

APPENDIX V2-8.1: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX V2-8.1: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT	1
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Scope of Assessment	3
1.3 Consultation	4
1.4 Potential Effects Scoped Out	6
1.5 Study Areas	6
1.6 Desk-Based Assessment	8
1.7 Field Surveys	8
1.8 Criteria for the Assessment of Effects	9
1.9 Criteria for Assessing Significance	11
1.10 Mitigation	13
1.11 Limitations and Assumptions	14
1.12 Visualisations	15

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Appendix outlines the general scope and methodology used in the assessment of potential impacts and the significance of residual predicted effects after taking into account proposed mitigation, which would be likely to arise from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage. The assessment has been carried out in relation to each of the seven geographical Sections through which the Proposed Development has been routed in order to assess the likely impacts and significance of effects for the whole of the Proposed Development. However, as certain aspects of the Study Areas and Field Survey methodology differ slightly between the Sections, it is also necessary to detail in the methodology those areas of difference.

1.2 Scope of Assessment

1.2.1 The proposed approach to the cultural heritage impact assessment is the same for all Sections of the project following the methodology detailed in the following paragraphs, except for the differences in the definition of the Outer Study Area in different Sections. For the assessment of setting impacts in Section 0, the Outer Study Area varies in extent from those for Sections 1 – 5 as the proposed Overhead Line (OHL) in Section 0 would be supported by trident wood poles that are of a reduced height (approximately 13 m), compared to the new steel lattice towers proposed in Sections 1 – 5 that would vary in height between 27 m to 33 m. No Outer Study Area has been used for the part of Section 2 from north of Sligachan to Luib, or for the entirety of Section 6, as the Proposed Development here would entirely comprise underground cable (UGC) and no setting effects are predicted.

1.2.2 The following effects have been assessed in full:

- Direct effects on all cultural heritage sites or features within a 200 m corridor centred on the alignment of the OHL and/or UGC elements of the Proposed Development (the Inner Study Area), and the 50 m Limit of Deviation (LoD) around off-line construction access routes.
- Indirect impacts (including cumulative impacts) on the setting of cultural heritage assets with statutory designations within 2.5 kilometres (km) of the steel lattice tower elements of the Proposed Development and 1.5 km from the wood pole elements of the Proposed Development, and which were identified from the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to have theoretical intervisibility with the OHL.

1.2.3 The assessment is based on the description of the Proposed Development as contained in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description and related Appendices.

1.2.4 The scope of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses summarised in **Table 8-1** and the following legislation, policy, and guidance:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979¹.
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997² (as amended by Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015)³;
- The Electricity Act 1989 Schedule 9 (paragraph 3)⁴;
- Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013⁵; and
- Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017⁶.

1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997

3 The Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015

4 Electricity Act 1989

5 The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

6 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

Planning Policy

1.2.5 National planning policy relevant to archaeology and cultural heritage that has been considered as part of this assessment includes:

- Draft National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4)⁷
- National Planning Framework for Scotland 3 (NPF3)⁸
- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)⁹
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS)¹⁰
- Planning Advice Note 1/2013 (PAN 1): Environmental Impact Assessment¹¹; and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011 (PAN 2): Planning and Archaeology¹².

1.2.6 Local planning policies and guidance relevant to archaeology and cultural heritage considered as part of this assessment include:

- Highland wide Local Development Plan¹³
- Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan¹⁴
- West Highland and Islands Local Development Plan¹⁵

Guidance

1.2.7 Cognisance has been taken of the following best practice guidelines and technical guidance:

- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting¹⁶
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment¹⁷
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook¹⁸
- Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work¹⁹
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance²⁰, and
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment²¹.

1.3 Consultation

1.3.1 **Table 8-1** summarises the consultation responses received during the scoping process that are of relevance to the EIA work in relation to Cultural Heritage. As requested in the Scoping Opinion, the Table provides information on where, and/or how, they have been addressed in this assessment.

⁷ Scotland 2045 - fourth National Planning Framework - draft: consultation - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)

⁸ National Planning Framework for Scotland 3 (NPF3) (Scottish Government, 2014)

⁹ Scottish Planning Policy - gov.scot (www.gov.scot) (Paragraphs 135-151)

¹⁰ <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/?msclid=84d847b3b0e611eca0da36f5b46eca5b>

¹² <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/?msclid=aed94f61b0e611ecbc77c4974456c35d>

¹³ Highland-Wide Local Development Plan (Highland Council, 2012)

¹⁴ Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Highland Council, 2015)

¹⁵ West Highland and Islands Local Development Plan (Highland Council, 2019)

¹⁶ Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016)

¹⁷ https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GDBA_4.pdf

¹⁸ <https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf?msclid=d160f4e1b0f011ec8d25110ce84ff9b7>

¹⁹ Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work (Highland Council, 2012)

²⁰ <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b&msclid=00e804ddb0f111ec8557f691dde295ba>

²¹ Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment, 2021)

Table 8-1: Scoping Responses

Organisation	Response	Comment
The Highland Council	<p>THC requires the EIA Report to identify all designated cultural heritage sites which may be affected by the development either directly or indirectly.</p> <p>THC also expects any assessment to contain a full appreciation of the setting of these historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings, supported by visualisations if significant impacts on settings are likely.</p> <p>The methodology as stated in the Scoping Report is acceptable to THC.</p>	<p>Details of the EIA Report's findings on Cultural Heritage sites are set out in this Chapter and associated appendices.</p> <p>Visualisations have been produced to assist with assessment of impacts on sites and their settings in respect of which it was considered there was the potential for significant effects on their setting, and these are included in Volume 3, Figure V2-8.3-S0a-d, Figure V2-8.4-S0a-d, Figure V2-8.3-S1a-d and Figure V2-8.3-S3a-b of this EIA Report.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland, Scoping Response, 15/2/2022	<p>HES state that they "are content with the scope of assessment for our remit" provided within the Scoping Report. [HES] welcome that the assessment will include consideration of the potential for direct physical effects on assets within our remit for both (sic.) all elements of the Proposed Development including off-line construction infrastructure, and for the removal of the existing overhead line infrastructure.</p> <p>[HES] welcome that the assessment will also consider potential effects on the setting of assets in the wider surrounding area. [HES] are content with the proposed study areas identified within Chapter 9 of the Scoping Report. [HES] agree that the potential cumulative effects of the various elements of the overall development, including the new substation infrastructure for example, should be assessed.</p> <p>[HES] have been involved in consultation for this proposed development throughout the route and alignment selection process. [HES] have previously provided detailed comments on the potential impacts of the proposed development at various stages in the design process. [HES]' most recent response to the applicant (dated 11 November 2021) provided detailed comments on the Preferred Alignment which is shown in the scoping report. [HES] have therefore not repeated these comments, however, the response [was] attached for information.</p> <p>As stated in that response there remains the potential for some adverse effects from the Proposed Development and [HES] would welcome continued consultation as the detailed design of the development progresses. In particular [HES] would</p>	<p>Potential for direct physical effects on designated assets from all elements of the Proposed Development including off-line construction infrastructure, and the removal of the existing overhead line infrastructure has been considered and assessed in this Chapter and associated Appendices in Volume 5 of this EIA.</p> <p>Potential effects (including cumulative effects) on the setting of assets in the wider surrounding area (using Study Areas proposed in the Scoping Report) have been considered and assessed in this Chapter and associated Appendices in Volume 5 of this EIA.</p> <p>Previous consultation with HES has informed the iterative design process of the Proposed Development and mitigation of direct impacts has been embedded in the project design where relevant.</p> <p>Potential direct effects upon Old Corry, cairns (SM 13673) were mitigated through</p>

Organisation	Response	Comment
	<p>welcome consultation on proposed mitigation to ensure avoidance of direct effects on Old Corry, cairns 820m NE of, Isle of Skye (SM 13673), and the potential effects on the setting of scheduled monuments in the vicinity of Section 4 of the proposed development.</p> <p>[HES] note that paragraph 9.5.29 suggests that the detailed methodology for assessment will be agreed in consultation with ourselves and THC's Historic Environment Team. [HES] would be happy to provide advice regarding the methodology if that would be helpful. In addition, [HES] would be happy to provide advice regarding the requirements for any further visualisations as suggested at paragraph 9.5.38. This may be particularly relevant to assets in the vicinity of section 4 of the proposed development.</p>	<p>design, and no further consultation with HES was sought in this regard.</p> <p>No significant effects are predicted on the settings of scheduled monuments in the vicinity of Section 4, and therefore no further consultation with HES was sought in this regard.</p> <p>Since HES declared themselves content with the assessment methodology as proposed in the Scoping Report, no further consultation with HES was sought in this regard.</p> <p>No significant effects are predicted on the settings of scheduled monuments in the vicinity of Section 4, and therefore no further visualisations were required beyond those proposed in the Scoping Report.</p>

1.4 Potential Effects Scoped Out

- 1.4.1 The Scoping Report proposed that the assessment of certain effects be scoped out of this Chapter. Consultees have agreed, and those assessments scoped out are detailed here.
- 1.4.2 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on any maritime archaeological resources within the Study Areas has been scoped out. These all lie offshore and would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development.
- 1.4.3 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of World Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and Inventory Historic Battlefields has been scoped out. There are no assets with those designations within 2.5 km of the Proposed Development.
- 1.4.4 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of key heritage assets more than 2.5 km from the steel lattice tower OHL and sealing end compound elements of the Proposed Development and 1.5 km from the wood pole OHL elements, has been scoped out. None have been identified through initial analysis as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development.
- 1.4.5 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development within the UGC element of Section 2 and the entirety of Section 6 on the settings of heritage assets has been scoped out. The entirety of the Proposed Development within Section 6 will comprise UGC. No impacts on the settings of heritage assets within these parts of the route are anticipated for both Sections 2 and 6. In particular, there will be no visibility of Section 6 from Torr Dhuin (SM 794) or from the Caledonian Canal (SM 6497). Assessment of potential impacts on their settings will therefore be scoped out.

1.5 Study Areas

- 1.5.1 The following study areas have been adopted for the cultural heritage assessment.

Section 0

1.5.2 No new on-line or off-line construction access routes are planned for Section 0 – all materials would be delivered to and from construction areas using a combination of existing roads, helicopter and / or tracked vehicles.

- The Inner Study Area comprises a corridor nominally 200 m wide centred on the alignment of the OHL and UGC for the identification of cultural heritage assets that could be directly affected by construction of the Proposed Development, including on-line construction access between pole or tower positions.
- An Outer Study Area for indirect effects (effects on setting): this is consistent with the Outer Study Area used in the Landscape and Visual impact Assessment (LVIA) (see **Volume 2, Chapter 3: Landscape and Visual**) and comprises a study area extending 1.5 km either side of the OHL. This Study Area has been used, in combination with the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) model for the Proposed Development, to identify those heritage assets with statutory or non-statutory designations (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscapes, etc.) that could have their settings adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

Section 1 to Section 5

1.5.3 Within Section 2, the Proposed Development from north of Sligachan to Luib will comprise UGC, and no setting impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no Outer Study Area has been used within those parts of Section 2 proposed for UGC.

- The Inner Study Area comprises:
 - A corridor nominally 200 m wide centred on the alignment of the OHL elements of the Proposed Development forms the study area for the identification of cultural heritage assets that could be directly affected by construction of the Proposed Development, including on-line construction access between tower positions.
 - Off-line construction access routes: a corridor 50 m wide (to allow for potential micro-siting) centred on the routes of proposed new access tracks (temporary or permanent) or existing tracks or paths that would be built or used to facilitate access to the Proposed Development forms the study area for the identification of cultural heritage assets that could be directly affected by access requirements.
- An Outer Study Area for indirect effects (effects on setting): this is consistent with the Study Area used in the LVIA (see **Volume 2, Chapter 3: Landscape and Visual**) extending 2.5 km either side of the OHL. This Study Area has been used in combination with the ZTV model for the Proposed Development, to identify those heritage assets with statutory or non-statutory designations (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Gardens and Designed Landscapes, etc.) that could have their settings adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

Section 6

1.5.4 The Proposed Development within Section 6 would entirely comprise UGC, and no setting impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no Outer Study Area has been used within Section 6.

- The Inner Study Area comprises:
 - A corridor nominally 200 m wide centred on the UGC elements of the Proposed Development forms the study area for the identification of cultural heritage assets that could be directly affected by construction of the Proposed Development, including on-line construction access.
 - Off-line construction access routes: a corridor 50 m wide (to allow for potential micro-alignment) centred on the routes of proposed new access tracks (temporary or permanent) or existing tracks or paths that would be built or used to facilitate access to the Proposed Development forms the study area for the identification of cultural heritage assets that could be directly affected by access requirements.

1.6 Desk-Based Assessment

1.6.1 The following information sources have been consulted to inform the desk-based assessment:

- HES Spatial Data Warehouse: for up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory status Garden and Designed Landscapes and Inventory status Historic Battlefields;
- THC Historic Environment Record (HER): for current data within the Proposed Development's Study Areas;
- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NHRE) database (Canmore): for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
- Map Library of the National Library of Scotland: for Ordnance Survey maps and other historical map resources;
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap): for information on the historic land use character of the Site and the surrounding area; and
- Modern vertical aerial photographic imagery (Google Earth, Bing Maps, and ESRI World Imagery): examined to obtain information on current land-use and evidence for continuing survival of sites and features identified through other desk-based resources.

1.7 Field Surveys

1.7.1 Any differences in field survey methodology between Sections are detailed below, but in general all assets visited and/or located during the field survey were recorded using a handheld global positioning system (GPS). For reasons of clarity and legibility, the detailed data recorded on the GPS is not depicted on the Figures, but the data has been retained as a GIS shapefile recording visible extents and locations of all assets visited and would be used to help inform mitigation proposals. Field notes on the assets' condition and extent were taken, and a photographic record was made to supplement those notes. The depictions of the assets on the Figures, included in Volume 3 of this EIA Report, record the general locations and maximum extent of visible surface features.

Section 0: Ardmore to Edinbane

1.7.2 The archaeological baseline of the Waternish peninsula, between Ardmore Substation and Fairy Bridge, is well recorded, having been surveyed in detail during the 1990s by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS). That survey recorded in detail the locations of individual features that make up the various townships, settlements and field systems, and those locations are shown as point data on **Figure V2-8.2-S0a-f**.

1.7.3 The Site for the Proposed Development in Section 0 was also targeted for a field survey early in the alignment selection study because of the archaeological sensitivity identified during the desktop phase of that study. The area was visited during the targeted field survey carried out in October 2020, when Trumpan church and burial ground (SM 949) and Dun Hallin (SM 916) were also visited to assess their settings. This site visit established that the remains survive as described by the Royal Commission for Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) survey.

1.7.4 The remains here have been well recorded and mapped in detail by RCAHMS in the 1990s, therefore no further survey work was undertaken for the part of Section 0 that lies north of Fairy Bridge.

1.7.5 From Fairy Bridge to Edinbane Substation, the route passes through an area of shielings, at Ben Horneval. Targeted field survey in October 2020 visited the shielings but found the area covered in dense heather that precluded identification of low relief features. The shielings were consequently not recorded as they could not be easily located in the dense vegetation. They were visited again in 2022 and successfully located.

1.7.6 In February and March 2022, the Proposed Development within the Section of the route from Fairy Bridge to Edinbane Substation was subject to a walk-over survey to identify and record any cultural heritage sites not located by the desk-based study that could be directly affected by the Proposed Development. This survey was undertaken by two teams of three experienced archaeological surveyors over two weeks. Conditions were typical for the time of year; a mix of rain, snow showers, bright sunshine and overcast skies. Vegetation was low, and surface visibility was good.

Section 1: Edinbane to North Sligachan and Section 2: North of Sligachan to Broadford

1.7.7 As agreed through the scoping and consultation process, the entire Inner Study Area within these Sections was subject to a walk-over survey to identify and record any cultural heritage sites not located by the desk-based study that could be directly affected by the Proposed Development. This survey was undertaken by two teams of three experienced archaeological surveyors over a week in mid-February 2022. Conditions were typical for the time of year; a mix of rain, snow showers, bright sunshine and overcast skies. Vegetation was low, and surface visibility was good.

Section 3: Broadford to Kyle Rhea, Section 4: Kyle Rhea to Loch Cuaich, Section 5: Loch Cuaich to Invergarry, and Section 6: Invergarry to Fort Augustus

1.7.8 The Inner Study Area within these Sections was subject to a targeted walk-over survey to confirm the nature and extent of known heritage assets identified during the desk-based study and to identify and record any previously unknown cultural heritage sites that could be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Areas to be targeted were agreed at scoping stage and subsequent consultation with HET. Targeted survey areas are depicted on the accompanying Figures. Surveys were undertaken by two teams of three experienced archaeological surveyors over two weeks in February and March 2022. Conditions were typical for the time of year; a mix of rain, snow showers, bright sunshine and overcast skies. Vegetation was low, and surface visibility was good.

1.8 Criteria for the Assessment of Effects

1.8.1 The effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets have been assessed based on their type (direct impacts, impacts on setting and cumulative impacts) and nature (adverse or beneficial). Consistent with the approach taken in Chapter 8, “heritage assets” comprises the historic environment and built heritage; (see paragraph 8.2.1 in the Introduction for Chapter 8. The assessment takes into account the relative 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.
- Beneficial effects are those that preserve, enhance or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

Criteria for Assessing the Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

1.8.2 Cultural heritage assets are given weight through the statutory designation process. Designation of heritage assets under statute ensures that sites and places are recognised in law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the relevant laws and policies²². **Table 8-2** summarises the relative sensitivity of key heritage assets relevant to the Proposed Development (it excludes maritime heritage assets and Inventory Historic Battlefields).

²² Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019)

Table 8-2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition / Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Heritage Sites; • Scheduled Monuments; • Category A Listed Buildings; • Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes; and • Non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designation.
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks); • Category B Listed Buildings; • Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes, where these are recorded in Council HERs; and • Conservation Areas.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 minor historic landscape features (e. g. quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc).

Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impact

1.8.3 The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) has been assessed in the categories 'high', 'medium', 'low' and 'negligible' as described in **Table 8-3**.

Table 8-3: Magnitude of Impact

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

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

Criteria for Assessing Cumulative Effects

- 1.8.4 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, in addition to the likely effects of other existing/operational, under construction, consented and proposed (at the application stage) developments. For this assessment, existing/operational developments, are taken to form part of the baseline against which the effects of the Proposed Development are assessed. Other proposed developments that have validated planning applications are considered to form part of the potential cumulative baseline. Proposed developments that are at the scoping stage are excluded from the assessment as there is insufficient information on the proposed scale and size, or configuration, to assess reliably the potential cumulative impacts. There is also uncertainty over whether such proposed developments will be progressed to a formal application.
- 1.8.5 The assessment takes into account the relative scale of the identified developments, their distance from the affected assets, and the potential degree of visibility of the various developments from the assets under consideration.

1.9 Criteria for Assessing Significance

Assessment of Effects on Setting

- 1.9.1 In its Scoping consultation response, HES recommended that their guidance on "Managing Change in the Historic Environment should be used when considering impacts on settings. This recommendation has been taken into account and the following guidance from that document has been in relation to the setting of heritage assets:

"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"²³.

- 1.9.2 The guidance also advises that:

²³ Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016), p5

"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"²⁴.

1.9.3 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.
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative impacts can be mitigated.

1.9.4 The ZTV (**Figure V2-8.2**) for the Proposed Development has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be theoretical visibility of the OHL (including towers / poles) and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration was also given to designated heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility from the asset but where views of, or across, the asset are important factors contributing to its cultural significance. In such cases, consideration has been given to whether the Proposed Development could appear in the background to those views.

1.9.5 Designated heritage assets, and undesignated heritage assets of a quality that they have the potential to be scheduled, which are within the ZTV and within 2.5 km of the OHL, are included in the assessment. These assets are included in the tabulated assessments in **Appendix V2-8.3: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area** presented in **Volume 5** of this EIA Report and shown on the series of **Figures V2- 8.2-S0a-f to V2 -8.2-S5a-c: Designated Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area** produced in **Volume 3** of this EIA Report.

1.9.6 Where it has been determined that the setting of an asset is such that there is no potential for it to be affected by the presence of the Proposed Development (including all assets of negligible sensitivity and all assets more than 2.5 km from the Proposed Development), the asset has not been considered further. For the remaining assets, the magnitude of impact on the setting was assessed according to the thresholds in set out in **Table 8-3**.

Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effects

1.9.7 The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 8-2**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 8-3**) have been used to assess the potential significance of the resultant effect. **Table 8-4** summarises the criteria for assigning significance of effect. Where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement supported by reasoned justification, has been employed to determine the level of significance.

1.9.8 For the purposes of the EIA Regulations, major and moderate effects are considered to be 'significant'. Minor and negligible effects are considered to be 'not significant'.

Table 8-4: Significance Criteria

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

²⁴ Ibid, p5

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

Assessment of Residual Effect Significance

1.9.9 The assessment of the significance of residual effects takes into account the mitigation proposed and the effectiveness of that mitigation to avoid, reduce or offset the predicted effects. Where a predicted impact is avoided through micrositing, the Proposed Development, this would result in no residual effect. Where an asset cannot be avoided but where the proposed mitigation would ensure that the affected asset is subject to an appropriate level of archaeological investigation and recording, resulting in its preservation by record, the significance of residual effect is accordingly reduced. Where an asset (usually one of little or no heritage importance and negligible sensitivity) is lost without any mitigation, or where a predicted effect is not mitigated (for example, a setting impact on an asset in the Outer Study Area resulting in a predicted effect that is not significant), the residual effect remains the same as the predicted effect; in all such cases the residual effect (high magnitude impact (**Table 8-3**) on an asset of negligible sensitivity (**Table 8-2**)) would be no more than minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms).

1.10 Mitigation

1.10.1 The routeing and alignment selection process for the Proposed Development has taken into consideration the potential for significant effects on archaeological features, and for such effects to be avoided or minimised where possible. This has continued through the EIA process, with survey data informing the siting of infrastructure and access routes to further minimise effects on archaeological features where practicable. This process is detailed in **Volume 1, Chapter 4: The Routeing Process and Alternatives**.

1.10.2 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (revised 2017)²⁵ 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 where possible.

1.10.3 The emphasis in PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology²⁶ is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible. The mitigation measures presented below therefore take into account this planning guidance and provide 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.

1.10.4 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or, where appropriate, during, the construction of the Proposed Development. All works would be conducted by a professional archaeological organisation, and 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) THC.

Mitigation during Construction

Preservation In-Situ

²⁵ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/?msclid=84d847b3b0e611eca0da36f5b46eca5b>

²⁶ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/?msclid=aed94f61b0e611ecbc77c4974456c35d>

- 1.10.5 Micrositing of the Proposed Development would take into account the desirability of preservation in situ where practicable. Preservation in situ of identified heritage assets would be achieved through marking off those assets that lie within the micrositing allowance prior to commencement of construction of the Proposed Development.
- 1.10.6 Marking out would be achieved using high visibility marker posts outside the edge of the identified heritage assets and these markers would be retained for the duration of the construction phase. The extent of marking out distances, and any and all assets to be protected in this way shall be agreed following consultation with THC.
- 1.10.7 Assets for marking out would be identified on the ground by a qualified archaeologist using the baseline information provided in **Appendix V2-8.2**. Marking out of the assets would be undertaken by the appointed Principal Contractor.

Evaluation / Watching Brief / Excavation

- 1.10.8 If required under the terms of a planning condition, the scope of any requirement for archaeological watching brief(s) during the construction works would be agreed through consultation with THC in advance of development works commencing and will be set out in the WSI.
- 1.10.9 If archaeological watching briefs are required under the terms of a planning condition, where buried remains are encountered during archaeological monitoring of groundworks, further mitigation may be required to a scope of works approved by THC. The preferred mitigation of any new archaeological discoveries would be preservation in situ. Where disturbance of the remains is unavoidable allowance would be made for the excavation of the features to a scheme to be agreed with THC under the terms of the WSI.
- 1.10.10 If significant discoveries are made during any archaeological monitoring works which are carried out, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered site or features in situ, provision would be made for the excavation where necessary, of any archaeological remains encountered. The provision would include the consequent production of written reports, on the findings, with post-excavation analysis conservation of finds and publication of the results of the works, where appropriate.

Construction Guidelines

- 1.10.11 Written guidelines, in the form of Construction Method Statements (CMS), would be issued for use by all construction contractors, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines would 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 in areas not subject to archaeological monitoring.
- 1.10.12 The guidelines would make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.

Mitigation during Lifespan

- 1.10.13 No mitigation is proposed in respect of any predicted effects on the settings of heritage assets during the operational lifespan of the Proposed Development.

1.11 Limitations and Assumptions

- 1.11.1 The assessment relies, in part, on the results of a desk-based assessment and uses data derived from the THC HER and the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE). It is assumed that the data was up to date at the time it was acquired.

1.11.2 Mitigation measures designed to prevent, reduce, or offset significant adverse effects are outlined and residual effects remaining following the implementation of proposed mitigation measures are reported.

1.12 Visualisations

1.12.1 Visualisation requirements for designated heritage assets were determined following an initial review of the Proposed Development ZTV and, where appropriate, viewpoints and visualisation types (photomontages or wirelines) were agreed through consultation with HES and THC.

1.12.2 The following visualisations are included:

- Figure V2-8.3-S0a-d: Visualisation from Trumpan Church and Burial Ground
- Figure V2-8.4-S0a-d: Visualisation toward Dun Hallin Broch from Knockbreck School
- Figure V2-8.3-S1a-d: Visualisation from Dun Arkaig Broch
- Figure V2-8.3-S3a-b: Wireline from Old Corry Cairns