) as a result of the Proposed Development. This is considered significant in EIA terms. However, it is not considered to breach the test of adverse impact upon the integrity of setting under Policy 7 h) ii. Whilst the Proposed Development would impact on the ability to appreciate the connection between the cairn and its placement above the River Findhorn, the valley and the nearby contemporary assets, the introduction of the Proposed Development

into the environment would not impact the ability to understand and experience the connection between the asset and the aforementioned aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance. Furthermore, the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the cairn whilst moving through the valley would remain intact. As such, the impact of the Proposed Development is not anticipated to be so significant to adversely effect the integrity of the setting of Woodend Cairn.

6.10.5 When considered cumulatively with the surrounding developments that are currently the subject of valid planning applications, the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development would stay at a moderate significance of effect, as the assessed cumulative developments would not cause further impact to the asset's significance.

Table 6.9: Summary of Residual Effects

Asset	Type of Impact	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect	Significant in EIA terms
Field System, Carn Na Loinee (SLR27)	Direct	Very Minor	Watching Brief, Fencing off of Hut Circles.	Planning Condition	Very Minor	No
Hut circle and/or shielings (SLR76)	Direct	Very Minor	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Very Minor	No
Potential Headland (SLR303)	Direct	Very Minor	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Very Minor	No
Unknown buried remains	Direct	Moderate	Watching brief on all ground-breaking works on previously undisturbed ground.	Planning Condition	Moderate	No
Shieling Location (SLR306)	T25 and related infrastructure	Low	Low Adverse	Very Minor	Watching Brief	No
Banchor, cairn 315m SE of (SM11814)	Direct (Setting)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor	No
Dalarossie Cottage, cairn 375m SSE of (SM11815)	Direct (Setting)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor	No
Woodend, cairn 760m	Direct (Setting)	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Moderate	Yes

Asset	Type of Impact	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect	Significant in EIA terms
NW of (SM11739)						
Edinchat, cairn 415m NNW of (SM11734)	Direct (Setting)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor	No
Soilsean, deserted township and hut circle 745m ESE of (SM11806)	Direct (Setting)	Neutral	N/A	N/A	Neutral	No
Drumbain Cottage, hut circles 725m, 845m and 975m ESE of (SM11673)	Direct (Setting)	Neutral	N/A	N/A	Neutral	No

Historic Environment Scotland (2014) Our Place In Time. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=fa088e13-8781-4fd6-9ad2-a7af00f14e30#:~:text=Our%20Place%20in%20Time%20is,value%2C%20cared%20for%20and%20enjoyed.>

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b) A Guide to Climate Change Impact: On Scotland's Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=843d0c97-d3f4-4510-acd3-aadf0118bf82>

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2023) Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=79204155-9eb2-4d29-ab14-aff200ec2801>

Mann, B. (2022) Guidance for Peatland Restoration and the Historic Environment in Scotland. Available at: <https://www.algao.org.uk/publications/2022/guidance-peatland-restoration-and-historic-environment-scotland>

NatureScot (2024) NatureScot pre-application guidance for onshore wind farms. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/doc/naturescot-pre-application-guidance-onshore-wind-farms>

North of Scotland Archaeology Society (2013) Report of a survey of archaeological sites on part of the Corrybrough estate, near Tomatin, Inverness-shire. Available at: <https://her.highland.gov.uk/Event/EHG4590>

Scottish Government (2011) Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/>

6.11 References

AOC Archaeology Group (2018) Reconductoring of the Overhead Line between Tomatin and Boat of Garten Archaeological Walkover Survey Report. Available at: <https://her.highland.gov.uk/Event/EHG5284>

British Geological Survey (2024) Geology Viewer. Available at: https://geologyviewer.bgs.ac.uk/?_ga=2.128753548.1474610860.1726233746-1040870690.1726233745

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Curtis, G R. (1981) 'Roads and bridges in the Scottish Highlands: the route between Dunkeld and Inverness 1725-1925', Proc Soc Antiq Scot, vol. 110, 1978-80. Available at: http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-352-1/dissemination/pdf/vol_110/110_475_496.pdf

Gearey, B., Bermingham, N., Chapman, H., Charman, D., Fletcher, W., Fyfe, R., Quartermaine, J. and Van de Noort, R., 2010. Peatlands and the historic environment. Scientific review for the UK IUCN Commission on Peatlands. Available at: <https://www.iucn-uk-peatlandprogramme.org/resources/commission-inquiry/work-commission-2011/peatlands-and-historic-environment>

Scottish Government (2014) Onshore Wind Turbines: Planning Advice Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-turbines-planning-advice/>

Scottish Government (2023) National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4). Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/>

Scottish Natural Heritage and HES (2018). Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook - Version 5: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/doc/handbook-environmental-impact-assessment-guidance-competent-authorities-consultees-and-others>.

The Highland Council (2012) Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Available at: https://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/development_plans/199/highland-wide_local_development_plan

UK Government (1979) The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>

UK Government (1997) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas (Scotland) Act 1997. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents>

UK Government (2014) The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2014. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2014/19/contents>

UK Government (2017) The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/contents>

Worth, S. (2023) Improvements Deferred: An historical-archaeological study of transitional farms in the Grampian Highlands of Scotland, during the Agricultural Improvements of the 18th and 19th centuries. Available at: <https://pure.uhi.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/improvements-deferred>

Cartographic References:

Ordnance Survey (1874) Inverness-shire (Mainland), Sheet XLIV. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/228778006>

Ordnance Survey (1875) Inverness-shire (Mainland), Sheet XLIII. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/74427063>

Roy, W. (174701755) Roy Military Survey Strip 26 (Highlands): Inverness-shire. Includes Inverness, I... Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/217499644>