

VOLUME 2: CHAPTER 12 – CULTURAL HERITAGE

12.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	12-1
12.1	Executive Summary	12-1
12.2	Introduction	12-3
12.3	Scope of Assessment and Baseline Methodology	12-4
12.4	Issues Scoped Out	12-13
12.5	Baseline Conditions (Archaeological and Historical Background)	12-15
12.6	Baseline Conditions (Assets)	12-17
12.7	Assessment of Effects	12-22
12.8	Cumulative Effects	12-36
12.9	Mitigation	12-55
12.10	Framework Mitigation Approach Summary	12-56
12.11	Residual Effects	12-57
12.12	Summary and Conclusions	12-57

Figures (Volume 3 of this EIA Report)

Figure 12.1: Baseline Designated Assets
 Figure 12.2: Baseline Non-Designated Assets
 Figure 12.3: Gazetteer Designated Assets
 Figure 12.4: Gazetteer Non-Designated Assets
 Figure 12.5: Sieved Setting Assets with ZTV
 Figure 12.6: Cultural Heritage 3D Visualisations Locators
 Figure 12.7: Cultural Heritage Photomontages / Wireframes Locator Maps
 Figure 12.8: Elevated archaeological Potential Areas

Appendices (Volume 5 of this EIA Report)

Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment
 Appendix 12.2: Archaeological and Historical Background
 Appendix 12.3: Baseline Tables
 Appendix 12.4: Gazetteer Tables
 Appendix 12.5: Impact Assessment Tables
 Appendix 12.6: Setting Assessment Tables
 Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary
 Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations
 Appendix 12.9: Walkover Survey Report

Visualisations (Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations)

Visualisation 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages

- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-01: SM419, SM420 - Chambered cairn 755m SW of Achkinloch, Loch Stemster
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-02: SM453 - Guidebest, stone circle, Latheronwheel Burn
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-03: SM6015, SM457, SM568 - Hut circles 330m SSE of, 370m ESE of and 270m E of Minera
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-04: SM6014 - Settlement 1170m S of Buolacrabher
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-05: SM5224 - Chambered cairn 1350m SSW of Buolacrabher
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-06: SM445 - Chambered cairn 1550m S of Buolacrabher
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-07: SM443 - Cnoc na Maranaich, chambered cairn, burial cist and standing stone
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-08: SM603 - Prehistoric settlement 1050m NNW of Wag Hill

- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-09: SM600 - Prehistoric settlement 1300m NE of Wag Hill
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-10: SM5304 - Standing stone 600m N of Bridge of Badnagie
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-11: SM5089 - Broch 180m NE of Greentulloch
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-12: SM5089 - Broch 180m NE of Greentulloch
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-13: SM5254 - Prehistoric settlement and post medieval enclosure 1400m WSW of Loedebest
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-14: SM5191 - Cairn 500m SSE of Loedebest
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-15: SM5150 - Settlements 1100m NNE of Achorn Bridge
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-16: SM522 - Broch 135m WNW of Balantrath
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-17: SM511, SM512 - Broch 200m NW of Achorn
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-18: SM3521 - Four hut circles 300m SSE of Balcraggie Lodge
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-19: SM596 - Upper Bogue, broch
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-20: SM3473 - Homestead 500m WNW of Rinsary, Berriedale
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-21: SM3537, SM3559 - Hut circle 250m SSW of Cnoc Fionn
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-22: SM3440 - Tulloch Tural, broch 500m WNW of Tural Rock, Langwell
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-23: SM13631 - Tural Rock, hut circle complex 250m NW of Langwell Tulloch broch
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-24: SM3441 - Langwell Tulloch, broch 400m SE of Tural Rock
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-25: SM423 - Chambered cairn 570m E of Cnoc Bad Asgaraidh, Langwell
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-26: SM524, SM525 - Bogue Langwell, broch, outworks and later settlement, Berriedale
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-27: SM2807, SM2810, SM1871 - Hut circles & field system 750m NNE of Kilphedir
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-28: SM1771 - Long cairn 460m NNW of Caen
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-29: SM432 - Long cairn 530m NW of Caen, Helmsdale
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-30: SM13647 - Caen Burn West, 935m WNW of Caen
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-31: SM1770 - Long cairn and round cairn 470m and 490m W of Caen
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-32: SM1778 - Standing stone, Glen Loth 4000m N of Clach Mhic Mhios, Lothbeg Bridge
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-33: SM1793, SM13646 - Hut circle & clearance cairns 270m SW of Kilbraur
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-34: SM1794 - Chambered cairn 800m N of Killin, Loch Brora
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-35: LB7063 - Ben Bhraigaidh Monument to the First Duke of Sutherland
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-36: SM13619 - Lettie's Grave, square cairns
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-37: GDL00160 - Dunrobin Castle
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-38: LB7063 - Ben Bhraigaidh Monument to the First Duke of Sutherland
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-39: GDL00160 - Dunrobin Castle
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-40: SM1772 - Cairn & chambered cairn 1200m WNW of Carn Liath, Torboll
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-41: SM5497 - Settlement and burnt mound 500m E of Invershin Farm
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-42: BTL19 - Battle of Carbisdale
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-43: BTL19 - Battle of Carbisdale
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-44: GDL00023, LB15031 - Ardross Castle
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-45: SM6644 - Boath, three chambered cairns NE and NNE of Easter Ballone Farm
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-46: SM10495, SM4728 - Settlement 1300m NW of Firth View, Settlement NW of Cnoc a'Mhuilinn, Strath Sgitheach
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-47: SM2312 - Heights of Brae, chambered cairn 375m NNW of Firth View

- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-48: GDL00370 - The Spa Gardens, Strathpeffer
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-49: LB1769 - Coul house Hotel, formerly Coul House
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-50: GDL00068 - Brahan
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-51: GDL00068 - Brahan
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-52: LB14030 - Fairburn Tower
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-53: SM13523 - Barrow 595m SW of Urchany
- Vis-WFPM- CHVP-54: SM4979 - Dun Mor, fort

Visualisation 12.8.2: 3D Renders (Plates)

- 3D model Renders – Section A, CHVP: 001 - 119; Plates: 1 - 668
- 3D model Renders – Section B, CHVP: 120 - 148; Plates: 669 - 828
- 3D model Renders – Section C, CHVP: 149 - 162; Plates: 829 - 895
- 3D model Renders – Section D, CHVP: 163 - 185; Plates: 896 - 985
- 3D model Renders – Section E, CHVP: 186 - 219; Plates: 986 - 1118

12. CULTURAL HERITAGE

12.1 Executive Summary

- 12.1.1 This chapter considers the potential significant effects on cultural heritage from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment has been undertaken by Environmental Resources Management Ltd (ERM), informed by comments and information provided by Historic Environment Scotland and The Highland Council.
- 12.1.2 The assessment was designed to identify and evaluate any cultural heritage receptors present within the Limit of Deviation (LoD) of the Proposed Development, construction related elements and associated access tracks, through the examination of desk-based resources and a programme of field investigation. It was also designed to identify and evaluate any potential setting impacts upon heritage assets within 10 km of the Proposed Development, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, garden and designed landscapes, conservation areas, battlefields and non-designated assets, where those assets were considered to derive part of their cultural significance from their setting.
- 12.1.3 A total of 5014 cultural heritage assets have been identified as part of the baseline, of which 1296 have been added to a gazetteer. These are assets potentially susceptible to impacts resulting from the introduction of the Proposed Development, either physically (direct) or as a result of changes to setting.
- 12.1.4 The Proposed Development has undergone an iterative design process, with the objective of avoiding or minimising impacts upon identified environmental and social constraints (including cultural heritage assets) by design. Where it has not been possible to mitigate impacts by design, a suite of proportionate additional mitigation measures have been identified, including further archaeological investigation, monitoring and recording, aimed at off-setting any unavoidable adverse impacts.
- 12.1.5 The Proposed Development has the potential to result in 76 significant adverse effects to cultural heritage assets. Of these 32 would be anticipated to result from the Direct (physical) impact of the Proposed Development, specifically the construction groundworks, upon heritage assets, e.g., their truncation or removal. The remaining 44 effects would be anticipated to derive from adverse changes to the setting of heritage assets.
- 12.1.6 The majority of the identified significant effects would result from the installation of the Proposed Development along Section A, which passes through an area of concentrated archaeological activity. Notably fewer significant effects have been identified within each of the remaining four sections (B-E).
- 12.1.7 A summary of the identified significant adverse effects, broken down by section, is as follows:
- Section A:*
- Twelve as a result of direct impacts (one major, 11 moderate); and
 - Thirty-four as a result of changes to setting (13 major, 21 moderate).
- Section B:*
- Ten as a result of direct impacts (one major, nine moderate); and
 - Two as a result of changes to setting (two major).
- Section C:*
- One as result of a direct impact (one moderate); and
 - Two as a result of changes to setting (two moderate).

Section D:

- Three as a result of direct impacts (three moderate); and
- Four as a result of changes to setting (one major, three moderate).

Section E:

- Six as a result of direct impacts (three major, three moderate); and
- Two as a result of changes to setting (one major, one moderate).

Integrity of Setting

12.1.8 Following an appraisal of significant effects to designated assets, it has been determined that the Proposed Development would potentially result in a single instance of significant adverse impact upon the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument, specifically:

- Balnacrae Cairn (SM2396), which is located within Section D.

Cumulative Effects

12.1.9 Four major adverse cumulative/in-combination effects are reported as a result of changes in setting on four designated assets:

Ceislein Wind Farm

- LB7926 Ardross Castle
- SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns

Lairg II Wind Farm Redesign

- SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound; and
- SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound.

12.1.10 For these assets, the cumulative effect to setting from the Proposed Development and proposed wind farms would add to the minor adverse projected effect generated from the Proposed Development alone, resulting in a major adverse in-combination, cumulative effect, which is significant.

12.1.11 Cumulative effects are present for Fairburn Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00174) concerning the inter-phase interaction of direct physical impacts/setting impacts at construction phase and the residual setting impacts throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The interaction of these construction and operational phase impacts is predicted to result in a cumulative moderate adverse effect on the GDL, which would be considered significant in the context of EIA regulations.

12.2 Introduction

12.2.1 This chapter considers cultural heritage receptors, including buried archaeological remains, built heritage features and other aspects of the historic environment, hereafter referred to as 'heritage assets'. This chapter has been informed by the results of a desk-based assessment undertaken by Environmental Resources Management (ERM), and field survey undertaken by both ERM (setting) and AOC Archaeology Group (walkover and setting). It has also been informed by information and comments provided by Historic Environment Scotland (HES), The Highland Council: Historic Environment Team (THC HET) and community stakeholders, during the EIA process. This baseline information has been integrated and used in the determination and contextual understanding of the cultural significance of heritage assets and their potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development. The nature and extent of any such impacts, and whether, following mitigation, any resultant effects would be considered 'significant' for the purposes of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has then been considered and a conclusion reached.

12.2.2 The specific objectives of this chapter are to:

- identify and describe the cultural heritage baseline within the Study Area, with regard to both known and potential heritage assets;
- identify and discuss the potential direct, indirect¹ and setting effects of the Proposed Development upon the baseline cultural heritage resource;
- propose and describe measures, where appropriate, to mitigate any predicted adverse effects; and
- present a justified determination of whether any predicted residual effects would be 'significant'.

12.2.3 This chapter is supported by the following appendices and figures:

- **Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Baseline Designated Assets**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.2: Baseline Non-Designated Assets**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.3: Gazetteer Designated Assets**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.4: Gazetteer Non-Designated Assets**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.5: Sieved Setting Assets with ZTV**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.6: Cultural Heritage 3D Visualisations Locators**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.7: Cultural Heritage Photomontages / Wireframes Locator Maps**
- **Volume 3, Figure 12.8: Elevated archaeological Potential Areas**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.2: Archaeological and Historical Background**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.3: Baseline Tables**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.4: Gazetteer Tables**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.5: Impact Assessment Tables**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.6: Setting Assessment Tables**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary**
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations**
 - Visualisation 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages

¹ Given the nature of the development indirect effects are anticipated to be limited to the construction phase and will be largely negligible in nature. While any noise generated will be integrated into the assessment of experience within setting.

- Visualisation 12.8.2: 3D Renders
- **Volume 5, Appendix 12.9: Walkover Survey Report**

12.3 Scope of Assessment and Baseline Methodology

12.3.1 This section provides a summary of the adopted assessment scope and methodology, to align with the aims and objectives of NPF4². Both are presented in detail in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**.

Study Areas

12.3.2 The following Study Areas have been agreed during scoping³ and adopted for the cultural heritage assessment. These Study Areas were utilised to inform the creation of the following datasets:

- Baseline – utilised standardised study areas buffered from Proposed Development infrastructure; the objective of which is provision of context to aid in the understanding of the heritage resource within the vicinity of the Proposed Development; and
- Gazetteer – extracted from the Baseline dataset, the Gazetteer contains only those assets that have the potential to be impacted directly or as a result of changes in setting, based upon the Proposed Development design for tower locations and infrastructure, and using the LoD to focus the Impact Assessment.

Baseline Data Collection and Assessment

12.3.3 For designated heritage assets, the following Study Areas⁴ were agreed at the scoping stage:

- 10 km from the centreline of the Proposed Alignment for:
 - World Heritage Sites;
 - Scheduled Monuments;
 - Category A Listed Buildings;
 - Gardens and Designed Landscapes;
 - Registered Battlefields; and
 - Conservation Areas.
- 5 km from the centreline of the Proposed Alignment for:
 - Category B Listed Buildings; and
 - Category C Listed Buildings.

12.3.4 For non-designated heritage assets, the following Study Area was agreed:

- 1 km from the centreline of the Proposed Alignment

Gazetteer and Impact Assessment

12.3.5 For purposes of determining direct impacts, a 5 m buffer around the Proposed Development Limit of Deviation (LoD) was considered, to ensure that regard was given to any possible direct impacts within special

² Scottish Government. 2024. NPF4/SPP – Policy 7. Available: [Part 2 – National Planning Policy - National Planning Framework 4 - gov.scot](#).

³ Use of specific radius acts as a guide, where an approach using professional judgement allows for nuance in the Study Areas based on the ZTV analysis and expert knowledge that may seek to include assets with potential for impacts beyond the stated Study Area buffers.

⁴ Note: An approach is utilised that sees professional judgement consider receptors beyond the reported Study Area distance, where appropriate, based on a review of longer distance considerations, while maintaining a reasonable Study Area for assessment in relation to the Proposed Development.

arrangement areas (as appropriate) and along the course of proposed access tracks (existing roads with no planned upgrades were excluded).

12.3.6 Impact was assessed in relation to the physical footprint of the Proposed Development, with presence within the LoD not considered as a direct impact. Should the design be updated post-EIA Report, however, a strategy for managing heritage impact is outlined in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary**.

12.3.7 For the purposes of determining setting impacts, the baseline assets within the following Study Areas were considered for assessment (see **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.5); provided they were identified as:

- susceptible to impact, during the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis and sieving exercise; and
- deriving value from any aspects of their setting that might be changed by the Proposed Development.

Baseline Assessments and Surveys

Desk-based Assessment

12.3.8 A desk-based assessment was undertaken in order to define the existing baseline historic environment conditions, to characterise the archaeological potential of the Study Areas, and identify the cultural significance of heritage assets with the potential to undergo changes to the existing condition, landscape character or setting. The desk-based assessment was informed by a wide range of datasets, including:

- designations data curated by HES⁵;
- THC Historic Environment Record (HER) data;
- historic mapping available online from the National Library of Scotland;
- modern time-lapse satellite imagery (Google Earth, and ESRI World Imagery);
- bare-earth ZTV's;
- 3D projected model; and
- other publicly available data sources.

12.3.9 All data sources consulted, and the detailed methodology adopted, for the purposes of the desk-based assessment are described in full in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**.

Areas of Elevated Archaeological Potential

12.3.10 The identification of non-designated assets, and groups of assets, of increased heritage value (**Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.10.4-9) was based upon a number of factors, including:

- whether setting makes a material contribution to the assets' value; or
- where the nature, concentration and/or configuration of the remains retains an unusually high level of coherence or provides an unusually high level of context for the individual features and the grouping as a whole.

⁵ It was concluded that the Natural categorisation of The Flow Country WHS, alongside an assessment of the component sensitivities (ix and x) of the listing did not require an impact assessment to report potential effects to the heritage value of the WHS.

Walkover Survey

12.3.11 An archaeological walkover survey (**Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.6) was conducted by AOC Archaeology Group between April and November 2024. The survey focussed on the alignment options and their respective LoDs before focusing on the Proposed Alignment for this EIA Report and associated access tracks during the survey programme, within a 200 m survey corridor. Where the LoD extended beyond the 100 m, the survey was designed to cover the extended area, where possible.

12.3.12 The survey aimed to:

- confirm the presence/absence, extent and condition of any known heritage assets;
- identify any previously unknown/potential heritage assets;
- recover any surface remains considered to be at risk; and
- conduct setting contribution and sensitivity survey.

12.3.13 In summary, the AOC Archaeology Group survey identified or confirmed the condition and presence/absence of 1267 assets; with setting appraisals for 103 designated assets also conducted as part of the survey.

12.3.14 The dataset recovered during the walkover survey is provided in full in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.9: Walkover Survey Report**.

12.3.15 Following the completion of the archaeological walkover survey, further mitigation design changes occurred. However, the survey undertaken to-date is considered sufficient to inform the present assessment.

12.3.16 In line with the design changes, together with incomplete survey coverage due to inaccessible areas or weather constraints, further pre-construction survey may be required (see **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary**, Section 1.3.6). This would comprise a mix of walkover (open areas) and windscreen survey (existing tracks/roads).

Setting Assessment

12.3.17 The setting assessment process aligned with that advocated in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2016, updated 2020). That process and the approach to the scoping out of any assets from further assessment are described in detail in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.5.

12.3.18 A sieving exercise was conducted to understand the contribution of setting to the cultural significance of, and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience, assets identified within the baseline (see Volume 5, **Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, paragraphs 1.5.5 - 1.5.8), resulting in 192 detailed assessments of individual and grouped assets (**Volume 5, Appendix 12.6: Setting Assessment Tables**).

12.3.19 Field assessment of the setting of heritage assets was undertaken by ERM concurrent with the AOC Archaeology Group walkover survey. These works are detailed in **Volume 5: Appendix 12.1**, Section 1.6.10-13.

12.3.20 ERM accompanied HES on a site visit 7th-10th April 2025, wherein discussions concerning potential setting impacts took place in the field, using available visualisations, and advice was provided by HES.⁶ This was

⁶ Feedback and outcomes from the site visit have been integrated into the mitigation approach.

followed, in June 2025, by a workshop to discuss the potential effects and the approach to mitigation post-submission.

12.3.21 The detailed setting assessment methodology is provided in full, alongside the wireframe and 3D visualisation methodologies in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment** and **Volume 5, Appendix 7.3: Technical Methodologies for Visual Representation**. The illustrative visuals can be found in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations, 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages and 12.8.2: 3D Renders**.

Consultation

12.3.22 Scoping comments and responses related to the Proposed Development are included in **Volume 5, Appendix 6.3: Scoping Matrix. Table 12.1** summarises the key scoping responses received in relation to cultural heritage as well as any additional consultation undertaken in relation to approach to assessment.

Table 12.1: Cultural Heritage Consultation

Consultee	Summary of Issue Raised	Response / Action Taken
Scoping Responses		
HES	HES recommend that the applicant refers to the EIA Handbook for best practice advice on assessing cultural heritage impacts which offers Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland.	The Applicant acknowledges the recommendation from HES to refer to the EIA Handbook for best practice guidance on assessing cultural heritage impacts. This chapter has been informed by this guidance so that the assessment of cultural heritage is thorough and compliant with established best practices.
	HES recommend that an appropriately detailed ZTV should be used to identify potential setting impacts.	ZTV analysis has been used to assess how the Proposed Development may affect the settings of historic environment assets.
	HES state that the potential alignment route runs through one of the densest concentrations of scheduled monuments in Scotland, and as a consequence there are a large number of nationally important sites that have the potential to be subjected to significant adverse impacts on their site and setting as a result of this scheme.	This is recognised and this chapter includes analysis of the potential adverse impacts on these nationally important sites and their settings. Where practicable and in consultation with HES the design has been modified to reduce the potential for impact e.g. micro-siting of infrastructure to avoid direct impacts and reduce setting impacts.
	HES welcome that field surveys are being carried out and recommend that site visits to assess the potential impacts on the settings of assets are also carried out.	A comprehensive site walkover and settings assessment site visits have been undertaken. The results of these surveys have been factored into the assessment baseline and has informed the impact assessment within this chapter.
	<p>HES do not generally recommend the use of a specific radius (e.g. 10km study area) is used for the identification of assets which may receive impacts to their settings.</p> <p>HES generally recommend that a ZTV is used in the first instance to identify assets which may receive impacts and any assets which might themselves fall outwith the ZTV but where important views towards them may have visibility of the infrastructure in the background of the asset.</p> <p>HES welcome that section 9.8.4 confirms that a ZTV will be used to identify assets that may receive impacts to their setting.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges the methodological note and recommendation. The 10 km and 5 km Study Areas are to be used as a guide and influenced by an appropriate ZTV as well and expert knowledge to interpret the 'fuzzy' boundaries of the Study Areas (see Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment , paragraph 1.3.1).
	HES have provided a list of historic environment assets which may be affected by the proposed development, both within and outwith the proposed route. It may be possible to exclude some assets at a later stage once a ZTV has been produced.	The Applicant acknowledges the list of historic environment assets provided by HES that may be affected by the Proposed Development. This chapter takes into account these assets during the assessment process. As the ZTV

Consultee	Summary of Issue Raised	Response / Action Taken
		was developed, there was an opportunity to reassess the significance of potential impacts on these assets. If the ZTV indicated that certain assets would not be significantly affected, the Applicant considered their exclusion from detailed assessment at that time.
	HES welcome that provision of visualisations to demonstrate potential impacts on the setting of historic environment assets is proposed. HES recognise that it may not be possible to produce visualisations for every site and advise that attention is given to certain sites where this is likely to be particularly relevant. In most cases, full photomontages, often using a 360° or planar view, will be required.	The Applicant acknowledges the support from HES for the proposed visualisations aimed at demonstrating potential impacts on the setting of historic environment assets. The Applicant has focussed on producing full photomontages, particularly for sites where significant impacts are anticipated and supplementing with 3D model visualisations (Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations, 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages and 12.8.2: 3D Renders, and Volume 3, Figures 12.6 and 12.7).
	Mitigation measures should be considered at an early stage so that they can be incorporated into the design of the project to avoid significant impacts rather than relying on off-setting or compensatory mitigation.	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of integrating mitigation measures early in the Proposed Development design to proactively avoid significant impacts. This chapter has considered potential mitigation strategies from the outset, ensuring that they are incorporated into the Proposed Development design rather than relying solely on offsetting or compensatory measures.
	LoDs will need to be significantly reduced where pylons are proposed near designated assets. In most cases, mitigation through avoidance of impacts should be the primary consideration.	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of inputting to the development of a concise LoD with avoidance as a first principle for heritage design input.
THC	<p>THC stated that the EIA Report needs to identify all designated sites which may be affected by the development either directly or indirectly. This will require the assessment to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the architectural heritage (Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings); the archaeological heritage (Scheduled Monuments); the landscape (including designations such as National Parks, National Scenic Areas, Areas of Great Landscape Value, Gardens and Designed Landscapes and general setting of the development; and the inter-relationship between the above factors. 	Potential for effects on cultural heritage assets have been addressed in this chapter.

Consultee	Summary of Issue Raised	Response / Action Taken
	THC would expect any assessment to contain a full appreciation of the setting of these historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings. THC stated that it would be helpful if, where the assessment finds that significant impacts are likely, appropriate visualisations such as photomontage and wireframe views of the development in relation to the sites and their settings could be provided. Visualisations illustrating views both from the asset towards the proposed development and views towards the asset with the development in the background would be helpful.	This chapter includes an assessment that contains a full appreciation of the setting of historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings. Where the assessment finds that significant impacts are likely, appropriate visualisations such as photomontage and wireframe views of the development in relation to the sites and their settings have been provided.
	<p>The THC's Historic Environment Team has noticed that the scoping report has identified key receptors in relation to listed buildings and conservation areas for each section of the proposed overhead line. These focus on Category (A) Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Battlefields and Scheduled Monuments. The proposed assessment therefore fails to consider impacts on a number of significant Category B and C listed buildings (as well as other designated heritage assets) along the route. The scope of the setting assessment will need to be widened to key Category B and C listed buildings where the ZTV indicates intervisibility with the proposal (including alternative routes) and/or the OHL is located within 5km of the listed building. THC would be pleased to agree with the applicant those Category B and C listed buildings that warrant further detailed assessment in advance of conducting the study.</p> <p>Equally, setting assessments are required in relation to all conservation areas where the ZTV indicates intervisibility with the proposal (including alternative routes). Due to the proximity of the proposal to the Strathpeffer Conservation Area, specific assessment is required to include photomontages from key vantage points.</p> <p>THC stated that the list of Category B/C listed buildings looks to be comprehensive and includes listed assets whose settings are of concern. THC queried if other heritage assets – including conservation areas (Strathpeffer) – were also being considered in the EIA.</p>	<p>This chapter includes an assessment of Category B and C listed buildings. The list of assets for inclusion was provided to THC HET for comment and the list was acknowledged and accepted.</p> <p>Conservation Areas were included and scoped out for setting effects, following a preliminary review and sieving exercise (see paragraph 12.4.9).</p>
Consultation on Setting Assessment Methodology		
HES	HES were content with the 10km study area around the line of the proposed overhead line and the use of ZTVs to determine which historic environment assets may have settings which could be affected by the proposals.	Noted.
	HES noted that the list of assets proposed to be scoped into the assessment mainly includes the assets which we have previously identified as requiring detailed assessment. However, there were	Noted, reviewed and included in assessment.

Consultee	Summary of Issue Raised	Response / Action Taken
	two scheduled monuments (Balcraggie Lodge, settlement 700m N of (SM5230) and Loedebest, settlement (SM5152)) which had not been included and recommended that these were included in the assessment.	
	<p>Although the potential impacts on the settings of the following three monument do not appear to be significantly adverse on the basis of the information currently provided, the impacts should be assessed and demonstrated to ensure this preliminary assessment is correct. Any further movement of the line may also have implications for these scheduled monuments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spittal farm, broch 180m E of (SM582) • Knockglass, broch E of (SM561) • Achnasoul, Medieval Earthwork 440m SSE of (SM13629) 	Noted, reviewed and included in assessment.
	<p>HES had previously noted that although there may be visibility and impacts on the setting of two category A listed buildings, Shin Viaduct, near Kyle of Sutherland (LB279) and Loth Parish Church (LB7149), but that these are unlikely to raise issues of national interest.</p> <p>For Loth Parish Church the alignment has moved the overhead line much further away than previous route consultations and we are satisfied that this asset can be scoped out of further assessment. For the Shin Viaduct we note that visibility is still highly likely, it would therefore be helpful if justification can be provided for scoping out the potential impacts on the setting of this asset.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A setting assessment has been undertaken for Shin Viaduct (LB279) and not scoped out.</p>
	HES noted that the reasons or rationale given for why each asset has been scoped in appear to take a more restrictive approach to understanding setting than we would recommend, and there is scope for a much wider approach as set out in our setting guidance. Whilst HES do not necessarily agree with the preliminary assessment of setting for each asset currently provided they expect that a more thorough approach will be taken during the main detailed assessment and which will then be used to inform the design and help identify, mitigate and avoid significant adverse impacts.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Preliminary investigations at Scoping Phase are necessarily reductive to provide indicative results, prior to detailed assessment alongside increased design information.</p>

Impact Assessment Methodology

Legislative, Planning and Guidance Context

12.3.23 The cultural heritage assessment has had regard to all relevant legislation, policy and guidance, as detailed in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**. In particular, the impact assessment methodology adopted is based upon the guidance and approach outlined in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment** and as agreed during Scoping and following consultation with HES and THC HET.

Proposed Development Footprint

12.3.24 For purposes of impact assessment, the Proposed Development has been taken to include:

- the main designed elements of the OHL; and
- ancillary structures and works, e.g., access tracks, and EPZs (pulling positions).

Effects Assessed

12.3.25 The assessment has considered the potential for significant effects associated with the following:

- **physical (direct) impacts** of construction (erosion of an asset's physical fabric, e.g., its fragmentation / truncation / removal by plant machinery) on cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Development LoD, the groundworks footprint for construction access, and in access and groundworks locations associated with the special arrangements;
- **setting impacts** resulting from changes to the landscape that may compromise the ability to understand, appreciate or experience an asset, and for which, in a realistic worst case scenario, the 'integrity' of the setting may be impacted (see **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.5.15-20); during the construction phase, and often maintained throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development; and
- **cumulative impacts**.

Mitigation Measures

12.3.26 A Framework Mitigation Approach (**Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation**) has been designed to prevent, reduce, or offset significant adverse effects, and the extent of their mitigative effect considered. Any residual effects (following the implementation of the iterative design process and embedded measures) have then been assessed. A summary of the mitigation is provided in **Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation**, while responses to the iterative design process for certain assets from HES are summarised in **Chapter 4: The Routing Process and Alternatives, Table 4.6**.

12.3.27 The residual effect of direct impacts to heritage assets may be seen to be lessened following an appropriate mitigation strategy utilising a programme of archaeological investigation, evaluation and recording. Mitigation through archaeological intervention, alongside the generated 'for-public' archive, shall be considered a reasonable offset for the loss of in-situ remains. As a result of the loss of in-situ heritage resource, the reported magnitude of impact and effect identified during this EIA Report process will be maintained, although the application of appropriate mitigation may be seen to act to lessen the importance of the reported effect (see **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.12).

12.3.28 The proposed Framework Mitigation Approach includes the accompanying curation of the associated written reports and physical archive, which aims to serve the desired outcome of public engagement and social value, with information becoming publicly available through the records within the HER and grey literature reports available through the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) and Discovery and Excavation Scotland (DES).

Additional action to promote public benefit may be considered as part of the post-submission mitigation design that aims to enhance the heritage resource (see **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, Section 1.11.9-12, and **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7 Mitigation Design**, Section 1.14.14).

Visualisations

12.3.29 Visualisations are referred to, as relevant, to illustrate potential significant effects upon the setting of identified heritage assets. These are included in in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations, 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages and 12.8.2: 3D Renders**.

12.4 Issues Scoped Out

12.4.1 The Scoping Report proposed that the assessment of certain effects be scoped out of this assessment. Following consultee agreement, assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the following has been scoped out:

- maritime archaeological resources within the Study Areas, as these resources all lie offshore and would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development; and
- the settings of World Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and Inventory Historic Battlefields beyond 10 km (unless specifically identified for inclusion).

12.4.2 The WHS site, The Flow Country (List entry: 1722)⁷, has been scoped out of the assessment following review and subsequent inputs into the World Heritage Toolkit preliminary review (**Volume 5, Appendix 8.10: WHS Assessment Report**). It has been concluded that the Natural categorisation, alongside an assessment of the component sensitivities (inscribed under criterion (ix)⁸) of the listing, did not require an impact assessment to report potential effects to the heritage value of the WHS. This results from the WHS making no material contribution to, or being inscribed as a result of, cultural heritage.

12.4.3 Direct impact to designated heritage assets has been scoped out. The Proposed Development LoD has been amended where possible to ensure that they are excluded and preserved in-situ (mitigated by design). Where assets remain present within the LoD there is a commitment to observe a variety of precautionary measures to ensure no physical interaction. Such measures would primarily include the exclusion of construction activity within a defined radius surrounding sensitive assets and/or the use of a barrier, such as Heras fencing, to demarcate and protect sensitive assets during the course of any proximate construction activity. Where designated asset boundaries would be over-sailed by the proposed cabling, there is a commitment for no physical change to/impact upon those assets.

12.4.4 Direct impact to designated heritage assets has been scoped out with the following two exceptions to this⁹:

- Fairburn GDL (GDL00174), where a small degree of direct (physical) impact would result from Towers S182 to S186 being erected within the western boundary plantation woodland area, to include tree felling within the Operational Corridor; alternatives to this have been considered throughout the optioneering process and have been fully discussed in consultation with HES.
- Settlement 600m E of Invershin Primary School (SM5498), where a forestry track subject to major upgrades runs the length of the asset boundary north to south. Subject to future discussions with HES, this is highly likely to require Scheduled Monument Consent for works within the asset boundary.

⁷ The Flow Country - UNESCO World Heritage Centre

⁸ UNESCO World Heritage Centre - The Criteria for Selection

⁹ Note: construction activity should prioritise low-impact solutions / design intervention within the boundaries of the assets, such as floating roads.

12.4.5 Further exceptions, listed below, relate to instances of oversailing or asset presence within the Proposed Development LoD, for which the impact is assessed in this EIA:

Oversailing

- Carbisdale battlefield (BTL19); and
- Settlement 700m north of Balcragie Lodge (SM5230).

Present within LoD (Working Corridor)

- Chambered Cairn 230m WSW of Balnacrae (SM2396); and
- Settlement and burnt mound 500m east of Invershin Farm (SM5497).

Present within LoD (Access Tracks)

- Dun Garbhlaich, Fort (SM2422) – Permanent;
- Standing stone 220m ENE of Invershin Farm (SM1791) – Temporary;
- Settlement 600m E of Invershin Primary School (SM5497) – Permanent; and
- Settlement and burnt mound 500m east of Invershin Farm (SM5497) – Permanent.

Present within LoD (Forestry Tracks)

- Cladh Churadain, chapel and burial ground (SM5007) – Minor upgrade; and
- Novar (GDL00303) – Minor upgrade.

12.4.6 Direct impacts to heritage assets beyond the Proposed Development LoD are not anticipated and have been scoped out of any further consideration.

12.4.7 Direct (physical) impacts resulting from ground disturbance, are scoped out for assets within the Operational Corridor management felling and additional felling areas,¹⁰ as there is no potential for affective ground disturbance. Considerations for monitoring and mitigation will be presented for these areas.

12.4.8 Indirect effects are not anticipated to be of significance and have been scoped out of any further consideration. The nature of the development negates the potential for any material indirect impacts; any that might occur would be entirely negligible in extent, and limited to the construction phase such that any further consideration of them would be disproportionate. Where the potential for indirect impacts are identified during archaeological monitoring, a proportionate approach shall be developed by a suitably qualified archaeologist, alongside the Principal Contractors. Operational noise as a sensory factor has been considered as part of the experiential aspect of the setting assessment, where appropriate.

12.4.9 Temporary adverse setting impacts resulting from construction-related activities have been scoped out, and are not considered within the assessment, given the nature of the impact.

12.4.10 Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the settings of significant non-designated heritage assets more than 1 km from the proposed alignment, has been scoped out. None have been identified through initial analysis as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development.

¹⁰ Additional felling areas beyond the Operational Corridor are not within this EIA mitigation purview, and the responsibility lies with the landowner/operator.

12.4.11 Assets identified during the setting sieving exercise (see paragraphs 12.3.7 and 12.3.15), as having no contribution to cultural significance derived from setting, or assets with no potential to be impacted by the introduction of the Proposed Development, have been scoped out for setting effect assessment.

12.4.12 Assets not identified as having the potential for impact as a result of changes to setting following the introduction of the Proposed Development are outlined in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, section 1.5.5-8. Following consultation with HES and the sieving exercise, it was agreed to scope out setting assessment for the below assets, since they are unlikely to experience significant effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Some have been included in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.6: Setting Assessment Tables**, due to the potential for non-significant impacts:

- Achingale Mill (LB14976);
- Dunbeath Castle (LB7936);
- Dunbeath Castle Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00150);
- Helmsdale Bridge (LB7193);
- Loth Parish Church (LB7149);
- Foulis Castle (LB7911);
- Tulloch Castle, Caisteal Gorach (LB24520);
- Castle Leod (LB7826);
- Novar (GDL00303);
- Castle Leod (GDL00094) and
- Contin Bridge over River Black Water (LB1789).

12.4.13 Following the sieving exercise and field setting assessment, it was concluded that it was appropriate to scope out further setting assessment for the four conservation areas present within the baseline, as the potential for impact as a result of the Proposed Development was assessed as 'No Impact', given the screened townscape setting and lack of visibility and external view contributing to their heritage significance:

- Beaully Village Square (CA102);
- Dingwall (CA107);
- Strathpeffer (CA123); and
- Lybster (CA114).

12.5 Baseline Conditions (Archaeological and Historical Background)

12.5.1 This section presents a summary review of the archaeological and historical background for the area through which the Proposed Development will pass. This summary outlines the chronological context that may affect land use and type-sites present in the landscapes surrounding the Proposed Development. A full and detailed background can be found in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.2: Archaeological and Historical Background**.

Prehistoric

12.5.2 The eastern coast of the Highlands is of considerable archaeological and historical interest. As detailed in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.2: Archaeological and Historical Background**, the evidence for prehistoric ritual, funerary, domestic, and defensive activities is comparatively extensive in these areas, raising the potential for previously unknown remains to survive within the Proposed Development. Recorded features such as middens, cairns, chambered tombs, stone settings and carvings, hut circles, hillforts, and brochs illustrate a breadth of prehistoric activity across a region in which communities were influenced by a range of environmental and geographic factors, with a particular affinity for river valleys and burn sides.

12.5.3 Within the coastal inlet of the North Sea Coast, broadly extending from Wick to Elgin, many prehistoric assets relate to the exploitation of marine and coastal resources while, across inland areas, exploitation of terrestrial resources and the gradual agricultural intensification of the later prehistoric period is better evidenced. Across both geographies, there are assets representing multi-phase and multi-period occupation, from the prehistoric to medieval periods, and occasionally through until present day.

Early Medieval

12.5.4 In a regional context, the Early Medieval period is characterised primarily by Northern Pictish and Norse activity. Changes to funerary monuments and burial customs are evident throughout the region, representing a long sequence of societal change that includes the withdrawal of Roman influence, the introduction of Norse paganism, and the transition to Christianity through Pictish monasticism; the latter also saw the beginnings of written language and religious organisation. Improvements to trade routes and the overall mobility of early medieval populations were made possible by the increase in opportunities along the coasts of the Moray Firth, with waterways continuing as key foci of economic and social activity.

Medieval

12.5.5 Norse culture continued to influence the areas of Caithness and Sutherland into the Medieval Period, with the Kingdom of Scotland only significantly controlling these areas by the 13th century AD. Cultural and political practices continued to be divided between the North and South, but farming remained a constant way of life. The expansion of agro-pastoral practices and animal husbandry continued throughout the Medieval Period, with political and religious figures utilising strongholds such as Castles and Manor Houses to communicate status and extend their control throughout the region, shaping the industry and economy. This reintroduced the use of stone-built fortifications in the region, as the brochs and forts of the Iron Age fell out of use. The coast retained its importance in the Medieval landscape and provided strategic placements for control and defence of land as well as trade routes. The Norse influence of the region is still noticeable today, as many placenames along the coast and further inland derive from Old Norse. Additionally, the remains of the castles, houses, defences, and other instruments of control are still visible within the region, and the turbulence of the Medieval Period continues to exert an influence on the contemporary landscape.

Post-Medieval & Modern

12.5.6 Religious and political instability characterised the Post-Medieval Period in the area, with the Reformation of 1560 leading to major change throughout the Highlands; the Highlands retained more religious diversity than the Lowlands, and this was perceived by ruling classes as a political threat. This led to the formation of a complex Medieval religious landscape, with various upheavals at both a local and national level. The Reformation benefitted the clan chiefs and gentry class who were quick to align themselves with the Crown and leaders of the new Church organisation, allowing them to attain swathes of redistributed Church lands. Unrest throughout the Highlands in the Post-Medieval period remains legible in the form of the Cromwellian forts at Inverness and Fort William, aimed at controlling Highland communities, as well as a network of defensive residences and associated features that may be present, as a result of military control of the navigable landscape.

12.5.7 The Jacobite risings of the 17th and 18th centuries had a profound effect throughout these communities, severing communal and familial relations in many cases. The risings also had an effect on the physical landscape and material culture of the Highlands, the annexation of estates in favour of the Crown altered Highland ways of life, and the introduction of objects that displayed Jacobite allegiances were kept as remembrance for generations after the fact. The consequences of the risings resulted in an increase in mobility throughout the Highlands, with roads and infrastructure expanding rapidly to maintain a militarised presence in

the area. It also promoted the concept of Highland tourism to higher social classes from the South, which persists to the present.

- 12.5.8 The presence of military forces somewhat ceased into the 19th century, though unrest was still tangible as the Highland Clearances and widespread famine influenced the communities and landscape of the Highlands. The shift to enclosed, private estates with tenancy farming and the abolition of crofts in favour of pastures for grazing animals resulted in a massive depopulation in the Highlands. Many inland settlements were forcibly abandoned and people displaced to larger cities and coastal towns, a process that has left few substantive traces in the archaeological record.

12.6 Baseline Conditions (Assets)

- 12.6.1 This section presents a quantitative breakdown of the baseline in regard to Proposed Development sections A-E.¹¹ The full baseline and gazetteer tables are available in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.3: Baseline Tables** and **Volume 5, Appendix 12.4: Gazetteer Tables**. Herein, the 'Proposed Development' refers to the extent within the LoD including the access track LoD, while the buffer zones are calculated from the centreline of the Proposed Alignment.

Section A

Designated Assets Summary

- 12.6.2 Within the Proposed Development there are two scheduled monuments¹².

- 12.6.3 Within 10 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 226 scheduled monuments;
- 10 Category A listed buildings;¹³
- One garden and designed landscape; and
- One conservation area.

- 12.6.4 Within 5 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 54 Category B listed buildings; and
- 42 Category C listed buildings.

Non-Designated Assets Summary

- 12.6.5 Within the Proposed Development there are 411 non-designated assets. Within 1 km of the Proposed Development there are 645 non-designated assets.

Gazetteer

- 12.6.6 The following have been included within the gazetteer and form the focus of the impact assessment.

Direct

- 12.6.7 Assets located within the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to direct impact comprise:

¹¹ 'Within Proposed Development', herein denotes any interaction between the Proposed Development LoD and the asset boundary. This may not represent direct interaction with Proposed Development infrastructure.

¹² See 12.4.3 – SM5230 is oversailed and the LoD abuts the boundary of SM3473, where it was specifically designed to be excluded from the LoD

¹³ Including assets such as: Shin Railway Viaduct (LB279), that may be considered Listed Structures.

- 411 non-designated assets.
- Five scheduled monuments.¹⁴

Setting

12.6.8 Assets assessed to be associated with the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes in setting, comprise:

- 94 scheduled monuments;
- Six Category A listed building;
- Three Category B listed buildings;
- One Category C listed building;
- One garden and designed landscape; and
- Two asset groupings of significant non-designated assets.¹⁵

Section B

Designated Assets Summary

12.6.9 Within the Proposed Development there are no designated assets.¹⁶

12.6.10 Within 10 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 51 scheduled monuments;¹⁷
- 15 Category A listed buildings; and
- One Garden and Designed Landscape.

12.6.11 Within 5 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 84 Category B listed buildings; and
- 36 Category C listed buildings.

Non-Designated Assets Summary

12.6.12 Within the Proposed Development there are 191 non-designated assets. Within 1 km of the Proposed Development there are 358 non-designated assets.

Gazetteer

12.6.13 The following have been included within the gazetteer and form the focus of the impact assessment.

Direct

12.6.14 Assets located within the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to direct impact comprise:

- One scheduled monument;¹⁸ and

¹⁴ See 12.4.3 – Scheduled Monuments: SM5230, SM3473, SM3441, SM512, SM1771, SM1770, abut the LoD or are oversailed with No direct Impact anticipated.

¹⁵ Grouped because of a collective setting significance, not ascribed to the individual components of the grouping.

¹⁶ A public road anticipated for use as a maintenance track is partially located within Dunrobin Castle GDL (GDL00160).

¹⁷ The boundary of SM13617 does overlap with a public road anticipated for use during Proposed Development works, but there is No potential for impact.

¹⁸ Scheduled Monuments: SM 1809 boundary is adjacent to an existing track identified to be upgraded.

- 191 non-designated assets.

Setting

12.6.15 Assets assessed to be associated with the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes in setting, comprise:

- 23 scheduled monuments;
- Two Category B listed buildings; and
- One asset grouping of significant non-designated assets.

Section C

Designated Assets Summary

12.6.16 Within the Proposed Development there are:

- Three scheduled monuments;
- One Category B listed building;¹⁹ and
- One registered battlefield.

12.6.17 Within 10 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 41 scheduled monuments; and
- 2 Category A listed buildings.

12.6.18 Within 5 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 23 Category B listed buildings; and
- 22 Category C listed buildings.

Non-Designated Assets Summary

12.6.19 Within the Proposed Development there are 56 non-designated assets. Within 1 km of the Proposed Development there are 362 non-designated assets.

Gazetteer

12.6.20 The following have been included within the gazetteer and form the focus of the impact assessment.

Direct

12.6.21 Assets located within the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to direct impact comprise:

- Three scheduled monuments;²⁰
- One registered battlefield;²¹ and
- 56 non-designated assets.

¹⁹ Carbisdale Castle Entrance gates (LB7165) is adjacent to a public road anticipated for use during Proposed Development works.

²⁰ Scheduled Monuments: SM1791 and SM5497's boundaries are within Proposed Development LoD with No Impact anticipated. SM5498 has existing track identified to be upgraded running through it. SM1791, where it was specifically designed to be excluded from the LoD, is adjacent to the LoD with No direct Impact anticipated.

²¹ The OHL cable oversails a very small portion of the Registered Battlefield boundary in the northwest, but no Proposed Development infrastructure is located within the designation boundary.

Setting

12.6.22 Assets assessed to be associated with the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes in setting, comprise:

- Five scheduled monuments;
- One registered battlefield.
- One Category A listed building;
- Two Category B listed buildings; and
- One Category C listed building.

Section D

Designated Assets Summary

12.6.23 Within the Proposed Development there are:

- One scheduled monument;
- One Category B listed building;
- Four Category C listed buildings;²² and
- Two garden and designed landscapes.

12.6.24 Within 10 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 80 scheduled monuments;
- 37 Category A listed buildings;
- Two garden and designed landscapes; and
- Three conservation areas.

12.6.25 Within 5 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 154 Category B listed buildings; and
- 159 Category C listed buildings.

Non-Designated Assets Summary

12.6.26 Within the Proposed Development there are 172 non-designated assets. Within 1 km of the Proposed Development there are 519 non-designated assets.

Gazetteer

12.6.27 The following have been included within the gazetteer and form the focus of the impact assessment.

Direct

12.6.28 Assets located within the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to direct impact comprise:

- One scheduled monuments;²³
- One Category B listed building;²⁴

²² LB7171, 7172 and 15034 are adjacent to existing public roads anticipated to be used during works.

²³ Scheduled Monuments: SM5007 abuts Proposed Development LoD for an existing access track requiring minor upgrades with No Impact anticipated.

²⁴ LB7167 is a bridge anticipated to be used for access during the Proposed Development works.

- Two garden and designed landscapes;²⁵ and
- 172 non-designated assets.

Setting

12.6.29 Assets assessed to be associated with the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes in setting, comprise:

- 10 scheduled monuments;
- One Category A listed building;
- Two Category B listed buildings;
- Three Category C listed buildings;
- Two garden and designed landscapes; and
- One asset grouping of significant non-designated assets.

Section E

Designated Assets Summary

12.6.30 Within the Proposed Development there are:

- One conservation area;²⁶
- Two category B listed buildings; and
- One garden and designed landscapes.

12.6.31 Within 10 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 63 scheduled monuments;
- 12 Category A listed buildings;
- Five garden and designed landscapes; and
- One conservation area.

12.6.32 Within 5 km of the Proposed Development there are:

- 122 Category B listed buildings; and
- 64 Category C listed buildings.

Non-Designated Assets Summary

12.6.33 Within the Proposed Development there are 198 non-designated assets. Within 1 km of the Proposed Development there are 771 non-designated assets.

Gazetteer

12.6.34 The following have been included within the gazetteer and form the focus of the impact assessment.

Direct

12.6.35 Assets located within the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to direct impact comprise:

²⁵ Existing public roads anticipated for use during the Proposed Development works, pass through both GDL's.

²⁶ Usage of a public road originating in Beaulieu Village Square (CA102) is anticipated during works.

- Three Category B listed buildings;²⁷
- One garden and designed landscape; and
- 199 non-designated assets.

Setting

12.6.36 Assets assessed to be associated with the Proposed Development, which are potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes in setting, comprise:

- 16 scheduled monuments;
- Two Category A listed buildings;
- Six garden and designed landscapes; and
- One (single) significant non-designated asset.

Assets Scoped Out

12.6.37 The assets scoped out are set out in detail in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment** and summarised above (Section 12.4).

Areas of Elevated Archaeological Potential (EAP)

12.6.38 EAPs represent areas of established and/or anticipated focussed archaeological potential, wherein a more detailed mitigation response is likely to be required. These areas have been identified on the following principal bases:

- where there is a known concentration of significant and/or coherent archaeological activity, e.g., areas where multiple significant and/or inter-related assets are concentrated; or
- where the topographic/environmental conditions raise the potential for a significant level of unrecorded archaeological activity, within the context of the local prehistoric/historic settlement pattern.

12.6.39 16 EAPs have been identified along the Proposed Development. These EAP areas are outlined in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary**, Section 1.5 and proposed boundaries for impact are shown on **Volume 3, Figure 12.8: Elevated Archaeological Potential Areas**.

12.7 Assessment of Effects

12.7.1 Effects have been assessed in accordance with the methodology set out in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment**, with detailed setting assessments presented in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.6: Setting assessments**. Relevant visualisations are presented in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.8: Cultural Heritage Visualisations, 12.8.1: Wireframes and Photomontages and 12.8.2: 3D Renders**. **Tables 12.2 to 12.6** (below) quantifies the number of identified effects of all levels (Major to No Effect) by asset category and section.

²⁷ LB14020 is a bridge that has been identified for use, LB14032 is the gate to Fairburn Estate to be used to access the tracks, and LB7106 is located within a meter of a public road centreline requiring an upgrade

Section A

Table 12.2: Summary of Effects (Section A)

Asset Type	Impact Type	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Effect
Total	Direct	1	11	33	142	231
Total	Setting	13	21	38	34	1
Scheduled Monument	Direct					5
	Setting	13	21	36	24	
Category A Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting				6	
Category B Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting			1	2	
Category C Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting					1
Garden/ Designed Landscape	Direct					
	Setting				1	
Elevated Archaeological Potential / Significant Non-Designated	Direct					
	Setting			1	1	
Non-Designated	Direct	1	11	33	142	226
	Setting					

Effects Deriving from Direct Impact

12.7.2 Of the direct impacts identified in relation to Section A, twelve 'Major' and/or 'Moderate' effects have been identified for non-designated assets. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect for:

- Cairn (MHG28675), located within, and is likely removed by, a temporary access track (cut & fill).

A moderate adverse effect for:

- Lady's Moss Building (MHG19758, confirmed by field survey (AOC 684.1, 684.2), located substantively within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N8 platform and compound;
- Hut circle (MHG814) confirmed by field survey (AOC 108.1, .3, .4, .5), located within, and likely to be partially removed by Tower N12 platform and compound;
- Hut circle (MHG28684), intersects, and is likely removed by, a temporary access track (cut & fill);
- Hut circle (MHG63445) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N115 platform and compound and temporary access track (cut & fill);
- Hut circle (MHG63446) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N115 platform and compound;
- Hut circle (649), located within, and likely to be substantially removed by Tower N61 compound;
- (Possible) kerb cairn (963), located within, and likely to be partially removed by Tower N170 platform and compound;
- Structure (663), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N58 platform and compound;
- Hut circle (892.1), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N150 platform and compound

- Rig and furrow (MHG29210), located within, and likely removed by, Tower compound for Tower N110 and an interaction with a temporary access track (cut & fill); and
- Clearance cairn (CanID 7537), partially located within, and likely removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) south of Tower N114.

12.7.3 There are 175 non-designated assets likely to be physically affected as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in a minor or negligible adverse effect. These include direct impacts to hut circles (MHG814, MHG28699, MHG10027, MHG9934, and MHG9981), cairns (MHG13573 and MHG28698) and a cairnfield (MHG39573). Otherwise, these are primarily low value assets that will be truncated, but still partially preserved, retaining much of their archaeological interest and the ability to understand them. They comprise a wide range of features including medieval - post-medieval agricultural/boundary/settlement or township remains and prehistoric enclosures and settlement remains.

12.7.4 Based on the Proposed Development design, there is currently no reported effect, as a result of no potential for direct impact, for 231 assets. This will be as the result of design mitigation measures, primarily avoidance, within the LoD.

Effects Deriving from Setting Impact

12.7.5 Of the setting impacts identified in relation to Section A, 34 potential significant effects to designated assets have been identified. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect to:

- Rinsary, homestead (SM3473), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure within the Berriedale Water valley;
- Caen, long cairn (SM1771), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure at the Marrel crossing and into the Caen valley and change to views of the River Helmsdale;
- Caen, long cairn and round cairn (SM1770), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure at the Marrel crossing including encroachment of transmission infrastructure into the Caen valley and views connected to the River Helmsdale;
- Buolacraber, settlement (SM6014), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development, which would result in the addition of transmission infrastructure close to the south of the asset group (c.200 m);
- Buolacraber, chambered cairn (SM5224), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development, which would result in the addition of transmission infrastructure close to the southeast of the asset group (c.490 m);
- Buolacraber, chambered cairn (SM445), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development, which would result in the addition of transmission infrastructure close to the south of the asset group (c.120 m);
- Cnoc na Maranaic, chambered cairn, burial cist and standing stone (SM443), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure c.1.5 km to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting overlooking numerous waterways;
- Loedebest, chambered cairn (SM5163), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission c.900 m to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;
- Cairn Liath, long cairn and round cairn (SM438), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.260 m to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;

- Loedebest, cairn (SM5191), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure c.170m to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;
- Caen, hut circles and souterrain (SM1841), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development, c. 300 m away, introducing transmission infrastructure at the Marrel crossing including encroachment of transmission infrastructure into the Caen valley and views connected to the River Helmsdale;
- Caen, long cairn (SM432), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure at the Marrel crossing including encroachment of transmission infrastructure into the Caen valley and views connected to the River Helmsdale; and
- Caen Burn West (SM13647), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure, c.400 m away, at the Marrel crossing including encroachment of transmission infrastructure into the Caen valley and views connected to the River Helmsdale.

12.7.6 A moderate adverse effect to:

- Clach Mhic Mhios, standing stone (SM1778), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting of Glen Loth, a maximum of c.280 m to the West and prominent in the near view as it crosses the Glen, although the ridgeline is maintained, with the Proposed Development designed to avoid breaching and maintaining solstitial/celestial alignments;
- Stone setting south-west of, Loch Stemster Achkinloch (SM420), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing additional transmission infrastructure c.420 m to the west, placing it within the immediate setting. Further, the Proposed Development places infrastructure in the mid-distance views looking north north-west along a purported axial alignment, affecting the shared setting with SM420 in relation to Loch Stemster;
- Balcraggie Lodge, settlement (SM5230), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding to the existing transmission infrastructure, and oversailing the northwestern edge of the scheduled monument;
- Achorn Bridge, settlements (SM5150), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.180 m to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;
- Achorn, broch (SM511), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.160 m to the north and west, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;
- Balantrath, broch (SM522), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.600 m to the north and west, placing it within the immediate setting of Dunbeath Water, although the backdropping of assets along Achorn Burn is unlikely due to the change in elevation;
- Prehistoric settlement Carn nan Uaigh (SM13627), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting of Glen Loth, a maximum of c.200 m to the south west and prominent in the near view as it crosses the Glen;
- Two standing stones Carradh nan Clach (SM1775), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting of Glen Loth, a maximum of c.415 m to the northeast and prominent in the north-facing, near view, as it crosses the Glen;
- Bridge of Badnagie, standing stone (SM5304), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure, encroaching on asset from the north (c.700 m), placing it within the immediate setting;

- Bridge of Badnagie, chambered cairn (SM425), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure, encroaching on asset from the north (c.450 m), placing it within the immediate setting;
- Greentulloch, broch (SM5089), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure, encroaching on asset from the north (c.1 km), placing it within the immediate setting;
- Standing stone 410m SSE of Upper Borgue (SM502), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting c. 200 m away, as well as backdropping and being prominent in sightlines within the linked asset group (SM596 and SM424);
- Clais-Cairn, chambered cairn (SM424), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting c.470 m away, as well as backdropping and being prominent in sightlines within the linked asset group (SM502 and SM596);
- Langwell Tulloch, broch (SM3441), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure c.50m to the west, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Tulloch Ternal, broch (SM3440), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.750 m to the east of these assets, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Ternal Rock, hut circle complex (SM13631), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.100 m to the east of these assets, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Cnoc Bad Asgaraidh, chambered cairn (SM423), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.300 m to the east, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Borgue Langwell, broch, outworks and later settlement (SM524), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.750 m to the west, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Borgue Langwell, homestead (SM525), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.600 m to the west, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Kilphedir, broch (SM1870), results from the introduction of Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the views south and east across and along the valley, placing it within the setting c.2.2 km away; and
- Broch, Upper Borgue (SM596), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting c.320 m away; in addition to backdropping and being prominent in sightlines within the linked asset group (SM502 and SM424).

12.7.7 The introduction of the Proposed Development between Kintradwell Burn, tracking along the coast spanning numerous valleys and turning north inland near Balcragie, to Spittal/Banniskirk, creates minor adverse effects resulting from changes in setting for 38 designated assets including brochs in Caithness and large settlement areas such as that at Kilphedir, as well as the significant non-designated grouping 'Shepherd and his Dogs' (MHG32405 and MHG13502, associated with SM502). This is due to alteration of landscape character, interruptions of views connecting valley landscapes, and/or the introduction of transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting of assets.

12.7.8 In relation to 14 assets with a reported minor adverse effect, based upon professional judgment, it is considered to be towards the upper end of the 'Minor' category, and those assets are therefore considered to be potentially more sensitive to small design changes within the LoD, as outlined below:

- Chambered cairn 755 m south-west of, Loch Stemster Achkinloch (SM419), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing additional transmission infrastructure c.470 m to the west, placing it within the immediate setting. Further, the Proposed Development affects the shared setting with SM420 in relation to Loch Stemster and the views to the west;
- Greysteil Castle, broch, Loch Rangag (SM555), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development introducing additional transmission infrastructure c.360 m to the east, placing it within the wider setting, while maintaining the immediate setting of Loch Rangag and views to the west;
- Achorn Bridge prehistoric and post medieval settlement (SM512), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure c.50 m to the north and west, placing it within the immediate setting;
- Bridge of Rhemullen, broch (SM574), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the near view arching c. 830 m to the north from east to west, placing it within the immediate setting. However, the primary coastal focus area, and inlet alignment is largely unchanged;
- Bridge of Rhemullen, broch (SM5088), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the near view arching to the north from east to west, placing it within the immediate setting c.1.2 km away. However, the primary coastal focus area, and inlet alignment is largely unchanged;
- Dun Beath, broch (SM546), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the near view arching to the north from east to west, placing it within the immediate setting c.1.7 km away. However, the primary coastal focus area, and inlet alignment is largely unchanged;
- Kilphedir, hut circles & chambered cairns (SM290), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the views south and east across and along the valley, placing it within the setting c.2 km away;
- Kilphedir, hut circles & field system (SM2809), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the views south and east across and along the valley, placing it within the setting c.2 km away;
- Kilphedir, hut circle (SM2814), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the views south and east across and along the valley, placing it within the setting c.1.8 km away;
- Balcraggie Lodge, four hut circles (SM3521), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development would result in the introduction of additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.620 m to the north and west, placing it within the immediate setting eroding views along Dunbeath Water and the wider east-west views;
- Balcraggie Lodge, souterrain (SM1884), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure into the views south and east across and along the valley from the assets, placing it within the setting c.1.4 km away;
- Loedebest settlement (SM5152), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.200 m to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting
- Loedebest, prehistoric settlement and post medieval enclosure (SM5254), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure a maximum of c.1.45 km to the south-east, placing it within the immediate setting affecting views along Dunbeath Water and the wider E-W views. However, given the siting and connections to the upper river valley primarily, SM5254 appears less impacted than the rest of the group; and

- Bridge of Badnagie, settlement (SM5186), results from the introduction of the Proposed Development adding additional transmission infrastructure, encroaching on asset from the north (c.600 m), placing it within the immediate setting.

12.7.9 Beyond the above, there are 34 reported negligible adverse effects as a result of the Proposed Development, but these are not assessed as having a material impact on the significance of those assets as a result of changes in setting. This may be as a result of existing OHLs and other modernisations, including settlement development and extensive plantation land, having altered the baseline condition of the landscape and ultimately reducing the impact of the Proposed Development on the assets' setting.

Section B

Table 12.3: Summary of Effects (Section B)

Asset Type	Impact	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Effect
Total	Direct	1	9	30	40	118
Total	Setting	2	0	12	12	0
Scheduled Monument	Direct					2
	Setting	2		12	9	
Category B Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting				2	
Garden/ Designed Landscape	Direct					1
	Setting					
Elevated Archaeological Potential / Significant Non-Designated	Direct					
	Setting				1	
Non-Designated	Direct	2	8	30	40	115
	Setting					

Effects Deriving from Direct Impact

12.7.10 Of the direct impacts identified in relation to Section B, 10 'Major' and/or 'Moderate' effects have been identified to non-designated assets. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect for:

- Souterrain (MHG11728) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N275 platform and compound.

A moderate adverse effect for:

- Hut circle (MHG10597) with one of the three hut circles in the group located within, and likely to be removed by, a temporary access track (cut & fill);
- Dyke (604), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N244 platform and compound, and a temporary access track (cut & fill);
- A degraded series of dykes (387.10), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N260 platform and compound;
- Building, Bad A' Chrasgaidh (387.15), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N260 platform and compound and permanent and temporary access tracks (floating);

- A stone and turf dyke (388.7), located within, and likely to be removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) to the north of Tower N261;
- A drystone dyke and enclosure (388.9), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N261 compound, and permanent (floating) and temporary (cut & fill) access tracks;
- Hut circle (389), located within, and likely to be removed by, existing access tracks denoted to be upgraded;
- A clearance cairn (422), located within, and likely to be removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) for north of Tower N261; and
- Mound (464), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower N276 compound.

12.7.11 There are 70 non-designated assets likely to be physically affected as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in a minor or negligible adverse effect. These include direct impacts to prehistoric assets around river and burn crossings and later enclosures and farmsteads suffering partial losses due to access tracks and the platforms and compounds of: Tower N220 (township Killin MHG10799), Tower N216 (broch Killin MHG10805), Tower N272 (three stonewalled huts MHG11725), Tower N273 (farmstead MHG19237), Tower N252 (Enclosure-PM MHG59242), Tower N278 (stone dyke 461), and Towers N211 and N268 (relict track 482 and 8m track 813). Otherwise, these are primarily low value assets that will be truncated, but still partially preserved, retaining much of their archaeological interest and the ability to understand them. They comprise a wide range of features including medieval - post-medieval agricultural/boundary/settlement or township remains, and prehistoric enclosures, degraded mortuary features and settlement remains.

12.7.12 Based on the Proposed Development design, there is currently no reported effect, as a result of no potential for direct impact, for 118 assets. This will be as the result of avoidance within, or presence beyond, the LoD.

Effects Deriving from Setting Impact

12.7.13 Of the setting impacts identified in relation to Section B, two potential significant effects to designated assets have been identified. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect to:

- East Kinnauld Broch (SM1862) and fort (SM1861), results from the introduction of the Proposed development adding additional infrastructure that serves to enclose both assets with the existing transmission infrastructure to the north and across the uplands to the east, while also interrupting views south along the Fleet valley. This includes Tower N263 being prominently located in the view to the coast for the broch (c.130 m away).

12.7.14 The introduction of the Proposed Development between Loch Buidhe and Kintradwell Burn creates 12 minor adverse effects resulting from changes in setting for: Morvich Lodge, cairns, hut circles & clearance cairns 400 m east of (SM1809); Duchary Rock, fort (SM1854); Loch a'Bhiocair, two hut circles and clearance cairns 800 m north-west of (SM1822); Carn Liath, cairn & chambered cairn 1.2 km WNW of Torboll (SM1772); Brae, broch, Strath Carnaig W of Mound Junction (SM1840); Brae Cottage, two hut circles 120 m and 200 m east south-east of (SM1830); Torboll Farm, cairn 1450m west south-west of (SM1819); Creag an Ameliah, hut circles & field system 270 m north north-east of Achinail (SM1851); Creag an Amalaidh, cairn, hut circles, field system (SM1782); and Carrol, fish farm 430 m south-east, 410 m south south-east, 660 m and 890 m south south-west of (SM13617). This may be due to alteration in the landscape character, interruptions to views connecting valley landscapes, or the introduction of transmission infrastructure into the immediate setting of assets.

12.7.15 In relation to two assets with a reported minor adverse effect, based upon professional judgment, it is considered to be towards the upper end of the 'Minor' category, and those assets are therefore considered to be potentially more sensitive to small design changes within the LoD, as outlined below:

- Killin, chambered cairn (SM1794), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure crossing Loch Brora (c.500 m south), interrupting the views to the coast and connection with Carrol broch (SM1846), but maintaining the connection to Allt nam Ban burn running east and the general association to the loch; and
- Carrol broch, 600 m south south-west of, Loch Brora (SM1846), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure crossing Loch Brora, interrupting and eroding connective views to settlement on the eastern valleyside, and to monuments SM1794 and MHG10805.

12.7.16 Beyond, there are a series of 12 negligible adverse effects as a result of the Proposed Development being introduced into the landscape but not being assessed as having a material impact on the significance of assets, as a result of changes in setting. This may be as a result of OHLs and other modernisations, including settlement development and extensive plantation land, having altered the baseline condition of the landscape and ultimately serve to lessen the impact of the Proposed Development on the assets' setting.

Section C

Table 12.4: Summary of Effects (Section C)

Asset Type	Impact	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Effect
Total	Direct	0	1	6	29	36
Total	Setting	0	2	5	3	0
Scheduled Monument	Direct				1	3
	Setting		1	3	1	
Registered Battlefield	Direct					1
	Setting			1		
Category A Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting				1	
Category B Listed Building	Direct					1
	Setting		1	1		
Category C Listed Building	Direct					1
	Setting				1	
Non-Designated	Direct		1	6	28	30
	Setting					

Effects Deriving from Direct Impact

12.7.17 Of the direct impacts identified in relation to Section C, one 'Moderate' effect has been identified to a non-designated asset. This is as follows.

A moderate adverse effect for:

- Possible hut circle or cairn - Carbisdale Wood (MHG62766), located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower S27 compound.

12.7.18 There are 34 non-designated assets likely to be physically affected as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in a minor or negligible adverse effect. These include direct impacts to a settlement of three circular stone-walled huts associated with SM5470 and SM5498 interacting with Tower S20 platform and compound (MHG9300). Otherwise, these are primarily low value assets that will be truncated but still partially preserved, retaining much of their archaeological interest and the ability to understand them. They comprise a wide range

of features including post-medieval agricultural/boundary/settlement remains, and prehistoric enclosures and settlement remains.

12.7.19 The Proposed Development (Tower S18-22) paths through the dense prehistoric settlement area of Invershin on the east side of the Kyle, including potential upgrades to an existing forestry track that runs within SM5498; and while there is plantation woodland present that may serve to disturb archaeological remains, the potential for substantial archaeological material is present.

12.7.20 The Carbisdale Battlefield (BTL19) designation boundary interacts with the Proposed Development LoD, however the assessment concluded that there was no impact and thus no direct adverse effect. This is a result of no Proposed Development infrastructure being located within the boundary of the Registered Battlefield; instead, the design necessitates that conductors oversail a very small portion (c.150 m) of the designated boundary in the northwest, as well as the use of an existing road that runs through the designation.

12.7.21 Based on the Proposed Development design, there is currently no reported effect, as a result of no potential for direct impact, for 36 assets. This may be as the result of avoidance within, or presence beyond, the LoD.

Effects Deriving from Setting Impact

12.7.22 Of the setting impacts identified in relation to Section C, two potential significant effects to designated assets have been identified. These are as follows:

A Moderate adverse effect to:

- Standing stone 220 m ENE of Invershin Farm (SM1791), results from the introduction of additional transmission infrastructure at a distance of c.300 m south, placing it within the immediate setting and eroding the views southward over the Kyle of Sutherland, while also moving existing minor infrastructure closer; and
- Category B listed Carbisdale Castle (LB7165), results from the introduction of the Proposed development into outward views from the Listed Building as well as backdropping the asset c. 600 m north-west of the asset, including from the approaches north and south along the Kyle of Sutherland, for which the existing transmission infrastructure is already visible.

12.7.23 The introduction of the Proposed Development around the Kyle of Sutherland creates a minor adverse effect resulting from changes in setting for: Carbisdale Battlefield (BTL19), prehistoric settlement SM5462 and burnt mounds SM5497 and SM5470, as a result of additional transmission infrastructure being introduced, that divides the connected landscape and encloses assets between additional and existing infrastructure. The category B listed Lydsurach Croft house (LB52528) will also suffer a minor adverse effect as a result of the introduction of the Proposed Development in the mid-distance, eroding the wider crofting landscape surrounding the structure, but retaining the intelligibility of this functional structure within a functional agricultural landscape.

12.7.24 Beyond, there are a series of three negligible adverse effects as a result of the Proposed Development being introduced to the landscape, but not being assessed as having a material impact on the significance of assets, as a result of changes in setting, including to, Shin Railway Viaduct (LB279) and Braelangwell Lodge (LB7179), and prehistoric settlement (SM5498). This may be as a result of OHLs and other modernisations, including settlement development and extensive plantation land, having altered the baseline condition of the landscape and ultimately serving to lessen the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the assets.

Section D

Table 12.5: Summary of Effects (Section D)

Asset Type	Impact	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Effect
Total	Direct	0	3	6	66	119
Total	Setting	1	3	3	11	1
Scheduled Monument	Direct				1	1
	Setting	1	3	1	4	1
Category A Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting			1		
Category B Listed Building	Direct					2
	Setting				2	
Category C Listed Building	Direct					5
	Setting				3	
Garden/ Designed Landscape	Direct				1	1
	Setting				2	
Elevated Archaeological Potential / Significant non-Designated	Direct					
	Setting			1		
Non-Designated	Direct		3	6	62	110
	Setting					

Effects Deriving from Direct Impact

12.7.25 Of the direct impacts identified in relation to Section D, three 'Moderate' effects have been identified to non-designated assets. These are as follows:

A moderate adverse effect for:

- Garabil settlement (MHG14142) located within, and likely to be partially removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) south of Tower S112 and compound;
- Building footprints (MHG19702) located within, and likely to be partially removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) south of Tower S112; and
- Strath Sgitheach Hut circle (MHG8903) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower S133 compound.

12.7.26 There are 68 non-designated assets likely to be physically affected as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in a minor or negligible adverse effect. These include direct impacts to Women's Timber Corp Camp - near Fannyfield, Kiltarn (MHG56249) that interacts with Tower S120 platform and compound and permanent and temporary access tracks. Otherwise, these are primarily low value assets that will be truncated, but still partially preserved, retaining much of their archaeological interest and the ability to understand them. They comprise a wide range of features including medieval - post-medieval agricultural/boundary/settlement or township remains, military roads (earmarked to be used as existing tracks requiring upgrades) and prehistoric enclosures and settlement remains.

12.7.27 Based on the Proposed Development design, there is currently no reported effect, as a result of no potential for direct impact, for 119 assets. This may be as the result of avoidance within, or presence beyond, the LoD.

Effects Deriving from Setting Impact

12.7.28 Of the setting impacts identified in relation to Section D, four potential significant effects to designated assets have been identified. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect to:

- Balnacrae Cairn (SM2396), results from the Proposed Development being located directly south (including Tower S129 c. 50 m south) and disrupting view out across the Cromarty Firth and eroding views east along River Sgitheach.²⁸

A moderate adverse effect to:

- Firth View settlement (SM4728) and settlement (SM10495), results from the introduction of the Proposed development into intra-settlement views within EAP_09 roughly c. 300 m north-west of the assets, as well as immediate views north and backdropping the asset when viewed from the lowland south along the Cromarty Firth; and
- The [Heights of Brae] chambered cairn (SM2312), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure into the backdrop view to the ridgeline with the Firth View settlements (SM4728 and SM10495) c.1.4 km north-west, and towards Balnacrae Cairn (SM2396), which would be entirely disrupted, with the Proposed Development obscuring the cairn by placing a tower (S129) directly in front

12.7.29 Along the River Averon valley, three chambered cairns (SM6644) are subject to a minor adverse effect alongside Ardross Castle (LB15031) because of changes to setting, resulting from the introduction of the Proposed Development and the associated management felling.

12.7.30 Beyond, there are 11 negligible adverse effects as a result of the Proposed Development being introduced to the landscape, but not assessed as having a material impact on the significance of assets as a result of changes in setting, including to Ardross Castle GDL (GDL00023) and Novar GDL (GDL00303) and the Fryish Monument (LB369). This may be as a result of OHLs and other modernisations, including settlement development and extensive plantation land, having altered the baseline condition of the landscape and ultimately serve to lessen the impact of the Proposed Development on assets' setting.

12.7.31 The Proposed Development results in no adverse effect being reported for Old Parish Church, Urquhart (SM5696), given the potential for limited glimpsed views at the most, across a distance of c.7.5 km.

²⁸ The Major adverse effect reported as a result of changes in setting introduced by the Proposed Development, have the potential to impact upon the ability to appreciate, experience and understand the asset. It has therefore determined that there is the potential for the integrity of the asset's setting to not be adequately retained.

Section E

Table 12.6: Summary of Effects (Section E)

Asset Type	Impact	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Effect
Total	Direct	3	3	13	67	137
Total	Setting	1	1	14	12	2
Scheduled Monument	Direct					
	Setting	1	1	6	8	
Category A Listed Building	Direct					
	Setting			2		
Category B Listed Building	Direct					3
	Setting			2	1	2
Garden/ Designed Landscape	Direct	1				
	Setting			3	3	
Non-Designated	Direct	2	3	13	67	135
	Setting			1		

Effects Deriving from Direct Impact

12.7.32 Of the direct impacts identified in relation to Section E, six 'Major' and/or 'Moderate' effects have been identified: one to designated, and six to non-designated assets. These are as follows:

A major adverse effect to:

- Fairburn GDL's (GDL00174), effect is due to loss within the curated woodland area in the west of the designation boundary between Towers S182 to S186 (alongside management felling, new and upgraded access tracks), along with any potential archaeological remains present;²⁹
- A Burial cairn (MHG62128) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower S218 compound; and
- Hut circle (MHG62069) located within, and likely to be removed by, Tower S218 platform and compound.

A moderate adverse effect to:

- An enclosure (MHG14111), as a result of substantial loss from the borrow pit and compound area north of Tower S173; and
- Two cairns (MHG62141 and MHG62142) located within, and likely to be removed by, the EPZ (pulling position) north of Tower S215.

12.7.33 There are 80 non-designated assets likely to be physically affected as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in minor or negligible adverse effects. These include direct impacts to EAP_16, the settlement and mortuary remains associated with Dun Mor (SM4979). Otherwise, these are primarily low value assets that will be truncated, but still partially preserved, retaining much of their archaeological interest and the ability to

²⁹ While reported as a Major adverse effect, resulting from a Low magnitude of impact, this effect should not be considered 'Significant' due to the non-material change that will occur, with the boundary and primary value being maintained, and a small portion of low archaeological potential, woodland being lost as a result of the Proposed Development.

understand them. They comprise a wide range of features including post-medieval agricultural/boundary/settlement remains, and prehistoric enclosures and settlement remains.

12.7.34 Based on the Proposed Development design, there is currently no reported effect for 137 assets. This may be as the result of avoidance within, or presence beyond, the LoD.

Effects Deriving from Setting Impact

12.7.35 Of the setting impacts identified in relation to Section E, two significant effects to designated assets have been identified. These are as follows.

A major adverse effect for:

- Dun Mor Fort (SM4979), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure c. 400 m to the west, disrupting views towards the associated settlement area and eroding views north towards SM2422, west through the Breakachy Burn valley towards the Urchany basin, and south across the lowlands.

A moderate adverse effect for:

- Dun Garbhlaich (SM2422), results from additional transmission infrastructure c. 100 m to the west, affecting the immediate setting, and potential to backdrop the asset from the settlement plateau due south.

12.7.36 The introduction of the Proposed Development north of Fairburn GDL (GDL00174) running north into the uplands and along the Strath Sgitheach ridgeline and progressing south across the uplands around Farley creates minor adverse effects for 14 assets, resulting from changes in setting, including for: Fairburn Tower (LB14030) and Coul House (LB1769) [Category A], Fairburn House (LB14031) and Mains of Coul (LB1771) [Category B] by compromising views south towards Fairburn GDL as well as views out from assets within the GDL, Loch Killenan Crannog (SM3987), Achilty henge (SM1667), and Knock Farril, fort (SM1672) overlooking the area around Castle Leod, as well as the significant non-designated grouping of prehistoric settlement assets on Strath Sgitheach ridgeline.

12.7.37 The effects for Spa Gardens Strathpeffer (GDL00370) and Castle Leod (GDL00094) do not result from an impact to any internal views within the GDL, but from the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape surrounding, and backdrop to, the assets, c. 800 m to 1.7 km west of them. This impact is not considered consequential enough to warrant a significant effect as the impact is limited to external views towards the GDL from scenic viewpoints, such as those along Knock Farril, wherein the GDL is a minor component of the value of the view.

12.7.38 In relation to four assets with a reported minor adverse effect, based upon professional judgment, it is considered to be towards the upper end of the 'Minor' category, and those assets are therefore considered to be potentially more sensitive to small design changes within the LoD, as outlined below:

- Urchany Barrow (SM13523), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure c. 900 m east across the basin area towards the Breakachy Burn valley spanned by the Proposed Development
- Dun Fhamhair (SM5212) and Dun a Chliabhain (SM2424), results from additional transmission infrastructure c. 1.4 km to the west, leaving the primary spheres of influence to the east and south largely undisturbed, with limited experiential impact affecting the immediate setting.
- Fairburn GDL (GDL00174), results from the introduction of transmission infrastructure across the Canon valley, within the western woodland of the designation boundary and wrapping round to the south along the River Orrin. Key internal view will remain largely unaffected; however, views towards the GDL and looking out to the north and south will be compromised;

- Along the River Orrin, the significant non-designated fort (MHG60939) is similarly subject to a minor adverse effect as a result of changes to setting, resulting from the introduction of the Proposed Development, compromising the key views of control along the River Orrin.

12.7.39 Beyond, there are a series of 12 negligible adverse effects because of the Proposed Development being introduced to the landscape, but not being assessed as having a material impact on the significance of assets, as a result of changes in setting. This may be as a result of OHLs and other modernisations, including settlement development and extensive plantation land, having altered the baseline condition of the landscape and ultimately serve to lessen the impact of the Proposed Development on assets' setting.

12.7.40 Based on the current proposed development infrastructure design there is currently no adverse effect reported for two assets. This is due to an unchanged setting and maintained association and understanding of the assets in their former estate grounds.

12.8 Cumulative Effects

12.8.1 **Chapter 17: Cumulative Assessment** sets out the findings of the assessment of effect interactions, i.e. effects from different impact types (as generated by the Proposed Development) on key sensitive receptors.

12.8.2 Based on the list identified in **Chapter 5: EIA Process and Methodology**, the projects with the potential for cumulative/in-combination effects with the Proposed Development are presented in **Table 12.3** below.

12.8.3 Cumulative projects have been excluded from consideration where they are at a sufficient distance to preclude cumulative impacts to setting, where they do not generate long-term setting impacts (e.g. the construction of an underground HVDC cable) or they have been fully assessed through an EIA Report and no overlapping setting impacts have been predicted.

12.8.4 All heritage assets with a predicted minor adverse effect, or greater, resulting from setting impacts associated with the Proposed Development, were considered for cumulative/in-combination setting impacts with other schemes. Heritage assets with no or negligible adverse effects resulting from setting impacts associated with the Proposed Development were not considered.

Table 12.3: Cumulative Effects for Cultural Heritage

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Projects considered for “intra-project” effects						
Banniskirk 400 kV Substation and High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) Converter Station	A	Adjacent	Under Consideration	Banniskirk 400 kV Substation and HVDC Converter Station is located within the northernmost area of the Proposed Development. Direct effects to non-designated assets are shared by both developments and are not cumulative. Cumulative effects to setting from both the Proposed Development and this project would not add to the effects already predicted from the Proposed Development in isolation.	No / Negligible Effect	None / Mitigated through substation construction
Carnaig 400 kV Substation	B, C	Adjacent	Under Consideration	Carnaig Substation is located to the north of LB525238 Lydsurach Crofthouse, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, and to the east of LB7165 Carbisdale Castle and BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale. Whilst the project would introduce additional infrastructure into the wider upland landscape to the east of the Kyle of Sutherland, there are no cumulative impacts predicted to the setting of these assets and the magnitude of impact and significance of effects are as predicted for the Proposed Development in isolation.	No / Negligible Effect	None Required
Fanellan 400kV Substation and HVDC Converter Station	E	Adjacent	Under Consideration	Fanellan Substation and Converter Station is located to the south-east of the Farley SM group (SM2422, SM2424, SM4979, SM5212) around the River Beaully valley and adjacent to the operational substation. The substation would add to the existing electrical infrastructure around the River Beaully valley but would not substantively alter views into and over the river valley from these assets. Whilst the project would introduce additional infrastructure around the River Beaully Valley there are no cumulative impacts predicted to the setting of these assets and the magnitude of impact and significance of effects are as predicted for the Proposed Development in isolation.	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
List of Projects considered for “inter-project” effects						
Ayre Offshore Wind Farm	A	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 1500 m east of Old Free Church Manse Bower and would comprise the construction of substation, inter-array cables, export cables and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Camster II Wind Farm	A	10 km east	Appeal Allowed	<p>The development is located on land 2 km north-west of Tannach Hill Tannach Wick and would comprise the erection of up to 11 wind turbines with a maximum tip height of 126.5 m with associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Golticlay Wind Farm Redesign	A	2 km east	Approved by Scottish Ministers	<p>Golticlay Wind Farm is located to the east of the A9 and 10 km north-east of the settlement of Badnagie. The project comprises the construction of up to 13 wind turbines, 11 with a maximum blade tip height of 200 m, two with a maximum blade tip height of 180 m, access tracks and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to Bridge of Badnagie scheduled monument group (SM425, SM5089, SM5186, SM5304) in the uplands north of Rumster Forest as well as the Bridge of Rhemullen group (SM574, SM5088, SM5640), the Buolacrabher group (SM445, SM5224, SM6014), SM420 Achkinloch stone setting, SM543 Cor Tulloch, prehistoric settlement, SM585 Tiantulloch broch and post-medieval farmstead, and the Loch Stemster/Loch Ranrag group (SM419, SM420, SM555)</p> <p>Whilst the development would introduce additional infrastructure into the wider upland landscape to the east of the A9 there are no cumulative impacts predicted to the setting of these assets and the magnitude of impact and significance of effects are as predicted for the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Slickly Wind Farm	A	16 km north-west	Appeal Allowed	<p>The development is located on land 1650 m East of Slickly and comprises the construction of up to 11 wind turbines up to 149.9 m blade tip height and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Tormsdale Wind Farm	A	2 km west	S36 Raise Objection	<p>The development is located on land at 1500 m South of Bridge of Westerdale, Halkirk and comprises the construction of 10 wind turbines with maximum blade tip height of 149.9 m, access tracks, substation, control building, Battery Energy Storage System, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The project has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Brochs, Knockglass group (SM582, SM561).</p> <p>The wind farm project would introduce new electrical infrastructure into the landscape south-west of the brochs, within upland moor west of the River Thurso. Whilst, further eroding the rural character surrounding the brochs, the proposed wind farm would not erode key views towards Loch Toftingall or Loch Watten, nor obscure views towards associated late prehistoric assets in the immediate historic landscape. The introduction of the wind farm would not generate additional adverse impacts beyond the negligible/low magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect predicted from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Watten Wind Farm	A	Adjacent	Under Consideration	<p>The project is located on land 3670 m south-west of Watten Village Hall Watten and comprises the construction of 7 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 220 m, access tracks, borrow pits, substation, control building, battery storage and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The project has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Brochs, Knockglass group (SM582, SM561).</p> <p>The wind farm project would introduce new electrical infrastructure into the landscape south-east of the brochs, within rough moor pasture south-east of Loch Toftingall. The wind farm would further erode the rural character surrounding the brochs as well as eroding historic views towards the Loch which contribute to setting and the cultural significance of the brochs. The introduction of the wind farm would generate additional adverse impacts to</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				Setting but would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted negligible/low magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.		
West of Orkney Wind Farm	A	Adjacent	Application Permitted	<p>The project is located on land at Halkirk KW12 6XA and comprises the construction of onshore transmission infrastructure comprising up to two cable landfalls, an onshore substation and up to five associated export circuits.</p> <p>The project has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Brochs, Knockglass group (SM582, SM561).</p> <p>The substation and grid connection project would introduce new electrical infrastructure into the landscape north-west of the brochs, within agricultural land and associated plantation forest west of the A9. Whilst, further eroding the agricultural character surrounding the brochs, the proposed BESS would not erode key views towards Loch Toftingall or Loch Watten, nor obscure views towards associated late prehistoric assets in the immediate historic landscape. The introduction of the substation would not generate additional adverse impacts beyond the negligible/low magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect predicted from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required
Hill of Lynchrobbie Wind Farm	A	2 km east	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land around the Hill of Lynchrobbie Dunbeath and comprises the erection of two wind turbines with a tip height of up to 149.9 m and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Cairnmore Hill Wind Farm (Re-design)	A	14 km north-west	Under consideration	<p>The development is located on land 1580 m south-east of Schoolhouse Forss Thurso and comprises the construction of five Wind Turbines with a maximum blade tip height 138.5 m, access tracks, substation, control building, battery energy storage system, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Ouglassy Wind Farm	A	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land at Ouglassy, east of the very northern limit of the Proposed Development. The project comprises the construction of eight wind turbines, with a blade tip height of up to 180 m, BESS technology, associated infrastructure and ancillary development.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Loch Toftingall BESS	A	1 km west	Under consideration	<p>The development is located on land 725 m east of Mybster Sub Station, Spittal and comprises the construction of a battery energy storage system with a maximum output of 49.9 MW including switchgear and control buildings, landscaping, fencing and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Acheilidh Wind Farm (formerly known as Lairg III)	B, C	2 km north	S36 Raise Objection	<p>The development is located on land 1150 m south-west of Tigh an Alt Acheilidh Rogart and comprises the construction of 12 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of between 200 m and 230 m, BESS, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to of LB525238 Lydsurach Crofthouse, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone , LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale, the Brae Monuments group (SM1830, SM1840), the Little Torboll Prehistoric Landscape: North group (SM1861, SM1862), and the Little Torboll Prehistoric Landscape: South group (SM1772, SM1782, SM1809, SM1819, SM1822, SM1851)</p> <p>The development is located to the east of the River Shin in valley, north of the Kyle of Sutherland and south of Loch Shin. Whilst the development would add to the infrastructure in this otherwise remote upland wilderness, it would not erode key views that contribute to the setting and cultural significance of these assets. There are no cumulative impacts predicted to the setting of these assets and the magnitude of impact and significance of effects are as predicted for the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Inveroykel Wind Farm	B, C	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located in the uplands west of the Kyle of Sutherland, south of the River Oykel and North of the River Carron. The development comprises the construction of 29 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 230 m, BESS facility.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB525238 Lydsurach Croft house, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, and BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale.</p> <p>Whilst the development would introduce new infrastructure into the uplands above the Kyle of Sutherland and be visible in views from or to the assets assessed for cumulative impacts to setting, the development would not erode views that contribute to setting or cultural significance. A negligible change to experience or appreciation may be experienced for some visitors as a result of the introduction of infrastructure into and around the Kyle of Sutherland. However, any impacts to setting and cultural significance resulting from such a change would not be sufficient to increase the predicted magnitude of impact and overall effects resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required
Strath Tirry Wind Farm	B, C	17 km north-west	Application Permitted	<p>The development is located on land 1450 m north-east of Dalmichie Lairg and comprises the construction of four wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 135 m, access tracks and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Achany Extension Wind Farm	C	10 km north	Approved by Scottish Ministers	<p>The development is located on land 2 km north-east of Glencassley Castle Rosehall and comprises the construction of 20 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height 149.9 m, access tracks and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Lairg II Wind Farm Redesign	C	3 km north	Application Permitted	<p>The project is located in the uplands east of the River Shin valley and north of the Kyle of Sutherland.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB525238 Lydsurach Croft house, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale, and the Brae Monuments group (SM1830, SM1840).</p> <p>In relation to SM5470, the development is located to the north of the monument. The wind farm would add to the infrastructure in this otherwise remote upland wilderness. In a scenario where the plantation forest around SM5470 was felled or lost through some other mechanism, the wind farm would backdrop key views from the monument north to associated prehistoric assets located on the east bank of the Kyle of Sutherland/River Shin valley, namely SM5498, SM5462, SM1761 and SM2208. Views to SM5470 from associated prehistoric assets would largely be unaffected. The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development and this project would add to the low magnitude of impact generated from the Proposed Development alone, resulting in a medium cumulative impact and major adverse cumulative effect.</p> <p>In relation to SM5497, the development is located to the north of the monument. The wind farm would add to the infrastructure in this otherwise remote upland wilderness. In a scenario where the plantation forest around SM5497 was felled or lost through some other mechanism, the wind farm would backdrop key views from the monument north to associated prehistoric assets located on the east bank of the Kyle of Sutherland/River Shin valley, namely SM5462, SM1761 and SM2208. The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development and this development would add to the low magnitude of impact generated from the Proposed Development alone, resulting in a medium adverse impact and major adverse effect.</p> <p>The development would introduce new infrastructure into the uplands above the River Shin valley, and be visible from the remaining assets listed above, adding to the erosion of views and loss of rural character. This is particularly true of Carbisdale Castle for which these</p>	Major Adverse Effect	No mitigation proposed – Design input to minimise effects already integrated to Proposed Development

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				views contribute notably to significance. However, the resulting setting impacts would not increase the magnitude of impact or significance of effect, predicted from the Proposed Development in isolation.		
Garvary Wind Farm	B, C	Adjacent	Under Consideration	<p>The development is located on land 4.6 km north-east of Invershin Community Hall Invershin, within the uplands east of the River Shin valley and north of the Kyle of Sutherland. The development comprises the erection and operation of wind farm for a period of 30 years, comprising of 25 (as amended) wind turbines with maximum blade tip height of up to 180 m, access tracks, up to six borrow pits, substation, battery storage compound, control building, four meteorological masts, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB525238 Lydsurach Crofthouse, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale, and the Brae Monuments group (SM1830, SM1840).</p> <p>In relation to SM5470, SM5497 and SM1791, the development is located north-east of these assets in the uplands east of the River Shin valley. The turbines of the development are far enough removed to the east of the river valley to avoid backdropping views between these assets or eroding views north along the river valley towards associated late prehistoric assets. As such, no cumulative setting impacts would be generated, and their effects would be no greater than generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>The development would introduce new infrastructure into the uplands above the River Shin valley, and be visible from the remaining assets listed above, adding to the erosion of views and loss of rural character. This is particularly true of Carbisdale Castle for which these views contribute notably to significance. However, the resulting Setting Impacts would not increase the magnitude of impact or significance of effect, predicted from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Balblair Wind Farm	C	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 695 m north-west of Coirshellach Airdens Bonar Bridge and consists of nine wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 180m, energy storage facility, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Braelangwell Wind Farm	C	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 1400 m north of Ar Dachaigh Ardgay and comprises the construction of 17 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 220 m and associated infrastructure. The development comprises up to 19 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 200 m, BESS, access tracks, borrow pits, substation, control building, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB525238 Lydsurach Crofthouse, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, and BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale.</p> <p>Negligible cumulative impacts to setting may be introduced through a combination of the Proposed Development and the wind farm to the assets detailed above. However, these are not predicted to increase the magnitude of impact and significance of effect generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required
Coillie Beith Wind Farm	C	21 km west	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 2.3 km south of Langwell Lodge Langwell Lairg, in the low foothills south of the River Oykel.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB525238 Lydsurach Crofthouse, SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound, SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound and SM1791 Invershin Farm, standing stone, LB7165 Carbisdale Castle, and BTL19 Battle of Carbisdale.</p> <p>Negligible cumulative impacts to setting may be introduced through a combination of the Proposed Development and the wind farm to the assets detailed above. However, these are not predicted to increase the magnitude of impact and significance of effect generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Abhainn Dubh Wind Farm	D	Adjacent	Under Consideration	<p>Abhainn Dubh Wind Farm is located to the northeast of Abhainn / Strath Sgitheach in the uplands north of the River Peffery valley, 3.45 km north Of Kaytoo Heights of Dochcarty Dingwall. The development comprises the construction of 13 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 149.9 m, energy storage facility, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The project has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to GDL00174 Fairburn, GDL00370 Spa Gardens Strathpeffer, GDL00094 Castle Leod, the Abhainn/Strath Sgitheach settlement group (SM10495, SM4728), SM1672 Knock Farril, SM2312 Heights of Brae, chambered cairn, SM2396 Balnacrae, chambered cairn and the Strath Sgitheach group of non-designated assets.</p> <p>For assets located in the Strath Sgitheach valley the project would introduce additional setting impacts resulting from a further erosion of the rural character of this upland zone and a loss of experience and appreciation. Key views that contribute to setting and cultural significance would not be greatly altered. Any cumulative impact to setting would not be of sufficient scale to increase the predicted magnitude of impact and significance of effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>For the remaining assets, located outwith the Strath Sgitheach valley these would undergo no cumulative effects and setting impacts and their effects would be no greater than generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required
Abhainn Dubh 132 kV OHL Wind Farm Connection	D	Adjacent	Screening Application EIA Required	<p>The development is located on land 140 m north-west of two Clashnabuiac Alness, spanning the uplands north of the River Sgitheach and running to the south-west along the low foothills south of Cnoc Ceislein and Cnoc Fyrish before reaching Alness. The development comprises the construction and operation of a 132 kV single circuit OHL of approximately 8.4 km and approximately 1 km of UGC to connect the proposed Abhainn Dubh Wind Farm to the existing Fyrish Substation.</p> <p>The project has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to GDL00174 Fairburn, GDL00370 Spa Gardens Strathpeffer, GDL00094 Castle Leod, the Abhainn/Strath Sgitheach settlement group (SM10495, SM4728), SM1672 Knock Farril, SM2312 Heights of</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				<p>Brae, chambered cairn, SM2396 Balnacrae, chambered cairn and the Strath Sgitheach group of non-designated assets.</p> <p>For assets located in the Strath Sgitheach valley the project would introduce additional setting impacts resulting from a further erosion of the rural character of this upland zone and a loss of experience and appreciation. Key views that contribute to setting and cultural significance would not be greatly altered. Any cumulative impact to setting would not be of sufficient scale to increase the predicted magnitude of impact and significance of effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>For the remaining assets, located outwith the Strath Sgitheach valley these would undergo no cumulative effects and setting impacts and their effects would be no greater than generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>		
Strathrory Wind Farm Redesign	D	6 km east	Appeal Allowed	<p>The development is located on land at Torr Leathann, Strathrory, Ardross, Alness, IV17 and comprises the construction of 7 Wind Turbines with a maximum height of 180 m, plus associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns,</p> <p>The wind farm is located to the north-east of the monument in the uplands north of Cnoc ant-Strathaidh and to the rear a series of prehistoric funerary cairns located in the low foothills of Cnoc ant-Strathaidh. The development would add to the existing electrical infrastructure around and above the River Alness valley and erode views from SM6644 across the river valley towards these associated funerary assets, notably SM4753. Views towards the cairns from associated assets would not be affected. Whilst the wind farm would introduce cumulative setting Impacts associated with SM6644, these impacts are not deemed to be of a sufficient magnitude to warrant an increase from the predicted Low magnitude of impact generated from the Proposed Development alone, nor the resulting Moderate adverse effect.</p>	Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Creachan Wind Farm	D	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 5.8 km north-east of the Bothy Kildermorie Strathrusdale Alness and comprises the construction of 21 Turbines with a maximum blade tip height 220 m, BESS facility, access tracks, borrow pits, substation, control building, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns,</p> <p>The wind farm is located 10 km north-west of the cairns, in the uplands north-west of the Black Water valley. The wind farm would not erode key views to or from the cairns, which are directed towards associated assets along and above the River Alness valley, east and north-east of the cairns, nor add to setting impacts generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Ceislein Wind Farm	D	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located in the uplands north-east of the Cromarty Firth, in and around Cnoc Ceislein, south of the River Alness valley and north of the River Glass valley. The development comprises the construction of 20 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 250 m, potential BESS and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to LB15031 Ardross Castle, SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns, SM1672 Knock Farril, SM2312 Heights of Brae cairn, SM2396, Balnacrae, chambered cairn and the Strath Sgitheach group of non-designated assets.</p> <p>In relation to LB15031 Ardross Castle, the wind farm is located 2.5 km south-west of the castle, in the uplands south of the River Alness valley. The wind farm would erode key views from the castle and terrace overlooking the river valley. In isolation, the wind farm is predicted to generate a low magnitude of impact resulting in a moderate adverse effect. In conjunction with the Proposed Development, the cumulative setting impacts are expected to increase from a low to medium magnitude of impact, resulting in a major adverse cumulative effect.</p> <p>In relation to SM6644, the wind farm is located 1 km south-east of the cairns in the uplands south of the River Alness valley. The wind farm is predicted to generate a low magnitude of</p>	Major Adverse Effect	No mitigation proposed – Design input to minimise effects already integrated to Proposed Development

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				<p>impact resulting in a moderate adverse effect, with setting impacts derived from the introduction of new infrastructure in close proximity to the cairns, possibly eroding the experience for visitors, and an erosion of views towards the cairns from associated assets along the River Alness valley. The cumulative effect of both the Proposed Development and this wind farm would add to the low magnitude of impact generated from the Proposed Development alone, resulting in a medium adverse impact and major adverse effect.</p> <p>For the remaining assets, located outwith the River Alness valley, negligible cumulative impacts to setting may be introduced through a combination of the Proposed Development and the wind farm. However, these are not predicted to increase the magnitude of impact and significance of effect generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>		
Carn Fearna Wind Farm	D	5 km north-west	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 4 km north-east of Gare and comprises the construction of nine turbines with a tip height of approximately 200 m and BESS.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Carn Fearna 132 kV OHL Wind Farm Connection	D	5 km west	Awaiting Decision	<p>The development is located on land 4 km north-east of Gare and comprises the construction and operation of a 132 kV single circuit OHL of approximately 7 km to connect the proposed Carn Fearna Wind Farm.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required
Tarvie Wind Farm	D	5 km west	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The development is located on land 1750 m south-west of Tarvie Services, Tarvie, Strathpeffer, and comprises the construction of five wind turbines with a tip height of approximately 200 m and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no predicted overlapping setting impacts resulting from this development and the Proposed Development.</p>	No Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
Beauly to Blackhillock to New Deer to Peterhead (BBNP) 400kV OHL	E	Adjacent	Scoping Application Decision Issued ³⁰	<p>The development is located on land 1525 m south-east of Finglack Culloden Moor Inverness and comprises the construction of a new double circuit steel structure 400 kV OHL between Beauly, Blackhillock, New Deer and Peterhead, approximately 194 km in length, including the diversion of an existing 400 kV OHL into a proposed new Coach.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Fairley Prehistoric Assets group (SM2422, SM2424, SM5212), SM4979 Dun Mor and SM13523, Uchany barrow</p> <p>The OHL is located to the south-east of a group of prehistoric assets (SM2422, SM2424, SM4979, SM5212) around the River Beauly valley and adjacent to the operational substation. The OHLs would extend east from the substation south of Inverness. The OHLs and towers would add to the existing electrical infrastructure around the river valley but would not substantively alter views into and over the river valley from these assets. Views between assets in this group and towards this group would not be affected. No cumulative setting impacts would be introduced, the predicted slight magnitude of impact generated from the Proposed Development alone, and the resulting Moderate adverse effect would not be added to.</p> <p>The OHL is located to the south-east of Urchany Barrow (SM13523) and adjacent to the operational substation. The OHLs would extend east from the substation south of Inverness. The OHLs and towers would add to the existing electrical infrastructure around the River Beauly valley but would not substantively alter views into and over the river valley from these assets. Views between assets in this group and towards this asset would not be affected. No cumulative setting impacts would be introduced and there would be no</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

³⁰ As stated in Chapter 5: EIA Process and Methodology, the final list of developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment was frozen at the end of March 2025, to allow sufficient time to compile this EIA Report. Therefore, this EIA Report for BBNP has not been submitted at time of writing. However, as it is an internal project, it has been possible to have sight of information available prior to finalising this EIA Report. This has therefore been used to undertake a cumulative assessment but will be subject to finalisation of the BBNP EIA Report.

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				increase to the predicted magnitude of impact and significance of effect generated from the Proposed Development in isolation.		
Ballach Wind Farm	E	1 km west	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The proposed wind farm is located on land 6 km north-east of Erchless Forest Cottage Struy Beauly. The development comprises the erection and operation of a wind farm for a period of 35 years, comprising 36 turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 200 m and 230 m, along with a BESS and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Farley Prehistoric Assets group (SM2422, SM2424, SM5212), SM4979 Dun Mor and SM13523, Uchany barrow.</p> <p>Wind farm turbines would be located 3.5 km north of the monuments assessed for cumulative impacts, and would introduce additional electrical infrastructure into the uplands north of the River Beauly</p> <p>In relation to the Farley Prehistoric Asset group, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the forts. Key views to and from SM2424 would be largely unaffected as these relate to the River Beauly valley to the south and south-east. Views from SM2422 would be unaffected, being focused directly south onto an upland terrace immediately below the fort. Views towards the fort, from this same terrace may be eroded with that fort at risk of being backdropped by turbines. Views from SM5212, towards the nearby Loch nam Bonnach would not be directly blocked, but would contain turbines in views north-west over the loch. Whilst the introduction of the wind farm would generate additional adverse impacts to setting, they would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted low magnitude of impact and moderate adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>In relation to Dun Mor, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the fort. Key views from the fort, south-east towards the river valley would not be affected, nor would views west towards Beinn a Chlaonaidh. Views towards the fort from the river valley approach do risk being eroded, with the fort backdropped by turbines. Whilst the introduction of the wind farm would generate additional adverse impacts to setting, they</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				<p>would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted medium magnitude of impact and major adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>In relation to the Uchany Barrow, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the monument. Key views from the barrow, south-east towards SM4979 Dun Mor, Fort, would be unaffected, nor would views souths be changed along the Erchless Burn and towards the River Beaully. Views towards the barrow from the southern approach along the Erchless Burn approach do risk being eroded, with the barrow being backdropped by turbines. Whilst the introduction of the wind farm would generate additional adverse impacts to setting, they would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted low magnitude of impact and moderate adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>		
Cnoc Farasd Wind Farm	E	10 km south-west	Scoping Application Decision Issued	<p>The proposed wind farm is located 2 km, north-east of The Lodge Buntait Glenurquhart Drumnadrochit. The development comprises the erection and operation of a wind farm comprising of up to nine wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 220 m, BESS and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The development has been assessed for cumulative impacts to setting in relation to the Farley Prehistoric Assets group (SM2422, SM2424, SM5212), SM4979 Dun Mor and SM13523, Uchany barrow.</p> <p>Wind farm turbines would be located 12 km south of the monuments assessed for cumulative impacts, and would introduce additional electrical infrastructure into the uplands south of the River Beaully</p> <p>In relation to the Farley Prehistoric Asset group, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the forts. Key views to and from the forts would not be affected. The introduction of the wind farm would not generate any adverse impacts to setting of note, and would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted low magnitude of impact and moderate adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>In relation to Dun Mor, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the fort. Key views to and from the fort would not be affected. The introduction</p>	No / Negligible Effect	None Required

Development	Section	Distance from Proposed Development	Status	Impact Description	Effect	Mitigation
				<p>of the wind farm would not generate any adverse impacts to Setting of note, and would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted medium magnitude of impact and major adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p> <p>In relation to the Uchany Barrow, the wind farm turbines would further erode the rural character surrounding the monument. Key views to and from the barrow would not be affected. The introduction of the wind farm would not generate any adverse impacts to Setting of note, and would not be sufficiently impactful to alter the predicted low magnitude of impact and moderate adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation.</p>		

12.8.5 Four major adverse cumulative/in-combination effects are reported as a result changes in setting, are predicted for four designated assets:

- LB15031 Ardross Castle;
- SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns;
- SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound; and
- SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound.

12.8.6 Cumulative/in-combination effects relating to Ardross Castle (LB15031) and Boath, three chambered cairns (SM6644) relate to interactions between the Proposed Development and Ceislein Wind Farm (24/03524/SCOP). Cumulative/in-combination effects relating to Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound (SM5470) and Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound (SM5497) relate to interactions between the Proposed Development and Lairg II Wind Farm Redesign (21/00849/FUL).

12.8.7 The cumulative effect to setting from the Proposed Development and proposed wind farms would add to the minor predicted effect generated from the Proposed Development alone, resulting in a major adverse cumulative effect, which is significant.

12.8.8 Setting impacts would persist throughout the lifecycle of the Proposed Development and/or the lifecycle of the assessed developments. Setting impacts would typically be fully reversible upon decommissioning of these projects.

12.8.9 The cumulative effects for all other cultural heritage assets have been assessed as negligible adverse or predicting no effect.

12.8.10 Of additional note are cumulative effects for Fairburn GDL (GDL00174) concerning the inter-phase interaction of direct physical impacts/setting impacts at construction phase and the residual setting impacts throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

12.8.11 During construction, a Major adverse effect is predicted that results from the felling of forest associated with the Fairburn GDL and impacts to below ground archaeology during tree clearance and construction. In addition, a Minor adverse effect is predicted for Fairburn GDL throughout the Operational phase of the scheme, resulting from setting impacts, derived from the loss of tree planting within the GDL, as well as well the proximity of the Proposed Development to the GDL and the loss of scenic value, which contribute to cultural significance. The truncation of any below ground archaeological remains during construction would be offset through preservation by record, noting that the physical archaeological remains are lost permanently. Setting effects would persist throughout the lifecycle of the Proposed Development but would typically be fully reversible after decommissioning.

12.8.12 The interaction of these construction and operational phase impacts is predicted to result in a cumulative Low magnitude of impact to the GDL, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect, which would be considered Significant in the context of EIA regulations.

12.9 Mitigation

Overarching Standards and Methodology

- 12.9.1 The Framework Mitigation Approach is outlined in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary** and is subject to approval following consultation with THC HET and will be implemented in accordance with Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (revised 2017)³¹ and PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.³² PAN 1/2013 describes mitigation as a hierarchy of measures, as follows:
- prevention;
 - reduction; and
 - compensatory (offset) measures.
- 12.9.2 An iterative process of design review and amendment was undertaken throughout this EIA Report pre-submission phase. The cultural heritage considerations were platformed and weighed against other Proposed Development constraints in workshop/forum-style optioneering meetings, including the environmental, social and engineering specialists. Options presented derived from a variety of sources, for example: topic team change request, stakeholder consultation/feedback, community responses, or access concerns / alternative development area requirements.
- 12.9.3 Impact was assessed in relation to the proposed locations of Proposed Development elements. The presence of heritage assets within the LoD, that are not within these proposed locations, are considered not to result in a direct impact. The approach to mitigating and managing heritage impact of any design iterations within the LoD post-EIA Report submission is as follows:
1. **Embedded mitigation (see Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment, Section 1.3):** develops the framework from which the detailed design interpreting the outlined approaches to avoidance, minimisation and reduction of impact to heritage assets that are universal across the Proposed Development, have been addressed through iterative design processes, and will be detailed through documentation (CEMP/WSI/PP) of the specific mitigation works.
 2. **Secondary mitigation (see Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment, Section 1.4):** outlines areas of EAP with relevant indicative mitigation approaches.
 3. **Tertiary mitigation (see Volume 5, Appendix 12.1: Scope and Method of Assessment, Section 1.5):** presents initial mitigation considerations for inclusion in the detailed design based on observations from field investigations during this EIA.
- 12.9.4 Prevention and reduction measures can be achieved through design, whilst compensatory measures offset effects that have not been prevented or reduced. The emphasis in NPF4 Policy 7 (O) [and PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology] is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where it is not.³³ The mitigation approach herein, is aligned with this guidance.
- 12.9.5 A supplementary mitigation design document will be compiled to outline and detail the Framework Mitigation Approach for the Proposed Development . This will be integrated into the Proposed Development CEMP documentation and will include:
- Considerations for direct impact;

³¹ Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment

³² Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and archaeology

³³ Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and archaeology

- Considerations for setting impact;
- Considerations for consultation, inclusive of;
 - Consultation with the qualified archaeologist on site (ACoW) prior to changes in Proposed Development design as a result of micro-siting;
 - Consultation with the THC HET or HES representative for agreement of proportionate mitigation in relation to heritage assets of particular cultural significance/complexity, to address relevant planning conditions for development; and
 - Agreement of an overall mitigation design with THC HET, to address relevant planning conditions for development.
- Documentation, inclusive of:
 - An overall (or series of) WSIs to detail heritage mitigation interventions;
 - A methodology for non-intrusive survey methods;
 - Project Plans for intrusive pre-commencement works;
 - A methodology for construction phase archaeological monitoring, and adherence to embedded mitigation;
 - A protocol for the reporting, assessment and management of unexpected archaeological discoveries; and
 - Outlined process for the reporting, data management/transfer, publication and archiving of archaeological works.
- Considerations for public benefit.
- Considerations for community engagement/involvement in works, where appropriate.

12.10 Framework Mitigation Approach Summary

12.10.1 The Framework Mitigation Approach is presented in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary** but, in summary, the following general measures may be required to fulfil the commitment to the mitigation of cultural heritage impacts along the route of the Proposed Development:

- Targeted pre-commencement non-intrusive surveys;
- Production of further visualisations;
- Regulator consultation;
- Trial trenching evaluation;
- Targeted open area excavations;
- Archaeological monitoring and recording (e.g., watching brief); and
- Public benefit action.

12.10.2 A review of the EAP areas that may be used to guide mitigation design are presented by section in **Volume 5: Appendix 12.7**.

12.10.3 The Mitigation Framework Approach presented in **Volume 5, Appendix 12.7: Mitigation Summary**, applies to pre-commencement works, or where appropriate, during the construction phase 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 WSI and Project Plans (PP) developed in consultation with, and agreed by, the ACoW, with THC HET, and the Principal Contractors.

Design and Documentation

12.10.4 A supplementary mitigation design document will be compiled to outline the detailed mitigation approach for the Proposed Development. This will be integrated into the Proposed Development CEMP documentation.

12.11 Residual Effects

12.11.1 Direct and setting effects identified for the construction phase will be maintained through the operational lifecycle of the Proposed Development.

12.11.2 The mitigation undertaken may not serve to reduce the reported impact or resultant effect, reflecting the loss of the asset or change to setting. Intrusive archaeological investigation is by its nature a destructive act, utilising a methodologically controlled and recorded process to generate a robust archive from the partial or total loss of the asset. Where the proposed mitigation would ensure that the impacted asset is subject to an appropriate level of archaeological investigation and recording, resulting in its preservation by record, the significance of the residual effect is accordingly lessened, although this may not reduce the reported level of effect.

12.11.3 Residual effects may be mitigated and/or offset through the curation of written reports and the physical archive for public use, and potentially supplemented by additional actions aiming to promote public benefit through the enhancement of the heritage resource as part of the Proposed Development's mitigation approach.

12.12 Summary and Conclusions

12.12.1 A total of 5014 cultural heritage assets have been identified as part of the Proposed Development baseline, of which 1296 have been added to a gazetteer. These are assets potentially susceptible to impacts resulting from the introduction of the Proposed Development, either physically (direct) or as a result of changes to setting.

12.12.2 The Proposed Development has undergone an iterative design process, with the objective of avoiding or minimising impacts upon identified environmental and social constraints (including cultural heritage assets) by design. Where it has not been possible to mitigate impacts by design, the Framework Mitigation Approach has been prepared to address further mitigation considerations.

12.12.3 The Proposed Development has the potential to result in 76 significant adverse effects to cultural heritage assets. Of these 32 would be anticipated to result from the direct (physical) impact of the Proposed Development, specifically the construction groundworks, upon heritage assets, e.g., their truncation or removal. The remaining 44 effects would be anticipated to derive from adverse changes to the setting of heritage assets.

12.12.4 The majority of the identified significant effects would result from the installation of the Proposed Development along Section A, which passes through an area of concentrated archaeological activity. Notably fewer significant effects have been identified within each of the remaining four sections (B-E).

12.12.5 A summary of the identified adverse significant effects, broken down by section, is as follows:

Section A:

- 12 as a result of direct impacts (one major, 11 moderate); and
- 34 as a result of changes to setting (13 major, 21 moderate).

Section B:

- Ten as a result of direct impacts (one major, nine moderate); and
- Two as a result of changes to setting (two major).

Section C:

- One as result of a direct impact (one moderate); and
- Two as a result of changes to setting (two moderate).

Section D:

- Three as a result of direct impacts (three moderate); and
- Four as a result of changes to setting (one major³⁴, three moderate).

Section E:

- Six as a result of direct impacts (three major, three moderate); and
- Two as a result of changes to setting (one major, one moderate).

Integrity of Setting

12.12.6 Following an appraisal of significant effects to designated assets, it has been determined that the Proposed Development would potentially result in a single instance of significant adverse impact upon the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument, specifically:

- Balnacrae Cairn (SM2396), which is located within Section D.

Cumulative Effect

12.12.7 The Framework Mitigation Approach outlines the mitigation design to be implemented and respond to any planning conditions levied. However, given the nature of archaeological investigation and the anticipated impacts to setting, the reported effects are anticipated to be maintained through the operational phase.

12.12.8 Four major adverse cumulative/in-combination effects are reported as a result changes in setting. These are predicted in relation to four designated assets:

Ceislein Wind Farm

- LB7926 Ardross Castle
- SM6644 Boath, three chambered cairns

Lairg II Wind Farm Redesign

- SM5470 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound; and
- SM5497 Invershin Farm, settlement and burnt mound.

12.12.9 Cumulative effects are also present for GDL00174, concerning the inter-phase interaction of direct physical impacts/setting impacts at construction phase and the residual setting impacts throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The interaction of these construction and operational phase impacts is predicted to result in a cumulative moderate adverse effect, which would be considered significant in the context of EIA Regulations.

³⁴ Significant adverse impact on the setting of a scheduled monument (SM2396).