

APPENDIX V6-8.1: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX V6-8.1: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT	1
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Scope of Assessment	3
1.3 Potential Effects Scoped Out	3
1.4 Study Areas	3
1.5 Desk-Based Assessment	3
1.6 Field Surveys	4
1.7 Criteria for the Assessment of Effects	4
1.8 Criteria for Assessing Significance	5
1.9 Mitigation	7
1.10 Limitations and Assumptions	8
1.11 Visualisations	8

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 likely to arise from the construction and operation of the Alternative Alignment within Section 3 of the project on cultural heritage.

1.2 Scope of Assessment

1.2.1 The proposed approach to the cultural heritage impact assessment for the Alternative Alignment is detailed in the following paragraphs.

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 (the Inner Study Area), and the 50 m Limit of Deviation (LoD) around off-line construction access routes.
- Indirect impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets with statutory designations within 2.5 kilometres (km) of the steel lattice tower elements of the Alternative Alignment, 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 6, Chapter 2: Project Description**.

1.3 Potential Effects Scoped Out

1.3.1 The Scoping Report proposed that the assessment of certain effects be scoped out of this assessment. Consultees have agreed, and those assessments scoped out are detailed here.

1.3.2 Assessment of the effect of the Alternative Alignment on 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.

1.3.3 Assessment of the effect of the Alternative Alignment 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.

1.3.4 Assessment of the effect of the Alternative Alignment on the settings of key heritage assets more than 2.5 km from the OHL, has been scoped out. None have been identified through initial analysis as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development.

1.4 Study Areas

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

- The Inner Study Area comprises:
 - A corridor nominally 200 m wide centred on 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 6, Chapter 3: Landscape and Visual**) extending 2.5 km either side of the OHL. This Study Area has been used in combination with the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) model, 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.

1.5 Desk-Based Assessment

1.5.1 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.

1.6 Field Surveys

1.6.1 The Alternative Alignment was subject to targeted walk-over survey to identify and record any cultural heritage sites not located by the desk-based study that could be directly affected. Areas to be targeted were agreed during scoping and subsequent consultation with HET. This survey was undertaken by two teams of three experienced archaeological surveyors during February and March 2022. Conditions were typical for the time of year; a mix of rain, snow showers, bright sunshine, and overcast skies, but this did not hamper the identification of surface features. Vegetation was low, and ground surface visibility was good.

1.7 Criteria for the Assessment of Effects

1.7.1 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 8.1.1 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

1.7.2 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 policies¹. **Table 8-1** summarises the relative sensitivity of key heritage assets relevant to the Proposed Development (it excludes maritime heritage assets and Inventory Historic Battlefields).

Table 8-1: 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).

¹ Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019)

Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impact

- 1.7.3 The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) has been assessed in the categories 'high', 'medium', 'low' and 'negligible' as described in **Table 8-2**.

Table 8-2: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Definition / 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 contributes 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>	

Criteria for Assessing Cumulative Effects

- 1.7.4 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.
- 1.7.5 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.

1.8 Criteria for Assessing Significance

Assessment of Effects on Setting

- 1.8.1 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"².

² Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016), p5

1.8.2 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"³.

1.8.3 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.

1.8.4 The ZTV (**Figure V6-8.2**) for the Alternative Alignment has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be theoretical visibility of the OHL (including towers) 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.

1.8.5 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 V6-8.3** and shown on **Figure V6-8.2**.

1.8.6 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 8.2**.

Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effects

1.8.7 The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 8-1**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 8-2**) have been used to assess the potential significance of the resultant effect. **Table 8-3** 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.

1.8.8 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 8-3: 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
Low	Moderate / Minor	Minor	Minor / Negligible	Minor / Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Minor / Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Negligible

Assessment of Residual Effect Significance

1.8.9 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 micro-siting, 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

³ Ibid, p5

magnitude impact (**Table 8-2**) on an asset of negligible sensitivity (**Table 8-1**) would be no more than minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms).

1.9 Mitigation

1.9.1 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (revised 2017)⁴ 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.

1.9.2 The emphasis in PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology⁵ 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.

1.9.3 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or, where appropriate, during, the construction of the Section 3 Alternative Alignment. 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

1.9.4 Micrositing of the Alternative Alignment 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.

1.9.5 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.

1.9.6 Assets for marking out would be identified on the ground by a qualified archaeologist using the baseline information provided in **Appendix V6-8.2**. Marking out of the assets would be undertaken by the appointed Principal Contractor.

Evaluation / Watching Brief / Excavation

1.9.7 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.

1.9.8 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.

1.9.9 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

1.9.10 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.

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

⁴ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/?msclid=84d847b3b0e611eca0da36f5b46eca5b>

⁵ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/?msclid=aed94f61b0e611ecbc77c4974456c35d>

Mitigation during Lifespan

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

1.10 Limitations and Assumptions

1.10.1 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.

1.10.2 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.

1.11 Visualisations

1.11.1 Visualisation requirements were determined following an initial review of the Section 3 Alternative Alignment ZTV and, where appropriate, viewpoints and visualisation types (photomontages or wirelines) were agreed through consultation with HES and THC.

1.11.2 The following visualisations are included:

- Figure V2-8.3-S3a-b: Wireline from Old Corry Cairns