

CONTENTS

9.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	9-2
9.1	Introduction	9-2
9.2	Methodology	9-2
9.3	Sensitive Receptors	9-10
9.4	Baseline Conditions	9-10
9.5	Issues Scoped Out	9-13
9.6	Assessment of Likely Effects	9-14
9.7	Mitigation	9-18
9.8	Residual Effects	9-18
9.9	Cumulative Effects	9-18
9.10	Summary	9-19

Figures (Volume 3)

Figure 9.1: Cultural Heritage

Figure 9.2: Cultural Heritage Visualisation from Broch

Appendices (Volume 4)

Appendix 9.1: Cultural Heritage Indirect Effects

9. CULTURAL HERITAGE

9.1 Introduction

- 9.1.1 This Chapter addresses the potential impact of the Proposed Development on sites of Cultural Heritage interest, including Scheduled and Designated sites, recorded archaeological features and features previously unrecorded but located during a walk-over survey. Direct impacts, where the feature may be damaged or destroyed, and indirect, visual impacts from both the Proposed Development and the construction phase are considered.
- 9.1.2 The assessment was prepared by an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) based in Wester Ross, Scotland. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the CIfA's code of conduct and relevant standards and guidance, as well as The Highland Council's Standards for Archaeological Work¹.

9.2 Methodology

Relevant Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislation

- 9.2.1 The assessment has taken account of the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011².
- 9.2.2 The Act received Royal Assent in February 2011 and all provisions and associated Regulations attached to the Act were commenced in December 2011. The Act is a tightly focused, technical amending piece of legislation that improves the management and protection of Scotland's historic environment. The Act amends three pieces of primary legislation, which include:
- The Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953³;
 - The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979⁴; and
 - The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997⁵.

Guidance & Policy

- 9.2.3 The assessment has taken account of the following guidance and policies.

*Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)*⁶

- 9.2.4 The latest Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) was published in June 2014 and is the statement of the Scottish Government's policy on nationally important land use planning matters. It replaces the previous SPP (2010).
- 9.2.5 The relevant subject policy in the consolidated SPP for this assessment, includes: 'Valuing the Historic Environment' (p.135 – 151), which sets out how all types of historic environment assets are to be dealt with within this planning framework.

¹ Highland Council. (2012). *Highland Council: Standards for Archaeological Work*. [online] Available at:

https://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/file/1022/standards_for_archaeological_work [accessed 28 February 2019].

² Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011). Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents/enacted> [accessed 28 February 2019].

³ Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act (1953). Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Eliz2/1-2/49/contents> [accessed 28 February 2019].

⁴ Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979). Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46> [accessed 28 February 2019].

⁵ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act (1997). Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents> [accessed 28 February 2019].

⁶ Scottish Government. (2014). *Scottish Planning Policy*. [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-planning-policy/> [accessed 28 February 2019].

*Our Place in Time: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (March 2014)*⁷

9.2.6 Scotland's first ever Historic Environment Strategy is a high level framework which sets out a 10 year vision for the historic environment. The key outcome is to ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of Scotland's historic environment continues to make a strong contribution to the wellbeing of the nation and its people. It was developed collaboratively and identified the need for strategic priorities to help align and prioritise sector activity towards a common goal.

9.2.7 Section C of the strategy 'Protect: Care and Protect' states the following:

"It is essential for future generations, as well as our own, that the historic environment is cared for in a sustainable way, and legally protected where appropriate".

"Change is an inevitable part of the dynamic of the historic environment, and how this is managed is the critical factor. It is vital to strike the right balance between development and the protection of significant historic environment assets."

*Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS)*⁸

9.2.8 HEPS, released in April 2019, is a policy statement directing decision-making that affects the historic environment. It is non-statutory, which means that it is not required to be followed as a matter of law or statute. It is relevant to a wide range of decision-making at national and local levels and supported by detailed policy and guidance. HEPS sets out a series of principles and policies for the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment. It promotes a way of understanding the value of the historic environment which is inclusive and recognises different views. It encourages consistent, integrated management and decision-making to support positive outcomes for the people of Scotland. It also supports everyone's participation in decisions that affect the historic environment. By doing these things, HEPS helps to deliver the vision and aims of Our Place in Time.

*Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology*⁹

9.2.9 PAN 2/2011 supersedes PAN 42 Archaeology - the Planning Process and Scheduled Monuments Procedures. It sits alongside Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) and the Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance Notes, which together set out the Scottish Ministers' policies for planning and the historic environment. This PAN is intended to inform the day-to-day work of a range of local authority advisory services and other organisations that have a role in the handling of archaeological matters within the planning process.

9.2.10 In determining planning applications that may impact on archaeological features or their setting, planning authorities may on occasion have to balance the benefits of development against the importance of archaeological features. The weight that should be given to archaeological considerations will depend on a number of factors, including:

- the relative rarity of the archaeological feature concerned;
- the completeness of the feature / whether it is a particularly good example of its type;
- the historical or cultural associations of the feature;

⁷ The Institute for Archaeologists. (2014). *Our Place in Time: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland*. [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/place-time-historic-environment-strategy-scotland/> [accessed 28 February 2019].

⁸ Historic Environment Scotland. (2019). *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland*. [online] Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7> [accessed 25 April 2019].

⁹ Scottish Government. (2011). *Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology* [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/> [accessed 28 February 2019].

- the value given to the feature by the local community;
- the potential value of the feature as an in situ educational or research resource; and
- the potential value of retaining the feature for tourism or place-making.

Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting

9.2.11 This guidance sets out the principles that apply to developments affecting the setting of historic assets or places, including Scheduled Monuments (SMs), listed buildings. Inventory historic gardens and designated landscapes, World Heritage Sites, conservation areas, historic battlefields, Historic Marine Protected Areas, and undesignated sites.

Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP), Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage¹⁰

9.2.12 Policy 57 of the HwLDP sets out the test against which development proposals within the plan area must be judged against when those proposals may affect cultural heritage assets. The policy states:

“All development proposals will be assessed taking in to account the level of importance and type of heritage features, the form and scale of the development, and may impact on the feature and its setting, in the context of the policy framework of Appendix 2. The following criteria will apply:

- 1. For features of local / regional importance we will allow developments if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the...heritage resource.*
- 2. For features of national importance, we will allow developments that can be shown not to compromise the heritage resource. Where there may be any significance adverse effects these must be clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance.*
- 3. For features of international importance developments likely to have a significant effect on a site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and which are not directly commented with or necessary to the management of the site will be subject to an appropriate assessment. Where we are unable to ascertain that a proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of a site, we will only allow development if there is no alternative solution and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature.”*

9.2.13 The policy also states that the Historic Environment Strategy (HES) described above will be adopted as supplementary planning guidance and therefore form part of local and regional policy.

Scope of the Assessment

9.2.14 This assessment considers the likely impacts of the Proposed Development on the cultural heritage interests of the site and surrounding area. This is comprised of an assessment of the sensitivity of nearby features, such as SMs, recorded sites and previously unrecorded sites identified during fieldwork associated with the Proposed Development, and a determination of the likely level of impact upon them that would arise from the Proposed Development.

9.2.15 The assessment considers the potential for both direct impacts, meaning those that have potential to physically disturb or damage heritage features within the development area, and indirect impacts, meaning those which can adversely affect the historic setting of heritage features via the Proposed Development’s visibility from each feature or its curtilage.

¹⁰ Highland Council. (2012). *Highland-wide Local Development Plan*. [online] Available at:

https://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/local_and_statutory_development_plans/199/highland-wide_local_development_plan [accessed 28 February 2019].

9.2.16 A study area appropriate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development is set out below, and the assessment considers cultural heritage features within this area. The study area is defined as the extent to which the Proposed Development has the potential to give rise to significant impacts.

Extent of the Study Area

Study Area: Direct Impacts

9.2.17 The study area to locate and define archaeological features with the potential for direct impacts was formed by the location of The Proposed Development infrastructure. This was set as a 200 m corridor, corresponding with the Limit of Deviation (LOD) as defined in Chapter 3 of this EIA Report.

Study Area: Indirect Impacts

9.2.18 All sites identified with statutory protection in the broad development area of the scheme were considered for potential indirect, visual impacts. The study area for indirect impacts was 2 km from the Proposed Development.

Consultation Undertaken to Date

9.2.19 Key issues raised by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and from The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Team (HET) through the consultation process of relevance to cultural heritage are summarised in **Table 9-1** below.

Table 9-1: Cultural Heritage Issues Raised During Consultation

Consultee	Consultee Response	Action
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) – Scoping Response	One SM: Altbreck, broch 1,650 m east south-east of Dalchork Bridge (SM1829) has been identified as having a prominent position in the landscape and intervisibility with other sites. It is recommended that a visualisation is provided from this asset to assist in assessment of impacts on the setting of the broch.	A visualisation of the Proposed Development from this historic asset has been produced and is included as Figure 9.2: Cultural Heritage Visualisation from Broch . This has been used to assist in assessment of potential impacts, as set out in Section 9.6 below.
	Overall, HES agree with the proposed approach for baseline collection, prediction and significance assessment.	Noted.
	Direct impacts on nationally important heritage assets have been avoided; however, potential for setting impacts remains and therefore this will be the most important issue to consider in assessment.	Indirect impacts on sites of cultural heritage importance have been included in the assessment within this Chapter (see Section 9.6).
	HES recommend use of 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' guidance.	The noted guidance has been used in this assessment.
	Any forthcoming application should be supported by an EIA Chapter on	This Chapter sets out the results of the walkover survey,

The Highland Council (Historic Environment Team (HET)) – Scoping Response	cultural heritage which incorporates the results of a walkover survey and makes recommendations for mitigation where appropriate.	an assessment of likely impacts from the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets (see Section 9.6), and proposals for mitigation (see Section 9.7).
	Particular concerns are raised in regard to the prehistoric settlement remains at Cnoc a Catha.	Potential impacts on this site are evaluated in Section 9.6.
	The survey and reporting should meet professional standards as set out by ClfA and follow the guidance provided in the Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work.	The survey and reporting have been carried out by a qualified member of ClfA, and in accordance with the noted guidance.

Method of Baseline Data Collation

9.2.20 This assessment has been prepared using the following methodology:

Desk Study

9.2.21 A desk-based assessment made use of available datasets and documentary sources, including all previous reported archaeological investigations in the area and Ordnance Survey (OS) information. The following archaeological surveys have covered sections of the Proposed Development area:

- Mercer, R. J. (1980a) – Archaeological field survey in northern Scotland, 1976 – 1979, University of Edinburgh, Department of Archaeology, Occasional Paper No. 4 [Edinburgh];
- Mercer, R. J. & Howell, J. M. 1980 – Archaeological field survey in northern Scotland, 1976 – 1979, University of Edinburgh;
- Peteranna, M. (2011) – Archaeological survey of Dalchork Forest, Lairg, Sutherland. Ross Cromarty Archaeological Services; and
- Creag Riabhach Grid Connection Environmental Alignment Selection Study Report (March 2019).

9.2.22 The first two studies noted above covered the entire study area north of Dalchork Forest. Some sites have been subsequently reassigned as natural features and all other sites recorded during this survey required verification. The third study covered forestry areas and was sponsored by Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) to verify the known archaeological record and evaluate changes since they were first recorded. The fourth study comprised targeted field surveys designed to determine the condition of heritage assets identified during an initial desk study at the alignment selection stage for the Proposed Development. All these surveys were taken to be accurate and comprehensive.

9.2.23 The desk-based assessment included a review of the Highland Historic Environment Record, the Pastmap online database of Historic Environment Scotland's records¹¹, and early maps held by the Map Library within the National Library of Scotland.

Field Survey

9.2.24 A site walkover was carried out in November 2018 to identify all previously unrecorded archaeological features within areas not previously subjected to detailed archaeological survey and to evaluate the post-felling status of sites at Cnoc a Chatha.

¹¹ Historic Environment Scotland. (2019). *Pastmap*. [online] Available at: <https://pastmap.org.uk/> [accessed 28 February 2019].

Determining Magnitude of Change and Sensitivity of Receptors

9.2.25 This Section explains criteria for evaluating the impact of the development on cultural heritage receptors.

Direct Impacts

9.2.26 The significance of a direct impact depends upon the importance of a cultural heritage site, combined with the magnitude of the impact.

Sensitivity / Importance

9.2.27 Archaeological sites, the definition of which extends to include areas considered to be of archaeological potential, and sites of historical or otherwise cultural interest fall into three categories:

- **National:** this category contains all sites and monuments with statutory protection, i.e. SMs and Listed Buildings¹². Other monuments, although not scheduled, may be considered to be of national importance if they are particularly rare and well-preserved examples of a type;
- **Regional:** almost all prehistoric and mediaeval sites would be considered to be of regional importance. Post mediaeval sites would be placed in this category if they are particularly well-preserved or unusual, dependent on the distribution of similar sites in the vicinity and if they form an element within a complex archaeological or historical landscape. Post-mediaeval townships, shieling sites and the more substantial relict agricultural, sporting or military remains of the 19th and 20th centuries would fall into this category; and
- **Local:** this category applies to minor landscape features of the post-mediaeval period, particularly those which are common or poorly preserved. Boundaries and trackways, unless forming elements of a well-preserved relict, archaeological or historical landscape, or bearing historical or cultural associations, would fall into this category.

Magnitude of Direct Impact

9.2.28 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of a direct impact include:

- **High Impact:** direct impact on sites of National importance is considered to be high, as these sites tend to be those with statutory protection. As such, any potential high impact would be unacceptable and would require a review of the development design in order to avoid or reduce direct impact;
- **Medium Impact:** direct impact on sites of Regional importance is considered to be medium, although each case will require separate consideration. In some cases, this impact would be considered acceptable, most likely following a further programme of recording and investigation, while in other cases, the recommendation would be to modify the development design if possible to avoid or reduce direct impact;
- **Low Impact:** sites of local importance would not generally require modification of the development design to avoid direct impact. Some recording may be advisable as mitigation; and
- **Imperceptible Impact:** impact on sites which lie within the study area but would not be intentionally directly affected.

¹² Scheduling is carried out under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Listing is carried out under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. The aim of scheduling and listing is to preserve our most significant sites, monuments and buildings as far as possible in the form in which they have been passed down to us today. For these monuments and buildings with legal protections, the assumption is that all efforts will be made to prevent destruction, damage or alteration. Where this is completely unavoidable, Scheduled Monument Consent or Listed Building Consent is required. This protection extends to the immediate surroundings, or the setting of the monument and its relationship with significant topographical features in the landscape.

Significance of Direct Impact

- 9.2.29 The predicted significance of impact is determined by consideration of a Site's importance in conjunction with the magnitude of impact predicted on it. **Table 9-2** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of a direct impact. A moderate or major effect is considered to be significant.

Table 9-2: Significance of a Direct Impact

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

Indirect Impacts

- 9.2.30 An indirect impact is related to the potential impact of a development on the setting of a cultural heritage site or asset. The significance of an indirect impact depends upon the importance of a cultural heritage site, combined with the magnitude of the impact.
- 9.2.31 Indirect impacts are considered to be where the Proposed Development becomes a substantial visual element as viewed from a site with statutory protection or otherwise alters the landscape setting of that site. Sites which have been placed in order to have a relationship with landscape features or other contemporary sites are particularly sensitive to indirect, visual impacts. Such sites would include standing stones, placed as part of a ritual landscape or as markers of community and land ownership.
- 9.2.32 Indirect impacts on non-statutory sites are not considered within this study. While there are no legal requirements to preserve the settings of non-statutory sites, there are certainly examples where this additional protection is advisable: in situations where the setting of the site or group of sites has altered little from the time of construction or occupation or where nearby landscape features play a significant role in the location and function of the site. This is not the case for the archaeological sites in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, which stand for the most part in a degraded landscape of coniferous afforestation and felling. Consideration is also given to the perception of these sites by the local community and by visitors: where the introduction of modern elements may significantly detract from the experience of visiting and interpreting the sites, the relationship between locals and visitors and the sites in question is weak, and unlikely to be strengthened in the near future.

Sensitivity / Importance

- 9.2.33 The sensitivity or importance of a site is set out in **Table 9-3**.

Table 9-3: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting:

Sensitivity	Guideline Criteria
High	The site has a clearly defined setting that is readily appreciable and is considered vital to its character and the appreciation of this. The site will generally be visible within the landscape.
Medium	The site's character and the appreciation of this relate to some extent to its setting. The site will generally be visible on the ground.

Low	The site's surroundings have little relevance to its character and the appreciation of this. The site is difficult to identify on the ground or its original setting features are difficult to appreciate.
Negligible	The site is imperceptible in the landscape and its character and appreciation do not relate to its surroundings.

Magnitude of Indirect Impact

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

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

9.2.35 The Magnitude of indirect impact of the Proposed Development should be considered High in all cases where it becomes a clearly visible feature as viewed from the receptor. However, in a situation where the landscape setting and views to landscape features or other archaeological features are already compromised by alteration the magnitude of impact has to be reviewed on an individual rather than a formulaic basis.

9.2.36 Following HES' *Guidance notes on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*, factors to be included in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place include:

- whether key views to or from the historic asset or place are interrupted;
- whether the proposed change would dominate or detract in a way that affects our ability to understand and appreciate the historic asset;
- the visual impact of the proposed change relative to the scale of the historic asset or place and its setting;
- the visual impact of the proposed change relative to the current place of the historic asset in the landscape;
- the presence, extent, character and scale of the existing built environment within the surroundings of the historic asset or place and how the proposed development compares to this; and
- the magnitude of the proposed change relative to the sensitivity of the setting of an asset – sometimes relatively small changes, or a series of small changes, can have a major impact on our ability to appreciate and understand a historic asset or place. Points to consider include:
 - the ability of the setting to absorb new development without eroding its key characteristics;
 - the effect of the proposed change on qualities of the existing setting such as sense of remoteness, current noise levels, evocation of the historical past, sense of place, cultural identity, associated spiritual responses; and
 - cumulative impacts: individual developments may not cause significant impacts on their own but may do so when they are combined.

9.2.37 These considerations are taken as the baseline for evaluating the indirect impacts of the Proposed Development on designated cultural heritage receptors.

Significance of Indirect Impact

9.2.38 **Table 9-4** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of an indirect impact upon the setting of each cultural heritage feature which was determined by considering its visual sensitivity in conjunction with the magnitude of visual impact predicted on it. A moderate or major effect is considered to be significant.

Table 9-4: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting:

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

9.2.39 While adhering for the most part to the above guidelines, professional judgement has also been employed in evaluating the significance of indirect impacts on individual Cultural Heritage receptors, where it is considered that local factors override the criteria outlined above.

Limitations and Assumptions

9.2.40 It is assumed that within areas covered by recent archaeology surveys the potential for unrecorded archaeology is negligible.

9.3 Sensitive Receptors

9.3.1 This assessment addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the Cultural Heritage within the defined study areas, which is taken to include:

- SMs, listed buildings, inventory gardens, designed landscapes and inventory battlefields;
- recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites and areas of archaeological, historical or cultural significance;
- previously unevaluated policies and designed landscapes; and
- links with local folklore and legend and other elements of Cultural Heritage.

9.4 Baseline Conditions

Sites with Statutory Protection

9.4.1 The following Section lists SMs, Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and Inventory Battlefield sites present within the vicinity of the Proposed Development (see **Figure 9.1: Cultural Heritage**).

Scheduled Monuments

9.4.2 This evaluation considers seven SMs within the 2 km study area for indirect impacts, as set out below:

1. **Cnoc Olasdail, Hut Circles and Field Systems SM4375** located at Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference 254946, 918194, 880 m south-west of the Proposed Development. A group of domestic settlements and associated field systems occupying a gentle south-west facing slope on the flank of Cnoc Olasdail;
2. **Cnoc A' Bhreac-Leathaid, Shielings and Cairnfield 700 m NNE of SM5300** located at OS grid reference 259017, 913844, situated 745 m east south-east of the Proposed Development. A site consisting of multi-period domestic features south of the Dalnessie access road. Most of the recorded features of this site are no longer visible;

3. **Loch Beag Na Fuaralachd, Cairn and Shielings 1175 m ESE of SW End** SM5081 located at OS grid reference 259820, 914948, 1.07 km south-east of the Proposed Development. An area of settlement occupying a gentle south-facing slope running down Feith Osdail;
4. **Loch Beag Na Fuaralachd, Prehistoric Settlement 950 m SW of SW End of** SM5401 located at OS grid reference 260030, 914916, 1.25 km south-east of the Proposed Development. Also, an area of settlement occupying a gentle south-facing slope running down Feith Osdail;
5. **Loch Beag Na Fuaralachd, Shielings 1000 m SW of SW End of** SM5159 located at OS grid reference 260190, 914673, approximately 1.52 km south-east of the Proposed Development. An area of shielings containing two hut circles as well as the possible remains of a post-medieval house and bothy;
6. **Altbreck, Broch 1650 m ESE of Dalchork Bridge** SM1829 located at OS grid reference 259123, 910347, approximately 1.2 km east of the Proposed Development. A prominent defensive Iron Age site located on the summit of a small rise with extensive panoramic views; and
7. **Altbreck, Homestead 1800 m ESE of Dalchork Bridge** SM5563 located at OS grid reference 259261, 910249, approximately 1.26 km north-east of the Proposed Development. A possible prehistoric defensive site on the south-east slope of a ridge.

Listed Buildings

9.4.3 Four listed buildings were identified within the 2 km study area for indirect impacts, as set out below:

8. **Allt a'Chraigs Bridge** LB7135 located at OS grid reference 253301, 927239, situated 14 m north-east of the Proposed Development. A bridge carrying the present public road over Allt a'Chraigs;
9. **Crask, bridge over Chraigs Burn** LB8017 located at OS grid reference 252437, 924539, 72 m east of the underground cable segment of the Proposed Development, and approximately 480 m north-west of the nearest section of OHL. A bridge carrying the present public road over Strath a'Chraigs;
10. **Rhian Bridge Over Abhainn Sgeamhaidh Burn** LB8026 located at OS grid reference 256319, 916621, located 1.44 km west south-west of the Proposed Development. A bridge carrying the present public road over Abhainn Sgeamhaidh Burn; and
11. **Feth Osdail, Bridge Over Feith Osdail Burn** LB8018 located at OS grid reference 257487, 913949, situated 365 m north-west of the Proposed Development. A bridge carrying the present public road over Feith Osdail Burn.

Inventory Gardens, Designed Landscapes and Inventory battlefields

9.4.4 There are no Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes or Battlefields within or adjacent to the indirect impacts study area which are likely to be affected directly or indirectly.

Recorded and Unrecorded Archaeological Sites

9.4.5 The following sites, recorded on the Highland Historic Environment Record (HER) and during the targeted field surveys at the alignment selection stage, are located within the 200 m study area for direct impacts:

12. **Enclosure** located at OS grid reference 252298, 924661, through which the underground cable would pass. An irregular shaped enclosure depicted on the OS 2nd Edition Map;
13. **Cnoc a'Ghubhais, Sheepfold, Wall** MHG55493-55494, located at OS grid reference 254178, 922819, 62 m north-east of the OHL. A circular sheepfold with a section of wall running from the south arc, of drystone construction and measuring 10 m in diameter;
14. **Dalmichy, Sheepfold** MHG33613, located at OS grid reference 258130, 914090, 96 m north north-east of the OHL. A circular sheepfold depicted on OS 1st and 2nd Edition maps. Field surveys carried out as part of alignment selection recorded that the sheepfold survives in good condition adjacent to the forest haul road. It is approximately 15 m in diameter with drystone walls 1.5 m high;

15. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870a located at OS grid reference 257722, 910119, 50 m west north-west of the OHL. A hut circle previously recorded by OS, little survives other than a faint outline of a circular platform terraced into a south-west facing slope and remnants of a short section of turf and stone bank. No other upstanding remains are visible;
16. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870b located at OS grid reference 257745, 910083, 11 m west north-west of the OHL. A hut circle previously recorded by OS, all that survives is a roughly circular platform terraced into a south-west facing slope. No other upstanding remains are visible;
17. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870c located at OS grid reference 257778, 910009, 20 m east north-east of the OHL. A hut circle previously recorded by OS, the rough outline is still visible comprising a roughly circular platform terraced into a south-west facing slope with a turf and stone bank running around the edge of the platform;
18. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870g located at OS grid reference 257855, 909933, 36 m north-east of the OHL. A cairn previously recorded at OS grid reference 257921, 909874, however none was visible at this exact location during alignment selection field surveys. What is likely to be a spread of clearance material was noted at the listed grid reference;
19. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870d located at OS grid reference 257887, 909959, 70 m north-east of the OHL. An enclosure previously recorded by OS, only poorly preserved remains survive on a flat plateau;
20. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870e located at OS grid reference 257908, 909931, 62 m north-east of the OHL. An enclosure previously recorded by OS, the remains of a roughly circular enclosure measuring 12 m in diameter are defined by a turf and stone bank;
21. **Cnoc Chatha, Cairn, Cist** MHG11873 located at OS grid reference 257923, 909869, 23 m north-east of the OHL. A small round cairn 5.5 m in diameter and 1.2 m high as recorded by OS in 1976. Field surveys at alignment selection recorded the possible remains at the noted grid reference. The full extent of the cairn was difficult to make out due to coverage by dense turf and tree debris;
22. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG11870h located at OS grid reference 257968, 909873, 67 m north-east of the OHL. A cairnfield, with two possible cairns recorded which may be the remnants of the cairnfield recorded by OS in 1963. The first is 4 m in diameter and 0.5 m high, the second 5 m in diameter and 0.5 m high;
23. **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system** MHG40487 located at OS grid reference 257920, 909910, 100 m north-east of the OHL. Recording of a number of hut-circles and tumuli on the OS 1st Edition map; and
24. **Cnoc Chatha, Field system, Hut-circles** MHG11994 and MHG40495 located at OS grid reference 258280, 909590, 31 m north-east of the OHL. Three hut circles and numerous tumuli depicted on the OS 1st Edition map, at OS grid references 258220, 909590; 258250, 909610; and 258290, 909580. The hut circles range in size from 9.5 m to 12.5 m in diameter, with one comprised of stone only and the other two of earth and stone. During field surveys at alignment selection, the area was found to have been disturbed by forestry felling activity.

Unrecorded Archaeological Sites

- 9.4.6 No new previously unrecorded sites were noted within the study area during the walkover survey.

Summary of Archaeological Sites

- 9.4.7 The archaeological sites, both previously recorded and located during field survey demonstrate that the hill land between the straths of Lairg and Alltnaharra has had at least two phases of settlement: prehistoric Bronze or Iron Age settlement represented by the hut circles (sites 1, 4 and 7), and cultivation (sites 1, 2 3). Early modern farmsteads, confined to the relatively sheltered environs of the major water courses and shielings, often occupy the same ground as in the prehistoric period (sites 2, 3, 5). The importance of Strath Tirry as a communication

route is represented by the prehistoric defensive brochs, the drovers' inn and enclosures at Crask and, by the early 19th century, road and bridges.

9.5 Issues Scoped Out

9.5.1 Within the Scoping Report, three Historic Environment Records (HERs) were proposed to be scoped out of assessment:

- **Milestone, benchmark MHG54479**, located at OS grid reference 252264, 925586. Situated north of the Crask Inn between the roadside shelterbelts; this site was scoped out of assessment as the historic feature itself has been removed and this is now deemed to be only the original location of the milestone;
- **Mound (natural) MHG10252**, located at OS grid reference 252340, 925340. Situated north of the Crask Inn between the roadside shelterbelts; this site has been scoped out of assessment as, although recorded as an archaeological feature, it has subsequently been redefined as being of natural origin; and
- **Mound (natural) MHG10249**, located at OS grid reference 252320, 925240. Situated north of the Crask Inn between the roadside shelterbelts; this site has been scoped out of assessment as, although recorded as an archaeological feature, it has subsequently been redefined as being of natural origin.

9.5.2 Following further survey and assessment of sites recorded on the HER within the direct impacts study area, the following sites have also been scoped out of further assessment:

- **The Crask, Bench mark, Milestone MHG54477**, located at OS grid reference 252863, 926612. The previous site of a milestone, not found during 2009 surveys carried out by RCAHMS, now deemed to be only the original site of the milestone;
- **Crask Inn, Milestone MHG54479**, located as OS grid reference 252265, 925590. The previous site of a milestone not found during 2009 surveys carried out by RCAHMS. Field surveys carried out at alignment selection stage confirmed the milestone no longer survives at this location;
- **The Crask, Mound MHG10250**, located at OS grid reference 252250, 925060. Formerly recorded as a heather covered peat mound, field surveys in 1981 by OS confirmed the mound was of natural origin;
- **Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circle MHG11871**, located at OS grid reference 257790, 909890. HER and Canmore entries record a hut circle on OS 2nd Edition maps. Surveys carried out by OS in 1963 and 1976 could not locate the hut circle. Surveys carried out as part of alignment selection confirmed that no remains survive in an area of recently felled forestry;
- **Cnoc Chatha, Wall MHG55465**, located at OS grid reference 257839, 909906. HER and Canmore recorded a degraded length of drystone wall. Field surveys at alignment selection did not locate any upstanding remains of this wall – it appears that felling works in the area have removed all remaining trace; and
- **Cnoc Chatha, Wall MHG55463 and MHG55464**, located at OS grid reference 258047, 909875. HER entry notes a recorded section of field wall of drystone construction and very degraded. Field surveys during alignment selection recorded the remains of a possible short section of wall 3 m long attributed to MHG55463. No remains were noted of MHG55464 and it is likely that recent felling works have removed the wall remains.

9.5.3 Following revision of the OHL by the Crask to an underground cable and adjustment of the alignment, two further sites were scoped out of assessment:

- **Crask, House Site MHG12321**, located at OS grid reference 252170, 924730. Recorded on the HER as 'house site', this is in fact a multi-compartmented sheep fank. Slight footings to the north-east suggest this was possibly originally a larger structure. This feature is located immediately north of the trackway running

west from the public road and is a visible feature in the landscape. This HER is outwith the LOD and not at risk of impact from the Proposed Development.

- **Lord Reay's Green Table** MHG12316, located at OS grid reference 252154, 924647, 47 m east north-east of the OHL. There appear to be two associations with this name: one is folkloric referring to a tale of Lord Reay inviting the devil to dine, the second is recorded by early travellers as being table and seats constructed from turf within the bend of the river, used by Lord Reay. This feature was recorded in the OS in 1875 as a low mound within an earthen bank, which presumably correspond to low, spread banks between the enclosure and the river. Although not now resembling a table and seats, this feature does retain its folkloric element. This HER is outwith the LOD and not at risk of impact from the Proposed Development.

9.6 Assessment of Likely Effects

9.6.1 A summary of how elements of The Proposed Development are considered to impact on archaeological features in the area are described below.

Direct Impacts

Sites with Statutory Protection

9.6.2 Two designated cultural heritage assets, both listed bridges over watercourses, are situated within the base 100 m LOD for the Proposed Development; Sites 8 and 9. The LOD has been restricted at these sites, setting a 25 m separation to minimise the potential for direct impacts. **Table 9.5** sets out the likely direct impacts upon each of these sites.

9.6.3 As sites with statutory protection, both sites are of national importance; however, the Proposed Development would be of imperceptible magnitude and therefore impacts would not be significant.

Table 9-5: Potential Direct Impacts on Designated Assets

Site Number	Site Name	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance
8	Allt a'Chraigs Bridge	National	Imperceptible	Negligible
9	Crask, bridge over Chraigs Burn	National	Imperceptible	Negligible

Recorded and Unrecorded Sites

9.6.4 Thirteen recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites were identified within the study area, with most grouped within two areas of archaeological and historical interest: the Crask; west of the Crask Inn, and Cnoc Chatha, at the south end of the OHL within Dalchork Forest.

9.6.5 The enclosure (Site 12) is considered to be at risk of direct impact from the Proposed Development. This site would be crossed by a section of underground cable and would experience direct impact as a result of digging the trench and laying cabling. The full extent and nature of the probable former drove stance and associated structures (site 12) is not known. Groundworks associated with the proposed underground section of cable would damage and remove sections of the enclosing banks and there is a moderate likelihood of further sub-surface archaeological deposits and features being located within the enclosed area. Appropriate mitigation would ensure that the impact on the archaeological record is kept to a minimum and any archaeological features or deposits are recorded appropriately, as detailed in Section 9.7.

9.6.6 At Cnoc Chatha, several sites of regional importance, relating to a series of hut circles, enclosures, field systems, cairns, dykes and sheep shelters are situated within the LOD. The sites were previously evaluated when the conifer plantations were still standing and marked before felling to reduce damage. They are now in

poor condition, mostly identifiable by residual construction tape markers. The three most northerly features are three hut circles (Sites 15-17) immediately below the former forest ride subsequently used as a haul road for felling. The OHL crosses between the sites in this area (Sites 15 – 24), at a distance varying from 11 m to 100 m, at the edge of the LOD. Without appropriate mitigation, these features of regional importance would potentially experience direct impacts from the Proposed Development, which would give rise to moderate significance of impacts. However, the survival of archaeological evidence in this area is considered to be very low and the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development for all but the first three hut circles (Sites 15 – 17) would likely be low in reality.

Summary of Direct Impacts

9.6.7 **Table 9-6** sets out the likely direct impacts upon each of the 13 assessed archaeological sites. No significant direct impacts are likely on any designated cultural heritage site: due to separation distances between designated sites and the Proposed Development, all direct impacts are likely to be negligible. Three recorded sites of regional significance and one of local significance are likely to experience a moderate significance of impact without appropriate mitigation.

Table 9-6: Potential Direct Impacts on Archaeological Sites

Site Number	Site Name	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance
12	Enclosure	Local	High	Moderate
13	Cnoc a'Ghubhais, Sheepfold, Wall	Local	Imperceptible	Negligible
14	Dalmichy, Sheepfold	Local	Imperceptible	Negligible
15	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Medium	Moderate
16	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Medium	Moderate
17	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Medium	Moderate
18	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Low	Minor
19	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Low	Minor
20	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Low	Minor
21	Cnoc Chatha, Cairn, Cist	Regional	Low	Minor
22	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Low	Minor
23	Cnoc Chatha, Hut-circles, Field system	Regional	Low	Minor
24	Cnoc Chatha, Field system, Hut-circles	Regional	Low	Minor

9.6.8 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was recently undertaken for the Dalchork Substation development¹³, identifying that several archaeological sites occupy the same location as the development footprint, and that these would be appropriately recorded and removed prior to construction. Site 24, as identified in this assessment, is amongst these, so while an assessment has been carried out and concluded a likely Low magnitude of impact, in reality there would be no impact upon this site as it would be removed prior to construction of the OHL.

Indirect Impacts

9.6.9 **Appendix 9.1** shows the likely indirect visual impact on the setting of statutory designated sites as a result of the Proposed Development, according to the criteria set out in **Table 9-4**.

9.6.10 It is not anticipated that any statutory designated sites are likely to experience indirect visual impacts of a significant level. Seven sites are likely to experience a minor significance of impact, one a negligible – minor significance, and two would experience negligible impacts. These are summarised as follows:

¹³ AOC Archaeology Group, October 2019. *Dalchork Substation, Lairg, Sutherland; Archaeological Programme: Written Scheme of Investigation*.

Site 1: Cnoc Olasdail, Hut Circles & Field Systems

- 9.6.11 Vistas to the north-east from this site, in the direction of the Proposed Development, are limited by topography and would be of low significance. The site is considered to have a medium sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact from the Proposed Development, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 2: Cnoc A' Bhreac-Leathaid, Shielings And Cairnfield 700 m NNE Of

- 9.6.12 Most of the recorded features of this multi-period domestic site are no longer visible. The site's visual relationship with other contemporary settlements to the north-east would be uninterrupted by the Proposed Development, which itself would be visible in a narrow arc from this site, and partially screened by topography. The site is considered to have a low sensitivity and likely to experience a medium magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 3: Loch Beag Na Furalachd, Cairn And Shielings 1175 m Ese Of Sw End

- 9.6.13 A post-medieval settlement is recorded here, although only fragmentary walling is now visible. The site will have a clear visual relationship with other contemporary settlements to the south-west and south-east and possibly more distant settlements to the west. The Proposed Development would pass to the west, and thus would not interrupt lines of sight to other nearby SMs. During proposed felling within the forest, the Proposed Development would be temporarily visible. The site is considered to have a medium sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 4: Loch Beag Na Fuaralachd, Prehistoric Settlement 950 m Sw Of Sw End of

- 9.6.14 An area of post-medieval settlement adjacent to Site 3, with only fragmentary walling now visible. As per Site 3, the site has clear visual links with other contemporary settlements to the north-east and south-east, and the Proposed Development would pass to the west, albeit slightly further away at 1.7 km. Temporary visibility of the Proposed Development would be offered during periods of felling. The site is considered to have a medium sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 5: Loch Beag Na Fuaralachd, Shielings 1000 m Sw Of Sw End of

- 9.6.15 An area of shielings containing two hut circles and the possible remains of a post-medieval house and bothy and likely to be contemporary with nearby SMs Site 3 and Site 4. At the time of assessment, views to the west towards the Proposed Development are screened by standing forestry, to be felled and replaced in the future offering temporary views of the OHL. The site is considered to have a medium sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 6: Altbreck, Broch 1650 m Ese Of Dalchork Bridge

- 9.6.16 A prominent defensive Iron Age site located on the summit of a small rise with extensive panoramic views. It would have been deliberately sited for visibility in the landscape and for intervisibility with other defensive sites. The nearest of such are 2 km to the north-west and 4 km to the west south-west at Dalness and Sallachy Broch, respectively, as shown on **Figure 9.1: Cultural Heritage**. The Proposed Development would pass to the west, at 1.2 km at the closest point, crossing the line of potential sight between Altbreck and Dalness Brochs, as shown on **Figure 9.2: Cultural Heritage Visualisation from Broch**. At present, Altbreck stands in open ground. However, while the original building standing to full height may have allowed intervisibility with both Sallachy and Dalness, from ground level the natural topography now intervenes. Based on the methodology outlined in Section 9.2, the site is considered to have a high sensitivity but the magnitude of impact is likely to be Low, resulting in a Moderate significance of impact at this site. In reality, the extent of the Proposed Development in comparison with the changes made by afforestation, development of croft land, raising of the

water level of Loch Shin, housing, and roads, all visible from the monument, reduce the significance of effect to a Minor and **non-significant** degree.

- 9.6.17 This Minor effect will diminish over time as new conifer plantations gain height to further reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development, reducing the eventual magnitude of impact to Imperceptible and magnitude of effect to Negligible. Consequently, the residual indirect impact on this site is likely to be **non-significant**.

Site 7: Altbreck, Homestead 1800 m Ese Of Dalchork Bridge

- 9.6.18 A possible prehistoric defensive site, its location would have been selected with vistas as an important factor, but these vistas are not as panoramic as the broch (Site 6). At present, the site is located on open ground, however the Proposed Development 1.26 km west would be unlikely to be visible between felling and replanting. The site is considered to have a medium sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor significance of impact.

Site 8: Allt a'Chraigs Bridge

- 9.6.19 A bridge carrying the present public road over a watercourse. Although aesthetically pleasing and in harmony with the landscape, these attributes were not considerations of the original builders. The Proposed Development, although passing close to the bridge, would not detract from the setting of the feature. This low sensitivity feature would likely experience a medium magnitude of impact, leading to a minor significance of impact.

Site 9: Crask, bridge over Chraigs Burn

- 9.6.20 A bridge carrying the present public road over a watercourse. Although aesthetically pleasing and in harmony with the landscape, these attributes were not considerations of the original builders. The Proposed Development would not detract from the setting of this feature. As the bridge is adjacent to the section of proposed underground cable, this low sensitivity feature would likely experience a low magnitude of impact, leading to a negligible significance of impact.

Site 10: Rhian Bridge Over Abhainn Sgeamhaidh Burn

- 9.6.21 A bridge carrying the present public road over a watercourse. Although aesthetically pleasing and in harmony with the landscape, these were not considerations of the original builders. The Proposed Development would not detract from this feature. At the time of assessment, residual forest blocks offer a degree of visual screening from the Proposed Development. The site is considered to have a low sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a negligible significance of impact.

Site 11: Feith Osdail, Bridge Over Feith Osdail Burn

- 9.6.22 A bridge carrying the present public road over a watercourse. Although aesthetically pleasing and in harmony with the landscape, these were not considerations of the original builders. The Proposed Development would not detract from this feature. At the time of assessment, residual forest blocks offer a degree of visual screening from the Proposed Development. The site is considered to have a low sensitivity and likely to experience a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a negligible significance of impact.

- 9.6.23 Indirect visual impacts on the setting of all other statutory designated sites outwith the study area as a result of the Proposed Development are likely to be negligible and **not significant**.

- 9.6.24 Indirect impacts for all non-statutory sites (i.e. HERs) are considered to be **non-significant**.

9.7 Mitigation

Mitigation by Design

9.7.1 The alignment for the Proposed Development was derived from initial route options selection which sought to avoid on-site constraints as far as practicable, inclusive of the presence of cultural heritage features. Through the design evolution, consideration of these features was retained, on balance with other environmental receptors, to produce the current proposal. The alignment as proposed avoids direct impacts on known heritage features, and, as described in Chapter 11: Forestry, seeks to minimise required tree felling and retain woodland screening which serves to mitigate indirect impacts in places. All associated works, such as temporary access routes, lay down areas and site compounds would be micro-sited to avoid direct impacts on identified cultural heritage sites.

Proposed Mitigation

9.7.2 The following mitigation measures would serve to reduce potential impacts upon cultural heritage features.

Direct Impacts

9.7.3 Consideration will be given to the location and extent of the two scheduled sites (Sites 8 and 9) and recorded archaeological features (Sites 12 – 24) during final design and micro siting of access routes and pole locations would ensure that all of these features are avoided. Any features directly adjacent to areas of work should be further protected within exclusion zones clearly marked out and signposted, and, where necessary, by use of temporary protective surfaces. The LOD has been restricted around heritage features near the alignment to minimise the potential for direct impacts. A 25 m buffer has been applied to the two listed sites (8 and 9), and a 20 m buffer to the recorded archaeological features.

9.7.4 Mitigation measures would be put in place for groundworks associated with the undergrounding of the cable as it crosses site 12, west of the Crask Inn. An archaeological watching brief is recommended to ensure that any sub-surface archaeological features and deposits are identified and recorded before removal. Damage to the visible features of this site would be minimised where practicable.

Indirect impacts

9.7.5 The present felled landscape exposes receptors to indirect visual impacts and proposed restocking of forest compartments, while having its own indirect impacts, would serve to screen out the modern element of the OHL. Careful micrositing of pole positions would be employed to ensure that key views, for example across watercourses from bridge features, are occupied by the less intrusive conductors components of the Proposed Development rather than the wood poles; in effect, poles would be sited equidistant from the centrelines of watercourses, where practicable.

9.8 Residual Effects

9.8.1 Residual direct effects are likely to be negligible and **not significant**.

9.8.2 Residual indirect effects on all archaeological sites are likely to be of a **non-significant** level.

9.9 Cumulative Effects

9.9.1 Cumulative, indirect impacts are considered on four key receptors: at the north end of the Proposed Development, where sites 8: Allt a'Chraisg Bridge and 9: Crask, bridge over Chraisg Burn, would experience a degree of indirect impact from the Creag Riabhach wind farm, and at the south end of the Proposed Development, where site 6: Altbreck Broch and 7: Altbreck, Homestead would experience a degree of indirect impact from Dalchork Substation and the Lairg – Loch Buidhe OHL.

- 9.9.2 As detailed in Section 9.6, and **Appendix 9.1**, sites 8 and 9, while technically considered sensitive to alterations to their setting, do in more practical terms have a low sensitivity, and this extends to the visual impact of Creag Riabhach wind farm. The cumulative impact on the two listed bridges is thus likely to be **non-significant**.
- 9.9.3 Sites 6 and 7 are likely to experience **non-significant** indirect effects from Dalchork Substation and the Lairg – Loch Buidhe OHL, as set out within their own respective assessments¹⁴. As the indirect impact of the Proposed Development is also considered to be non-significant for these two sites, with impacts diminishing to imperceptible over time for site 6 and unlikely to be visible from site 7, cumulative effects are also considered to be **non-significant**.
- 9.9.4 The indirect impacts on the other statutory designated sites considered in this evaluation have been deemed to be insignificant. They are therefore likely to experience **non-significant** cumulative effects.

9.10 Summary

- 9.10.1 The Proposed Development would be situated in an area containing a number of SMs, listed buildings, and a series of recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites confirmed during walkover surveys at alignment selection stage and later in November 2018. These were recorded and the likely magnitude of effects on them from the Proposed Development identified.
- 9.10.2 Of the designated sites assessed, none are likely to experience a significant level of indirect impact, and direct impacts are likely to be minor to negligible for the two scheduled sites (Site 8: Allt a'Chraisg Bridge and Site 9: Crask, bridge over Chraisg Burn) that fall within the LOD.
- 9.10.3 Of the recorded and unrecorded sites, four have potential for significant direct impacts (Site 12 at Crask, and sites 15 – 17 at Cnoc Chatha) due to having regional sensitivity / importance or a high magnitude of impact and being situated within the LOD. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce direct impacts to non-significant levels, comprising establishment of exclusion zones during construction and, where necessary, use of temporary protective surfaces. No significant indirect effects are likely for recorded and unrecorded sites.
- 9.10.4 It is anticipated, using a combination of guideline criteria and professional judgement, that all effects from the Proposed Development on nearby heritage features, following the noted mitigation measures at construction stage, would be of a non-significant level.

¹⁴ Lairg to Loch Buidhe 132 kV overhead line Highland Council planning reference 19/01236/S37, Dalchork Substation Highland Council planning reference 19/00374/FUL