

## 6. CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY APPRAISAL

### 6.1. Introduction

This chapter identifies the likely impacts on cultural heritage and archaeology receptors (i.e., historic environment sites and features, archaeology and built heritage; hereafter referred to as ‘heritage assets’) associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

The chapter comprises an assessment based on the findings of a desk-based assessment and walkover field survey carried out in April 2021, undertaken by CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA), and draws on data provided by Historic Environment Scotland (HES), and West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), historic environment advisors to Argyll and Bute Council (ABC).

The objectives of the chapter are to:

- describe the cultural heritage and archaeology baseline, including identifying the archaeological potential of the Inner Study Area (comprising the Proposed Development Site and a 1 km buffer from the centre line of the proposed OHL);
- identify the potential direct (construction) and indirect (operational) impacts on heritage assets; and
- describe any mitigation measures proposed to address likely impacts.

This chapter is supported by:

- **Technical Annex 6.1 (Volume 2): Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area;**
- **Technical Annex 6.2 (Volume 2): Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area;**
- **Figure 6.1 (Volume 3a): Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area;**
- **Figure 6.2 (Volume 3a): Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area - Actual Tower Height ZTV; and**
- **Figure 6.3 (Volume 3a): Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area - Actual Tower Height plus 20% vertical LOD ZTV.**

The assessment has been undertaken by Mhairi Hastie BSc (Hons) MSc FSA Scot MCIfA at CFA, a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) based in Musselburgh, East Lothian. Miss Hastie is a Senior Consultant with CFA and is a member of the CIfA (MCIfA). She has over 15 years full-time experience of producing EIAs for renewable energy developments, and for other industrial and commercial development across the UK.

The assessment has been prepared with reference to the following guidelines and technical guidance:

- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (CIfA, 2014, updated 2020<sup>1</sup>);
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019<sup>2</sup>);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016<sup>3</sup>);
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (SNH<sup>4</sup> and HES, 2018<sup>5</sup>);
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (IEMA, 2021<sup>6</sup>);
- The UK Forestry Standard: The Government Approach to Sustainable Forestry: 6.3. Historic Environment (UKFS, 2017<sup>7</sup>);
- The UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and Historic Environment (UKFS, 2011<sup>8</sup>); and
- Scotland’s Woodland and the Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2008<sup>9</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2014, updated 2020) ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment’.

<sup>2</sup> Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (2019) ‘Designated Policy and Selected Guidance’.

<sup>3</sup> Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (2016) ‘Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting’.

<sup>4</sup> The agency was formed in 1992 as Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). In November 2019 it was announced that SNH would be re-branded as NatureScot.

<sup>5</sup> Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland (2018) ‘Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook’, Edinburgh.

<sup>6</sup> Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2021) ‘Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment’.

<sup>7</sup> Forestry Commission UKFS (2017) The UK Forestry Standard: The Government Approach to Sustainable Forestry: 6.3. Historic Environment.

<sup>8</sup> Forestry Commission UKFS (2011) The UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and Historic Environment.

<sup>9</sup> Forestry Commission Scotland (2008) Scotland’s Woodland and the Historic Environment.

## 6.2. Scope and Methodology

This chapter considers direct (physical) impacts on cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Development Site arising from construction works and impacts on the setting of heritage assets in the surrounding landscape.

### 6.2.1 Study Areas

Two zones have been employed for the cultural heritage appraisal:

- An Inner Study Area (refer to **Figure 6.1, Volume 3a**): The Study Area for consideration of potential direct impacts upon heritage assets, comprising the Proposed Development Site plus a 1 km buffer from the centre line of the proposed OHL to inform the archaeological potential of the Proposed Development area. A gazetteer of heritage assets identified within the Inner Study Area is provided in **Technical Annex 6.1 (Volume 2)**.
- An Outer Study Area (refer to **Figures 6.2 and 6.3, Volume 3a**): The Study Area for consideration of impacts affecting the setting of heritage assets (including cumulative impacts), employs a 5 km radius from the centre of the Proposed Development. A 5 km Actual Tower/Pole<sup>10</sup> Height (ATH) Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 6.2, Volume 3a**) and a 5 km ATH plus 20% vertical LOD Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 6.3, Volume 3a**) were used to indicate the number of towers that would be theoretically visible from heritage assets identified within the Outer Study Area. The ATH plus 20% vertical LOD Bare-Earth ZTV was used to identify where greater numbers of towers and/or poles would potentially be theoretically visible from heritage assets if increased tower heights were utilised, and to present a worse-case scenario. Details on the methodology and parameters used to generate the ATH ZTV and ATH plus 20% vertical LOD are provided in **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Volume 1)**. A gazetteer of the designated heritage assets within the Outer Study with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development is provided in **Technical Annex 6.2 (Volume 2)**.

### 6.2.2 Desk Study

The following information sources were consulted for this appraisal:

- ABC Historic Environment Record (HER): a digital database extract was obtained in March 2021 from WoSAS, ABC heritage advisors, ahead of the field survey for all assets within 5 km of the Proposed Development. Updated data was acquired in July 2022 and checked against the original data to ensure that any discrepancies were identified;
- National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) Scotland online database (Canmore) (HES, 2021a<sup>11</sup>): for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
- Historic Environment Scotland Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2022b<sup>12</sup>): provided up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, and Inventory Historic Battlefields;
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES, 2021c<sup>13</sup>): for information on the historic land-use character of the Site and the surrounding area;
- Map Library of the National Library of Scotland: for Ordnance Survey maps (principally 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions) and other historic maps;
- Modern aerial photographic imagery available through Google Earth and Bing Maps; and
- Bare-Earth ZTV mapping generated for the Proposed Development: used to identify those designated assets within the Outer Study Area that would have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

<sup>10</sup> The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV and ATH plus 20% vertical LOD Bare Earth ZTV capture both the proposed Permanent Towers (steel lattice towers) and Temporary Poles (wood mounted poles). Details on the methodology and parameters used to generate the ZTVs are provided in Chapter 6: LVIA & RVAA.

<sup>11</sup> NHRE (2022a) Canmore Database, available at <https://pastmap.org.uk/> (Accessed August 2022)

<sup>12</sup> HES (2022b) Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> (Accessed August 2022)

<sup>13</sup> HES (2021c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap), available at: <http://hlapmap.org.uk> (Accessed August 2022).

### 6.2.3 Field Survey

A targeted walk-over field survey, concentrating on the Proposed Development Site was carried out on 23 April 2021<sup>14</sup> in order to:

- locate all visible cultural heritage sites, monuments, and landscape features, including those identified during the desk-based assessment and any previously unrecognised, and to record their character, extent, and condition;
- identify areas with the potential to contain unrecorded, buried archaeological remains, taking into account factors such as topography, geomorphology, and ground conditions; and
- inform the appraisal of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on heritage assets.

Site visits were also made to key receptors in the Outer Study Area, to appraise whether the Proposed Development would affect their settings.

### 6.2.4 Appraisal of Potential Impacts

An appraisal has been undertaken of potential impacts on heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development during construction and operation. Where potential impacts have been identified, consideration has been given to the sensitivity of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact when determining the need for additional mitigation measures.

**Table 6.1** summarises the relative sensitivity of cultural heritage assets (and their settings), excluding in this instance World Heritage Sites and Marine Resources.

Heritage assets are given weight through the designation process. Designations ensures that sites and places are recognised 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 designations and its laws and policies<sup>15</sup>.

Table 6.1: Sensitivity of Heritage Asset	
Sensitivity	Receptor
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: Scheduled Monuments Category A Listed Buildings Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes Inventory Historic Battlefields Non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designation (including heritage assets in the WoSAS HER with non-statutory register (NSR) codes C and V).
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, including: Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research framework) Category B Listed Buildings Conservation Areas
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: Archaeological sites that have local heritage value Category C Listed buildings Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics

<sup>14</sup> The targeted field survey was undertaken at the same time as the survey for the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation. The Proposed Development will tie into the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation and will utilise access tracks infrastructure developed for the proposed substation. Further details are provided in Chapter 3: Proposed Development.

<sup>15</sup> HES, 2019. Designation Policy and Selection Guidance, Edinburgh.

**Table 6.1: Sensitivity of Heritage Asset**

Sensitivity	Receptor
Negligible	Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value; including: Artefact find-spots (where artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain) Poorly preserved examples of particular types of features (e.g. quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc.)

The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) is assessed in the categories, high, medium, low, and negligible and described in **Table 6.2**.

Adverse impacts are those that detract from or reduce cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

Beneficial impacts are those that preserve, enhance or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

**Table 6.2: Magnitude of Impact**

Contribution	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.
Low	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. Changes that slightly detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting detracting from its cultural significance being removed. Changes that result in a slight improvement in the way a heritage asset is understood, appreciated and experienced.
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.	

#### 6.2.5 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

A cumulative impact on a heritage asset results from a change to its baseline condition caused by new development in conjunction with other schemes, as identified in **Chapter 2: Environmental Appraisal Methodology and Scope (Volume 1)**, that are located within the Outer Study Area. **Figure 2.2 (Volume 3a)** shows the distribution of cumulative developments in the wider landscape, including schemes that are either Approved, in Planning (application), or are at the Scoping stage.

Operational developments and those that are under construction are taken as part of the baseline against which the Proposed Development is assessed. Proposed developments that are at the scoping stage are excluded from the assessment as there is insufficient information on the proposed scale and size or configuration to reliably assess the potential cumulative impact, and uncertainty over whether they will be progressed to a formal application.

The assessment takes into account the relative scales (i.e. size, extent, etc) of the various developments, their distance from the affected asset, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets of the various developments. Those developments that lie within the Outer Study Area and are relevant to the assessment of cumulative impacts on heritage assets are:

#### Consented Schemes

- Blarghour Wind Farm, Land 7 km northwest of Inveraray (ECU00005267; consented 29 October 2021, not yet under construction).

#### In Planning Schemes

- Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL Connection (ECU00002199, In Planning, part of the Argyll and Kintyre 275kV Strategy);
- Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL Connection (in planning ECU00003442 part of the Argyll and Kintyre 275 kV Strategy); and
- Creag Dhubh Substation (22/00782/PP, In Planning, part of the Argyll and Kintyre 275kV Strategy).

The Proposed Development Site lies within existing commercial forestry plantation (which include the M23, Keppochan East and Tullich Indicative LTFP<sup>16</sup>), which is subject to an ongoing felling and replanting regime which would be subject to UK Forestry Standards and would result in limited potential for disturbance to identified historic assets. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the commercial forestry operations would continue to take place should the Proposed Development not be taken forward. Accordingly, no further consideration has been given to the forestry schemes in the cumulative assessment.

### 6.3. Baseline Conditions

#### 6.3.1 Inner Study Area

As shown in **Figure 6.1 (Volume 3a)**, five heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area. Bold numbers in brackets in the following text correspond to asset numbers shown on **Figure 6.1 (Volume 3a)**.

Full descriptions and an assessment of their heritage value/sensitivity are provided in **Technical Annex 6.1 (Volume 2)**.

There are no statutory designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields or Conservation Areas) within the Inner Study Area.

##### *Prehistoric Period*

There are no recorded sites or find-spots of any prehistoric period within the Inner Study Area.

##### *Medieval or Later Settlement and Activity*

A group of nine shieling huts (2) (**Figure 6.1, Volume 3a**), is depicted on the first and second edition Ordnance Survey maps (1874) and lies approximately 350 m of the Proposed Development, northwest of Taynafead and close to a tributary of the River Aray. The shieling huts are shown as unroofed on the first edition map suggesting that they were out of use by the mid-19th century. None of the huts are visible on modern aerial photographs (Google Earth) in what is now an area of commercial forestry plantation. As the shieling huts lie well away from the Proposed Development footprint and would not be directly affected, they were not visited during the targeted field survey carried out for this assessment. Shieling huts are usually associated with medieval or post-medieval summer grazing activity, although some can have considerably longer

---

<sup>16</sup> Long Term Forest Plan.

history, and are components of the local historical landscape. Through consultation for other developments in this area, WoSAS, heritage advisors to ABC, have advised that they would consider groups of shieling huts to be potentially of heritage value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity.

#### *Former Roads/ Trackways and Footpaths*

The HER and Canmore entries record that the route of a former drove road **(4) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)** is shown on a map of the Duke of Argyll's estate dating to 1734 (Cowley, 1734<sup>17</sup>) running along Glen Aray from Inveraray Castle to Loch Awe. It appears that the drove road **(4)** follows the same route as the later, mid-18th century Dumbarton to Tyndrum Military Road **(5) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)**, shown on Roy's map (1747 to 1755). It is likely that construction of the current forestry access track where it follows the route of the former drove road/military road has disturbed the remains of the former road, although it is possible that buried remains may still survive below the present forestry track surface. As the route of a former military road **(5)** (formerly the route of the earlier drove road **(4)**) which is still discernible on the ground and may contain archaeological evidence relating to its construction and use, it is assessed as being of value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity.

The route of a former footpath **(1) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)**, is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first and second edition maps (1874 and 1897) running north from Taynafead to Ardbrecknish, crossing the Proposed Development Site, including the Substation Site, with a northeast to southwest orientation. No remains of this former footpath were visible during the field survey, in what is now a commercial forestry plantation. As little more than a hill track, it is considered to have little or no heritage value and is of negligible sensitivity.

#### *19th Century Commemorative Monument*

In 1935, a commemorative memorial **(3) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)** to Neil Munro, a local journalist and novelist (1863 to 1930), was erected on a hillock to the west of the A819 public road, 1 km to the southeast of the Proposed Development. The monument comprises a stone pillar topped with a Celtic book-shrine. The monument is considered to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.

### 6.3.2 Archaeological Potential of the Inner Study Area

The Inner Study Area is currently in use as commercial forestry. Examination of historic maps (Roy's 'Military Map of Scotland' (1747-55) and Ordnance Survey first edition (1874)) reveals that the Inner Study Area was open moorland during the 18th and 19th centuries. The results of the desk-based study and field survey show that there was some seasonal (summer) occupation, associated with a number of shieling huts **(2) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)**, around a tributary of the River Aray likely dating to this period.

The current land-use as commercial forestry plantation suggests that the potential for hitherto undiscovered buried archaeological remains to survive within the Inner Study Area is low to negligible, except in discrete areas around the shieling huts **(2) (Figure 6.1, Volume 3a)** and along the tributary of the River Aray. In afforested areas, pre-afforestation ploughing and drainage works, as well as planting and subsequent tree root growth and the effect of wind-throw, is likely to have disturbed or destroyed the integrity of any surviving buried archaeological deposits that might formerly have been, or may still be, present.

### 6.3.3 Outer Study Area

There are 12 statutory designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area **(Figure 6.2, Volume 3a)**, these are:

- Nine Scheduled Monuments (three with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).

<sup>17</sup> Cowley, J (1734), *A map of such part of his Grace the Duke of Argyle's heritable dukedom, and justiciary territories, islands, superiorities & jurisdictions as lye contiguous upon the western Coast of North Britain, within the now united shires of Inverary and Tarbat.*

- Two Category B Listed Buildings (none with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).
- One Category C listed Buildings (none with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).

In addition, there are five non-designated heritage assets (one with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development) within the Outer Study Area that are classed in the HER as NSR Sites and recorded as being potentially of national importance and of schedulable quality.

A list of those statutory designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development is provided in **Technical Annex 6.2 (Volume 2)**.

Comparison of the ATH Bare-Earth ZTV and ATH plus 20% LOD ZTV (**Technical Annex 6.2, Volume 2**) indicates that there would be no additional heritage assets within the Outer Study Area with theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development if increased tower heights were utilised.

## 6.4. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

### 6.4.1 Construction

Construction (direct) impacts on cultural heritage assets, which may damage, and possibly destroy, cultural heritage remains, are most likely to arise from ground-disturbing activities. Ground-disturbing activities would include: proposed forest felling activities in advance of construction works for the Proposed Development, erection of temporary wood poles, removal of two existing towers and their replacement with two angle towers, construction of two new terminal towers, and excavation and levelling works relating to the construction of proposed new permanent access tracks. Direct impacts can also occur as a result of above-ground disturbance: for example, as a result of vehicle movement over cultural heritage features, or from the storage of construction materials on top of them. Direct impacts on cultural heritage assets are normally adverse, permanent, and irreversible.

The assessment of potential construction impacts has been carried out with reference to the Proposed Development layout and the disposition of heritage assets shown on **Figure 6.1 (Volume 3a)**.

- No remains of the former footpath (1) (**Figure 6.1, Volume 3a**), the route of which intersects with the Proposed Development Site in its north-eastern part, survive and it would not be affected by construction of the Proposed Development.
- The shieling huts (2), Neil Munro Commemorative Monument (3), and the former drove road/military road (4/5) (**Figure 6.1, Volume 3a**) lie outside of the Proposed Development Site, well away from the footprint of the Proposed Development and would not be affected by construction works.

There is a possibility that any ground disturbing works in areas required for construction of the Proposed Development could disturb or destroy any hitherto unrecorded buried archaeological remains present in affected areas. It has been assessed that there is a low to negligible likelihood of buried remains to survive within the Inner Study Area. Based on the results of the desk-based study and field survey, there are no specific areas within the Proposed Development Site, which is predominantly covered by commercial forestry, where construction works could be expected to encounter buried archaeological remains and no mitigation measures are proposed.

Potential impacts during construction are summarised in **Table 6.3** below, which also details the relevant receptor and mitigation or control measures, where appropriate.



**Table 6.3: Potential Impacts to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology during Construction and Relevant Mitigation/Control Measures**

Potential Impact	Receptor	Mitigation Proposed
Potential direct impact on any surviving buried remains from ground disturbance works within the Site boundary.	Potential buried remains.	No mitigation proposed.

#### 6.4.2 Operation

**Technical Annex 6.2 (Volume 2)** provides information on the baseline character of the each of the heritage asset within the Outer Study Area that have predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development together with the magnitude of predicted impact on their settings from the Proposed Development.

The ATH ZTV (**Figure 6.2, Volume 3**) shows that there is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development in views of, or from, six Scheduled Monuments (SM 4272, SM 4193, SM 4201, SM 4202, SM 4048 and SM 4033); two Category B Listed Buildings (LB 12175 and LB 13701); one Category C Listed Building (LB 11890); and five NSR Sites of potential schedulable quality (1582, 1639, 1618 and 1630). Consequently, there would be no impact from the Proposed Development on their settings.

It is assessed that the introduction of the Proposed Development would have a negligible magnitude adverse impact on the settings of three Scheduled Monuments, Larach Bhan, Cairn (SM 4105), Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone (SM 4186), Loch Awe, Ceann Mara, Crannog (SM 4229) and one NSR Site, Claddich Chambered Cairn (1778) that lie within the Outer Study Area, and which are assessed as being of high sensitivity heritage assets.

Visibility of the Proposed Development from these heritage assets would be largely limited by intervening topography, with no more than four towers being visible from any one monument. Where visible, the Proposed Development would be seen in a narrow arc of view, at over 2 km distant (the closest monument being Keppochan Cup Marked Rock (SM 4186)), and on the opposite side of Loch Awe to Larach Bhan, Cairn (SM 4105) and Loch Awe, Ceann Mara, Crannog (SM 4229).

Overall, it is considered that the impact of the Proposed Development on the settings of these monuments would not detract from the character or cultural significance of the monuments and the presence of the Proposed Development in the wider landscape surrounding the monuments would not appreciably alter the way in which the monuments and their settings are experienced and appreciated. The integrity of their current settings would be retained.

It is assessed that the introduction of the Proposed Development would have a low magnitude adverse impact on the setting of the Neil Munro Monument (3) (**Figure 6.2, Volume 3a**), which is assessed as being of low sensitivity heritage asset and which is 1 km from the Proposed Development. A photomontage (**Figure 5.7c, Volume 3b**) showing the predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from the monument indicates that views to the Proposed Development would currently be largely screened by commercial forestry. In the absence of this existing forestry, the views from the monument to the east, towards the Proposed Development would open up. A wireline (**Figure 5.7b, Volume 3b**) showing the predicted bare-earth visibility of the Proposed Development indicates that there would be visibility of six proposed permanent towers in views to the east of the monument. Where visible these towers would be backdropped by higher ground to the east, and would not be seen skylined. Key views from the monument along Glen Array would not be affected. Overall, it is considered that the presence of the Proposed Development within the wider landscape surrounding the monument would not appreciably detract from the character or cultural significance of the monument as a memorial to a noted local writer and it would remain possible for any visitor to the monument to understand and appreciate the monument, and its setting within the Glen Array valley.



Potential impacts during operation are summarised in **Table 6.4** below, which also details the relevant receptor and mitigation or control measures, where appropriate.

<b>Table 6.4: Potential Impacts to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology during Operation and Relevant Mitigation / Control Measures</b>		
<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Receptor</b>	<b>Mitigation Proposed</b>
Negligible magnitude impact on setting of scheduled monuments.	Larach Bhan, Cairn (SM 4105). Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone (SM 4186). Loch Awe, Ceann Mara, Crannog (SM 4229)	No additional mitigation required
Negligible magnitude impact on setting of NSR Site.	Cladich, Chambered Cairn (1778)	No additional mitigation required
Low magnitude impact on setting of non-designated asset.	Neil Munro Commemorative Monument (3).	No additional mitigation required

#### 6.4.3 Cumulative Impacts

**Figure 2.2 (Volume 3a)** shows the Proposed Development along with the locations of other cumulative developments.

##### *Construction*

Cumulative construction impacts may arise from the Proposed Development in combination with developments that have the potential to directly affect the same heritage assets.

The former footpath (1) no longer survives within the Proposed Development Site and would not be directly affected by construction works for the Proposed Development or from any of the other cumulative developments which would tie-in with the Proposed Development.

##### *Operational*

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

The identification of likely cumulative effects focuses upon the operational impacts 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 (not yet constructed), at the application stage (In planning), or are reasonably foreseeable. Those developments that are operational or under construction have been considered as part of the current baseline.

- There is no predicted visibility of the consented Blarghour Wind Farm from the heritage assets that are predicted to have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development (**Technical Annex 6.2, Volume 2**). As a result, there would be no cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets arising from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with Blarghour Wind Farm.
- There is no predicted visibility of the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation, from three Scheduled Monuments (SM 4105, SM 4186 and SM 4229) and one NSR Site (1778) that are predicted to have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development (**Technical Annex 6.2, Volume 2**). As a result, there would be no cumulative effects on the settings of these heritage assets arising from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation.

- It is predicted that the proposed Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL would be theoretically visible from one Scheduled Monument (SM 4105) that also has predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would be seen in combination with the cumulative development, in views to the southeast of the monument where both developments converge at the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation; the Proposed Development and the cumulative development being seen in the same arc of view and at c.5 km from the monument. Views of both the Proposed Development and the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL would be largely screened by intervening topography and given the distance the proposed towers would not be prominent in the surrounding landscape. As a result, it is considered that the cumulative impact on the setting of Larach Bhan, Cairn (SM 4105) arising from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL would be of no more than negligible magnitude.
- It is predicted that the proposed Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL would be theoretically visible from three scheduled Monuments (SM 4105, SM 4186 and SM 4229) and one NSR Site (1778) that also have predicted visibility of the Proposed Development. Combined views of the Proposed Development with the proposed Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL, may be visible from these heritage assets where the Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL crosses hill slopes to the south of the monuments. The Proposed Development would however be largely screened from view from the heritage assets by intervening topography and where visible seen beyond the Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL and would contribute less to the cumulative impact. Taking this into account, it is assessed that the cumulative impact, in relation to the Scheduled Monuments (SM 4105, SM 4186 and SM 4229) and the NSR Site (1778), from the introduction of the Proposed Development in combination with the proposed Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL would be no more than negligible magnitude.
- It is predicted that the proposed Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL, and Creag Dhubh Substation would all be seen together, in combination with the Proposed Development, where they converge at the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation in views to the northeast of the Neil Munro Commemorative Monument (3) (Figure 6.2, Volume 3a) and consequently would give rise to a cumulative impact on the setting of this monument. Views of the Proposed Development and the cumulative developments would be largely screened by current surrounding commercial forestry. In the absence of the screening afforded by the forestry, the Proposed Development would be seen in combination with the cumulative developments, in the same arc of view, and at roughly a similar distance from the monument. The proposed OHL connections would however be backdropped by higher ground and the Proposed Development would be visible beyond the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275kV OHL. Taking this into account, it is assessed that the cumulative impact, in relation to the Neil Munro Commemorative Monument (3), from the introduction of the Proposed Development in combination with the other proposed developments would be of no more than low magnitude.

## 6.7. Conclusion

A desk-based study and a targeted field survey, concentrating on the Proposed Development Site, have been undertaken to inform the assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets.

Five heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area, including a former footpath, a group of shieling huts, the route of a former drove road/ military road, and a 20th century commemorative memorial monument.

The Inner Study Area is currently in use as commercial forestry and the current land-use suggests that the potential for hitherto undiscovered buried archaeological remains to survive in the Proposed Development Site is low or negligible.

**There are no predicted direct impacts on cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Development Site.**

It is possible that any ground disturbing works in areas required for construction of the Proposed Development could disturb or destroy any hitherto unrecorded buried archaeological remains present in affected areas. However, it is assessed that

there is a low to negligible likelihood of buried remains surviving within the Proposed Development Site and accordingly no additional mitigation measures are proposed.

Five heritage assets in the Outer Study Area are predicted to have some degree of visibility of the Proposed Development. It is assessed that there would be negligible magnitude effects on the settings of three Scheduled Monuments and one NSR Site, all of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity. There would also be a low magnitude effect on the setting of one non-designated heritage asset (Neil Munro Commemorative Monument) of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.

Indirect impacts in-combination with five cumulative schemes may also arise. The Proposed Development in combination with the cumulative schemes considered by the assessment would not detract from the character or cultural significance of the heritage assets within the Outer Study Area and it is assessed that the cumulative impacts would be of no more than low magnitude.