

9 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

9.1 Executive Summary

- 9.1.1 This chapter assesses the potential effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests (hereafter ‘heritage assets’) associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
- 9.1.2 A total of 31 heritage assets (sites and features) have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities. Field survey indicates that medieval/post-medieval settlement and cultivation remains survive within open moorland and rough pasture areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century and it is considered that there is a medium to low potential for further buried archaeology to survive in these areas. In areas where the Proposed Development crosses commercial forestry plantation the potential for hitherto undisturbed archaeological remains to survive is considered to be negligible.
- 9.1.3 There is a potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on 14 heritage assets. In addition, nine heritage assets lie within the micro-siting allowance (LOD) and could potentially be affected by any micro-siting of proposed towers or proposed access track routes. In the absence of mitigation, three of these (possible building CFA023, farmstead CFA030 and shieling huts (44203)) are assessed as being potentially of **moderate** significance. The other impacts are assessed as being not significant.
- 9.1.4 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted construction effects and residual effects of no more than **minor** significance (not significant in EIA terms) have been identified.
- 9.1.5 Twenty-four Scheduled Monuments, two Category A Listed Buildings, four Category B Listed Buildings, two Category C Listed Buildings, one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), and four NSR Sites have been identified within the 5 km Outer Study Area, from which there is theoretical visibility of one or more elements of the Proposed Development.
- 9.1.6 The assessment has resulted in the identification of **moderate** significance effects on the settings of three Scheduled Monuments (Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a’Chaisteal dun (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149)) and one Category B Listed Building, Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument (LB 12167). However, the monuments would not be isolated from their surroundings, nor would their settings be appreciably fragmented. It would remain possible for any visitor to the monuments to understand and appreciate their settings. As such, the integrity of the settings of the monuments and their capacity to inform and convey their cultural significance, will not be compromised.
- 9.1.7 The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity is considered to be **not significant**.

9.2 Introduction

- 9.2.1 This chapter assesses the potential effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests (hereafter ‘heritage assets’) associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This chapter (and its associated Figures and Appendices) is not intended to be read as a standalone assessment and reference should be made to the introductory chapters of the EIA Report (EIAR) **Chapters 1-5, EIAR Volume 2**.
- 9.2.2 The assessment has been carried out by Mhairi Hastie BSc (Hons) MSc FSA Scot MCIfA of CFA Archaeology Ltd (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 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA). She has over 15 years full time experience of producing Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for renewable energy developments and electricity transmission infrastructure, and for other industrial and commercial development across the UK.

- 9.2.3 This chapter details the results of a desk-based assessment and a walkover field survey covering the Inner Study Area¹ and provides an assessment of the potential impacts (direct impacts and impacts on the settings of heritage assets) arising from the Proposed Development. The assessment draws on comments provided by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and Argyll and Bute Council (ABC), and from West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), historic environment advisors to ABC.
- 9.2.4 The objectives of the chapter are to:
- Describe the cultural heritage and archaeology baseline;
 - Describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the impact assessment;
 - Describe the potential effects, including direct effects (construction), effects on setting and cumulative effects; and
 - Assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation.
- 9.2.5 This chapter is accompanied by the following Figures and Technical Appendices:
- **Figure 9.1a-h: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**
 - **Figure 9.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area – Standard Tower Height ZTV²**
 - **Figure 9.3: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area – Actual Tower Height plus 20% LOD ZTV³**
 - **Figures 9.4 - 9.16: Cultural Heritage Visualisations**
 - **Technical Appendix 9.1: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area**
 - **Technical Appendix 9.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area**
 - **Technical Appendix 9.3: Cultural Heritage Visualisations**
- 9.2.6 Figures and Technical Appendices are referenced in the text where relevant.

9.3 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Scope of the Assessment

- 9.3.1 The assessment evaluates the effects of the Proposed Development on Scheduled Monuments (SM) and other archaeological features, Listed Buildings (LB) and other buildings of historic or architectural importance, and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDL).
- 9.3.2 For issues scoped out see **Section 9.4**.
- 9.3.3 The types of effect on heritage assets which might result from the Proposed Development have been assessed in the following categories:
- Direct: where there may be a physical effect on a heritage asset caused by the construction of the Proposed Development.
 - Indirect: where elements of the Proposed Development would affect the setting of heritage assets present in the vicinity.
 - Cumulative: where the Proposed Development in conjunction with other developments in the surrounding landscape would affect the setting of heritage assets present in the vicinity. Operational, including existing grid infrastructure elements, and under construction developments are considered as part of the baseline. Other cumulative developments that are consented (not yet constructed), at the application stage, and are reasonably foreseeable are considered within the cumulative assessment.

¹ Study area for consideration of potential direct impacts upon heritage assets, comprising a 200 m wide corridor centred on the proposed 275 kV overhead line (OHL) and a 100 m wide corridor centred on the proposed access track locations

² Standard Tower Height ZTV assumes maximum tower heights of 60 m

³ Actual Tower Height plus 20% LOD ZTV assumes a 20% increase to the actual tower heights provided in **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**

9.3.4 The assessment is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2)**.

9.3.5 The scope of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses summarised in **Table 9.1: Consultation Responses** and the following legislation, guidance, and policies:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011)).
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).
- National Planning Framework for Scotland 3 (NPF3) 2014.
- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) 2014 (paragraphs 135-151).
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (published 2019, finalised amended 2020).
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2/2011).
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2015:
 - LDP 3 – Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of our Environment.
 - LDP 6 – Supporting the Sustainable Growth of Renewables.
 - LDP 9 – Development Setting, Layout and Design.
- SG LDP ENV 15 – Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
- SG LDP ENV (16a) – Development Impact on Listed Buildings.
- SG LDP ENV 19 – Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
- SG LDP ENV 20 – Development Impact of Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 (Proposed Plan)
 - Policy 15: Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment.
 - Policy 16: Listed Buildings.
 - Policy 19: Scheduled Monuments.
 - Policy 20: Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
 - Policy 21: Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA 2014; updated 2020).
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021).
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019).
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment (HES, 2016).
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage⁴ (SNH) & HES, 2018).
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (IEMA, 2021).
- UK Forestry Standard: The Governments Approach to Sustainable Forestry (Forestry Commission, 2017).
- UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2011).
- Forests and Historic Environment: Information and Advice (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2016).
- Scotland's Woodlands and the Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2008).

Extent of the Study Area

9.3.6 Two study areas have been employed for the cultural heritage assessment:

- An Inner Study Area: the study area for consideration of potential direct impacts upon heritage assets, comprising a 200 m wide corridor centred on the proposed 275 kV overhead line (OHL) and a 100 m wide

⁴ Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has changed its name to NatureScot as of the 24th August 2020.

corridor centred on the proposed access track locations. A gazetteer of heritage assets within the Inner Study Area is provided as **Technical Appendix (TA) 9.1 (EIAR Volume 4)** and they are shown on **Figure 9.1a-h (EIAR Volume 3a)**.

- An Outer Study Area: the study area for consideration of impacts affecting the setting of heritage assets, using a 5 km wide corridor centred on the proposed 275 kV OHL. The 5 km study area is consistent with the ZTV study area employed by the Landscape and Visual Appraisal and has been agreed as being appropriate with HES and WoSAS (see details in **Table 9.1**). A 5 km Actual Tower Height (ATH) Bare-Earth ZTV⁵, a 5 km Standard Tower Height (STH)⁶ Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3a**), and a 5 km Actual Tower Height (ATH) plus 20% vertical LOD 'Bare-Earth' ZTV⁷ (**Figure 9.3, EIAR Volume 3a**) from the centre line of the proposed 275 kV OHL were used to indicate the number of towers that would be theoretically visible from heritage assets identified within the Outer Study Area. The STH Bare-Earth ZTV and the ATH plus 20% vertical LOD Bare-Earth ZTV were used to identify where greater numbers of towers would potentially be theoretical visible from heritage assets, if increased tower heights were utilised, and to present a worst-case scenario. A gazetteer of the heritage assets identified within the Outer Study Area is provided as **TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)**, which also provides a tabulated assessment of the predicted impacts on their settings.

Consultation Undertaken to Date

- 9.3.7 **Table 9.1** summarises the consultation responses received regarding cultural heritage interest and provides information on where and how they have been addressed in this assessment. The following organisations made comment on cultural heritage interest: HES, ABC, and WoSAS.
- 9.3.8 Full details on the consultation responses can be reviewed in **TA 4.3: Consultation Register (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Table 9.1: Consultation Responses

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
HES	EIA Scoping Opinion; 08/04/2021	HES welcomed the assessment of the potential effects on cultural heritage are scoped into the EIA.	Noted Assessment of the direct impacts of the Proposed Development on the heritage assets in the Inner Study Area is set out in Section 9.6: Construction Effects . Assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area is set out in Section 9.6: Operational Effects .
		Noted that one Scheduled Monument, Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), is located at the north end of the preferred route of the OHL and advised that any route alignment, including both the pylon structures and any ancillary developments, such as access tracks,	Noted In line with national policy the route of the Proposed Development (towers and infrastructure) has been designed to avoid any direct impacts on Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019).

⁵ Actual Tower Height (ATH) Bare-Earth ZTV based on the tower heights provided in the tower scheduled (refer to **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)** centred along the centre line of the proposed development LOD

⁶ Standard Height Bare-Earth ZTV assumes a maximum tower height of .60 m centred along the centre line of the proposed development LOD.

⁷ Actual Tower Height (ATH) Bare-Earth ZTV assumes a 20% increase in tower height provided in the tower schedule (refer to **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)** centred along the centre line of the proposed development LOD.

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
		should be designed to ensure that direct impacts on the designated heritage asset are avoided, in line with national policy.	
		Advised that they were content with the proposed 5 km Outer Study Area.	Noted The study areas used for the assessment are set out in Section 9.2: Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria .
		Advised that three Scheduled Monuments, Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) are likely to have potential adverse impacts on their settings from the Proposed Development and consider that photomontages are likely to be required to demonstrate the impacts on the settings of these heritage assets.	Noted Photomontage visualisations are provided for Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) from locations agreed with HES (Figures 9.5 and 9.10-9.11, EIAR Volume 3a). These are referenced, where applicable, in TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4) and in the assessment in Section 9.6 . A site visit (20/04/2021) to Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) found that commercial forestry currently surrounding the monument largely limits views out from the dun and it was considered that a photomontage would not adequately show the potential impact of the Proposed Development on its setting. Post-scoping consultation was carried out with HES (23/07/2021) to agree that a photo-wireline would be provided from the monument, and this is provided as Figure 9.9 (EIAR Volume 3a) .
		Welcomed that the Scoping Report identifies Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) and Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219) as key considerations to be included within the EIA and consider that photomontages are likely to be required to demonstrate the impacts on the settings of these heritage assets.	Noted Visualisations (photomontages/photo-wirelines and/or wirelines) are provided for each of these assets from locations agreed with HES (Figures 9.4-9.16, EIAR Volume 3a). A list of visualisations is provided in Table 9.5 and details on their locations and visualisation type (photo-wireline/wireline) is provided in TA 9.3 (EIAR Volume 4) . These are referenced where applicable in TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4) and in the assessment in Section 9.6 .

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
		<p>Requested that the assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the following heritage assets should consider if micro-siting of the Proposed Development within the proposed Limit of Deviation (LOD) might increase impacts on the asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019) • Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) • Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) • Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) • Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219) 	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is proposed that towers will be subject to a horizontal 100 m micro-siting allowance (LOD) either side of the alignment and a vertical LOD up to 20% variation of the tower heights provided in the tower scheduled (TA 2.1, EIAR Volume 4) to allow for flexibility in the final siting of individual towers.</p> <p>Movement of towers and infrastructure will be dependent on consideration of identified constraints and subject to advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECOW).</p> <p>Assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development within the 100 m micro-siting allowance is set out in Section 9.6.</p> <p>Proposed towers close to Scheduled Monuments: Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019) (Towers T39 - T42), and Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) (Towers T27 – T30) would not be micro-sited any closer to the Scheduled Monuments than currently located (Figure 9.1a-h, Volume 3a), in order to limit the impact of the Proposed Development on the settings of these Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>Section 9.6 includes an assessment of the potential effects of micro-siting proposed towers on the settings of: Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209), Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149), Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) and Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219).</p>
		<p>Recommended that the potential impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Category A Listed, St Conan's Church of Scotland, Lochawe (LB 4700) should be included in the EIA.</p> <p>Advised that the garden and terracing around the church are intended to take advantage of the scenic location and recommended that a visualisation from</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Assessment of the impact on the settings of St Conan's Church (LB 4700) is set out in Section 9.6 and in TA 9.2 (Volume 4).</p> <p>A wireline is provided for St Conan's Church of Scotland from the location agreed with HES (Figure 9.15, EIAR Volume 3a). A list of visualisations is provided in Table 9.5 and details on their</p>

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
		the area to the southeast of the church be included within the EIAR.	locations and visualisation type (photo-wireline/wireline) is provided in TA 9.3 (EIAR Volume 4) .
		<p>Recommended that the potential impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes (GDL), Ardanaiseig House (GDL 18) should be included in the EIA.</p> <p>Advised that there are important views from the GDL along and across Lochawe, and a historic relationship with Inishail, and Scheduled Monument, Inishail, Church, Cross and Burial Ground (SM 4184), which would likely be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Assessment of the impact on the settings of Ardanaiseig House (GDL 18) is set out in Section 9.6 and in TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4).</p> <p>A wireline is provided for Ardanaiseig House GDL from the location agreed with HES (Figure 9.13, EIAR Volume 3a).</p> <p>A list of cultural heritage visualisations included in the assessment is provided in Table 9.5 and details on visualisation types and locations are provided in TA 9.3 (EIAR Volume 4).</p>
HES	Post-Scoping Response; 06/08/2021	<p>Confirmed that they were content with the proposed cultural heritage viewpoints to be included in the EIAR and that there were no additional assets that they wish to add to the viewpoint list.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>A list of cultural heritage visualisations included in the assessment is provided in Table 9.5 and details on visualisation types and locations are provided in TA 9.3 (EIAR Volume 4).</p>
		<p>Confirmed that they were broadly content with Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) being assessed by photo-wireframe.</p> <p>Advised that HES were being consulted separately on a Long-Term Forest Plan that covers both with Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) and this plan includes felling and restocking in the vicinity of both monuments.</p> <p>Advised that this would likely result, in the short term at least, in there being clear-fell around Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teale Water (SM 4209), and between it and the Proposed Development, and that the screening effect of the commercial forestry would be short-term until the restocked area reaches a certain maturity.</p> <p>Requested that either a photomontage of inward views to Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) from the lower ground to the north and west (around Ardteatle area) be included in the EIAR or that the location of the dun be identified</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The impact of the Proposed Development on Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) is assessed in Section 9.6: Operational Effects.</p> <p>A photomontage showing the inward views from the lower ground to the west, looking along the Teatle Water to the dun, with the Proposed Development beyond the monument, is provided as Figure 9.10 (EIAR Volume 3a).</p> <p>The location of the dun is also shown on the visualisation (photomontage) taken from Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument (LB 1267). Figure 9.16 (EIAR Volume 3a) provides a low resolution copy of the visualisation showing the location of the dun, this visualisation should be viewed together with Figure 8.8k(EIAR Volume 3b).</p>

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
		on the photomontage from Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument Beacon Hill (LB 12167)	
		Advised that high level access is possible from the interior of Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) with views out over Loch Awe and requested that a visualisation be included in the EIAR that demonstrates the visual impact of the Proposed Development from the higher level.	Noted A wireline showing the outward views from the southeast tower of Kilchurn Castle looking toward the Proposed Development, is provided as Figure 9.12 . This should be viewed together with Figure 8.8d, (EIAR Volume 3b) (photomontage from the ground level of the castle).
HES	Preferred Alignment Opinion (Pre-Application Consultation) 13/08/2021	Noted that their preferred option is the baseline option as it presents the least impact on the setting of Scheduled Monuments, Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149). Advised that, whilst alignments GL1 to GL4 all lessen the impact on the setting of Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) compared to the baseline, these alignments would be closer to and uphill of Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and would therefore have an increased adverse impact on the more sensitive setting of this monument. Advised that alignment GL5 would increase the impact on the setting of Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), as it brings the Proposed Development closer to the monument and locates it at a greater altitude, thus increasing its prominence in outward views.	Noted Assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area is set out in Section 9.6 .
WoSAS	EIA Scoping Opinion 22/07/2021	Advised that they agree with the proposed methodology outlined in the Scoping Report cultural heritage chapter.	Noted The methodology and study areas used for the assessment are set out in Section 9.2: Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria .
ABC	EIA Scoping Opinion 16/11/2021	Advised that although the OHL route would be at a lower level than the Category B Listed Duncan Ban MacIntyre Monument (LB 12167) the scale and	Noted Assessment of the impact on the settings of Duncan Ban MacIntyre Monument

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
		<p>proximity of the OHL to the monument could be harmful to the setting of the Listed Building. As a local high point the setting and character of the monument is sensitive to what could be a large industrial scale infrastructure in close proximity to it.</p> <p>Requested that the potential impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Listed Building should be specifically scoped into the EIA and addressed in detail.</p>	<p>(LB 12167) is set out in Section 9.6 and in TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4).</p> <p>A photomontage is provided for this asset (Figure 8.8k, EIAR Volume 3b).</p>

Method of Baseline Data Collation

Desk Study

Inner Study Area

9.3.9 A detailed desk-based assessment was conducted for the Inner Study Area using a range of documentary, archival and bibliographic sources. Up-to-date information was obtained from appropriate sources on the locations and extents of heritage assets with statutory protection and non-statutory designations within the study area. Sources included:

- ABC Historic Environment Record (HER): a digital database extract was obtained in March 2020 for all assets within 5 km of the Proposed Development;
- National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) Scotland online database (Canmore) (HES, 2021a⁸): checked for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
- Historic Environment Scotland Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2021b⁹): provided up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, and Historic Battlefields;
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap; HES, 2021c¹⁰): for information on the historic land use character of the Inner Study Area;
- National Library of Scotland Map Library: for Ordnance Survey maps (principally 1st and 2nd edition) and other historic maps;
- Modern aerial photographic imagery available through Google Earth and Bing Maps; and
- Relevant bibliographic references and on-line historic resources, consulted to provide background and historic information.

9.3.10 Details of the sources consulted during the desk-based assessment are provided in **TA 9.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

9.3.11 Desk-based assessment (using the resources listed above) was completed for associated infrastructure that lay out with the Inner Study Area. This included proposed tree felling areas and access tracks comprising new permanent, new temporary and existing access track upgrades. No heritage assets or areas of high sensitivity were identified within proximity to these associated infrastructure locations (**Figure 9.1a-h (EIAR Volume 3a)**).

⁸ HES (2021a) Historic Environment Scotland's National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore), available at: <http://pastmap.org.uk> (Accessed March 2021)

⁹ HES (2021b) Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> (Accessed March 2021)

¹⁰ HES (2021c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap), available at: <http://hlapmap.org.uk> (Accessed March 2021).

Outer Study Area

- 9.3.12 Up-to-date information was obtained from HES and the ABC HER on statutory and non-statutory designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area.
- 9.3.13 The Bare-Earth ZTV map generated for the Proposed Development was utilised to identify those designated assets within the Outer Study Area that would have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

Field Survey

- 9.3.14 A reconnaissance walk-over field survey was carried out for the whole of the Inner Study Area where the Proposed Development crosses areas of open moorland, rough and improved pasture, and woodland. Targeted field survey was carried out to inspect previously recorded heritage assets identified during the desk-based assessment, that are now located in areas of commercial forestry, where access was possible. Areas of dense plantation were excluded from the walkover survey due to access difficulties.
- 9.3.15 The field survey was undertaken between 19 – 23 April 2021, with the following aims:
- Assess the baseline condition of the known heritage assets identified by the desk-based assessment;
 - Identify any further features of cultural heritage interest not detected from the desk-based assessment that could be affected by the Proposed Development; and
 - Identify areas with the potential to contain currently unrecorded buried archaeological remains.
- 9.3.16 No intrusive archaeological interventions have been carried out as part of this assessment.
- 9.3.17 The positions of assets (and where appropriate their extents) identified during the survey were logged using a Global Positioning System (GPS) device with sub-metre accuracy. The baseline condition of identified assets was recorded on pro-forma monument recording sheets and by digital photography.
- 9.3.18 Site visits to assess the character and sensitivity of the setting of selected heritage assets in the Outer Study Area (Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3a) were also undertaken between the 19 – 23 April 2021. The site visits focused on those heritage assets with the most potential to receive significant effects on their settings (i.e. those closest to the Proposed Development and those considered, on preliminary analysis, to potentially be the most sensitive to change within their settings from analyses of the Bare-Earth ZTVs, including those identified by consultees as requiring assessment). Cultural Heritage Viewpoints
- 9.3.19 Twelve viewpoints (**Figures 9.3-9.11, EIAR Volume 3a**) were identified for designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, where the assets were considered to be potentially sensitive to changes to their setting arising as a result of the Proposed Development. Details on the locations and visualisation type of each viewpoint is provided in **TA 9.3 (EIAR Volume 4)**. The heritage assets and viewpoint locations to be represented were agreed through consultation with HES and WoSAS (see **Table 9.1**, for summary of consultation responses) and from site visits. In addition, cross-reference is made to Landscape and Visual (LVIA) viewpoints where appropriate (details of LVIA VPs cross-referenced within the following assessment are provided in **Table 9.5**).

Assessment of Potential Effect Significance

Criteria for Assessment of Effects

- 9.3.20 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). The assessment takes into account the value/sensitivity of the heritage asset and its setting and the magnitude of the predicted impact.
- 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.

- 9.3.21 The assessment of significance of effects has been undertaken using two key criteria: the 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.

Criteria for Assessing the Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

- 9.3.22 Cultural heritage assets are given weight through the designation process. Designation 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 designation and its laws and policies (HES, 2019¹¹).
- 9.3.23 **Table 9.2** summarises the relative sensitivity of those heritage assets relevant to the Proposed Development, excluding in this instance Word Heritage Sites and Marine Resources.

Table 9.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity of Assets	Definition / Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes; Inventory Historic Battlefields; and Non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designations.
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, including: Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks); Category B Listed Buildings; and Conservation Areas.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: Archaeological sites that have local heritage value; Category C Listed Buildings; and Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics.
Negligible	Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value, including: Artefact find-spots (where the artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain); and Poorly preserved examples of particular types of features (e.g. quarried and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc)

Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impact

- 9.3.24 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) are presented in **Table 9.3**.

¹¹ HES (2019) 'Designation Policy and Selection Guidance', Edinburgh.

Table 9.3: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
High	<p>Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of the asset's cultural significance.</p> <p>Changes that substantially detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>	<p>Preservation of a heritage asset in situ where it would otherwise be completely or almost completely lost.</p> <p>Changes that appreciably enhance the cultural significance of a heritage asset and how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>
Medium	<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 appreciably altered.</p> <p>Changes that appreciably detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Changes that improve the way in which the heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>
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	<p>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.</p>	

Assessing Effects on Setting

9.3.25 Historic Environment Scotland guidance, 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting', 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".

9.3.26 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".

9.3.27 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.

Criteria for Assessing Cumulative Effects

- 9.3.28 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 designations and non-statutory designations within the Outer Study Area, in addition to the likely effects of cumulative development. **Figure 14.1: Cumulative Development (Volume 3a)** illustrates the Proposed Development along with other cumulative developments within 10 km of the Proposed Development.
- 9.3.29 Operational, under construction developments, and existing 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.
- 9.3.30 Other cumulative development which are consented (not yet constructed), at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable (including Creag Dubh Substation, Creag Dubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL connection, Creag Dubh Substation connection to existing 132 kV Taynuilt to Inveraray OHL connection and the Blarghour Wind Farm Connection) are considered as being potential additions to the baseline and are considered in the cumulative impact assessment (for details on Cumulative Developments considered within this assessment see **Chapter 14: Cumulative Effect (EIAR Volume 2)**).
- 9.3.31 The assessment takes into account the relative scales (i.e. size, number of turbines, etc) of the various development, their distance from the affected asset, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets of the various developments.

Criteria for Assessing Significance

- 9.3.32 The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 9.2**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 9.3**) are used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect (direct effect or effect on setting), summarised using the formula set out in the matrix in **Table 9.4**. 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 level of significance.

Table 9.4 Significance of Effect

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

- 9.3.33 Major and Moderate effects are considered to be significant for the purposes of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations). Minor and Negligible effects are considered to be 'not significant'.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 9.3.34 The desk-based assessment draws on the records in the ABC HER, provided in digital Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset acquired in March 2020 ahead of the field survey. It is assumed that the data provided was up to date at the time it was acquired. It is unlikely that there have been significant changes to the dataset since it was acquired, and it is assumed to be a reliable and accurate reflection of the recorded cultural heritage for the purpose of the study.

- 9.3.35 Field survey has not been carried out along proposed access track locations where these would utilise existing tracks. The desk-based assessment that covered these areas has not identified any heritage assets or areas of high sensitivity in proximity to those access locations. Consequently, field survey has not been necessary to inform appropriate mitigation proposals for these areas, details of which are set out below.
- 9.3.36 Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3a**) have been identified from the HES database and downloaded from the HES website¹² in March 2021. This data is assumed to have been up to date at the time of its acquisition.

9.4 Baseline Conditions

Inner Study Area

- 9.4.1 In total, 31 heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area.
- 9.4.2 Numbers in brackets in the following text, refer to asset numbers shown on **Figure 9.1a-h (EIAR Volume 3a)**.
- 9.4.3 Full descriptions, and an assessment of their value/sensitivity, are provided in **TA 9.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

General Observations

- 9.4.4 There are no Scheduled Monuments (SM) or Listed Buildings (LB) within the Inner Study Area and the Inner Study Area does not cross any Conservation Area (CA), Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), or Inventory Historic Battlefield (HB).
- 9.4.5 There are no heritage assets of prehistoric date within the Inner Study Area. The majority of the assets identified within the Inner Study Area are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities.

Medieval or Later Land Use Features

Settlement

- 9.4.6 Field survey identified the remains of two possible building platforms (CFA030a-b) within a relatively flat area of rough pasture to the southeast of Brackley Farm and just east of an unnamed watercourse. All that survives of the possible buildings are grass-covered platforms, and no building structures or internal features are visible. The remains of a curvilinear stone and turf bank (CFA030c) were identified c.7 m to the west of the building platforms, running parallel with the adjacent watercourse. No settlement or buildings are shown at this location on historic maps and the function and date of the buildings are unknown. As features of the historic farming landscape, they are assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
- 9.4.7 Field survey identified the remains of a possible building (CFA023) at the edge of an improved pasture field southeast of Achlian farm. The structure, which measures c.9 m by 7 m, is oval in plan and defined by a stone and turf bank, 1 m wide and 0.2 m-0.4 m high. The function of the structure is unknown, but it appears that it underlies the drystone wall which now encloses the pasture field, demonstrating that the structure is earlier in date than the present field boundary which is shown on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874). Given the overall shape of the structure, it is possible that it is the remains of a medieval building, as such it is assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.

¹² Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> (Accessed March 2021)

- 9.4.8 The HER and Canmore database records that the presence of a possible farmstead (44180), comprising a single unroofed building and an associated field, is shown on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874) to the south of Easa Ghaill River. What maybe the faint outline of the building (44180a) is visible on modern aerial photographs (GoogleEarth) dating to 2005, located at the edge of commercial forestry; while the field (44180b) is no longer visible on modern aerial photographs (Bing) in what is now an area of commercial forestry and ploughing in advance of forestry planting in this area is likely to have disturbed or removed the field. As the remains of a former local farmstead which former part of the historic farming landscape, the asset is considered to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
- 9.4.9 A group of three sheiling huts (44203), is depicted on the first and second edition maps (1874 & 1897) to the north of the Galla Bheag. 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. Shieling huts are usually associated with medieval or post-medieval summer grazing activity and are components of the local historical landscape, as such they are assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.

Agrarian Features

- 9.4.10 Several areas of relict rig and furrow cultivation remains (CFA003, CFA022, CFA008 and CFA015) within the Inner Study Area are visible on aerial photographic imagery (Google Earth). The cultivation remains survive primarily within areas of moorland/rough pasture to the southwest of Cladich (CFA003), to the northwest of the former township at Bovay (WoSAS HER Ref: 44811), to the southwest of Achlian Farm (CFA022 and CFA008) and surrounding the former township at Auchtermally (SM 4019) and Brackley Farm. The rig varies in preservation, ranging from 2 m-4 m wide from crest to crest and 0.1 m-0.3 m high. A number of stone and turf banks, ranging in size from c. 0.3 m-0.5 m high and 1 m-1.5 m wide, were recorded along with the rig and furrow cultivation (including CFA003, CFA014, CFA024, CFA025, CFA013 and CFA029) and these likely once enclosed the areas of rig and furrow. In addition, the field survey identified two areas of possible lynchets (CFA008d and CFA013a) measuring c. 1 m-2 m wide and following the contours of two small hillocks. Unenclosed areas of cultivation are depicted on Roy's 'Military Survey of Scotland' map (1747-55) surrounding the main settlements within Loch Awe valley, including Cladich, Achlian and Brackley, indicating that the cultivation remains are of at least mid-18th century in date. As relicts of post-medieval, and possibly earlier, cultivation, the rig and furrow, field banks, and lynchets are assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
- 9.4.11 A field system, comprising a series of drystone walls (CFA005a-g), that define several rectangular fields to the southeast of Achlian Farm, is shown on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874). These walls were likely constructed during the improvement period, in the late-18th to 19th century, when the land surrounding Achlian was enclosed. Field survey recorded the presence of three drystone walls (CFA005b-c and CFA005e) that still survive; albeit they are all tumbled and in varying conditions along their lengths. Four additional walls recorded within the Inner Study Area from the Ordnance Survey first edition map (CFA005a, CFA005d, CFA005f and CFA005g) in this area no longer survive; walls (CFA005d, f and g) have been replaced by modern post and wire fences. As a feature of the historic landscape, the field system is assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
- 9.4.12 Field survey recorded an additional stretch of drystone wall (CFA027) crossing rough pasture to the north of Barran. Only the poorly preserved footings of the wall survive, spread 1 m wide and 0.5 m (max) high. Given the poor condition of the wall it is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.13 An enclosure (CFA009) is shown on the first edition map (1874) surrounding the deserted croft at Dychlie (SM 5149) and likely originally defined the extent of the land associated with the croft. Field survey found that no remains of the enclosure (CFA009b) survive where it falls within the Inner Study Area. The section of enclosure wall that once ran along the south bank of the Teatle Water, north of the croft buildings, has been removed by water erosion and there was no evidence for any wall or bank surviving within the commercial forestry plantation to the west, where access was possible. As no remains of the former enclosure (CFA009b) now survive it is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

- 9.4.14 An irregular shaped enclosure (or field) (CFA016) is shown on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874) surrounding Auchtermally township (SM 4019) defining the extent of the improved land around the township. Field survey found that sections of this enclosure still survive within the Inner Study Area, preserved as a tumbled drystone wall footing, running from OSGR¹³ 217289, 726131 to OSGR 217290, 7261674, and then continuing as a stone and turf bank running parallel with an unnamed watercourse. There are no upstanding remains to the north side of the enclosure. As the enclosure is associated with the pre-improvement township it is assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
- 9.4.15 A rectangular enclosure (CFA031) is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first edition (1874) immediately south of the Easa Ghaill River, but not shown on the second edition map (1894). No remains of the enclosure are visible on modern aerial photographs (Bing) in what is now an area of commercial forestry. As a minor element of the former farming landscape the enclosure is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.16 Three sheepfolds (CFA002a, CFA006 and CFA032) are depicted on the Ordnance Survey first edition (1874) and second (1897) edition maps, the first to the south of Cladich, the second southwest of Achlian Farm and the third.
- Both sheepfolds were identified during the field survey.
- The first (CFA002a) to the south of Cladich lies outwith the Inner Study Area and was not recorded in detail; a wall (CFA002b) visible running from an unnamed watercourse to this sheepfold and then continuing to terminate at the Cladich River, was recorded partially within the Inner Study Area surviving as a tumbled drystone wall, 0.5 m-0.8 m high. As generally well-preserved features of the historic landscape, the sheepfold (CFA002a) and associated wall (CFA002b) are assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.
 - Fragments of the original second sheepfold (CFA006), as shown on the second edition map to the southwest of Achlian Farm, still survive, although the structure has been modified over the years and is now partially brick built. A series of modern fences have also been added to the sheepfold to extend the area utilised. As little of the original structure survives, it is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
 - The third sheepfold (CFA032) is visible on modern aerial photographs to the south of an existing forestry access track. Examination of the second edition map (1897) indicates that the original four compartment sheepfold, shown on the first edition map, had been extended by the late 19th century. As a generally well-preserved feature of the historic landscape, the sheepfold is assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.

Former Roads/Trackways and Footpaths

- 9.4.17 The HER and Canmore entries record that the route of a former drove road (13857) is shown on a map of the Duke of Argyll's estate dating to 1734 (Cowley, 1734) running along Glen Aray from Inveraray Castle to Loch Awe. It appears that the drove road (13857) follows the same route as the later mid-18th century Dumbarton to Tyndrum Military Road (21742/21747), shown on Roy's map (1747-55). Field survey recorded that two sections of the former military road (21742) survive as visible remains, on either side of the modern road alignment, centred at OSGR 209934, 7211029. The military road measures c.6 m-7 m wide and there are sections of turf and stone bank running along either side. The former road surface is now covered in turf but there is evidence in places for an original metalled surface. The section of military road (21742) that survives to the west of the modern road alignment is generally well-preserved, the other section (21742), to the east of the modern road alignment, is covered in trees and harder to distinguish. The generally well-preserved remains of a former military road (formerly the route of the earlier drove road (13857) is assessed as being of heritage value at the regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

¹³ Ordnance Survey Grid Reference (OSGR)

- 9.4.18 Additional sections of the former military road (21742/21747/21750) are recorded within the Inner Study Area, at Creag Dhubh forest, between Ardteatle and Leac na Ceardaich, and east of Dalmally respectively. These sections are overlain by modern forest access tracks or by the A85 public road and no remains of the former military road are visible. It is likely that construction of the current forest access tracks and public road where they follow the route of the former military road has disturbed the remains of the former road, although there is the possibility that buried remains may still survive below the present track/road surfaces. As the route of a former military road is still discernible on the ground in these areas, these sections of military road are assessed as being of heritage value at the regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.
- 9.4.19 Roy's map (1747-55) depicts the route of a former road (CFA020) running from Dalmally to Garren Bridge, Inveraray. The road is shown crossing farmland/moorland to the south of Dalmally and passing east of Barran. The road is not shown on the later historic maps (Ordnance Survey first and second editions) and the exact route of the former road is not known. Field survey found no visible remains of the road within the Inner Study Area, and it is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.20 Field survey recorded two short sections of a former track (CFA026 and CFA028) running from the Allt an Daimh burn to the east and along the slopes of two hillocks. The trackway is c.2 m wide and peters out in rough pasture. The track runs passed an area of lynchets (CFA013a) and it was likely a former farm access track leading to the cultivation area. Little now survives of the trackway, and it is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.21 A footpath (CFA001) is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first (1874) and second (1897) edition maps, running north from Taynafead to Ardbrecknish. No remains of the footpath were visible during the field survey in what is now an area of commercial forestry plantation. The former footpath is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

Miscellaneous Features

- 9.4.22 Field survey recorded the presence of a former quarry (CFA021) immediately west of the old Military Road (21742). It was irregular in plan, measuring c.4 m deep and grass-covered, with no working faces visible. It was likely used as a source of stone for the construction of the adjacent military road. It is assessed to be of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.23 A 'stone' (CFA018) is depicted just north of 'Auchtermally' township on the Ordnance Survey second edition map (1900). The stone is not visible on modern aerial photographs (Google Earth) in an area of pasture, and it is assessed as being of little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 9.4.24 The route of the Callander and Oban Railway line (CFA018) is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first (1874) and second (1900) edition maps, running along the southern side of Glen Orchy. The railway line was opened in 1870 and is still in use today. As a feature of the historic landscape, the railway is assessed as being of heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.

Archaeological Potential of the Inner Study Area

- 9.4.25 HLAMap (HES 2021¹⁴) records that much of the Inner Study Area is covered in 20th century commercial forestry plantation although some areas of open moorland and pasture still survive, at Cladich, Achlian, Blarchaorian, Barran and Brackley (**Figure 9.1a-h, EIAR Volume 3a**).
- 9.4.26 Field survey found that upstanding cultivation remains survive within the areas of moorland and rough pasture that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century. The remains of former pre-improvement townships and 18th century farmsteads along with the remains of their associated field systems (field banks, clearance cairns, sheepfolds, etc) also survive within these areas, particularly around Achlian and at Brackley.

¹⁴ HES (2021) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland HLAMap, available at: <http://hlapmap.org.uk/>, accessed October 2021

- 9.4.27 In areas where the Proposed Development crosses areas of modern commercial forestry plantation the potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to survive is considered to be negligible. Forestry ploughing and drainage works, as well as subsequent tree root growth, the effects of wind-throw and forestry harvesting, are likely to have disturbed or destroyed the integrity of any surviving buried archaeological deposits in these areas.
- 9.4.28 In those areas that have been undisturbed by modern commercial forestry, particularly in moorland/rough pasture areas at Achlian and Brackley, it is considered that there is a low to moderate potential for further buried archaeology to survive. Taking into account the limited land-take required by the separate elements of the Proposed Development, the likelihood of encountering hitherto undiscovered sites of archaeological importance during the course of the construction work is assessed to be low.

Outer Study Area

- 9.4.29 Based on analysis of the ATH Bare-Earth ZTV, and as shown in **Figure 9.2 (EIAR Volume 3a)** and detailed in **TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)**, there are 38 designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, these are:
- 25 Scheduled Monuments (24 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
 - 2 Category A Listed Buildings (both with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
 - 6 Category B Listed Buildings (four with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
 - 4 Category C listed Buildings (two with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development); and
 - 1 Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (with some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).
- 9.4.30 In addition, there are six non-statutory heritage assets (four 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.
- 9.4.31 Comparison of the ATH Bare-Earth ZTV, STH Bare-Earth ZTV, and ATH plus 20% LOD ZTV (**TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)**) 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.

Future Baseline

- 9.4.32 If the Proposed Development was not to proceed, there will likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets that presently exist within the Inner and Outer Study Areas. Current agricultural land-use will most likely continue and there will be no change to the character of the heritage assets, other than the erosion of features through natural processes and agricultural activities. The current rough pasture and moorland land-use (on higher ground) will also likely continue, limiting the potential for disturbance to heritage assets, and only natural decay (weathering and erosion) will affect the surviving upstanding remains.
- 9.4.33 Commercial forestry land-use will also be likely to 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 will be subject to the normal requirements of UK Forestry Standards and will 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. It is probable that only natural decay through erosion or arising from tree planting will occur to surviving remains within forested areas.

9.5 Issues Scoped Out

- 9.5.1 Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas and Historic Battlefields has been scoped out. There are no assets with those designations within 5 km of the Proposed Development.

9.6 Mitigation by Design

- 9.6.1 The results of the desk-based assessment and field survey were digitised as GIS data, showing the locations (and where relevant, the extent) of heritage assets. The layout of the Proposed Development, including the positioning of proposed towers and the siting of other infrastructure, has subsequently been designed to avoid or minimise direct effects and to minimise effects on the settings of heritage assets as far as possible. The layout shown on **Figure 9.1a-h: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**, therefore embeds design mitigation into the siting of the proposed towers and the ancillary infrastructure.
- 9.6.2 One of the design considerations was to ensure that the Proposed Development (towers and infrastructure) was routed to avoid any direct impacts on the Scheduled Monument Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019).
- 9.6.3 Proposed towers close to three Scheduled Monuments: Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh Deserted Township (SM 4209) (Towers T39 – T42), Tom a’Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209), and Dychlie deserted crofts (SM 5149) (Towers T27 – T30) would not be micrositied any closer to the Scheduled Monuments than currently located (see proposed tower locations on **Figure 9.1a-h, EIAR Volume 3a**) in order to limit the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of these Scheduled Monuments.

9.7 Potential Effects

Construction Effects

Assumptions for Potential Construction Effects

- 9.7.1 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 impacts on heritage assets.
- 9.7.2 The potential adverse, permanent, and irreversible direct impacts identified below would result primarily from ground disturbance associated with the erection of the OHL towers and construction of and upgrading of access tracks close to recorded heritage assets shown on **Figure 9.1a-h: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**.
- 9.7.3 For the purpose of this assessment, potential direct (construction) impacts have been based on the proposed OHL alignment, indicative tower locations, and access track locations shown on **Figure 9.1a-h: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**.
- 9.7.4 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 section tower locations and within 80 m for angle towers, to take into account working areas around towers and vehicle movement at these locations;
 - Where heritage assets lie alongside, or close to, proposed access track locations, including where the proposed access tracks run along the line of the proposed OHL;
 - Where heritage assets lie within proposed forestry felling areas (see **Chapter 11: Forestry (EIAR Volume 2)**); and
 - Where heritage assets lie within, or lie close to, proposed tension pull-through working areas, proposed temporary diversion and proposed tie in with existing Dalmally to Inverarnan OHL.

Micrositing (Limit of Deviation)

- 9.7.5 It is the intention that the Proposed Development would be subject to a Limit of Deviation (LOD) of 100 m in either direction along the Proposed Alignment, measured from each pole centre, and 50 m around proposed access track locations. This permits detailed design and construction activities to avoid environmental constraints or physical features as required (see **Chapter 2: Description of Proposed Development**). Movement of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would, be dependent upon consideration of identified constraints in the micrositing area and subject to advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). No micrositing of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be undertaken where this could potentially affect cultural heritage interests without consultation with an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW), who would advise on the acceptability of any proposed realignments, and consultation with the Council Archaeologist to agree appropriate mitigation where there are potential impacts as a result.

Potential Direct (Construction) Effects: Inner Study Area

- 9.7.6 Thirty-one non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area and it is assessed that there is potential, in the absence of mitigation, for construction works to result in direct impacts on fourteen of these. These are:
- The tumbled remains of a drystone wall (CFA002b), of low sensitivity, lie within the proposed 80 m working area around the proposed tension Tower T6, are within 12 m of the proposed access track between Towers T5 and T6, and are intersected by the proposed access track to Tower T9. Construction works for the proposed tower and along the proposed access tracks would disturb small sections of the tumbled wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of no more than of negligible magnitude, resulting in an effect of **negligible** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
 - The remains of a former field bank (CFA003a), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working area around Tower T7. The field bank forms part of a larger field system, comprising several field banks (CFA003a-CFA003d) and areas of relict rig and furrow cultivation remains, that survive within moorland to the south of Cladich. Construction works would disturb a small section of the southern end of the field bank, but the majority of the field bank and the remaining field system would be preserved in situ. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of no more than negligible magnitude, resulting in an effect of **negligible** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
 - The remains of a section of the former mid-18th century military road (21742), of medium sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working area around Tower T9. Construction works for the proposed tower would disturb part of this section of the military road. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of medium sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, as only a small section of the overall military road would be affected. The resulting effect would be of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
 - The route of a former military road (21742 and 21747) (and route of former drove road (13857)) and other sections of former military road (21742 and 21747) underlie existing forestry access tracks that require upgrading as part of the Proposed Development at Creag Dhubh forestry, Achlian, and between Creagan Chaorach and Leac na Ceardaich, respectively. No visible remains of the former road survive along these sections of existing forestry tracks but there is some potential that buried remains may survive below the present track surfaces. Any remains present could potentially be exposed or disturbed by upgrading/road widening works along the existing forestry track. If buried remains of the former road (13857/21742 and 21747) do survive, and are encountered, it is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct impact, on an asset of medium sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately identified and recorded.

- Two sections of drystone wall (CFA005c and CFA005e), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the proposed access tracks between Towers T21 and T24. Construction works along the proposed access track would disturb the walls. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- An area of relict rig and furrow cultivation remains (CFA008a) of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the proposed access track running between Towers T23 and T24. Construction works along the proposed access track would disturb the former cultivation remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- An area of poorly preserved relict rig and furrow cultivation remains (CFA022), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the working area around Tower T22. Construction works for the proposed tower would disturb the rig and furrow remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- A field bank (CFA025), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working area around Tower T30 and by the proposed access track to Tower T30. Construction works for the proposed tower, and along the proposed access track, would disturb the northern end of the field bank. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- The remains of a section of former trackway (CFA028), of negligible sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working area around Tower T38. Construction works for the proposed tower would disturb a small section of the eastern end of the track. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of negligible sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **negligible** significance. No mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset.
- An area of possible lynchets (CFA013a) and an associated field bank (CFA013b), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working area around Tower T38 and by the proposed access track to Tower T38. Construction works for the proposed tower and along the proposed access track would disturb a small part of the lynchets and field bank. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- Small areas of poorly preserved relict rig and furrow cultivation remains (CFA015), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the 50 m working areas around Towers T40 and T42 and by the proposed access tracks to Towers T40 and T43. The relict rig and furrow is part of a larger field system comprising several field banks and areas of rig and furrow cultivation that survive to the southeast of Brackley. Construction works for the proposed towers and along the proposed access tracks would disturb only small sections of the rig and furrow remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation to avoid or reduce the predicted effect is set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- An enclosure (CFA016), of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the proposed access track running between Towers T40 and T41. Construction works along the proposed access track would disturb only a small section of the enclosure (tumbled stone wall) and the bulk of the enclosure would be preserved in situ. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation to avoid or reduce the predicted effect is set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.
- A group of shieling huts (44203) of low sensitivity, which lie within c.7 m of an existing access track that may require to be upgraded as part of the Proposed Development. Any widening works along the section of proposed access track where it passes the shieling huts could potentially disturb the remains of the shieling

huts. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude resulting in an effect of **moderate** significance. Mitigation to avoid or reduce the predicted effect is set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.

- A sheepfold (CFA032), of low sensitivity, which lies within c.7 m of an existing access track that may require to be upgraded as part of the proposed Development. Any widening works along the section of proposed access track where it passes the sheepfold could potentially disturb the sheepfold. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude resulting in an effect of **minor** significance. Mitigation to avoid or reduce the predicted effect is set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.

9.7.7 If proposed towers or proposed access track locations were to be relocated within the LOD, there are nine additional heritage assets that could potentially fall within workings areas around proposed tower positions and be directly affected by construction operations. These are:

- Field banks (CFA003c and CFA003d), and associated rig and furrow, could potentially be affected if Towers T7 and T8 are moved to the north and northwest respectively. The field banks and associated rig and furrow form part of a larger field system surviving in moorland to the southeast of Cladich and only a small part of the overall field system would be affected. Consequently, the possible impact is assessed as potentially being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- Walls (CFA005b) could potentially be affected if Tower T19 and the proposed access track between Towers T19 and T20 is moved to the southwest. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- Rig and furrow (CFA008a and CFA008c) could potentially be affected if Tower T23 is moved southwest and an area of former lynchets (CFA008d) could potentially be affected if Tower T23 is moved to the northeast. The possible impact is assessed as being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- A possible building (CFA023) could potentially be affected if Tower T24 and proposed access track between Towers T23 and T24 are moved southeast. The possible impact is assessed as being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **moderate** significance.
- A section of former track (CFA026) could potentially be affected if Tower T37 is moved to the east and if the proposed access track between Towers T37 and T38 is moved to the southeast. The possible impact is assessed as being of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an effect of **negligible** significance.
- Bank (CFA029) could potentially be affected if Tower T40 is moved to the northwest. The possible impact is assessed as being of medium magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- Field bank (CFA015a), and associated rig and furrow, could potentially be affected if Towers T41 is moved to the north and T45 is moved to the northwest. The field bank and associated rig and furrow form part of a larger field system surviving in pastureland to the south/southeast of Brackley and only a small part of the overall field system would be affected. Consequently, the possible impact is assessed as potentially being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- Enclosure (CFA016) could potentially be affected if T41 is moved to the west. The possible impact is assessed as being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- Farmstead (CFA030) could potentially be affected if Tower T44 is moved to the northeast. The possible impact is assessed as being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **moderate** significance.

9.7.8 Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effects described above are set out in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**.

- 9.7.9 In addition to the impacts identified above, there is the possibility that any ground disturbing works in areas required for construction of the OHL connections could disturb or destroy hitherto recorded buried archaeological remains present in affected areas. It has been assessed that there is a low to moderate potential of encountering buried remains where the Proposed Development crosses moorland/pasture areas, particularly at Achlian and at Brackley) and a negligible potential in areas of modern commercial forestry plantation. Mitigation is proposed below to address the possibility of discoveries of buried archaeological remains. Based on the evidence acquired, it is assessed that there is a low likelihood 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, resulting in a potential for moderate adverse effects prior to adoption of any mitigation. Measures are proposed in **Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately addressed.

Setting Effects during Construction

- 9.7.10 Construction activity such as pull-through/machine positions, scaffolding and temporary access tracks have the potential to indirectly affect the setting of sites of heritage assets both within the LOD (Inner Study Area) and in the Outer Study Area. These construction activities, would be temporary, resulting in a short-term/low impact effect on heritage assets within the LOD and the Outer Study Area and would have no permanent effects. Therefore, indirect temporary impacts have not been assessed on a site-by-site basis.

Operational Effects

Direct Operational Effects

- 9.7.11 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 these works.

Setting Effects during Operation

- 9.7.12 The Proposed Development could result in adverse effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets, both within the Inner Study Area and in the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the site. At distances greater than 5 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.
- 9.7.13 **TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)** contains tabulated assessments of the predicted effects on the settings of designated assets and non-designated heritage assets, considered to be of national heritage importance in the HER (NSR Sites Code C and V), from which there is some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development based on analysis of the Bare-Earth ZTVs (**Figures 9.2-9.3, EIAR Volume 3a**).
- 9.7.14 There are no heritage assets beyond 5 km from the Proposed Development that have been identified through appraisal of the Bare-Earth ZTVs or notified through consultation with HES and WoSAS that require consideration of potential impacts on their settings.
- 9.7.15 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 cultural heritage assets shown on **Figures 9.2-9.3 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. For the methodology used for assessment of potential effect significance refer to **Section 9.2**).

9.7.16 The following discussion addresses those assets where potentially significant adverse effects have been identified through the tabulated assessment and those assets identified by HES as requiring detailed consideration, even where the significance of the predicted effect is assessed as being not significant in EIA terms. The assessments are supported with cultural heritage visualisations (**Figures 9.4-9.16, EIAR Volume 3a**) and by reference to the LVIA photo-wirelines listed in **Table 9.5**. The visualisations are referenced in the tabulated assessment set out in **TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)**, where relevant, and are referenced in the assessment below. The visualisations have been produced to show theoretical views of the Proposed Development from each asset, based on the ATH height provided in **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**. Further explanation of the method used in generating these visualisations is included within **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Volume 2**.

Table 9.5 Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (details on visualisation type and location of visualisation of cultural heritage viewpoints is provided in TA 9.3)¹⁵

Figure Ref.	Figure Title – Asset Name (& Ref. No)
Figure 9.4 (CH 1)	Glenorchy Parish Church, Churchyard and Tombstones (SM 3810) & Glenorchy Kirk Clachan An Diseart (LB 12192)
Figure 9.5 (CH 2)	Autermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019)
Figure 9.6 (CH 3)	Carn Ban, Cairn (SM 4048)
Figure 9.7 (CH 4)	Inishail, Church, Cross & Burial Ground (SM 4184)
Figure 9.8 (CH 5)	Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone (SM 4186)
Figure 9.9 & 9.10 (CH 6 & CH 7)	Tom a'Chaistel Dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209)
Figure 9.11 (CH 8)	Dychlie Deserted Crofts (SM 5149)
Figure 9.12 (CH 9)	Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179 & PiC)
Figure 9.13 (CH 10)	Aranaiseig House GDL (GDL 18)
Figure 9.14 (CH 11)	Cladich Chambered Cairn (HER 1778)
Figure 9.15 (CH 12)	St Conan's Church of Scotland (LB 4700)
Figure 9.16 (CH 13)	Low resolution photo-wireline showing location of Tom A'Chaisteal (SM 4209) in views from Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument (LB 12167)
Figure 8.8i (LVIA 9)	Froach Eilean Castle (SM 2219)
Figure 8.8d (LVIA 4)	Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179 & PiC)
Figure 8.8k (LVIA 11)	Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument Beacon Hill (LB 12167)
Figure 8.8n (LVIA 14)	Ardanaisig House (LB 12182)

Inner Study Area

9.7.17 There are no heritage assets within the Inner Study Area where consideration of the impact on their setting is warranted. The majority of these assets are all minor historical settlement or agrarian features that form elements of the local historical landscape. They are assessed overall as being of no more than of value at the local level and of low sensitivity and are considered to have localised settings that would not be significantly adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

¹⁵ Visualisations have been produced to show the predicted visibility of the proposed towers based on the actual tower heights provided in **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Outer Study Area

- 9.7.18 There are eight designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (six Scheduled Monuments (Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219), Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal, Dun (SM 4209), Dychlie, Deserted Crofts (SM 5149) and Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179)); one Category A Listed Building (St Conan's Church (LB 4700)), one Category B Listed Building (Duncan Ban Monument (LB 12167)) and one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (Ardanaiseig House (GDL 18), that HES and ABC requested be focused upon in the assessment. Each of these is discussed in detail below.

Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219) (Figure 8.8i (LVIA 9))

- 9.7.19 This monument comprises the ruins of a medieval castle that occupies the plateau summit of the northeast eminence of Fraoch Eilean Isle within Loch Awe. The Castle, which dates to at least the 13th century, comprises the remains of a hall house, ancillary buildings, and a curtain wall along with later buildings associated with reuse of the site in the 17th century. The Castle stands in a strategic defensive position and would have controlled movement along Loch Awe and the Pass of Brander. The Castle is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level, as the well-preserved ruins of a late-medieval castle, which was later reoccupied in the 17th century. It has the potential to provide information on high-status medieval and post-medieval settlement and is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 9.7.20 Long views along Loch Awe to the west and east, backdropped by surrounding hillslopes, and along the River Awe to the northwest with distant views to the Firth of Lorne and the Atlantic Ocean beyond are afforded from the Castle. Views to the Castle can be gained from the north, whilst travelling along the A85 public road, the wooded island being visible within the loch backdropped by hillslopes. From the south, travelling along the A819 public road, the Castle is visible within the loch backdropped by Ben Cruachan.
- 9.7.21 An existing steel lattice tower mounted OHL passes the Castle on its north side and is visible from the A819 crossing the lower hill slopes that form the backdrop to the Castle. Views of the existing towers are also visible from the Castle itself, in views to the north, with the towers being visible running along the lower slopes of Ben Cruachan.
- 9.7.22 The Proposed Development would run past the Castle on its southeast side, at its closest being 2 km away (further than the existing OHL). The STH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis indicates that, from the Castle and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 38 towers. A photomontage showing the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the Castle (**Figure 8.8i: LVIA 9, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that the proposed towers would be visible running from the east to the south, the proposed towers visible passing the monument at a slightly higher elevation than the castle on the south side of Loch Awe. The Proposed Development would be backclothed by hillslopes and would pass through areas of mature deciduous woodland and commercial forestry. Some screening of the Proposed Development would be provided by intervening topography, and/or surrounding woodland that edges both Fraoch Eilean Isle, on which the castle stands, and the southern edge of Loch Awe. The Proposed Development would be visible in views to the south from the Castle but would not dominate these views. The Proposed Development would be glimpsed beyond the Castle in views from the A85, passing across wooded hillslopes (**Figure 8.8h: LVIA 8, EIAR Volume 3b**). Views to the Castle from the A819 would remain unaffected.
- 9.7.23 The presence of the Proposed Development within the wider landscape surrounding the Castle would not adversely affect the loch setting of the Castle and it would not appreciably alter the way in which the monument and its setting are experienced and appreciated. It would remain possible for any visitor to the Castle to understand the nature and character of the monument, its island setting, and the Castle's strategic position within Loch Awe.
- 9.7.24 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Castle is assessed as being low magnitude (**TA 9.2, EIAR Volume 4**). The resulting effect, based on professional judgement, is assessed as being of **minor** significance. The cultural significance of the monument and its loch setting would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019) (Figure 9.5 (CH 2))

- 9.7.25 This monument comprises the well-preserved remains of a pre-improvement township comprising of at least sixteen structures, including a longhouse, several houses, a corn or lime kiln, and a flax retting pit all located on either side of the Allt Mhaluidh watercourse. The site is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level, as a well-preserved deserted township which has the potential to provide information about pre-improvement rural settlement activity. It is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 9.7.26 The remains of the township lie within open pasture next to the Allt Mhaluidh. Views out from the township take in surrounding farmland and commercial forestry plantation to the north. There is rising ground present to the northeast and northwest of the township and these concentrate views along the Allt Mhaluidh valley. The township remains are not prominent features in the landscape and are appreciated best at close quarters. The township sited in pasture farmland has surroundings that make a strong contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the township; its setting being characterised by the pastureland in which it sits and its historical association with the surrounding farmland that would have originally supported the occupants.
- 9.7.27 The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis (**Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3**) indicates that, from the deserted township and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 19 towers running from the northwest to the northeast where they pass the monument. The nearest proposed tower (T41) would be c.300 m to the northeast. A photomontage of the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the township (**Figure 9.5: CH 2, EIAR Volume 3b**) shows that the proposed towers would be seen crossing pastureland to the north of the township with the towers visible on the rising ground present to the north of the township and partially skylined.
- 9.7.28 The Proposed Development would be visible in the surrounding landscape of the township and would have an effect upon its setting as it will cross land historically associated with the township. The Proposed Development would be a new, modern addition to the wider surroundings and would give rise to a noticeable change within the township's immediate setting. It would however remain possible for any visitor to the township to understand its layout and its relationship with the surrounding farmland.
- 9.7.29 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the deserted township is assessed as being one of medium magnitude, resulting from the close proximity of the Proposed Development. The resulting effect is assessed, based on professional judgement, to be of **moderate** significance (significant in EIA terms). However, the character and cultural significance of the deserted township, within a post-medieval farming landscape, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Tom a'Chaisteal, Dun (SM 4209) (Figures 9.9 & 9.10 (CH 6 & CH 7))

- 9.7.30 This monument comprises the remains of a dun (prehistoric defended settlement) surviving as earthwork remains that occupy the summit of a small rocky knoll on the south banks of the Teatle Water. The dun is roughly circular in plan defined by a low stone wall with an entrance in the east-southeast. The site is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level, as remains of a well-preserved prehistoric settlement site which has the potential to provide information about prehistoric settlement activity. It is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 9.7.31 Views out from, and towards, the dun are currently screened by surrounding commercial forestry (**Figures 9.9 (CH 6) - 9.10 (CH 7)** and **Figure 9.16: (CH 13), EIAR Volume 3b**) and the dun currently has a localised setting dominated by the surrounding commercial forestry. In the absence of the existing forestry, open views to the surrounding landscape would be gained from the monument. The dun stands in a strategic position overlooking the Teatle Water and it has been positioned so as to control movement along the Teatle Water valley. Key views out from the dun are concentrated along the Teatle Water, to the northwest, and looking west/southwest towards Loch Awe.

- 9.7.32 The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis (**Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3a**) indicates that, from the dun and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 15 towers running from the northeast to the southwest where they pass the monument. The nearest proposed tower (T29) being 200 m to the southeast of the dun. A photo-wireline showing the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the monument (**Figure 9.9: CH 6, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that, in the absence of the surrounding commercial forestry, the proposed towers would be visible within the immediate landscape setting of the monument. In the absence of the trees, the Proposed Development would be a noticeable addition to the baseline by introducing steel lattice towers to the east of the dun, with towers in close proximity to the monument.
- 9.7.33 In views from the west, along the Teatle Water, the proposed towers would be visible beyond the dun. A photomontage (**Figure 9.10: CH 7, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that visibility of the proposed towers in these views would be largely screened by intervening topography and by woodland that edges the Teatle Water. In views looking towards the dun from the higher slopes to the north (**Figure 9.16: CH 13, EIAR Volume 3b**), the Proposed Development would be seen running past the eastern side of the dun; the towers visible beyond the dun fully backdropped by hillslopes. In views to the east looking towards the dun from the later pre-improvement settlement at Dychlie Deserted Crofts (SM 5149) (**Figure 9.11: CH 8, EIAR Volume 3b**) two towers (T29 and T30) would be seen either side of the dun but would not interrupt the views between the two Scheduled Monuments.
- 9.7.34 The Proposed Development would be a new element in the immediate landscape of the dun and would result in a discernible change to its surroundings, such that its baseline would be partly altered. However, it would remain possible for any visitor to understand the strategic position of the dun and its landscape surroundings within the Teatle Water valley. Key views from the monument to the northwest overlooking the Teatle Water, and to the west/southwest towards Loch Awe, would be unaffected.
- 9.7.35 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the dun is assessed as being of medium magnitude, resulting from the close proximity of the Proposed Development. The resulting effect is assessed, based on professional judgement, to be of **moderate** significance. However, the character and cultural significance of the dun, standing in commercial forestry, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Dychlie, Deserted Crofts (SM 5149) (Figure 9.11 (CH 8))

- 9.7.36 This monument comprises the ruins of three buildings that form a small farmstead, or croft. The site is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level, as a well-preserved, deserted croft which has the potential to provide information about pre-improvement rural settlement activity. It is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 9.7.37 The ruins of the croft stand within a clearing in commercial forestry plantation on a relatively level area of ground between the Teatle Water and the Easnan Croman watercourses. The commercial forestry that surrounded the monument has recently been felled and restocked. Views out from the township take in surrounding commercial forestry plantation. The original farmland, which would have once surrounded the croft, no longer survives. The building ruins are currently visible from forestry access tracks to the south and east of the monument, within an area of felled forestry, but they are not prominent features in the surrounding landscape.
- 9.7.38 The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis (**Figure 9.2, EIAR Volume 3a**) indicates that, from the monument and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 17 towers. The nearest proposed tower (T29) from the monument would be 200 m away to the northeast. A photomontage produced for the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the croft (**Figure 9.11: CH 8, EIAR Volume 3b**) shows that the proposed towers would be seen from the township running from the northeast to the southwest within its immediate landscape setting. The closest towers (T28-T30) would be visible beyond recently restocked commercial forestry and backdropped by surrounding plantation and hillslopes. Although the Proposed Development would introduce a new modern element in the surrounding landscape of the monument, it is considered that the presence of the Proposed Development would not affect the ability to understand the layout of the croft or its relationship with the surrounding landscape.

- 9.7.39 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the former croft is assessed as being one of medium magnitude, resulting from the close proximity of the Proposed Development. The resulting effect is assessed, based on professional judgement, to be of **moderate** significance (significant in EIA terms). However, the character and cultural significance of the monument, within a commercial forestry setting, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) (Figures 9.12 (CH 9) & Figure 8.8f (LVIA 6))

- 9.7.40 This monument comprises the well-preserved ruins of a late medieval castle: a four-storey tower house with the remains of a small courtyard (or barmkin) and curtain wall, a 'latch-hall' and a two-storey range with garret, that range in date from the mid-15th to the 17th century. The Castle was originally constructed in mid-15th century and then rebuilt as barracks in the late 17th century. The Castle stands at the northeast end of Loch Awe in a strategic position on a rocky promontory with a commanding view over the loch and the surrounding area and it would have controlled movement along the Strath of Orchy and the Pass of Brander. The Castle is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity. As the very well-preserved ruins of a late medieval castle which was later used as a military base in the 17th century, it has the potential to provide information on the layout and occupation of late medieval castles and information on military occupation and organisation during the Jacobite Rebellion in 1715 and 1745.
- 9.7.41 Long views to the west along Loch Awe are afforded from the Castle, and out over surrounding hill slopes to the north, east, and south. The Castle is a promoted tourist attraction and a Property in Care (PiC 80). It is a prominent landmark and photographs of the Castle are used widely to promote Scotland's heritage. Views of the Castle are gained principally from the southern side of Loch Awe and whilst travelling along the A819, from where the Castle is seen backdropped by hill slopes surrounding the loch. Views from the A85, which passes the Castle on its north and east sides, are screened by mature trees that edge the road and the loch. Visitors to the site approach the Castle from the northeast, along a footpath leading to the Castle entrance.
- 9.7.42 An existing steel lattice tower OHL passes the Castle on its north and east sides and is visible from the A819 crossing the lower hill slopes that form the backdrop to the Castle. Glimpses of the existing towers are also visible in views to the east from the Castle itself, with the tops of towers being visible above surrounding woodland.
- 9.7.43 The Proposed Development would run past the Castle on its south side, at its closest being 1.7 km away (further than the existing OHL). The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis indicates that, from the Castle and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 15 towers. A bare-earth wireline (**Figure 9.12: CH 9, EIAR Volume 3a**), showing the predicted 'bare-earth' view of the Proposed Development from the upper levels of the Castle, indicates that the proposed towers would be visible running from the northeast to the south of the monument, crossing wooded hill slopes to the east/south of the Castle with the proposed towers backclothed by surrounding hills. The bare-earth wireline does not take into consideration surrounding woodland, which would largely screen views of the proposed OHL from the Castle, although some tower tips may be visible above the trees (**Figure 8.8d: LVIA4, EIAR Volume 3a**). The proposed towers would not be visible in views of the Castle from the usual visitor's approach route, nor from the principal views of the Castle from the southern side of Loch Awe.
- 9.7.44 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Castle is assessed as being of negligible magnitude, and the resulting effect is assessed, based on professional judgement, as being of no more than **negligible** significance. It would remain possible for any visitor to understand and appreciate the Castle set in a prominent topographic position at the head of Loch Awe, and the presence of the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter the way in which the Castle and its settings are experienced and appreciated.

St Conan's Church (LB 4700) (Figure 9.15 (CH12))

- 9.7.45 This 19th century church stands on a terrace on the northside of Loch Awe. The church was designed and built by Walter Douglas-Campbell and is unique in that it incorporates an example of almost every style of church architecture. The building is a Category A Listed Building, of heritage value at the national level and is assessed as being of high sensitivity.

- 9.7.46 The church stands on the east bank of Loch Awe, immediately west of the A85 Dalmally to Oban road. The church is surrounded by lochside gardens and terraces that provide a peaceful setting for the church and offer long views over Loch Awe to the south and to the surrounding hill slopes around the loch. The church is a promoted visitor's site and a local landmark. The monument and its setting have a strong aesthetic appeal and experiential character.
- 9.7.47 Views to the church are gained whilst travelling along the A819 Dalmally to Oban road, the church visible set down on the lochside, framed by mature trees and gardens. Views to the church from the opposite (south) side of the loch, whilst travelling along the A819 Inveraray to Dalmally road, are screened from view by woodland that edges the road. An existing steel lattice tower OHL passes the church on its north side, although views of the existing towers from the church are screened by woodland.
- 9.7.48 The Proposed Development would run past the church on its south side, at its closest being c.2.8 km away on the opposite (south) side of Loch Awe. The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis indicates that, from the church and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 30 towers. A bare-earth wireline (**Figure 9.15: CH 12, EIAR Volume 3b**), showing the predicted 'bare-earth' view of the Proposed Development from the terraces to the south of the church, indicates that the proposed towers would be visible running from the east to the southwest of the church, and crossing wooded hill slopes to the southeast of the church with the proposed towers backclothed by surrounding hills. The proposed towers would not be visible in views to the church from the B819 (Dalmally to Oban) road.
- 9.7.49 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the church is assessed as being one of low magnitude, the resulting effect assessed, based on professional judgement, as being of no more than **minor** significance. It would remain possible for any visitor to understand the lochside setting of the church and the presence of the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter the way in which the church and its setting is experienced and appreciated.

Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument, Beacon Hill (LB 12167) (Figure 8.8n (LVIA 14))

- 9.7.50 This monument was erected in 1859 to commemorate one of Strath Orchy's most famous sons: the Gaelic bard/poet Duncan Ban MacIntyre. The commemorative monument is a Category B Listed Building, of heritage value at the regional level and is assessed as being of medium sensitivity.
- 9.7.51 The monument stands in rough pasture/moorland on the summit of Dun Athaich, to the south of Loch Awe and its hilltop setting is surrounded by commercial forestry. The monument is a local landmark, accessible from the Old Military Way between Inveraray and Dalmally and is visible from the opposite side of Loch Awe, backclothed by surrounding hill slopes. Wide views are gained from the monument in all directions, with particularly extensive views afforded across and along Loch Awe. The monument was visited by Queen Victoria in 1875 who was said to be delighted by the views (<https://www.ardnaiseig.com/duncan-bans-monument>). The monument has a strong aesthetic appeal and experiential character.
- 9.7.52 The Proposed Development would be present to the southeast of the monument, at its closest being c.600 m away. The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis indicates that, from the monument and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 46 towers. A photo-wireline showing the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the monument (**Figure 8.8n: LVIA 14, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that proposed towers would be visible running from the southeast to southwest, the proposed towers visible passing the monument at a lower elevation than the monument and passing through commercial forestry plantation which would provide some screening of the Proposed Development.
- 9.7.53 Proposed towers would be seen in views of the monument from the opposite side of Loch Awe, (for example **Figure 8.8n: LVIA 14 (EIAR Volume 3b)**, showing a view from Ardnaiseig House) although the towers would be visually separate from the monument and not positioned directly adjacent to it. No proposed towers would be visible in views of the monument from Kilchurn Castle (**Figure 8.8d: LVIA VP 4, EIAR Volume 3b**); the towers being screened by intervening topography where they pass the monument.

- 9.7.54 The Proposed Development would be discernible as a new element in the wider landscape views from the monument and would have an effect upon the monument's wider landscape setting. It would be visible in views from the monument to the northeast, east and southeast, although it would not affect views from the monument across Loch Awe, to the southwest/west.
- 9.7.55 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Duncan Ban MacIntyre monument is assessed as being one of medium magnitude, the resulting effect being assessed, based on professional judgement, as of **moderate** significance. However, it would remain possible for any visitor to understand the monument as a commemorative monument set in a prominent topographic position with wide ranging views and it would remain a prominent local landmark when seen from its surroundings.

Ardanaiseig House GDL (GDL 18) (Figure 19.13: CH10)

- 9.7.56 This Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL) is situated on the western head of Loch Awe, where the River Awe joins the loch. It forms the setting for Category B Listed Ardanaiseig House (LB 12182) which stands towards the centre of the GDL. The GDL was laid out in the 18th century and comprises formal gardens and terraces around Ardanaiseig House, surrounded by woodland and parkland policies. The woodland canopy of the GDL contributes to the shoreline scenery visible from the A85, where it passes the GDL on the north shore of Loch Awe. The Inventory of Garden and Designed Landscapes (<http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/GDL00018>) states that the GDL has a High Scenic Value.
- 9.7.57 The GDL is a heritage asset of value at the national level, as an important designed landscape forming the setting for a historic country house, and it is assessed as being of high sensitivity.
- 9.7.58 The GDL is bordered on two sides by Loch Awe, and by a minor road on its north and west sides. There are extensive panoramas from the GDL to the surrounding landscape, particularly east across Loch Awe to Ben Lui and to the northeast to Ben Cruachan. Ardanaiseig House is orientated east to enjoy views overlooking Loch Awe and surrounding terraced gardens that extend to the loch side. From parkland policies on the south shore of the GDL, panoramic views can be gained south overlooking Loch Awe and surrounding wooded hillslopes. Ardanaiseig has historical links with the Holy Isle of Inishail, situated within Loch Awe, with the area being the embarking point for the Holy Isles. Views are afforded to the isle from the southern shores of the GDL.
- 9.7.59 A woodland garden lies between the house and the walled garden and extends up the slopes to the northwest of the house. A number of paths meander through the gardens with one path extending from the east side of the house to the Boathouse on Loch Awe, and another, heads south from the house to the northern shore of Loch Awe. The approach drive to the House runs through woodland policies to the west of the House. The surrounding trees and vegetation provide a sheltered setting for the gardens and approach drive and largely screen views out to the surrounding area. The woodland canopy of the GDL is visible from the railway and the A85 along the northern shore and the A819 on the east side of Loch Awe. Views to the House itself from surrounding public roads are largely screened by trees that edge the roads and by woodland that surround the House.
- 9.7.60 An existing steel tower OHL passes the GDL on its east side and is visible from the GDL on the opposite side of Loch Awe, crossing the lower hillslopes of Ben Cruachan and along the Pass of Brander.
- 9.7.61 The ATH Bare-Earth ZTV analysis indicates that there would be theoretical visibility of 46 towers from the GDL. The Proposed Development would be visible running from the east to the south, passing the GDL on its southeast side and visible on the opposite (south) side of Loch Awe to the GDL, the nearest tower being 2.7 km away. Views to the Proposed Development within the woodland garden or from the approach drive would be screened by surrounding woodland and the sheltered setting within the woodland garden would not be affected. The Proposed Development would be visible from the House and from the southern shores of the policies.

- 9.7.62 A bare-earth wireline (**Figure 9.13: CH 10, EIAR Volume 3b**), showing the predicted 'bare-earth' view of the Proposed Development from parkland to the south of the House, indicates that the proposed towers would be visible crossing hill slopes to the southeast of the GDL. The proposed towers would be backclothed by surrounding hills and visually separate from the GDL, seen on the opposite side of Loch Awe. Some screening of the proposed towers would be provided by woodland policies surrounding the GDL, and by woodland/commercial forestry present along the southern side of Loch Awe. although proposed towers would be visible where they cross more open farmland areas (**Figure 8.8n: LVIA 14, EIAR Volume 3b**).
- 9.7.63 At over 2.7 km away the proposed towers would form a minor change to the wider views obtained from the asset. The Proposed Development would be seen as a new feature in views from the opposite side of Loch Awe, however the presence of the proposed towers would not significantly affect the ability of any visitor to understand the layout of the GDL, its historic links with Holy Isle of Inishail, nor affect an ability to appreciate the scenic contribution the GDL makes to the surrounding landscape.
- 9.7.64 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Ardanaiseig House GDL is assessed as being one of low magnitude, the resulting effect assessed, based on professional judgement, to be of **minor** significance. The character and cultural significance of the GDL, and its contribution to the local scenery of Loch Awe, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Micrositing Effects

- 9.7.65 It is noted that the Proposed Development, as described in Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development, includes both horizontal and vertical limits of deviation to allow for micrositing and variation of tower heights. The Proposed Development would be subject to a horizontal LOD of 100 m either direction along the Proposed Alignment and a vertical LOD of up to 20% of the actual tower heights (ATH) (as set out in the tower schedule (refer to **Technical TA 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**)).
- 9.7.66 HES identified five heritage assets (see below) as requiring detailed assessment (see Table 9.1 for details) to consider whether micrositing of the Proposed Development within the LOD could result in any increase of the predicted impact on their settings.
- Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019)
 - Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209)
 - Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149)
 - Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179)
 - Fraoch Eilean, Castle (SM 2219)
- 9.7.67 Proposed towers close to three Scheduled Monuments: Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019) (Towers T39 - T42), and Tom a'Chaisteal dun, Teatle Water (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149) (Towers T27 – T30) would not be microsited any closer to the Scheduled Monuments than currently located (**Figure 9.1a-h, Volume 3a**) and there would therefore be no change to the predicted impact of the Proposed Development on their settings.
- 9.7.68 For the two other heritage assets, Froach Eilean, Castle (SM 2219) and Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179), micrositing of the proposed towers within the horizontal LOD (100 max), could bring proposed towers marginally closer too, or further from, the Scheduled Monuments. In any micrositing, the proposed towers would not be brought appreciably close to the monuments (being no closer than 1.6 km from Kilchurn Castle (SM 90179) and 1.9 km from Froach Eilean, Castle (SM 2219)), a modest change in the stand-off distance from the monuments. The Proposed Development would continue to pass the monuments on the south side of Loch Awe and micrositing within the horizontal LOD would result in a minimal, barely detectable, change to the visual impact of the Proposed Development when seen from these two Scheduled Monuments. Micrositing within the horizontal LOD for the Proposed Development would therefore not result in an appreciable change to the magnitude of the impacts or to the resulting significance of the effects on their settings to that assessed above (**Section 9.6: Setting Effects during Operation: Outer Study Area**).

- 9.7.69 Analysis of the STH Bare-Earth ZTV and the ATH plus 20% vertical LOD Bare-Earth ZTV (presenting the worst-case scenario if increased tower heights were utilised (refer to **TA 9.2, EIAR Volume 4**)) indicates that micro-siting within the vertical LOD would result in a slight increase in the degree of visibility of the Proposed Development from the Scheduled Monuments. The increase in the number of towers visible from the individual heritage assets would be minimal, resulting in slight change to the appearance of the Proposed Development from each of the heritage assets. However, this change would, in each case, not be so apparent as to result in an appreciable change to the visual impact of the Proposed Development when seen from the heritage assets. As such, any increase in the height of the towers within the vertical LOD would not result in any change to the magnitude of the impacts or to the significance of the effects on the settings of heritage assets assessed above (**Section 9.6: Setting Effects during Operation: Outer Study Area**).

9.8 Proposed Mitigation

- 9.8.1 Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental impact assessment (PAN1/2013¹⁶) 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.
- 9.8.2 Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS¹⁷) requires the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment and the emphasis in Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2) is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible. The mitigation measures presented below take this policy advice and planning guidance into account and provides various options for protection or recording and ensuring that, where practical, surviving assets are preserved intact to retain the present historic elements of the landscape.
- 9.8.3 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or, where appropriate, during, the construction of the Proposed Development. The scope of works would be detailed in one or more Written Scheme(s) of Investigation (WSI) developed in consultation with (and subject to the agreement of) WoSAS, acting on behalf of ABC.
- 9.8.4 A professionally qualified Archaeological Contractor would be appointed to act as an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) for the duration of the development works (forestry felling works and construction phase). The role of the ACoW would be to provide advice to the appointed Construction Contractor regarding micro-siting of development components, where there is a possibility of intersecting with identified heritage assets, and to undertake archaeological monitoring of topsoil stripping operation in areas designated and approved by the Council's Archaeological Advisors (WoSAS). The activities of the ACoW would be carried out according to the scope of work and terms specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.
- 9.8.5 Final tower positions and access track locations would be subject to micro-siting within the horizontal LOD on the basis of detailed ground investigation. At this stage, consideration would also be given to detailed local environmental sensitivities, including the proximity to heritage assets. Movement of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be dependent upon consideration of identified constraints in the micro-siting area and subject to advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECow). No micro-siting of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be undertaken where this could potentially affect cultural heritage interests without consultation with an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW), who would advise on the acceptability of any proposed realignments, and consultation with the Council Archaeologist to agree appropriate mitigation where there are potential impacts as a result.
- 9.8.6 Mitigation proposals are set out on a site-by-site basis in **TA 9.1: Cultural Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area**.

¹⁶ Scottish Government (2013) Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental impact assessment (PAN1/2013)

¹⁷ Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (published 2019, finalised amended 2020).

Mitigation During Construction

Preservation in Situ

- 9.8.7 Should micro-siting be undertaken, forestry felling works, towers and associated infrastructure would be located, where possible, away from heritage assets.
- 9.8.8 Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, ground-breaking works at proposed tower positions and proposed access track locations, as far as reasonably practicable and as advised by an ACoW.
- 9.8.9 Known heritage assets and archaeologically sensitive areas, would not be used for storage of materials or as parking areas for vehicles or machinery.
- 9.8.10 Where linear assets survive as upstanding features (principally field banks and walls) 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 consented LOD. Disturbance to field banks, walls, relict rig and furrow remains and lynchets would be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact.
- 9.8.11 The remains of a section of former mid-18th century military road (21742), possible building (CFA023), a former farmstead (CFA030), and a group of shieling huts (44203) would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. The assets would be identified by placing high visibility markers 5 m from the outer limit of the visible remains, facing the working area. Any required micro-siting of access tracks or Tower T9 would be managed to avoid the visible remains and the demarcated areas, as advised by the ACoW. The markers will be left in place for the duration of the construction phase and removed on completion of the Proposed Development.
- 9.8.12 Any road widening activity along existing access tracks would be managed to avoid identified cultural heritage assets within close proximity to the access track routes, including shielings huts (44203) and sheepfold (CFA032), with road widening works being kept to the opposite side of the track to the heritage assets.

Watching Briefs

- 9.8.13 The Applicant would seek to agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with WoSAS in advance of development works (forestry felling activity and construction phase). The scope of the agreed works will be confirmed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be signed-off prior to commencement of the development works, including enabling works.
- 9.8.14 Taking account of the avoidance through design, and the character of the identified cultural heritage baseline, it is proposed that watching briefs would be carried out at the following locations:
 - Assets (13857/21742/21747): where existing access tracks that require upgrading follow the route of a former drove road (13857) and military road (21742/21747). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works along the access tracks where they follow the route of a former drove road/military road (**Figure 9.1a-h (EIAR Volume 3a)**), to identify and record any surviving remains that may be encountered. If significant discoveries are made during the watching brief, and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to be agreed in writing with WoSAS.
- 9.8.15 Based on the results of the desk-based study and the field survey, there are no other specific areas where construction works could be expected to encounter buried archaeological remains. It has been assessed that there is a medium to low potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to be present particularly in moorland/rough pasture areas at Achlian and Brackley. Therefore, if required under the terms of a condition of consent, the scope of any required archaeological watching brief(s) will be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and will be set out in the WSI.

Post-excavation Assessment and Reporting

- 9.8.16 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

- 9.8.17 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.
- 9.8.18 The guidelines will make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.

9.9 Residual Effects

Residual Construction Effects

- 9.9.1 Construction residual effects are set out on a site-by-site basis in **TA 9.1: Cultural Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area**.
- 9.9.2 Taking account of the mitigation proposals set out above (**Section 9.8: Proposed Mitigation**), the following residual construction effects have been identified.
- 9.9.3 Minor residual effects are predicted on the remains of three field banks (CFA025 and CFA029), three walls (CFA005b, CFA005C and CFA005e), four areas of rig and furrow (CFA022, CFA008a, CFA008c and CFA015), an area of lynchets and associated field bank (CFA013a and CFA013b) field bank (CFA015c) and associated rig and furrow remains, and an enclosure (CFA016), as a consequence of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development.
- 9.9.4 A minor residual effect is predicted on former drove road/military road (13857/21742 and 21747) the impact of the Proposed Development on any surviving buried remains being offset by archaeological investigations and recording to a standard acceptable to WoSAS.
- 9.9.5 Negligible residual effects are predicted on the remains of a wall (002b), field banks (CFA003a, CFA003c and CFA003d) and two sections of a former track (CFA026 and CFA028).
- 9.9.6 Where upstanding heritage assets (a section of former military road (21742), possible building (CFA023), farmstead (CFA030), and shieling huts (44203)) lie close to the Proposed Development, or within the proposed LOD, they would be marked off and avoided for the duration of the construction works. Consequently, no residual effects are predicted on these assets.

Residual Operational Effects

- 9.9.7 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 **TA 9.2 (EIAR Volume 4)** for a tabulated assessment of the predicted operational effects.

- 9.9.8 Three impacts, affecting the settings of three Scheduled Monuments (Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal, Dun (SM 4209) and Dychlie Deserted Croft (SM 5149)), of national importance and of high sensitivity, and one impact, affecting the setting of one Listed Building (Category B Listed Building Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument (LB 12167) of regional importance and medium sensitivity, have been assessed as being of **moderate** significance. Those effects would not lead to any diminishing of the cultural heritage assets concerned. It would remain possible for any visitor to the monuments and listed building to understand and appreciate the assets and their settings.
- 9.9.9 All other impacts, affecting the settings of heritage assets in the surrounding landscape, would give rise to effects that are either of minor or negligible significance.
- 9.9.10 All operational effects identified would be fully reversible upon decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

9.10 Cumulative Effects

Construction Effects

- 9.10.1 Cumulative construction impacts may arise from the Proposed Development in combination with developments that have the potential to impact the same heritage assets.
- 9.10.2 It is predicted that one heritage asset, former drove road/military road (13857 /21742), of medium sensitivity, potentially affected by the Proposed Development, would also be potentially directly affected by ground disturbance works relating to the following cumulative developments:
- Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL connection: which would cross the former drove road/military road to the south of the Proposed Development and utilise the same access track alignment, which follows an existing forestry track that overlies the former drove road/military road route; and
 - Creag Dubh Substation: which would utilise the same access track alignment which follows an existing forestry track, that overlies the former drove/military road route.
- 9.10.3 The schemes in-combination would result in potential direct impacts to small sections of the former drove road/military road (13857/21742), the full length of which runs from Dalmally to Inveraray, and the disturbance to the integrity of the remains, as a whole, would be minimal. The cumulative impact from ground disturbance works would therefore be of no more than low magnitude, resulting in an effect of **minor** significance.
- 9.10.4 No other cumulative impacts from the Proposed Development in combination with other developments are predicted.

Operational Effects

- 9.10.5 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.
- 9.10.6 The identification of likely cumulative effects focuses upon the residual 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, or are reasonably foreseeable. Those developments that are operational or under construction have been considered as part of the current baseline conditions.
- 9.10.7 The proposed Temporary Diversion (connecting the existing SPEN 275 kV OHL Route (YW Route) with the Proposed Development and comprising of a short section of temporary OHL and two temporary towers (**ref to Figure 14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**) would be present for the duration of the construction works. It would result in only a short term/low magnitude cumulative effect in combination with the Proposed Development on heritage assets in close proximity to the Proposed Development and would have no permanent effect on their settings. Therefore, temporary cumulative effects from the proposed Temporary Diversion have not been assessed.

- 9.10.8 Blarghour Wind Farm would be c.10 km from the nearest heritage asset within the Outer Study Area predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development. At this distance the proposed turbines would not be prominent in the surrounding landscape and, as a result, it is considered that no cumulative effects on the setting of heritage assets will arise from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with Blarghour Wind Farm.
- 9.10.9 There is no predicted visibility of the proposed Creag Dhubh substation from any of the heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets arising from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the proposed Creag Dhubh substation.
- 9.10.10 Other cumulative developments (including Ladyfield Forest Meteorological Mast, Telecommunications Tower east of Keeper's Cottage, proposed forest tracks at Succoth, and proposed hydro schemes at River Aray (see **Figure 14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**) for details) are all small-scale developments, which are considered unlikely to represent significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets when combined with the Proposed Development and they are not further assessed.
- 9.10.11 Intervening topography would largely screen views of the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL connection, Creag Dhubh to existing 132 kV Taynuilt to Inveraray OHL, and the Blarghour Wind Farm connection from heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, but there could potentially be cumulative impacts on the setting on the settings of a small number of heritage assets located around the Ardanaiseig. This would apply to four Scheduled Monuments (SM 4104, SM 4049, SM 4105 and SM 4198) and to Ardanaiseig GLD (GDL 18), resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with these three cumulative developments. Combined views of the three cumulative developments, which would be located at their closest 4 km from the heritage assets, in combination with and beyond the Proposed Development, may be visible from these assets where the Proposed Development crosses hill slopes to the south. However, they would collectively be no more visually dominant in the view than the Proposed Development on its own. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL connection and the Creag Dhubh to existing 132 kV Taynuilt to Inveraray OHL connection, would have no more than a low magnitude impact on the settings of cultural heritage assets resulting in cumulative effects of no more than **minor** significance.

9.11 Summary

- 9.11.1 A desk-based assessment and walk-over field survey have been carried out for the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by HES, ABC and WoSAS, historic environment advisors to ABC.
- 9.11.2 A total of 31 heritage assets (sites and features) have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities.
- 9.11.3 Field survey indicates that medieval/post-medieval settlement and cultivation remains survive within open moorland and rough pasture areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century and it is considered that there is a medium to low potential for further buried archaeology to survive in these areas. In areas where the Proposed Development crosses commercial forestry plantation the potential for hitherto undisturbed archaeological remains to survive is considered to be negligible.
- 9.11.4 There is a potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on 14 heritage assets. In addition, nine heritage assets lie within the micro-siting allowance (LOD) and could potentially be affected by any micro-siting of proposed towers or proposed access track routes. In the absence of mitigation, three of these (possible building CFA023, farmstead CFA030 and shieling huts (44203) are assessed as being potentially of **moderate significance** (significant in EIA terms). The other impacts are assessed as being not significant.
- 9.11.5 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted construction effects and residual effects of no more than **minor** significance (not significant in EIA terms) have been identified.

- 9.11.6 Twenty-four Scheduled Monuments, two Category A Listed Buildings, four Category B Listed Buildings, two Category C Listed Buildings, one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), and four NSR Sites have been identified within the 5 km Outer Study Area, from which there is theoretical visibility of one or more elements of the Proposed Development.
- 9.11.7 The assessment has resulted in the identification of **moderate** significance effects (significant in EIA terms) on the settings of three Scheduled Monuments (Auchtermally or Uachdar Mhaluidh, Deserted Township (SM 4019), Tom a'Chaisteal dun (SM 4209) and Dychlie, deserted crofts (SM 5149)) and one Category B Listed Building, Duncan Ban McIntyre Monument (LB 12167). The Proposed Development would result in discernible changes to the surroundings of these designated heritage assets. However, the monuments would not be isolated from their surroundings, nor would their settings be appreciably fragmented. It would remain possible for any visitor to the monuments to understand and appreciate their settings. As such, the integrity of the settings of the monuments and their capacity to inform and convey their cultural significance, will not be compromised.
- 9.11.8 The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity is considered to be not significant.