

CONTENTS

8.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	8-2
8.1	Executive Summary	8-2
8.2	Introduction	8-2
8.3	Scope of Appraisal	8-2
8.4	Consultation	8-3
8.5	Methodology	8-4
8.6	Baseline Conditions	8-7
8.7	Potential Effects	8-11
8.8	Mitigation	8-13
8.9	Summary	8-14

Appendices

There are no appendices associated with this Chapter

Figures

Figure 8.1: Cultural Heritage Assets

Figure 8.2a-b: Wireline from Invershin Farm, Standing Stone

8. CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 Executive Summary

- 8.1.1 This Chapter provides an appraisal on the potential effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets and archaeological features.
- 8.1.2 The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid heritage assets where possible throughout all project stages.
- 8.1.3 Within a 3 km outer study area of the Proposed Development, there are numerous designated sites along the River Shin. These are all screened from any visual effects by intervening high ground with the exception of a cluster of designated sites adjacent to the eastern end of the Proposed Development. These sites could be vulnerable to some degree to indirect, visual effects and comprise a total of six cultural heritage designated assets, consisting of four Scheduled Monuments (SMs) and two Listed Buildings (LBs).
- 8.1.4 Three non-designated cultural heritage assets were identified within an inner study area consisting of a 200 m buffer (100 m either side) of the Proposed Development, all of regional significance. The potential for unidentified archaeological remains, outwith the broad area of the identified non-designated assets, is considered to be low.
- 8.1.5 Mitigation measures are recommended in this Chapter for three non-designated sites to ensure their protection during the construction phase.
- 8.1.6 Following the application of mitigation measures, no significant residual effects, as a result of the Proposed Development would be anticipated.

8.2 Introduction

- 8.2.1 This Chapter appraises the potential effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This Chapter (and its associated Figure and Wireline) should be read in conjunction with the introductory chapters of this EA (Chapters 1 to 3).
- 8.2.2 The appraisal considers the potential for both direct effects, meaning those that have potential to physically disturb or damage heritage features within the vicinity, and indirect effects, meaning those which can adversely affect the historic setting of heritage features via the Proposed Development's visibility from each feature or its curtilage.
- 8.2.3 The underground cable (UGC) elements of the Proposed Development in relation to cultural heritage considerations are considered in **Appendix 1.1: Permitted Development Works Appraisal**.
- 8.2.4 The appraisal has been carried out by field archaeologist and cultural heritage consultant Catherine Dagg who is an associate member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA); please see **Appendix 1.3: EA Team**, for all details of the EA team.
- 8.2.5 This Chapter is supported by one figure and one wireline which are referenced in the text where relevant.

8.3 Scope of Appraisal

- 8.3.1 This Chapter considers effects on:
- Designated assets:
 - Scheduled Monuments (SM);
 - Listed Buildings (LB);

- Inventory gardens;
- designed landscapes; and
- inventory battlefields.
- Non-designated assets:
 - recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites and areas of archaeological, historical or cultural significance;
 - previously unevaluated policies and designed landscapes; and
 - other elements of Cultural Heritage.

8.3.2 Two study areas appropriate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development are shown on **Figure 8.1: Cultural Heritage**, and set out below, and the assessment considers cultural heritage features within these areas. The inner study considers both direct and indirect effects, whilst the outer study area considers indirect effects only.

Inner Study Area: Direct and Indirect Effects

8.3.3 The inner study area consists of a 200 m buffer, 100 m either side of the centreline of the overhead line (OHL), elements of the Proposed Development.

Outer Study Area: Indirect Effects

8.3.4 The outer study area for indirect effects consists of a 3 km buffer from the OHL elements of the Proposed Development.

Effects Scoped Out of Appraisal

8.3.5 There are a number of nationally important Scheduled Monuments in the area of Gruids Wood and to the southwest of The Ord, some of which would fall into the outer study area, but most are outwith it. These prehistoric monuments form a possible ritual landscape, whose setting would extend to the Proposed Development despite being at a distance greater than 3 km from it. However, a study of intervening topography indicates that no aspect of the Proposed Development would be visible from these designated assets, evident in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (**Figure 4.1: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)**), and they have therefore been scoped out of this appraisal.

8.4 Consultation

8.4.1 The consultation process for the Proposed Development is described in **Chapter 2. Table 8.1: Consultation Responses** below, sets out the comments received from consultees in relation to cultural heritage and the actions taken to address them.

Table 8.1: Consultation Responses

Organisation and Date / Project stage	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee
The Highland Council (THC) August 2023 / Screening Stage	THC noted that there are no designated cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Development itself, but that there are some 1 km, 1.5 km and 4.5 km away.	Designated assets considered to be sensitive to indirect effects were identified at the route selection stage of the project, and the extent of effects on setting confirmed by field survey carried out in August 2022. These potential effects are addressed in Section 8.7 .
	THC noted that there are non-designated assets that could potentially be susceptible	These non-designated assets were identified at the route selection stage. The

Organisation and Date / Project stage	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee
	to impacts. These are 3 sites of multiple hut circles with associated field systems. They are MHG12803 Doir a'Chatha, MHG 12800 Allt a'Ghlughern and MHG12891 Linsidemore Wood.	Proposed Development runs north of MHG12803 Doir a'Chatha. MHG 12800 Allt a'Ghlughern and MHG12891 Linsidemore Wood are within the inner study area of the Proposed Development and mitigation is recommended for minimising any potential direct effects on these assets. See Section 8.8 .
	THC noted that there would be no direct impact on any designated heritage asset and the topography, buildings and vegetation would screen views from heritage assets further afield.	This was noted. Designated heritage assets further afield, notably those within Gruid's Wood and also the Ord, would be screened from views of the Proposed Development by intervening topography. There are SMs closer to the Proposed Development than The Ord, but they would not be considered as sensitive to visual effects. See effects scoped out of the appraisal in Section 8.3 .
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) July 2023 / Alignment Selection stage	HES noted that they were content that none of the heritage assets within their remit had been overlooked during the alignment selection of the Proposed Development.	This was noted.
HES December 2022 / Route Selection Stage & July 2023 / Alignment Selection stage	HES recommend at route selection stage and alignment selection stage that as the development progressed and further consultation was undertaken that a visualisation should be provided showing Invershin Farm, standing stone 220m ENE of (SM1791) in its setting looking north-west towards the existing Shin substation and the Proposed Development. This would enable a full assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the monument.	This was noted. A wireline has been prepared and included with this EA to demonstrate the visual effect from Invershin Farm, standing stone 220m ENE of (SM1791). This is Figure 8.2a-b: Wireline from Invershin Farm, Standing Stone . Correspondence with HES in August 2024 confirmed that a bare earth wireline without photography would be sufficient to enable a full assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of the monument.

8.5 Methodology

Legislation, Policy and Guidance

8.5.1 The key legislation, policy and guidance listed below has been considered in the assessment:

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

- Policy Context:
 - National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4) (Scottish Government, 2023)
 - Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES, 2019a, finalised amended 2020);
 - Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013) (Scottish Government, 2013, revised 2017);
 - Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN 2/2011) (Scottish Government, 2011);
 - Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (Highland Council (THC), 2012):
 - Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage;
 - Policy 69: Electricity Transmission Infrastructure; and
 - Appendix 3: Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features.
 - Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019);
- Technical Guidance:
 - Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA, 2017);
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016; updated 2021);
 - Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work (THC, 2012);
 - Highland Historic Environment Strategy: Supplementary Planning Guidance (THC, 2013);
 - Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and ClfA, 2021);
 - Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES), 2018); and
 - Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021).

Desk-Based Evaluation

8.5.2 This appraisal has been prepared using the following methodology:

8.5.3 The desk-based evaluation consisted of all databases available online including:

- Highland Historic Environment Record (HER);
- CANMORE database of Historic Environment Scotland;
- British Newspaper Archive;
- Historical Ordnance Survey maps and pre-Ordnance Survey maps held in the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland; and
- Modern aerial photographic imagery: available through Google Earth and Bing Maps.

8.5.4 In addition, the following previous survey work covering sections of the Proposed Development, available online through the Highland HER were noted and consulted:

- Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd 2011: Rosehall Wind Farm, Lairg: Watching Brief. for E.on Climate and Renewables (HER ref. EHG3625)
- AOC Archaeology Group 2012: Glencassley Wind Farm Environmental Statement, (HER ref. EHG4520); and
- AOC Archaeology Group 2021: Achany Extension Wind Farm EIA Report (HER ref. EHG5901).

8.5.5 None of these previous evaluations identified any archaeological features within the inner study area of the Proposed Development.

Field Survey

- 8.5.6 Field survey was carried out in August 2022 at the route selection stage of the project, covering sections of the route options not previously covered by survey work for other projects but targeting sections where the desk-based study indicated a greater potential for unrecorded archaeological features. All survey work was carried out by Catherine Dagg (see **Appendix 1.3**) and consisted of a walk over on the targeted sections, recording features using hand-held GPS and camera. The aim of the survey was to record all features, including those of minor importance and low sensitivity and to use this data to recreate former patterns of land use and enable predictions of sub-surface archaeological features or deposits.
- 8.5.7 The section of the Proposed Development located north of the A839 lies within the survey areas for the consented Achany Wind Farm Extension EIA Report (HER ref. EHG5901), Glencassley Wind Farm Environmental Statement (HER ref. EHG4520) and Rosehall Wind farm pre-felling survey (HER ref. EHG3625) and was not revisited for this evaluation.
- 8.5.8 The section of the Proposed Development located between the A839 and the A837 was subjected to the walkover survey carried out in August 2022, concentrating on areas of open ground. Recently felled coniferous plantation severely restricted access in some areas. All archaeological features visible within the inner study area were noted. However, dense vegetation cover made the location and identification of known archaeological features difficult and in some cases prevented the identification of minor associated features.
- 8.5.9 No intrusive archaeological interventions have been carried out as part of this assessment.

Cultural Heritage Wireline

- 8.5.10 In consultation with HES (see **Table 8.1**), one designated heritage asset, Invershin Farm, Standing Stone, within the outer study area was identified where a Wireline would aid the assessment of and demonstrate effects on its setting (see **Figure 8.2a-b**).

Assessment of Effects – Direct Effect

- 8.5.11 The significance of a direct effect depends upon the sensitivity / importance of a cultural heritage asset, combined with the magnitude of effect.

Sensitivity / Importance of Direct Effect

- 8.5.12 Archaeological sites, including areas considered to be of archaeological potential, and sites of historical or otherwise cultural interest fall into three categories:
- **National:** this category contains all sites and monuments with statutory protection, i.e. Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings. Other monuments, although not scheduled, may be considered to be of national importance if they are particularly rare and well-preserved examples of a type. Sensitivity of sites of National interest to direct or indirect effects would be considered to be High;
 - **Regional:** almost all prehistoric and mediaeval sites would be considered to be of regional importance. Post mediaeval sites would be placed in this category if they are particularly well-preserved or unusual, dependent on the distribution of similar sites in the vicinity and if they form an element within a complex archaeological or historical landscape. Post-mediaeval townships, shieling sites and the more substantial relict agricultural, sporting or military remains of the 19th and 20th centuries would fall into this category. Sensitivity of sites of Regional interest to direct or indirect effects would be considered to be Medium; and
 - **Local:** this category applies to minor landscape features of the post-mediaeval period, particularly those which are common or poorly preserved. Boundaries and trackways, unless forming elements of

a well-preserved relict, archaeological or historical landscape, or those bearing historical or cultural associations, would fall into this category. Sensitivity of sites of Local interest to direct or indirect effects would be considered to be Low.

Magnitude of Direct Effects

8.5.13 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of a direct effect include:

- **High:** direct effect on sites of National importance is considered to be high, as these sites tend to be those with statutory protection.;
- **Medium:** direct effect on sites of Regional importance is considered to be medium, although each case will require separate consideration;
- **Low:** direct effect on sites of Local importance would generally be considered to be low; and
- **Negligible Effect:** effect on sites which lie within the study area but which would not be directly affected is considered to be negligible.

Significance of Direct Effects

8.5.14 The predicted significance of effects is determined by consideration of a site's importance in conjunction with the magnitude of effect predicted on it. **Table 8.2: Significance of Effect** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of a direct effect. An effect of Moderate or Major is considered to be significant (as highlighted in **Table 8.2**). Where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement supported by reasoned justification has been applied to determine the level of significance.

Table 8.2: Significance of an Effect

Magnitude of Effect	Importance / Sensitivity		
	National / High	Regional / Medium	Local / Low
High	Major	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor
Medium	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible
Low	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Assessment of Effects – Indirect Effects

8.5.15 An indirect effect is related to the potential effect of a development on the setting of a cultural heritage site or asset. The significance of an indirect effect depends upon the importance of a cultural heritage site, combined with the magnitude of the effect.

Sensitivity / Importance of Indirect Effects

8.5.16 The sensitivity or importance of a site is set out in **Table 8.3**.

Table 8.3: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting

Sensitivity	Guideline Criteria
High	The site has a clearly defined setting that is readily appreciable and is considered vital to its character and the appreciation of this. The site will generally be visible within the landscape.
Medium	The site's character and the appreciation of this relate to some extent to its setting. The site will generally be visible on the ground.
Low	The site's surroundings have little relevance to its character and the appreciation of this. The site is difficult to identify on the ground or its original setting features are difficult to appreciate.
Imperceptible	The site is imperceptible in the landscape and its character and appreciation do not relate to its surroundings.

Magnitude of Indirect Effect

8.5.17 Criteria to assess the magnitude of visual effect on the setting of a cultural heritage feature are provided below:

- High: a fundamental material impact obviously changing the surroundings of an asset, such that its baseline is substantially altered;
- Medium: an effect discernibly changing the surroundings of an asset, such that its baseline setting is partly and materially altered;
- Low: a slight, but detectable, effect that does not materially alter the baseline setting of the asset; and
- Imperceptible: a very slight and barely distinguishable change from baseline conditions.

Significance of Indirect Effect

8.5.18 Table 8.4 summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of an indirect effect upon the setting of each cultural heritage feature which was determined by considering its visual sensitivity in conjunction with the magnitude of visual effect predicted on it. A moderate or major effect is considered to be significant. Where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement supported by reasoned justification has been applied to determine the level of significance.

Table 8.4: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting:

Magnitude of Effect	Sensitivity / Importance		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Major	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor
Medium	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible
Low	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible	Negligible
Imperceptible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

8.6 Baseline Conditions

Overview

- 8.6.1 Baseline information on known cultural heritage assets recorded within the outer study area of the Proposed Development was obtained from datasets curated by HES and the HER.
- 8.6.2 The density of prehistoric settlement and, more significantly monuments and burials dating back to the Neolithic period, indicate the importance of the Strath Oykel and the Kyle of Sutherland and Strath Shin routes for both trade and expansion of settlement from east to west from the earliest times of human occupation of the north Highlands. While not all contemporary, the stone circle at Achinduich (SM1761), standing stone at Invershin Farm (SM1791), chambered cairns at Invershin Primary School and Settlement (SM1792) and The Ord (SM1812) amongst others indicate a rich ritual landscape where monuments were placed in significant locations, holding visual relationships with settlements, landscape features and other monuments. The majority of these monuments are located along the River Shin, with the density of sites at the confluence of the River Shin with the Kyle of Sutherland in particular indicates the importance of this location in the prehistoric period.
- 8.6.3 While land that would now be considered to be good arable ground is scarce, particularly before the flooding of the River Oykel and the Kyle of Sutherland was controlled, the higher ground along both straths is rich in prehistoric settlement dating to the Bronze or Iron Ages. Above the steep slope rising on the north side of the Kyle of Sutherland, hut circle settlements and their associated field systems occupy land anywhere between 50 m AOD and 180 m AOD and similarly at Dürcha, between 150 m OD and 190 m OD. It is in the Iron Age that defensive monuments first appear, with the broch at Achness (MHG 11879) controlling access to the Strath Cassley, the two Carn Mor brochs (MHG 7421 and MHG 9174) on the south side of the Kyle of Sutherland and Sallachy and Ferry Wood broch (MHG 12006) controlling the Shin route. These structures would have been placed in the landscape to maximise visibility and even intervisibility and can be seen on **Figure 8.1**.
- 8.6.4 Strath Oykel is taken to be the southern boundary of Norse influence in the north Highlands and Norse settlement is inferred from place name evidence such as Langwell (lang-vollr, long field), Rosehall (hross-vollr, horse field) and the River Oykel itself (Ekkjals-bakki). However, as yet no known archaeological sites have been dated to the Norse period.
- 8.6.5 The Mediaeval period is represented by Caisteal nan Corr at the confluence of the River Oykel with the River Cassley and Invershin Castle immediately south of the confluence of the River Oykel and the River Shin, both no longer prominent in the landscape but, placed so as to control the routes and resources along the rivers.

Designated Cultural Heritage

- 8.6.6 Designation is the legal recognition of some of Scotland's most important historic sites, buildings and places. It ensures that these assets are protected by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. Designation includes SMs and LBs and the level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation.
- 8.6.7 There are no cultural heritage designations within the inner study area as can be seen on **Figure 8.1**.
- 8.6.8 In the outer study area, there are numerous designated sites along the River Shin. However, these are all screened from any visual effects by intervening high ground.
- 8.6.9 A cluster of designated sites adjacent to the eastern end of the Proposed Development form the exception to this. These sites could be vulnerable to some degree to indirect, visual effects. This comprises four SMs and two LBs as described below (see also **Figure 8.1**).

SMS:

- **Invershin Farm, Standing Stone SM1791:** This monument is strategically located in open ground just east of the confluence of the Kyle of Sutherland and the River Shin and it is assumed that its location was chosen to command views up both straths. It may have been part of a prehistoric ritual landscape, the other elements of which are now lost, or may have had associations with natural landscape features now obscured by extensive coniferous planting.
- **Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound (500 m east) SM5497:** A domestic group of hut circles with an associated burnt mound, the latter being of possible ritual use but on a localised scale. Location of this settlement would have been dependent on access to resources and consideration of visual setting would have been on a small local scale. The site is effectively screened from views of the Proposed Development by mature trees flanking the A836 and any visibility from the higher features of the site would consist of a very tight arc descending through the coniferous plantings of Shin Forest to Invershin.
- **Invershin Farm settlement and burnt mound (1,200 m east) SM5470:** Occupying open ground above the 100 m contour and flanked to east and west by mature coniferous planting, a group of hut circles and associated field system with a burnt mound on the north. Location of this settlement would have been dependent on access to resources and consideration of visual setting would have been on a small local scale. The site is screened from views of the Proposed Development by the coniferous plantings. When these trees are felled, visibility of features of the Proposed Development would consist of a very tight arc descending through the coniferous plantings of Shin Forest to Invershin.
- **Invershin Primary School, settlement SM5498.** A domestic group of hut circles and an associated field system dating to the Bronze or Iron Age, partially destroyed by road widening and forestry plantation. Location of this settlement would have been dependent on access to resources and consideration of visual setting would have been on a small local scale. The site is effectively screened from views of the Proposed Development by mature trees flanking the A836 and any visibility from the higher features of the site would consist of a very tight arc descending through the coniferous plantings of Shin Forest to Invershin.

8.6.10 As can be seen on **Figure 8.1**, the last three of these listed SMSs lie to the east of Inveran. They are screened for the most part from vistas to the west by existing tree cover. In addition, their sensitivity to visual effect or alterations to their setting is in practical terms reduced by the domestic nature of the sites, their placement in the landscape being dictated by access to resources rather than by relationship to distant landscape features.

LBs:

- **Invershin Farm and Salmon Station LB267, Category B:** This 19th century industrial complex has been located adjacent to the confluence of the River Shin and the Kyle of Sutherland for the purpose of landing catches of salmon for processing at the salmon station. More precise location was dictated by the need to be set into the bank to allow upper access to the two ice houses. Any consideration of setting would have been limited to views of the rivers. The structure is only viewed from close proximity.
- **Inveran, old Shin Bridge over River Shin LB265, Category B:** Designed by Thomas Telford and built in 1822, this is a feature of transport and communication, placed for practical considerations of crossing the river and without any consideration of wider aspects of setting. This low-lying feature is best viewed from the adjacent public roads, looking east or north-east, away from the Proposed Development.

8.6.11 These two structures are both located in the landscape for the practical purposes of industry and transport / communication. Neither are sensitive to alterations to the wider setting and appreciation of the structures is only possible from close proximity.

Non – Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

8.6.12 In addition to the designated assets, the Highland HER contains details of a number of non-designated assets of archaeological and cultural heritage interest within the inner study area (see **Figure 8.1**). Field survey for this appraisal noted a few previously unrecorded minor features of local interest.

8.6.13 The non-designated assets most vulnerable to direct effects from the Proposed Development include three sites consisting of multiple hut circles with associated field systems. These are listed below and shown on **Figure 8.1**:

- **MHG12803 Doir a'Chatha:** a scattered group of at least five hut circles, with three more possible structures identified by recent Lidar but not yet verified. While most of the settlement is located in open ground, the three unverified hut circles lie within the forestry plantation to the north-east. This site is of Regional importance and therefore, according to the criteria outlined in **Section 8.5**, of Medium sensitivity to direct effects.
- **MHG 12800 Allt a'Ghlugheran:** a scattered group of four hut circles to the east of the Allt a'Ghlugheran, north of Linsidmore. This site is of Regional importance and therefore, according to the criteria outlined in **Section 8.5**, of Medium sensitivity to direct effects.
- **MHG12891 Linsidmore Wood:** a scattered group of five hut circles and a kerb cairn, mostly to the west of the Allt an Ruigh Mhuide, north of Linsidmore. This site is of Regional importance and therefore, according to the criteria outlined in **Section 8.5**, of Medium sensitivity to direct effects.

8.6.14 Allt a'Ghlugheran and Linsidmore Wood, to the north of Linsidmore are indistinct on the ground, obscured by dense ungrazed vegetation rendering identification of minor features of the field system impossible to locate.

8.6.15 In addition to the prehistoric settlements north of Linsidmore, field enclosures and boundaries probably dating to the Early Modern period were noted during field survey for this project. The following previously unrecorded archaeological feature¹ lies on the line of the Proposed Development (see also **Figure 8.1**):

- **An t-Alltan Gruideach, Enclosure:** Located from NH 54985 99611 to NH 55062 99704, an approximately oval to rectangular enclosure with a long axis aligned NE-SW, the only visible constructed feature being the enclosing bank or dyke. This feature is crossed by the faint traces of a stalkers path and is interpreted as being a small arable area dating to the Early Modern period. It is not shown on any historic or modern mapping. This site is of Local importance and therefore, according to the criteria outlined in **Section 8.5**, of Low sensitivity to direct effects.

Cumulative

8.6.16 In relation to the potential for cumulative effects, no consented developments, or developments for which an application has been submitted, in the vicinity of the Proposed Development have been identified which are considered likely to lead to changes to the cultural heritage baseline². The consented Achany Wind Farm Extension has been considered within the baseline for the appraisal, as the Proposed Development is reliant on its construction and operation.

¹ This previously unrecorded archaeological feature was located by associate member of the CIfA during site work in August 2022.

² Based on a cumulative baseline search of consented or submitted planning applications three months prior to submission of the application to allow finalisation of the EA.

8.7 Potential Effects

8.7.1 Taking account of the findings of the desk-based assessment and field survey, potential effects on cultural heritage associated with the construction and / or operation of the Proposed Development are described in the following Section.

Direct Effects – Inner Study Area

8.7.2 Direct (physical) effects on three non-designated cultural heritage assets at the construction phase within the inner study area are predicted for the following three assets:

- **Allt a'Ghlugheran (MHG 12800):** of the four hut circles within this group, two are located within the inner study area of the Proposed Development, at NC 53995 00362 and NC 54114 00295. The Proposed Development passes to the south of these features but they may be vulnerable to damage from construction of access routes and laydown of materials. In addition, the associated field system, consisting of stone clearance heaps and lynchets, extends along the 160 m contour in both directions and continues on the west side of the Allt a' Ghlugheran. This area has potential for sub-surface archaeological features and deposits, as slag from iron working and a stone spindle whorl have been recovered from disturbed ground in the vicinity. This asset, of Regional importance, is of Medium sensitivity to direct effect and any effects would be considered to be of Medium magnitude. In this case modification of the design of the Proposed Development would not be recommended but rather mitigation measures implemented as outlined in **Section 8.8**.
- **Linsidmore Wood (MHG12891):** of the five hut circles within this group, one is located within the LoD of the Proposed Development, to the east of the stream at NC 54741 99863. This is directly under the Proposed Development and adjacent to both a pole position and a section of permanent access track. This makes this asset particularly vulnerable to damage from either ground disturbance or the placement and movement of cables. In addition, both the poles and the permanent access track pass through the associated field system, consisting of stone clearance heaps and lynchets. This area has the potential for sub-surface archaeological features and deposits which could be damaged or destroyed, particularly during construction of the access track. This asset, of Regional importance, is of Medium sensitivity to direct effect and any effects would be considered to be of Medium magnitude. In this case modification of the Proposed Development design would not be recommended but rather mitigation measures implemented as outlined in **Section 8.8**.
- **An t-Alltan Gruideach enclosure (n/a):** The Proposed Development crosses this previously unrecorded feature. The enclosing banks are vulnerable to damage and there may be sub-surface features or deposits which would be disturbed by any groundbreaking work. This asset, of Local importance is of Low sensitivity to direct effects and the magnitude of direct effects would be low. However, in accordance with best practice, some mitigation is recommended as outlined in **Section 8.8**.

8.7.3 In relation to Doir a'Chatha (MHG12803), although some of the hut circles of this group are located within the former coniferous plantation, none are within the LoD of the proposed OHL or access tracks. The associated field system extends north, but these minor features are assumed to have been damaged or destroyed by tree planting and felling. No potential direct effects are anticipated for this asset.

8.7.4 No further direct effects are predicted for any of these assets at the operational stage.

8.7.5 Physical disturbance of unknown hitherto undiscovered sites or features, including unforeseen buried remains of archaeological interest could also be possible.

Indirect Effects - Inner and Outer Study Area

8.7.6 Visibility of the Proposed Development at both the construction and the operational stage is only predicted for one designated asset: **Invershin Standing Stone SM1791**, significantly placed at the confluence of the Rivers

Oykel / Kyle of Sutherland and Shin with, originally, clear views up the Kyle of Sutherland and presumably so placed to have ritual or social significance. To show the potential indirect effect, a wireline of the vista from Invershin Standing Stone towards the Proposed Development has been prepared. This is **Figure 8.2a-b**.

- 8.7.7 The Proposed Development, descending to Inveran through Inveran Wood would be visible from the standing stone but only adding a small new element to the pre-existing landscape elements of coniferous planting and overhead lines converging on Shin substation. Critical vistas from the standing stone up the River Shin valley and along the Kyle of Sutherland will not be broken or intruded upon by the Proposed Development. Any minor visibility is therefore considered to be non-significant in terms of its effect on the setting of the standing stone.
- 8.7.8 The Proposed Development has the potential for indirect visual effects on some other SMs in the Inveran area only as it descends through Linsidecroo Wood and Inveran Wood. As viewed from the SMs on the east side of the A836 the Proposed Development occupies a very narrow arc of visibility, further reduced by extant coniferous planting and natural woodland. Furthermore, the SMs here are almost entirely domestic in nature, their location and setting dictated by factors associated with land use and resources. Any minor visibility is therefore considered to be non-significant in terms of its effect on the setting of the SMs.

Cumulative Effects

- 8.7.9 No cumulative effects are predicted in relation to cultural heritage and the Proposed Development. m

8.8 Mitigation

- 8.8.1 The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid heritage assets where possible as described in **Chapter 2**.
- 8.8.2 It is recommended though, that mitigation measures be agreed in advance of any groundbreaking work and be clearly set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), agreed with THC and to be implemented by an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW).
- 8.8.3 Protection of all three non-designated sites (listed in the *Direct Effects – Inner Study Area* sub-heading in **Section 8.7** above) from accidental damage during the construction phase is recommended below.
- 8.8.4 This should be in the form of identifying and clearly marking off with some form of barrier and appropriate signage. The exclusion zones should extend as far as practicable out from the visible features of the sites.
- 8.8.5 In addition, awareness of site workers to the significance and sensitivity of the archaeological exclusion zones should be raised through on-site toolbox talks.
- 8.8.6 Specifically, mitigation would be required to reduce the direct effect on the Allt a'Ghlugheran, Linsidemoor Wood and An t-Alltan Guideach features as follows:
- **Allt a' Ghlugheran (MHG 12800):** marking out of two hut circles within the LoD within exclusion zones extending preferably 10 m beyond the visible edge of the feature to prevent accidental damage. Archaeological monitoring by ACoW in the form of a Watching Brief to be carried out on any ground breaking work within the defined broader area of the site;
 - **Linsidemoor Wood (MHG12891):** marking out by ACoW of one hut circle within the LoD with as wide an exclusion zone as possible given its proximity to one pole location and the temporary access route. Protection to the feature during the laying out or dragging of cables in the form of protective matting and archaeological monitoring by ACoW in the form of a Watching Brief to be carried out on any groundbreaking work within the defined broader area of the site; and

- **An t-Alltan Gruideach Enclosure (n/a):** although any damage to this feature is of low magnitude, protection of the enclosing banks in the form of matting is recommended where possible as well as monitoring of groundbreaking work by the ACoW in the form of a Watching Brief within the enclosure.

8.8.7 Following implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, no significant residual effects on cultural heritage assets are predicted. All mitigation measures refer to assets within the inner study area only.

8.9 Summary

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

8.9.2 An appraisal has been made of the predicted significance of effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage interests in the inner and outer study area. This appraisal identified no significant residual effects, assuming application of proposed mitigation measures.