

## CHAPTER 11: CULTURAL HERITAGE

<b>11.</b>	<b>CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>	<b>11-2</b>
11.1	Executive Summary	11-2
11.2	Introduction	11-3
11.3	Scope of Assessment	11-3
11.4	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	11-7
11.5	Methodology	11-8
11.6	Baseline Conditions	11-13
11.7	Embedded Mitigation / Mitigation by Design	11-17
11.8	Potential Effects	11-18
11.9	Mitigation	11-23
11.10	Residual Effects	11-25
11.11	Summary and Conclusions	11-26

### Figures (Volume 2 of this EIA Report)

Figure 11.1: Cultural Heritage Inner Study Area

Figure 11.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area

Figures 11.3.1-11.3.6: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Torr Dhuin Scheduled Monument

Figures 11.4.1-11.4.4: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Coiltry Farm

Figures 11.5.1-11.5.5: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 3 - Auchterawe Road

### Technical Appendices (Volume 4 of this EIA Report)

Technical Appendix 11.1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets within the Proposed Development LODs

Technical Appendix 11.2: Inner Study Area Gazetteer of HER Assets

Technical Appendix 11.3: Outer Study Area Gazetteer of Designated Heritage Assets

## 11. CULTURAL HERITAGE

### 11.1 Executive Summary

- 11.1.1 A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey has been carried out to assess the effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Highland Council (THC).
- 11.1.2 A total of six non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Proposed Development LODs. The majority of these are associated with post-medieval settlement and agricultural activities, although a quern stone findspot relating to prehistoric occupation is recorded to the south of Auchterawe.
- 11.1.3 There is potential for construction works within the Proposed Development LODs to result in direct effects on three heritage assets. In addition, three additional elements of these assets lie within the micrositing allowance (LOD) and could be affected by micrositing of the towers or access track routes. In the absence of mitigation, one of these impacts (on a group of clearance cairns (5b)) is assessed as being potentially of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms). There is also a recognised potential for construction works to affect hitherto unknown, buried archaeological remains. Although the likelihood of such impacts is judged to be low, the effects on any of archaeological importance could be of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms). The other impacts are assessed as being *not significant*.
- 11.1.4 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid, reduce or offset the predicted effects, and residual construction effects of no more than **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms) are predicted.
- 11.1.5 The assessment has resulted in the identification of a **moderate** significant effect (*significant* in EIA terms) on the setting of one Scheduled Monument (Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794)), although that effect would not significantly adversely affect the integrity of its setting.
- 11.1.6 With the exception of the **moderate** significance residual effect on the setting of Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794), the residual cumulative effects of the Proposed Development, in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity, are considered to be *not significant*.

## 11.2 Introduction

11.2.1 This Chapter considers the potential effects, including cumulative effects, of the Proposed Development on archaeology and cultural heritage interests (hereafter 'heritage assets') during construction and operation. As described in **Chapter 3: Project Description**, it is anticipated that the effects associated with the construction phase could be considered to be representative of worst-case decommissioning effects on heritage assets. As such, a separate assessment of potential decommissioning effects is not included in this Chapter. Where likely significant effects are predicted during construction and operation, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed, and the significance of predicted residual effects are assessed.

11.2.2 This assessment has been carried out by Oliver Rusk MA (Cantab) MLitt ACIfA of CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA), a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), based in Musselburgh, East Lothian. Mr Rusk is a Consultant with CFA with six years post-graduate experience as an archaeologist and is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ACIfA). The assessment was internally reviewed and approved by George Mudie MA(Hons) MCIfA FSA Scot, CFA's Principal Consultant. Mr Mudie has 26 years' post graduate experience in commercial archaeology and 22 years full-time experience as an archaeological consultant. A table presenting relevant qualifications and experience of key staff involved in the preparation of this Chapter is included in **Technical Appendix 4.1**, contained within Volume 4 of this EIA Report.

## 11.3 Scope of Assessment

11.3.1 The chapter considers effects on:

- Scheduled Monuments (SM) and other archaeological features;
- Listed Buildings (LB) and other buildings of historic or architectural importance;
- Inventory Historic Battlefields (BTL); and
- Conservation Areas (CA).

11.3.2 For effects scoped out see Paragraph 11.3.8.

11.3.3 The chapter assesses cumulative effects as arising from the addition of the Proposed Development with other developments, which are the subject of a valid planning application, consented, or are reasonably foreseeable. Operational and under construction developments are considered as part of the baseline. Developments close to the end of their operational life are included as part of the baseline to present 'worst case scenario'.

11.3.4 The assessment is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 3: Project Description**.

### *Study Area*

11.3.5 Three study areas have been employed for the cultural heritage assessment:

- The Proposed Development LODs: used as the study area for identification of potential direct impacts upon heritage assets resulting from construction of the Proposed Development, including access routes (a 100 m corridor centred on the sections of the existing 132 kV overhead lines (OHLs) to be dismantled is also included to account for working areas around towers). A gazetteer of heritage assets within the Proposed Development LODs (including the study area for dismantlement of the existing 132 kV overhead line (OHL)) is provided as **Technical Appendix 11.1** and the sites identified are shown on **Figure 11.1**.
- An Inner Study Area: a 500 m wide corridor centred on the proposed 400 kV OHL was used to inform the archaeological baseline close to the proposed OHL and to guide design of the final alignment. A gazetteer of Historic Environment Record (HER) assets within the Inner Study Area is provided as **Technical Appendix 11.2** and the sites identified are shown on **Figure 11.1**.

- An Outer Study Area: a study area extending 4 km either side of the preferred alignment Limit of Deviation (LOD) corridor, employing the Proposed Development Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) model, to identify those designated heritage assets with statutory or non-statutory designations (e.g. Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Historic Battlefields) that could have their settings adversely affected by the Proposed Development. A gazetteer of designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area is provided as **Technical Appendix 11.3** and they are shown on **Figure 11.2**.

#### Consultation Responses

11.3.6 To inform the scope of the assessment for the Proposed Development, consultation was undertaken with statutory and non-statutory bodies. Table 11.1 summarises the scoping and consultation responses relevant to the Cultural Heritage Assessment and provides information on where and/or how points raised have been addressed in this assessment.

11.3.7 Further details on the consultation and scoping responses can be found in **Chapter 5: Scoping and Consultation**, and associated appendices.

**Table 11.1: Consultation Responses**

Consultee	Consultation Type	Response	Action
THC	Pre-App Advice (1 <sup>st</sup> December 2021)	Several features of interest are recorded within or close to the proposed route and site options. These mostly consist of the remains of historic land-use such as farmsteads and areas of shieling settlement. Many other sites are recorded across the wider area and there remains the potential for further features or remains of prehistoric or later date to be present. However, direct impacts to cultural heritage are not envisaged to be a significant constraint in any of the options.	A 500 m Inner Study Area has been used to identify known sites recorded in the HER that inform the archaeological baseline and guided design of the OHL alignment ( <b>Technical Appendix 11.2; Figure 11.1</b> )
		The Cultural Heritage chapter of the Environmental Statement will need to be undertaken by a professional and competent historic environment consultant.	CFA Archaeology Ltd is a Chartered Institute for Archaeologist (CIfA) Registered Organisation (RO)
		The ES chapter should include a walkover survey of the development area (including any land required for associated infrastructure).	A walk-over survey of the route of the Proposed Development (excluding areas of commercial forestry) has been carried out to verify and augment the findings of a desk-based study.
		The assessment will consider the potential direct impacts of the development to	An assessment of both direct effects and effects on

Consultee	Consultation Type	Response	Action
		cultural heritage as well as indirect impacts, particularly to the scheduled Caledonian Canal.	setting has been carried out and is reported as part of this chapter (see <b>Section 11.8</b> ).
		The indirect impact assessment must include a study of cumulative impacts. Where indirect impacts are predicted, these will be illustrated using photomontages.	The assessment of effects on setting includes cumulative effects (see <b>Section 11.8</b> ).  Photomontage visualisations are provided in relation to effects on the setting of Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794)
		Where impacts are unavoidable, THC Historic Environment Team (HET) expect proposed methods to mitigate this impact to be discussed in detail, including both physical (i.e. re-design) and where appropriate, compensatory/off-setting.	Proposed mitigation measures are described in <b>Section 11.9</b> of this chapter.
HES	Pre-App Advice 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2021	<p>We have some comments regarding potential impacts on heritage assets within and out with the preferred route of the proposals:</p> <p>We note that the preferred route for Route 2 of the OHL element of the proposals between Loch Lundie and Fort Augustus contains the following scheduled monuments:</p> <p>Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794)</p> <p>The Caledonian Canal (SM 5291, SM 6496 &amp; SM 6497)</p>	<p>Follow up consultation was carried out with HES at a meeting (31<sup>st</sup> March 2022) to discuss the issues raised and seek advice on mitigation options, as detailed in <b>Chapter 5: Scoping and Consultation</b> of this EIA Report.</p>
		<p>We recommend early consultation with us to discuss the proposed works and identify any requirements for scheduled monument consent (SMC) or particular mitigation measures to ensure that direct impacts are avoided. We would expect that any development would avoid any direct impacts on the monument.</p> <p>Should significant setting impacts be anticipated we recommend the consideration of mitigation measures, such as undergrounding sections of the OHL.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid any direct impact on either Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794) or The Caledonian Canal (SM 5291, SM 6496 &amp; SM 6497).</p> <p>Consultation was carried out with HES to seek advice on further design mitigation measures, as detailed in <b>Chapter 5: Scoping and</b></p>

Consultee	Consultation Type	Response	Action
		Should any works be required within the scheduled area of the monument, please be aware that SMC would first be required.	<b>Consultation</b> of this EIA Report. As above.
		Regarding indirect impacts outwith the preferred route, we note that the following heritage assets within our remit lie within the vicinity of the proposals:  Invergarry Castle (SM 5481)  Category A-listed Oich, Old Bridge Over River Oich (LB 1872)  We would expect setting impacts on the above assets to be assessed in any EIA application. We would also recommend that the assessment is undertaken with reference to the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland and the advice on good practice in cultural heritage assessment in Appendix 1 of the EIA Handbook.  We would be happy to provide further advice on any aspects of the methodology of assessment if that would be helpful.	The assessment includes consideration of scheduled monuments, listed buildings and historic battlefields within a 4 km Outer Study Area, commensurate with the study area adopted by the LVIA ( <b>see Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Assessment</b> ).  The proposed methodology for the setting assessment follows HES guidance and was presented in the Scoping Report (submitted: 07 <sup>th</sup> February 2023).
HES	Route Option Consultation Response 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2022	Based on the information supplied we consider it likely that the Proposed Development would have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the setting of Torr Dhuin, fort, Fort Augustus (SM 794). As the proposals stand it is likely that we would object to the proposals.	The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid any direct impact on Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794) and to minimise as far as possible effects on its setting.  Consultation was carried out with HES to seek advice on further design mitigation measures. As above.
		Would welcome the exploration of mitigation that looks to relocate the pylon so that it no longer appears taller than the fort in most inward views of the monument, so that it no longer challenges the dominance of the monument, and so that it no longer impacts on the way that the fort is understood, appreciated and experienced within its setting.	Alignment options were explored by SSEN engineers (correspondence required).  Further consultation between SSEN and HES is ongoing.
		From the information provided we are content that setting impacts on other	Noted.

Consultee	Consultation Type	Response	Action
		heritage assets within our remit within the vicinity of the proposals, such as the Caledonian Canal (SM 6496 & SM 6497) will not raise issues of national interest.	The EIA assessment focusses on the setting of Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794). A full assessment of the impact on its setting is provided in <b>Section 11.8: paragraph 11.8.19-11.8.25.</b>

#### *Issues Scoped Out of Assessment*

11.3.8 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of World Heritage Sites, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, and Marine Resources has been scoped out. There are no assets with these designations within 4 km of the Site.

11.3.9 Assessment of the settings of designated heritage assets that fall outside of the ZTV for the Proposed Development has been scoped out. Because of the characteristics of the Proposed Development (steel tower mounted overhead line), where there is not predicted to be visibility of the Proposed Development from these assets their settings would not be adversely affected.

11.3.10 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of designated heritage assets more than 4 km from the Site has been scoped out. None have been identified through initial analysis as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development beyond that distance.

## 11.4 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

### *Legislation Context*

11.4.1 Legislation relevant to cultural heritage includes:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011)); and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).

### *Policy Context*

11.4.2 The primary planning policy at the national and regional level comprises:

- *National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4)* (Scottish Government, 2023)
- *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS)* (HES, 2019a, finalised amended 2020);
- *Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013)* (Scottish Government, 2013, revised 2017);
- *Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN 2/2011)* (Scottish Government, 2011);
- *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA, 2017)*;
- *Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021)*;
- *Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP)* (Highland Council (THC), 2012):
  - Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage;
  - Policy 69: Electricity Transmission Infrastructure;
  - Appendix 3: Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features;
- *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance* (HES, 2019);

- *Scotland's Woodlands and the Historic Environment* (Forestry Commission, 2008); and
- *UK Forestry Standard: The Governments Approach to Sustainable Forestry* (Forestry Commission, 2017).

#### *Technical Guidance*

11.4.3 The scope of the assessment has been informed by the following guidelines:

- *UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and the Historic Environment* (Forestry Commission, 2011);
- *Forests and Historic Environment: Information and Advice* (Forestry Commission, 2016);
- *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (HES, 2016; updated 2021);
- *Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work* (THC, 2012);
- *Highland Historic Environment Strategy: Supplementary Planning Guidance* (THC, 2013);
- *Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment* (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and ClfA, 2021); and
- *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook* (Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES), 2018).

## 11.5 Methodology

### *Desk Study*

11.5.1 A detailed desk-based assessment was conducted covering the Proposed Development LODs, using a range of documentary, archival, and bibliographic sources. Up-to-date information was obtained on the locations and extents of heritage assets with statutory protection and non-statutory designations within the study area.

Sources consulted for the assessment include:

- The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Record (HER): a digital database extract was obtained in August 2021 for all assets within an initial study area of 5 km from the preferred alignment for the Proposed Development to guide design. That dataset, covering the extent of the Inner Study Area (defined in paragraph 11.3.5), was reviewed in February 2023 through the Council's on-line HER portal<sup>1</sup> for any changes that might be relevant for the EIA (no changes were noted);
- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore) (HES, 2023a<sup>2</sup>): for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
- Historic Environment Scotland Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2023<sup>3</sup>): for up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, and Inventory Historic Battlefields;
- Map Library of the National Library of Scotland: for Ordnance Survey maps and other historic maps;
- Google Earth, Bing Maps and ESRI World Imagery: for modern aerial photographic imagery to obtain information on current land-use and evidence for continuing survival of sites and features identified through other desk-based resources; and
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES, 2023b<sup>4</sup>): for information on the historic land use character of the Inner Study Area.

11.5.2 Details of the sources consulted during the desk-based assessment are provided in **Technical Appendix 11.1**.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://her.highland.gov.uk/map>

<sup>2</sup> HES (2023a) Historic Environment Scotland's National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore), available at: <http://pastmap.org.uk> (Accessed February 2023).

<sup>3</sup> HES (2022) Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> (Accessed October 2022).

<sup>4</sup> HES (2023b) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap), available at: <http://hlapmap.org.uk> (Accessed February 2023).



### *Field Survey*

11.5.3 A reconnaissance walk-over field survey was carried out covering the Inner Study Area and the off-line construction access routes between 22/02/2023 and 24/02/2023. Field survey was not carried out within areas of commercial forestry, except to record the baseline condition of heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment. The survey was undertaken with the following aims:

- to locate and record the baseline character and condition of heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment;
- to identify any further heritage assets not revealed through the desk-based study that could be affected by the Proposed Development;
- to identify any areas of archaeological potential within the Proposed Development LODs; and
- to assess and record the heritage value of the heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment and field survey.

11.5.4 No intrusive archaeological investigations have been carried out as part of this assessment.

11.5.5 The field survey was undertaken by a team of two experienced archaeologists who hold current ClfA membership and have sufficient competency in surveying. All data were captured electronically using a Spectra Geospatial SP20 Handheld GNSS with sub-metre accuracy. The baseline condition of identified assets was recorded on pro-forma monument recording sheets and by digital photography.

### *Assessment of Effects*

11.5.6 The effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets have been assessed on the basis of their type (direct effects, effects on setting, and cumulative effects) and nature (adverse or beneficial):

- Adverse effects are those that detract from or reduce cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets; and
- Beneficial effects are those that preserve, enhance, or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

11.5.7 The assessment of significance of effects has been undertaken using two key criteria: the value/sensitivity of the cultural heritage asset and the magnitude of the predicted impact, which measures the degree of change to the baseline condition of an asset resulting from the Proposed Development.

### *Sensitivity / Importance of Receptors*

11.5.8 Cultural heritage assets are attributed importance through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised and protected by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the laws and policies applicable to it (HES, 2019<sup>5</sup>).

11.5.9 Table 11.2 summarises the relative sensitivity of those heritage assets (and their settings) relevant to the Proposed Development, excluding in this instance World Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Marine Resources.

**Table 11.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition/Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduled Monuments</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> HES (2019) 'Designation Policy and Selection Guidance', Edinburgh.

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition/Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Category A Listed Buildings</li> <li>Inventory Historic Battlefields</li> </ul>
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks)</li> <li>Category B Listed Buildings</li> <li>Conservation Areas</li> </ul>
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Archaeological sites that have local heritage value</li> <li>Category C listed buildings</li> <li>Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics</li> </ul>
Negligible	Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Artefact find-spots (where the artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain)</li> <li>Poorly preserved examples of particular types of features (e.g. quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc)</li> </ul>

#### *Magnitude of Effect*

11.5.10 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) are presented in Table 11.3.

**Table 11.3: Description of Spatial Impact Magnitudes**

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
High	Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of the asset's cultural significance.  Changes that substantially detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Preservation of a heritage asset in situ where it would otherwise be completely or almost completely lost.  Changes that appreciably enhance the cultural significance of a heritage asset and how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.
Medium	Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is appreciably altered.  Changes that appreciably detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Changes to important elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting, resulting in its cultural significance being preserved (where this would otherwise be lost) or restored.  Changes that improve the way in which the heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
Low	<p>Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is slightly altered.</p> <p>Changes that slightly detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>	<p>Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting detracting from its cultural significance being removed.</p> <p>Changes that result in a slight improvement in the way a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>
Negligible	Changes to fabric or setting of a heritage asset that leave its cultural significance unchanged and do not affect how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	

#### *Assessing Effects on Setting*

11.5.11 The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) Appendix 1, paragraph 42 advises that:

*“In the context of cultural heritage impact assessment, the receptors are the heritage assets and impacts will be considered in terms of the change in their cultural significance”.*

11.5.12 Historic Environment Scotland's guidance document, 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES, 2016), notes that:

*“Setting can be important to the way in which historic structures or places are understood, appreciated and experienced. It can often be integral to a historic asset's cultural significance.”*

*“Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or ‘curtilage’ of an individual historic asset into a broader landscape context”.*

11.5.13 The guidance also advises that:

*“If proposed development is likely to affect the setting of a key historic asset, an objective written assessment should be prepared by the applicant to inform the decision-making process. The conclusions should take into account the significance of the asset and its setting and attempt to quantify the extent of any impact. The methodology and level of information should be tailored to the circumstances of each case”.*

11.5.14 The guidance recommends that there are three stages in assessing the impact of a development on the setting of a historic asset or place:

- Stage 1: identify the historic assets that might be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated, and experienced; and
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any adverse impacts can be mitigated.

11.5.15 The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) Appendix 1, paragraph 43 advises that:

*“When considering setting impacts, visual change should not be equated directly with adverse impact. Rather the impact should be assessed with reference to the degree that the proposal affects those aspects of setting that contribute to the asset's cultural significance”.*

11.5.16 Following these recommendations, the ZTV for the Proposed Development has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration has also been given to designated heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from the asset but where views of or across the asset are important factors contributing to its cultural significance. In such cases, consideration was given to whether the Proposed Development could appear in the background of those views.

11.5.17 Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, and Inventory Historic Battlefields, where present within the Outer Study Area, are included in the assessment. These assets are included in tabulated assessments in **Technical Appendix 11.2**, using the parameters set out in Table 11.2, and they are shown on **Figure 11.1**. A detailed assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794) is set out in **Section 11.8: paragraph 11.8.19-11.8.25**.

#### *Cultural Heritage Viewpoints*

11.5.18 From HES's response to the Coire Glas Grid Connection Project Consultation Document<sup>6</sup>, as documented in the project Report on Consultation<sup>7</sup>, it was clear that the key issue for potential impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets would be in relation to Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794). No issues of concern were raised in regard to the settings of other designated heritage assets (**Table 11.1: Consultation Responses**). Through consultation with HES, three locations were agreed as viewpoints for representation by photomontages to exemplify the visual impact on the setting of the fort. **Figures 11.3-5** are provided to support the assessment presented in **Section 11.8: paragraph 11.8.19-11.8.25**. As it was not possible to gain access to the land at Coiltry Farm, a wireline visualisation only (**Figure 11.4.1-11.4.4**) is provided from this viewpoint.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

11.5.19 The assessment of cumulative effects on heritage assets is based upon consideration of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of assets with statutory and non-statutory designations within the Outer Study Area (which includes the Inner Study Area), in addition to the likely effects of cumulative developments. **Figure 4.1: Cumulative Developments** shows the Proposed Development along with the cumulative developments in the surrounding area. For assessment of the potential cumulative effects on heritage assets, cumulative developments with footprints within the 4 km Outer Study Area are considered. No designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area have been identified as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development, in combination with any cumulative developments more than 4 km from the Site.

11.5.20 Operational, under construction developments, and existing transmission grid infrastructure elements, are considered as part of the baseline and taken to be such for the assessment of effects on the settings of heritage assets.

11.5.21 Other cumulative developments which are consented, at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable (including the proposed 400 kV Coire Glas Switching Station, the proposed 400 kV / 132 kV Loch Lundie Substation, the consented Coire Glas Pump Storage Scheme, the proposed Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Grid Connection and the proposed Skye Reinforcement Project) are considered as being potential additions to the baseline and are addressed in the cumulative impact assessment (**Section 11.8**). For details on Cumulative Developments considered in this assessment see **Chapter 4: EIA Process and Methodology**.

11.5.22 The assessment takes into account the nature and relative scales of the various developments, their distance from the affected assets, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets within the Outer Study Area.

<sup>6</sup> Coire Glas Grid Connection Project: Bhlaraidh and Buinneun-Fort Augustus OHL: (May 2022), produced by SSEN Transmission

<sup>7</sup> Coire Glas Grid Connection Project: Report on Consultation: (April 2023), produced by SSEN Transmission

### Significance of Effect

11.5.23 The sensitivity of the asset (Table 11.2) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (Table 11.3) are used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect (direct effect or effect on setting), summarised using the approach set out in the matrix in Table 11.4. The matrix employs a graduated scale of significance (from negligible to major effects) and where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement, supported by reasoned justification, has been used to determine the assessed level of significance.

**Table 11.4: Significance of Effect**

Magnitude of Impact	Sensitivity of Asset			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	<b>Major</b>	<b>Major / Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate / Minor</b>	Minor / Negligible
Medium	<b>Major / Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate / Minor</b>	Minor / Negligible
Low	<b>Moderate / Minor</b>	<b>Moderate / Minor</b>	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

11.5.24 Major and moderate effects are considered to be *significant* for the purposes of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). Minor and negligible effects are considered to be *not significant*.

#### Limitations to the Assessment

11.5.25 The desk-based assessment draws on the records in the THC HER, provided in a digital Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset in August 2021, ahead of the route and alignment selection stage of the project. It is assumed that the data provided was accurate and up to date at the time it was acquired. The data was reviewed in February 2023 through the Council's online HER portal for any changes within the Inner Study Area that could result in changes to the heritage assets that may be directly affected by the Proposed Development. No changes were noted, and, for the purpose of this assessment, the data used has been taken to be a reliable and accurate reflection of the recorded cultural heritage baseline.

11.5.26 Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 11.2**) have been identified from the HES database and were downloaded from the HES website<sup>3</sup> in February 2023. This data is assumed to have been accurate and up to date at the time of its acquisition.

## 11.6 Baseline Conditions

### Existing Baseline

#### Proposed Development LODs

11.6.1 Six heritage assets have been identified within the Proposed Development LODs. Full descriptions, and an assessment of their heritage value/sensitivity, are provided in **Technical Appendix 11.1**. Numbers in brackets in the following text, refer to asset numbers shown on **Figure 11.1**.

#### Designated Heritage Assets

11.6.2 There are no Listed Buildings (LB) or Scheduled Monuments (SM) within the Proposed Development LODs and the LODs do not cross any Conservation Areas (CA) or Inventory Historic Battlefields (BTL).

#### Non-Designated Heritage Assets

##### Prehistoric

11.6.3 The HER records a find-spot for a trough quern (2) (datable to 2500–1400 BC) of micaceous schist, found in 1977 within the Inchnacardoch Forest. The artefact was donated to Inverness Museum and no further discoveries were made upon inspection of the site. Accordingly, the findspot is assessed as having little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Farmsteads

11.6.4 Three farmsteads are depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1873), comprising enclosures and buildings within improved pasture or areas of cultivation: at Auchterawe House (1), Dail a' Chuirn (5) and Glean Laogh (6). The farmsteads at Auchterawe House (1) and Glen Laogh (6) are in modern use with some buildings retaining the footprint of structures depicted on the 1st and 2nd edition Ordnance Survey maps. Field survey recorded limited sections of field walls (1b and 1c) and banks (1a and 6a), delineating the enclosed fields associated with the farmsteads, though most of the former field boundaries have been removed by commercial forestry.

11.6.5 The remains of the pre-improvement township at Dail a' Chuirn (5) comprise stone footings of buildings, pens and walled enclosures, within two larger sub-rectangular enclosures to the north of the Eas Dail a' Chuirn watercourse. Field survey identified two turf and stone banks (5a and 5c) enclosing an area of six field clearance cairns (5b) to the south of the watercourse.

11.6.6 Surviving farmstead remains, enclosures and field systems (1 a-c, 5a-c and 6c) represent constituent elements of a former historic farming landscape to the northwest of the Great Glen, and they are likely to retain archaeological evidence of domestic life and farming practices in the 18th to 19th century. They are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

Miscellaneous

11.6.7 The HER records the site of a graveyard (3), to the southwest of Auchterawe House, depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1873). The graveyard remains in use and is enclosed by a drystone wall in good condition. As a long-established burial ground, it is assessed as having heritage value at a regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

11.6.8 An enclosure (4) to the west of the graveyard (3) is also depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1873), with three cairns abutting the western exterior of the burial ground. The cairns are not shown on later maps and field survey found that these no longer survive. As a minor feature in the historic landscape, the enclosure is assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

*Inner Study Area*

11.6.9 Within the Inner Study Area, around the OHL LOD, a further ten non-designated heritage assets are recorded in the HER. Full descriptions are provided in **Technical Appendix 11.2**.

Medieval/post-medieval: Structures

11.6.10 Several structures, associated with the post-medieval farming landscape, are depicted on the 1st and 2nd edition Ordnance Survey maps (1873–1904). They include:

- An unroofed building (MHG 22941) to the south of the Invervigar Burn;
- A rectangular sheepfold (MHG 32909) to the north of Dail a' Chuirn township (5); and
- Two buildings at Coille an T-Salaich (MHG 22917), of which one survives within commercial forestry.

11.6.11 Two other structures are not depicted on historic maps. These are a bridge (MHG 30741) over the Invervigar Burn, west of Invervigar farmstead, and the remains of a stone building (MHG 28404) at the edge of a small birch woodland, south of Loch Lundie.

### Modern/industrial

11.6.12 The remainder of assets recorded in the HER within the Inner Study date to the 20th century, including:

- Two Lock-keeper's cottages (MHG 53365 and MHG 60389) flanking Kyltra Lock (SM 5291);
- A concrete spillway (MHG 60389) to the southwest of Kyltra Lock;
- The foundations of a sanatorium (MHG 30740) at Invervigar, opened in 1907; and
- Invergarry Dam (MHG 58692) built as part of the Great Glen Hydroelectric Power Scheme in 1956.

### *Outer Study Area*

11.6.13 Within the Outer Study Area there are 58 designated heritage assets, as shown on **Figure 11.1.1-3** and detailed in **Appendix 11.3**. There are:

- Thirteen Scheduled Monuments (nine with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Three Category A Listed Buildings (each with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Twenty-three Category B Listed Buildings (ten with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Seventeen Category C Listed Buildings (eleven with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- One Conservation Area (with some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development)); and
- One Inventory Historic Battlefield (with no predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).

### *Archaeological Potential*

11.6.14 The route of the Proposed Development runs northeast from the lower slopes of Beinn Bhreac, west of Invergarry (**Figure 11.1.1**), crossing the River Garry at White Bridge and continuing to the proposed Loch Lundie Substation (**Figure 11.1.2**). It then diverts north-northeast to Inchnacardoch Forest, before running northeast and roughly parallel to the line of the existing 132 kV OHL (**Figures 11.1.2-3**), to terminate at the existing substation at Auchterawe (**Figure 11.1.3**). HLA Map (HES, 2023) records that much of the Inner Study Area along this route comprises 20th century commercial forestry plantation, with some earlier managed woodland to the south of Inchnacardoch Forest and north of White Bridge. An area of rough grazing and upland moorland lies to the south and northeast of Loch Lundie. That assessment was borne out by the field survey which found that most of the route of the Proposed Development passes through commercial forestry, with only limited sections passing through rough grazing ground.

11.6.15 No prehistoric settlement remains have been identified within the Inner Study Area, although a Bronze Age trough quern (2) was found, in 1977, in the forestry to the south of Auchterawe House (1) providing evidence for possible settlement of that date in the locality. The natural routeway afforded by the Great Glen would have made the immediate area both favourable and strategic for settlement throughout prehistory. This is exemplified by the Iron Age fort at Torr Dhuin (SM 794), 1 km to the south of Auchterawe, which occupies a commanding viewpoint overlooking Loch Lochy and the Great Glen, and by a crannog in Loch Ness (SM 9762). Evidence of prehistoric activity on higher ground and away from the Great Glen is scarce, however.

11.6.16 Roy's 'A Military Survey of Scotland' map (1747-55) shows cultivated land and settlements concentrated along the lochs and watercourses by the 18th century, such as those at 'Faichem' and 'Invergarry'. Several post-medieval settlements (1, 5 and 6) lie along the route of the Proposed Development; two (1 and 6) surviving as modern settlements or farmsteads and one (5) as long-abandoned ruins. These settlements potentially date to the 18th century or earlier, although none are depicted on Roy's map. They are first shown on the 1st edition



Ordnance Survey map (1873) and consist of roofed and unroofed buildings with associated enclosures and sheepfolds. Two of these farmsteads, at Auchterawe House (1) and Glean Laogh (6), have developed through the 19th century and continue to be occupied in the modern day. A burial ground (3) and enclosure (4) near Auchterawe, of at least 19th century date, similarly remain in use. The remains of a pre-improvement township at Dail a' Chuirn (5), with 19th-century buildings, along with the remains of their associated field systems (field banks, sheepfolds, enclosures, clearance cairns), survive in rough pasture along the Invervigar Burn that has seen little modification or development since the 19th century. All these remains indicate that there has been activity and settlement within the local area from the post-medieval period onwards.

11.6.17 In areas where the Proposed Development crosses modern commercial forestry plantation, the survival of both the historic character of the landscape and any hitherto unrecorded features in these areas is likely to have been appreciably compromised through pre-afforestation ploughing and drainage works, as well as subsequent tree root growth, and the effects of wind-throw and forestry harvesting. The potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to survive in these areas is considered to be negligible.

11.6.18 In those areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century, it is considered that there is a generally low potential for any buried archaeological remains to survive, although there is an increased potential for buried remains to survive in areas of known previous settlement: for example, where the Proposed Development passes Dail a' Chuirn (5). It is also possible that there is a low potential for archaeological remains of prehistoric date to survive in the vicinity of the previously recorded trough quern (2), to the south of Auchterawe.

#### *Future Baseline*

11.6.19 If the Proposed Development were not to proceed, there would likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets that presently exist within the Proposed Development LOD. Current pasture grazing and forestry land-use would most likely continue and there would be no change to the character of the heritage assets, other than the erosion of features through natural processes or agricultural and forestry activities.

11.6.20 The current rough pasture and moorland land-use would also likely continue, limiting the potential for disturbance to heritage assets. Commercial forestry land-use would likely continue, on a cyclical felling and replanting basis, with some potential for the extension of areas covered by forestry and for new areas of woodland planting to be identified. The forestry land-use regime would be subject to the normal requirements of UK Forestry Standards, would result in limited potential for disturbance to identified historic assets and could result in new heritage assets being brought to light and added to the archaeological record.

11.6.21 Designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be subject to normal statutory requirements and planning constraints.

#### *Sensitive Receptors*

11.6.22 A summary of the receptors identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development and which have been 'scoped in' to the assessment are given in Table 11.5, together with the justification for inclusion.



**Table 11.5: Summary of Sensitive Receptors Scoped-In**

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
Scheduled Monuments up to 4 km from the Site. A list of these is provided in <b>Technical Appendix 11.3</b> along with their relative sensitivities.	High	These are monuments protected by statute. The consent of Scottish Ministers is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a Scheduled Monument. In addition, effects of the Proposed Development works upon the setting of a Scheduled Monument form an important consideration in the granting or refusal of planning consent to conduct development works.
Listed Buildings up to 4 km from the Site. A list of these is provided in <b>Technical Appendix 11.3</b> along with their relative sensitivities.	Low to High	Buildings which are statutorily protected as buildings of special architectural or historic interest. They are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (1997 Act). Planning authorities and Scottish Ministers are required to have special regard for the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings and any features of special architectural or historic importance they possess.
Inventory Historic Battlefields up to 4 km from the Site. A list of these is provided in <b>Technical Appendix 11.3</b> along with their relative sensitivities.	High	The impact of a development on a Historic Battlefield listed in 'the Inventory of Historic Battlefields in Scotland' (Inventory; published by HES) is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, although the designation is non-statutory in effect. Under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992 (1992 Order), planning authorities must consult HES on any development that may affect a site contained in the Inventory.
Conservation Areas up to 4 km from the Site. A list of these is provided in <b>Technical Appendix 11.3</b> along with their relative sensitivities.	Medium	Areas proposed by Local Development Plans as areas of special architectural or historic interest and contain key features which it is desirable to conserve, sustain and enhance. Planning authorities are required to consider planning applications affecting the appearance, character or setting of Conservation Areas.
Other non-designated historic environment assets within the Site. A list of these is provided in <b>Technical Appendix 11.1</b> along with their relative sensitivities.	Negligible to Medium	Other non-designated archaeological sites, monuments and areas of historic interest which do not have statutory protection but are curated by the local planning authority.

## 11.7 Embedded Mitigation / Mitigation by Design

11.7.1 The route taken by the Proposed Development has been arrived at taking into account all environmental constraints, including cultural heritage. The setting of Torr Dhuin (SM 794) was identified at an early stage as a design consideration and alternative alignments that would have adversely affected the setting of the fort to a greater degree, in its relationship with and in views from the Great Glen, were discounted. The Caledonian Canal and its setting were also taken account of, and the route of the Proposed Development takes these heritage considerations into account, as far as it has been possible within engineering and other environmental constraints. Further information on design mitigation measures is presented in **Chapter 2: The Routeing Process and Alternatives**.

## 11.8 Potential Effects

11.8.1 This section considers the potential impacts and associated effect significance of the construction, and operation of the Proposed Development based on the typical activities described in **Chapter 3: Project Description**.

### *Construction Effects*

11.8.2 Any ground-breaking activities or ground disturbance associated with construction of the Proposed Development have the potential to disturb or destroy features of cultural heritage interest. Other construction activities, such as vehicle movements, storage of construction materials, and soil and overburden storage, also have the potential to cause permanent and irreversible impact on heritage assets.

11.8.3 The potential adverse, permanent, and irreversible direct impacts identified below would result primarily from ground disturbance associated with erection of the OHL towers and construction or upgrading of access tracks close to recorded heritage assets shown on **Figure 11.1**.

11.8.4 It is considered that there is potential for direct impact on heritage assets in the following circumstances:

- where heritage assets lie within 50 m of proposed tower locations (to allow for working areas);
- where heritage assets lie along proposed new or upgraded access routes;
- where heritage assets lie within proposed forestry felling areas (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 14.1: Woodland Reports**); and
- where heritage assets lie within 50 m of towers along the existing 132 kV OHL between the Loch Lundie Substation and the existing Fort Augustus Substation, to allow for dismantling working areas.

11.8.5 It is the intention that the Proposed Development would be subject to a Limit of Deviation (LOD) of 100 m (comprising a 200 m wide corridor along the proposed OHL alignment). This allowance permits detailed design and construction activities to avoid environmental constraints or physical features as required within the LOD (see **Chapter 3: Project Description**). Movement of infrastructure, or modification of proposed felling areas, would be dependent upon consideration of identified constraints within the micro-siting area and subject to advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW).

11.8.6 No micro-siting of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be undertaken where this could potentially affect cultural heritage interests without prior consultation with an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW), who would advise on the acceptability of any proposed realignments, and subject to consultation with the Council Archaeologist to agree appropriate mitigation, where there are potential impacts as a result.

### Potential Construction (Direct) Effects

11.8.7 Six non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Proposed Development LODs and it is assessed that there is potential, in the absence of mitigation, for construction works to result in direct impacts on three of these:

- Sections of field bank (1a) and walling (1b), forming part of the field system at Auchterawe House (1), lie within the proposed tree felling area between Towers 1 and 2. Tree felling operations could disturb a small section of the remaining field boundaries. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms). Mitigation measures to reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 11.9**.
- A group of clearance cairns (5b) to the south of Dail a' Chuirn township (5) would be crossed by the proposed temporary access route to Tower 18. Access route construction would likely disturb a number of the cairns. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity,

would be of medium magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms). Mitigation measures to reduce or offset the predicted effect are set out in **Section 11.9**.

- The remains of an enclosure boundary (6a) to the north of Gleann Laogh (6) lies within the working area for Tower 39 and the associated tree felling area. The boundary would also be crossed by the proposed temporary access route to the Tower. Tree felling and construction works for the Proposed Development and vehicular access would disturb a section of the boundary. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms). Mitigation measures to reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 11.9**.

11.8.8 No direct impacts are predicted on the graveyard (3) and enclosure (4) at Auchterawe, which lie within 50 m of towers along the section of the existing 132 kV Fort Augustus to Fort William OHL between the Loch Lundie Substation and the existing Fort Augustus Substation. These assets are in modern use and lie beyond existing access tracks. It is considered that they would not be impacted by works to dismantle the decommissioned towers.

11.8.9 If proposed towers or access tracks were to be relocated within the LOD, it is possible that there could be direct adverse impacts on one further element at Auchterawe House (1c) and two additional elements at Dail a' Chuirn township (5a and 5c), identified within the OHL LOD and in proximity to revised access routes. In each case, it is unlikely that micrositing would be required to the extent that the Proposed Development would impinge on the recorded remains. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are set out in **Section 11.9** to ensure that, where practical, the recorded heritage assets are avoided and, where direct impacts are unavoidable, measures are put in place to either minimise the direct effects or to record any assets lost or damaged as a result of construction work, where appropriate.

11.8.10 In addition to the impacts identified above, there is the possibility that any ground disturbance works in areas required for construction of the Proposed Development could disturb or destroy hitherto unrecorded buried archaeological remains present in affected areas. This is most likely to occur where new, permanent tracks are to be constructed or existing tracks upgraded by widening.

11.8.11 Based on the evidence acquired, it is assessed that there is only limited potential that construction works associated with the Proposed Development could have a high magnitude direct adverse effect on hitherto undiscovered remains likely to be of no more than medium sensitivity. Such impacts are most likely where proposed temporary access tracks pass close to the findspot of a prehistoric trough quern (2) and the settlement of Dail a' Chuirn (5). Any such impacts could, in the absence of mitigation, result in **moderate** adverse effects (*significant* in EIA terms). Measures are proposed in **Section 11.9** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately addressed.

#### Setting Effects of Construction

11.8.12 Construction activity such as pull-through machine positioning and tower erection have the potential to affect the setting of sites of heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (which includes the Inner Study Area). These construction activities would though be temporary, resulting in only short-term/low magnitude effects on heritage assets within the Outer Study Area and would have no permanent effects. As such, temporary impacts on the settings of heritage assets have not been assessed on a site-by-site basis.

#### *Operational Effects*

#### Direct Operational Impacts

11.8.13 There are no heritage assets likely to receive a direct effect during operation of the Proposed Development as any required maintenance or replacement works would use the as-built tracks and infrastructure to facilitate any such works as may be required.

### Setting Impacts During Operation

- 11.8.14 The Proposed Development could result in adverse effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets, within the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the Site. At distances greater than 4 km, it is considered that, in most instances, the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter features of the setting of the heritage assets that contribute to their cultural significance, neither would it appreciably alter how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced and, as such, the integrity of their settings would be retained.
- 11.8.15 There are no designated heritage assets beyond 4 km from the Site that have been identified through appraisal of the ZTV, or notified through consultation with HES and THC, that require consideration of potential impacts on their settings.
- 11.8.16 **Technical Appendix 11.3** contains tabulated assessments of the predicted effects on the settings of designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area from which there is some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development based on analysis of the bare-earth ZTV.
- 11.8.17 The assessment of operational effects on the settings of heritage assets has been carried out with reference to the layout of the Proposed Development and the locations of the designated heritage assets shown on **Figure 11.2 (EIAR Volume 2)**. For the methodology used for assessment of potential effect significance refer to paragraph 11.5.23.
- 11.8.18 The following discussion addresses the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794), identified by HES as requiring detailed consideration. The assessment is supported with photomontage visualisations from three viewpoints (**Figure 11.3-5**). The remaining designated assets within the Outer Study Area have not been identified as requiring detailed consideration.
- Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794) (Figure 11.3-5)
- 11.8.19 The monument comprises the remains of an Iron Age vitrified fort atop a rocky knoll to the south of Auchterawe. The fort is oval in plan with three concentric lines of defence consisting of stone walls up to 3.5 m in width, the uppermost of which is heavily vitrified. The lower defences surround the base of the knoll to the northwest and south, while a precipice to the east drops down to the valley floor of the River Oich. More pronounced reduction of the middle defences suggests that the inner fortification and dun was constructed on the summit within an earlier fort. The site is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level and is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 11.8.20 The fort holds commanding views to the east, southeast and northeast, along the valley of the River Oich where it would have guarded the important routeway through the Great Glen in the prehistoric period. These views, in addition to the prominence of the fort in its setting in views towards the monument when moving along the valley (especially from the northeast), are integral to understanding the significance of the fort and its dominance over the local landscape. The remains of the fort are now largely encircled by commercial forestry, screening views of the monument from the north and west. Partial views to and from the southeast are possible through the sparser tree cover on the cliffside. To the south and east, the Beaully-Denny 400 kV OHL can be seen approaching from the opposite side of the Great Glen, passing within 1.5 km at the existing Fort Augustus Substation and continuing to the north. Two existing 132 kV OHLs (the Fort Augustus to Ceannacroc / Glen Moriston 132 kV OHL and the Fort Augustus-Fort William OHL) can also be seen, in views to the north where they approach the existing Fort Augustus Substation, respectively from the north and east, largely screened by forestry.
- 11.8.21 The wireline visualisations (**Figure 11.3.1-11.3.6**) from the monument demonstrate that the Proposed Development would be seen, at least in part, in an arc from the southwest to northeast of the fort, at a lesser

distance than the existing 132 kV Fort Augustus to Fort William OHL, which would be decommissioned and dismantled as part of the works (following the commissioning of the proposed 400 kV OHL). The wirelines indicate that, from the fort, there would be visibility of eight towers of the Proposed Development, with the alignment passing within 150 m of the monument. From the photomontages it can be seen that Tower 6 (**Figure 11.3.5**) would be visible at a higher elevation than the monument in the view to the northwest of the fort and five towers would, in the absence of the existing trees, be visible on the lower ground to the north, where the Proposed Development approaches the existing Fort Augustus Substation (**Figure 11.3.6**). Two other towers, to the southwest of the fort, would be largely screened by topography and additionally by the existing forestry (**Figure 11.3.5**). The predominant views along the Great Glen to the east, southeast and northeast, and those that are an important aspect of the cultural significance of the fort, the views controlling access along and through the River Oich valley, would be unaffected, and it would remain possible to understand and appreciate the dominant position of the fort.

11.8.22 Visualisations from viewpoints looking towards the fort (**Figure 11.4.1-11.4.4 and Figure 11.5.1-11.5.5**) demonstrate that Tower 6 would be visible above and offset from views of the monument.

11.8.23 From Coiltry Farm (**Figure 11.4.1**), in the absence of screening afforded by commercial forestry, the Proposed Development would be visible along and behind the ridge that Torr Dhuin occupies, then on the lower ground where the route runs toward the existing Fort Augustus Substation to the northwest. In practice, commercial forestry along the ridge to the southwest and on the low land to the northwest would screen the majority of the Proposed Development from view, with only partial visibility of Tower 6 beyond and slightly offset from the Scheduled Monument. The addition of Tower 6, at a greater elevation than the fort and seen in the same view as the fort, would result in a noticeable alteration to the integrity of its setting; the fort's elevated position and prominence in the landscape being an important factor in its cultural significance.

11.8.24 From Auchterawe Road (**Figure 11.5.1-11.5.5**), the Proposed Development would be seen approaching from the southwest to pass in front of the view towards the fort (**Figure 11.5.2**), with the towers appearing in the foreground. The existing 132 kV OHL already passes through this view, at a lower level, but would be dismantled following commissioning of the proposed development (**Figure 11.5.5**). The prominence of the fort, at the north end of the ridge and heavily obscured by commercial forestry in views from the north, would remain uninterrupted (Tower 6 being seen offset from the view of the fort) and the key views from the fort along the Great Glen would be unaffected. A temporary impact of medium magnitude and **moderate** significance would be likely to arise during construction of the Proposed Development, prior to the decommissioning of the existing 132 kV Fort Augustus-Fort William OHL, during which time there will be an increase in the number of towers visible from the combined infrastructure, in the vicinity of the monument. Upon dismantling the existing 132kV OHL, the impact would be slightly (but not materially) reduced in magnitude as the existing towers and OHL is removed.

11.8.25 Overall, taking account of the prominent setting of the fort, key views to and from the fort and the proximity of the Proposed Development where it passes the fort, the operational impact of the Proposed Development on its setting is assessed as being of low magnitude. Key views from the fort to the east, northeast and southeast along the River Oich valley, which contribute appreciably to the cultural significance of the fort, would remain unaffected; although key views of the fort which are also important to understanding its cultural significance, would be adversely affected; the presence of Tower 6, at a greater elevation than the fort and seen in the same view as the fort, being a noticeable alteration to its setting. The resulting adverse effect, based on professional judgement, would be of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms) as the prominence of the fort in its setting would be challenged to some degree by the presence of Tower 6 in views from the north (Auchterawe) and southeast (Coiltry), views that are important in contributing to its cultural significance.

11.8.26 However, whilst the effect on the setting of the fort is assessed as being significant in EIA terms, it is necessary to consider whether the predicted effect would 'significantly adversely affect the integrity of its setting' (NPF4

Policy 7(h) ii). As noted above, the key contributors to the fort's cultural significance are its relationship with the Great Glen and River Oich Valley and its defensive siting in controlling access through the Great Glen. This quality of its setting would be retained, and it would still be possible to understand and appreciate these qualities and the ability to understand its defensive position would not be diminished. As such, the impact of the Proposed Development would not amount to a significantly adverse effect on the integrity of its setting (NPF4 Policy 7(h) ii).

#### *Cumulative Effects*

#### Construction Effects

11.8.27 Cumulative construction effects arise from the Proposed Development in combination with developments that have the potential to impact the same heritage assets.

11.8.28 The footprint of the Coire Glas Switching Station and the Loch Lundie Substation lie within commercial forestry along the alignment of the Proposed Development. The footprints of the consented Coire Glas Pump Storage Scheme and the proposed Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Grid Connection lie outside the area for potential direct effects from construction of the Proposed Development. No heritage assets that would be potentially affected by the construction of the Proposed Development would be directly affected by construction works related to these cumulative schemes.

11.8.29 The Skye Reinforcement Project would run parallel with the alignment of the Proposed Development as an OHL between Tower 35 and Tower 31 before transitioning to an underground cable via a Cable Sealing End compound. No heritage assets that would be potentially directly affected by the construction of the Proposed Development would be directly affected by construction works related to this part of the Skye Reinforcement Project.

11.8.30 The Skye Reinforcement Project then comprises an underground cable (UGC) running to the west and north of the Proposed Development, and terminating at Fort Augustus Substation. The UGC of the proposed Skye Reinforcement Project crosses Dail a' Chuirn farmstead (5) to the north of the Proposed Development and, in the absence of mitigation, would disturb a greater part of the farmstead. Towers 17 and 18 of the Proposed Development are sited outwith the remains of the farmstead and access for construction and decommissioning of the existing 132 kV OHL would make use of an existing access track that skirts around the farmstead but would include a section of new temporary track passing through the southern part of the site, leading to further disruption of elements of the site (5b). Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the combined effect of the Proposed Development with the proposed UGC of the Skye Reinforcement Project, on the settlement at Dail a' Chuirn (5), would be of medium magnitude, on the basis that the Proposed Development would not directly affect the core elements of the farmstead (the remains of farm buildings) and would only directly affect short sections of old field banks of a later phase of occupation. The resulting effect, based on professional judgement, would be of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms) as the remains of the farmstead would be bisected in two places. Mitigation measures to reduce the predicted cumulative effect to no greater than **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms) are set out in Section 11.9.

#### Operational Effects

11.8.31 The presence of the Proposed Development in combination with other proposed developments may have an adverse cumulative effect on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area.

11.8.32 The identification of likely cumulative effects focuses upon the residual operational effects of the Proposed Development on the setting of cultural heritage assets in combination with cumulative developments. The cumulative developments considered within this assessment are restricted to those that are consented, at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable. Those developments that are operational or under construction have been considered as part of the current baseline conditions.



11.8.33 There is no predicted visibility of the consented Coire Glas Pumped Storage Scheme or the proposed Skye Reinforcement Project from Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794) (**Figure 11.3.1-11.3.6**), or from viewpoints towards the fort (**Figure 11.4.1-11.4.4 and Figure 11.5.1-11.5.5**). There would be no visibility of the proposed Coire Glas Switching Station and proposed Loch Lundie Substation, which lie beyond the topography to the southwest of the fort. Visibility of the proposed Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension Grid Connection OHL is predicted in the view from the fort to the north (**Figure 11.3.2**), as a new addition to existing transmission infrastructure atop the valley slope, 3 km distant and entirely screened by commercial forestry. The proposed Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension Grid Connection would then approach the existing Fort Augustus Substation from the northwest as an underground cable. The presence of these cumulative developments would not alter the impact made by the Proposed Development upon the setting of the monument. Cumulative impacts on the setting of Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794) from the Proposed Development and other cumulative developments would be of low magnitude and **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms).

## 11.9 Mitigation

11.9.1 The routeing and alignment selection process for the Proposed Development has taken into consideration the potential for significant effects on heritage assets, and for such effects to be avoided or minimised where possible. This has continued through the EIA process, with survey data informing the siting of infrastructure and access routes to further minimise effects on archaeological features where practicable.

11.9.2 Mitigation measures will be agreed following discussion with THC and will be implemented in accordance with Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (revised 2017) and PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology. PAN 1/2013 describes mitigation as a hierarchy of measures: prevention, reduction and compensatory (offset) measures. Prevention and reduction measures can be achieved through design, whilst compensatory measures offset effects that have not been prevented or reduced. The emphasis in PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible.

### *Mitigation During Construction*

#### Preservation in Situ

11.9.3 Should micro-siting of the Proposed Development be required, associated forestry felling works, towers and associated infrastructure would be located, where possible, away from heritage assets.

11.9.4 Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, ground-breaking works at proposed tower positions, and construction access tracks, as far as reasonably practicable and as advised by the appointed ACoW. This would be achieved through marking out the locations of assets to be avoided using high visibility markers placed a minimum of 2 m from the outermost edge of the identified features but noting that some assets may require a larger protection buffer. It may also be appropriate to employ tracking mats over earthworks and to define access corridors so as to minimise disturbance to linear features such as field boundary banks and tracks.

11.9.5 Known heritage assets and archaeologically sensitive areas, would not be used for storage of material or as parking areas for vehicles or machinery.

11.9.6 Where linear assets survive as upstanding features (principally field banks and drystone walls), such as the field wall (1b) and enclosure boundary (6a) and the later elements of field walls at Dail a' Chuirn farmstead (5), access tracks would be routed through any existing gates or through broken or less well-preserved sections of banks or walls wherever possible, within the LOD. Disturbance to field banks and walls would be kept to the minimum necessary to facilitate the Proposed Development, to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact. In the case of upstanding drystone walls breached to facilitate access, these would be made good upon completion of the works using traditional drystone walling techniques.

11.9.7 The following heritage assets would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase:

- Field banks (5a and 5c)
- Clearance cairns (5b)

11.9.8 Construction contractors would be made aware of the need to avoid these assets during construction works and any markers would be removed upon completion of the Proposed Development.

11.9.9 In the event that the clearance cairns (5b) at Dail a' Chuirn cannot be avoided, allowance will be made for the excavation of the features to a scheme to be agreed with THC under the terms of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

#### Micrositing

11.9.10 In order to mitigate potential impacts on identified heritage assets, no micrositing would take place without prior consultation with the appointed ACoW. Any identified heritage asset or feature that falls within or close to a revised working area or access route would be marked out and avoided in line with the mitigation outlined above in paragraphs 11.9.3 – 11.9.4.

#### Watching Briefs

11.9.11 The Applicant would seek to agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with THC in advance of development works (forestry felling activity and construction phase). The scope of the agreed works would be confirmed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be signed-off prior to commencement of work on site, including any required enabling works.

11.9.12 Taking account of the avoidance through design, and the character of the identified cultural heritage baseline, it is recommended that watching briefs be carried out at the following locations:

- Dail a' Chuirn farmstead (5): where access routes lie in proximity to known settlement remains (5a-c). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during ground-breaking works for the temporary access route passing the settlement, to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered.
- Blar an Ruighe, quern stone (2): where access routes lie in proximity to the recorded findspot of a prehistoric trough quern. An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during ground-breaking works for the new access route east of the Torr Dhuin car park, to identify and record any potential remains that may be encountered.

11.9.13 Where buried remains are encountered during archaeological monitoring of groundworks, further mitigation may be required to the approval of THC. The preferred mitigation will be preservation in situ.

- Where topsoil removal is required for the purposes of constructing access tracks or establishing working areas, preservation of any exposed archaeological deposits could be achieved by recording the locations and extents of any features identified and retaining them unexcavated beneath a geotextile membrane placed on the subsoil surface and beneath the track or compound make up layer.
- Where disturbance of the remains is unavoidable (for example, where tower foundations are required) allowance will be made for the excavation of any features encountered to a scheme to be agreed with THC under the terms of the WSI.

#### Post-Excavation Assessment and Reporting

11.9.14 If new, archaeologically significant discoveries are made during archaeological monitoring, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered remains in situ, provision will be made for the excavation where necessary, of any archaeological deposits encountered. The provision will include the consequent production of written reports, on the findings, with post-excavation analysis and publication of the results of the works, where appropriate.



### Construction Guidelines

11.9.15 Written guidelines will be set out in the WSI, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines will set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional support if buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc.) should be discovered during any construction activities.

11.9.16 The guidelines will make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.

### **11.10 Residual Effects**

11.10.1 This section describes the predicted residual effects and associated effect significance of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development, following the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 11.9.

#### *Construction Residual Effects*

11.10.2 Residual construction effects are set out on a site-by-site basis in **Technical Appendix 11.1**.

11.10.3 In the absence of mitigation, the predicted effects from construction of the Proposed Development are:

- **Minor** effects on elements of Auchterawe House (1a-c) and Gleann Laogh (6a) field systems; and
- A **moderate** effect on Dail a' Chuirn farmstead (5).

11.10.4 Taking account of the mitigation proposals set out above, the following residual construction effects are predicted:

- **Negligible** residual effects on elements of Auchterawe House (1a-c) and Gleann Laogh (6a) field systems as a consequence of minimal disturbance during tree felling and construction of the Proposed Development; and
- A **minor** residual effect on Dail a' Chuirn farmstead (5) as a result of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development. Any impact of the Proposed Development on surviving buried archaeological remains or deposits would be offset by archaeological investigations and recording to a standard acceptable to THC.

11.10.5 Where upstanding heritage assets have been marked off and avoided (5a-c) for the duration of the construction works, there would be no residual effects on those assets.

11.10.6 Where buried archaeological remains are encountered, recorded, and excavated where necessary, the residual effects would be of no more than **minor** significance.

#### *Operational Residual Effects*

11.10.7 During its operational lifetime, the residual effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be the same as the predicted effects. See **Technical Appendix 11.3** for a tabulated assessment of the predicted operational effects.

11.10.8 With the exception of a **moderate** significance residual effect on the setting of Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794), all impacts, affecting the settings of heritage assets in the surrounding landscape, would give rise to residual effects that are of **negligible** significance.

### *Cumulative Residual Effects*

11.10.9 The presence of cumulative developments would not alter the **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms) residual effect on the setting of Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794). Other residual effects of the Proposed Development, in combination with cumulative developments, are considered to be of no greater than **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms).

### **11.11 Summary and Conclusions**

11.11.1 A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey have been carried out for the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by HES and THC.

11.11.2 A total of six non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Proposed Development LODs. The majority of these are associated with post-medieval settlement and agricultural activities, although a quern stone findspot relating to prehistoric occupation is recorded to the south of Auchterawe.

11.11.3 There is potential for construction works within the Proposed Development LODs to result in direct effects on three heritage assets. In addition, three additional elements of these assets lie within the micrositing allowance (LoD) and could be affected by micrositing of the towers or access track routes. In the absence of mitigation, one of these impacts (on a group of clearance cairns (5b) at Dail a' Chuim) is assessed as being potentially of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms). There is also a recognised potential for construction works to affect hitherto unknown, buried archaeological remains. Although the likelihood of such impacts is judged to be low, the effects on any of archaeological importance could be of **moderate** significance (*significant* in EIA terms). The other impacts are assessed as being *not significant*.

11.11.4 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid, reduce, or offset the predicted effects, and residual construction effects of no more than **minor** significance (*not significant* in EIA terms) are predicted. The proposed mitigation includes the demarcation of assets for preservation in-situ and the implementation of a watching brief during ground-breaking works for establishment of access requirements across specified areas with increased potential for the presence of archaeological features or deposits. If significant discoveries are made during the watching briefs and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to a programme to be agreed in writing with THC.

11.11.5 Nine Scheduled Monuments, three Category A Listed Buildings, ten Category B Listed Buildings, eleven Category C Listed Buildings and one Conservation Area have been identified within the 4 km Outer Study Area, from which there is some degree of theoretical visibility of one or more elements of the Proposed Development.

11.11.6 The assessment has resulted in the identification of a **moderate** significant effect (*significant* in EIA terms) on the setting of one Scheduled Monument: Torr Dhuin Fort (SM 794). The Proposed Development would constitute an addition to the foreground of views from Torr Dhuin, largely screened by intervening commercial forestry but more prominent than existing infrastructure. Views from the north and the east of the fort on its hilltop setting would also be changed by the addition of the Proposed Development. However, it would remain possible for any visitor to the fort to understand and appreciate its character and its dramatic setting. As such the integrity of the setting of the monument and its capacity to inform and convey its cultural significance, would be unhindered.

11.11.7 With the exception of the **moderate** significance residual effect on the setting of Torr Dhuin fort (SM 794), the residual cumulative effect of the Proposed Development, in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity, is considered to be *not significant*.