Chapter 15: Sloy Pumped Hydro Storage Scheme: Cultural Heritage

Chapter 15: Cultural Heritage - Contents

Figures

Appendices

15. Cultural Heritage

15.1. Executive Summary

This chapter considers the environmental effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage interests (historic environment sites and features, archaeology and built heritage). The chapter describes the results of a desk-based assessment, undertaken by CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA), and informed by comments and information supplied, by Historic Environment Scotland (HES), the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA) and West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS).

The assessment considers the potential direct effects on assets within the Proposed Development Area (PDA) (Inner Study Area) and also considers the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets within 1km of the Proposed Development (Outer Study Area) (**see Volume 2** and **Figure 15.2**).

Two heritage assets were identified within the Inner Study Area: Category A Listed Sloy Awe Hydro Scheme, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers, assessed as being of high sensitivity, and a section of former military road, assessed as being of low sensitivity.

The archaeological potential of the Inner Study Area has been assessed as being low. The Proposed Development lies within the footprint of the Sloy Hydroelectric Power Station ('the existing power station') grounds and most of the PDA lies within an area previously disturbed by construction of the existing power station. A small part of the area proposed for site establishment within the wooded area to the north of the existing power station may not have been affected by construction of the existing power station and there is a slightly higher probability that buried remains may be present within part of this area.

There is potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on the Category A Listed Gate Piers and Boundary Wall of Sloy Power Station and the section of former military road. Mitigation is proposed to avoid or reduce the effects. Following application of the proposed mitigation, there would be no significant residual direct effects on cultural heritage.

Within 1km of the PDA there is one Scheduled Monument, one Category A Listed Building, one Category B Listed Building and four Category C Listed Buildings. The assessment has identified a minor effect (not significant) on the setting of one Scheduled Monument, Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) and one Category A Listed Building, Sloy Power Station (LB 43188). All other effects on the settings of heritage assets within the Outer Study Area are assessed as being of no more than negligible significance (not significant).

The cumulative effects of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity are considered to be not significant.

15.2. Introduction

This chapter considers the potential significant effects on cultural heritage (historic environment sites and features, archaeology and built heritage; hereafter referred to as 'heritage assets') associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The Chapter details the results of a desk-based assessment undertaken by CFA Archaeology Ltd and draws on information and comments provided by Historic Environment Scotland (HES), West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) and Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA).

The specific objectives of this Chapter are to:

- describe the cultural heritage baseline, within the PDA;
- describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing this impact assessment;
- describe the potential effects, including direct, impacts on setting and cumulative effects;
- describe the mitigation measures and, where appropriate, monitoring measures proposed to address potential significant effects; and
- assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation.

The assessment has been carried out by Mhairi Hastie BSc (Hons) MSc FSA Scot MCIfA of CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA) based in Musselburgh, East Lothian, a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA). Mhairi has over 18 years full time experience of producing Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for renewable energy developments, and for other industrial and commercial development across the UK.

The Chapter is supported by figures and technical appendices which are referenced in the text where relevant.

15.3. Scope Of Assessment

15.3.1. STUDY AREA

Two Study Areas were used for this assessment:

- The Inner Study Area:
  - The PDA forms the Study Area for identification of heritage assets that could receive direct impacts arising from the construction of the Proposed Development. **Volume 2, Figure 15.1** shows the PDA, the Proposed Development layout and the locations of heritage assets identified and described in **Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area**.
- The Outer Study Area
  - A 1km study area, extending from the PDA and including the Inner Study Area, has been used for the identification of cultural heritage assets whose settings may be affected by the Proposed Development (including cumulative effects). Assets identified as having settings sensitive to change are included in the assessment, even where no visibility is predicted from the asset, as views towards or across such sites may be important aspects of the settings. **Volume 2, Figure 15.2** shows the Proposed Development, together with the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and the locations of heritage assets which are included in the assessment. A list of these heritage assets is provided in **Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area**, which also provides a tabulated summary assessment of the predicted impacts on their settings on an asset-by-asset basis. The consideration of cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets also uses the 1km Outer Study Area. The cumulative developments included in the assessment are those agreed with consultees and listed in **Chapter 5: EIA Process and Methodology**.

15.3.2. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Table 15.1 summarises the consultation responses received regarding Cultural Heritage and provides information on where and / or how they have been addressed in this assessment. The following

organisations made comment on archaeology and cultural heritage: Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and LLPTNA. No response was received from WoSAS.

Table 15.1: Consultation Responses

Consultee	Key Consultee Comments	Application Action
HES Scoping Response 3 August 2023	Advised that the Proposed Development would have a direct impact on Category A Listed Building Sloy Awe Hydro Electric, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers (LB 43188) and would have the potential to impact on the setting of both Sloy Awe Hydro Electric, Power Station (LB 43188); and Scheduled Monument Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264)	Noted Assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Sloy Awe Hydro Electric, Power Station (LB 43188) and Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) is provided in **Section 15.7.2**.
	Advised that given the specific nature of the area they are content that all designated assets within HES's remit that are likely to experience an impact from the development have been identified in the Scoping Report.	Noted Assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Sloy Awe Hydro Electric, Sloy Power Station, (LB 43188) and Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) is provided in **Section 15.7.2**.
	Requested that potential cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development in combination with other developments in the vicinity should be assessed as part of the EIA. Noted that assessment of the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development should assess the incremental impact or change when the Proposed Development is combined with other present and foreseeable developments.	Noted The criteria for assessment of cumulative effects are set out in **Section 15.5.7** and assessment of cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development is provided in **Section 15.9.3**.
	Advised that the Proposed Development would result in direct physical impacts on the fabric of Category A Listed Building Sloy Power Station. These impacts are likely to require Listed Building Consent and should be controlled through the consent process.	Noted Application for Listed Building Consent (LBC) has been submitted to LLTNPA for the Proposed Development.
	Advised that the Proposed Development has the potential to have significant impacts on the setting of the Sloy Power Station	Noted Assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the

	complex. The final proposals should demonstrate that the new building would not adversely impact the setting of the existing Category A Listed Building, both in terms of its setting, and in longer views from Loch Lomond and the adjacent A82 trunk road.	setting of these heritage assets is provided in **Section 15.7.2**.
	Requested that visualisations of how the Proposed Development would look should be submitted as part of the EIA. If these demonstrate potential for significant adverse impacts on the Listed Building then these impacts should be reduced or avoided by amendments to the proposed building's siting, massing, and design.	Noted **Volume 3, Figures 4.5 - 4.9** provide architectural drawings and photomontage visualisations of the Proposed Development. Assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the setting of these heritage assets is provided in **Section 15.7.2**.
	Advised that the Applicant takes every reasonable step to minimise setting impacts upon Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) but note that the existing Sloy Power Station forms part of the established setting of the monument. Considered that minor changes to the existing Sloy Power Station in keeping with the industrial aesthetic of the power station would be unlikely to have an impact of national significance upon the monument.	Noted Assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) is provided in **Section 15.7.2**.
	Requested that a photomontage visualisation be produced looking towards the Proposed Development from the northwest shore of the island upon which Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) sits.	Noted Following further consultation (see Post-Scoping Consultation, 13/09/2023), HES advised that a photomontage visualisation from the northwest shore of the island upon which Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) is situated was not required to be included in the EIA Report. A wireline is included in **Volume 3, Figure 4.9**.
HES Post Scoping Consultation Meeting	Advised that a visualisation, as previously requested in HES's Scoping Response (03/08/2023) (see above) from the northwest shore of Inveruglas Isle was not required and agreed that a visualisation	Noted A photomontage visualisation (**Volume 3, Figure 4.8a-c**), from Inversnaid Hotel Car Park, on the opposite side of Loch Lomond, looking towards

13 September 2023	from a wider landscape viewpoint, showing the island upon which Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264) sits in its wider landscape context, along with the Proposed Development, would be more useful.	Inveruglas island, is provided to show the island, upon which Inveruglas Castle sits, in its wider landscape context along with the Proposed Development.
LLTNPA Scoping Response 4 August 2023	Noted the presence of cultural heritage assets in the vicinity of the Proposed Development and advised that consideration should be given to the relevant Historic Environment Policies in the National Park Local Development Plan.	Noted The legislation and guidance that has informed the scope of the cultural heritage assessment is provided above in **Section 15.4**.

15.4. Legislation, Policy and Guidance

The scope of this assessment has been informed by consultation responses summarised in **Table 15.1** and the following guidance / policies.

- National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) (2023);
  - Policy 7: Historic Assets and Places;
- Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS) (2019a);
- Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment (2023);
- Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN1/2013);
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011 (PAN2) (2011);
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan (LDP) (2015);
  - LDP 3 – Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of our Environment.
  - LDP 9 – Development Setting, Layout and Design.
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan: Supplementary Guidance (2016);
  - SG LDP ENV (16a) – Development Impact on Listed Buildings.
  - SG LDP ENV 19 – Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
  - SG LDP ENV 20 – Development Impact of Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 (Proposed Plan)
  - Policy 15: Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment.
  - Policy 16: Listed Buildings.
  - Policy 19: Scheduled Monuments.
  - Policy 21: Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- The Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Local Development Plan, 2017-2021 (2017)
  - Strategic Principles overarching Policy 1
  - Historic Environment Policy 1: Listed Buildings
  - Historic Environment Policy 3: Wider Built Environment and Cultural Heritage
  - Historic Environment Policy 6: Scheduled Monuments and other Nationally Important Archaeological Sites.
  - Historic Environment Policy 7: Other Archaeological Resources

  - Historic Environment Policy 8: Sites with Unknown Archaeological Potential

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Code of Conduct (CIfA, 2014 revised 2022);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (CIfA, 2014 updated 2020);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment (2014, updated 2020)
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (IEMA, 2021);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016 updated 2020);
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019); and
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and HES, 2018)

15.5. Methodology

15.5.1. DESK STUDY

The following information sources were consulted as part of the desk-based assessment:

- HES Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2024a): provided up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscape, and Inventory Historic Battlefields;
- Argyll and Bute Council (ABC) Historic Environment Record (HER) provided by WoSAS, heritage advisors to ABC: a digital database extract for all assets within 5km of the Proposed Development was obtained initially in July 2021; updated data was then acquired in March 2023 and checked against the original data;
- National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) online database (HES, 2024b): online for any information additional to that contained by the HER;
- Map Library of the National Library of Scotland: for Ordnance Survey maps and other historic resources;
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES, 2024c): for information on the historic land-use character of the PDA and the surrounding area;
- National Collection of Aerial Photographs (NCAP): for historical vertical aerial photographs dating from 1946 to 1990, to obtain information on historic land-use development;
- Modern aerial photographs imagery available on-line through Google Earth and Bing Maps: examined to provide information on current land-use character of the PDA; and
- Relevant bibliographic references were consulted to provide background and historic information. No attempt was made within the remit of his study to conduct detailed historic analysis.

15.5.2. FIELD SURVEY

As set out in the Scoping Report, no field survey has been undertaken to inform this assessment as the Inner Study Area has been subject to previous walkover survey in 2008 for the consented pumped hydro storage scheme. The assessment presented below for potential direct impacts relies upon the results of the previous work, which is considered sufficiently accurate to assess the potential direct impacts arising from construction work.

As there has been only a slight change to the layout and height of the Proposed Development from a cultural heritage perspective, it is considered that the results of setting visits undertaken in 2008 remain valid for this assessment and the setting assessment has been informed by the results of those visits.

15.5.3. ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY EFFECTS SIGNIFICANCE

The effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets have been assessed based on their type (direct effects, indirect effects, effects on setting, and cumulative effects) and nature (adverse or beneficial). The assessment takes into account the relative value / sensitivity of the heritage asset, and its setting, and the magnitude of the predicted impact. The following types of impacts, as defined in *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook* (SNH/HES 2018; Appendix 1, Paragraph 44), have been considered.

- Direct effects occur where the physical fabric of the asset is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as a direct result of the proposal. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- Indirect effects occur where the fabric of an asset, or buried archaeological remains, is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as an indirect result of the proposal even though the asset may lie some distance from the proposal. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- Setting effects are generally direct and result from the proposal causing change within the setting of a heritage asset that affects its cultural significance or the way in which it is understood, appreciated, and experienced. Such impacts are generally, but not exclusively, visual, occurring directly as a result of the appearance of the proposal in the surroundings of the asset. However, they may relate to other senses or factors, such as noise, odour or emissions, or historical relationships that do not relate entirely to intervisibility, such as historic patterns of land-use and related historic features. Such impacts may occur at any stage of a proposal's lifespan and may be permanent, reversible, or temporary.
- Cumulative effects can relate to the physical fabric or setting of assets. They may arise as a result of impact interactions, either of different impacts of the proposal itself, or additive impacts resulting from incremental changes caused by the proposal together with other projects already in the planning system or allocated in a Local Development Plan.
- Adverse effects are those that detract from or reduce cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.
- Beneficial effects are those that preserve, enhance or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

15.5.4. ASSIGNING SENSITIVITY TO HERITAGE ASSETS

Cultural heritage assets are assigned value / importance through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the laws and policies that apply to it (HES, 2019b updated 2020).

Table 15.2 summarises the relative sensitivity of key heritage assets relevant to the Proposed Development drawing on the guidance provided in the SNH/HES handbook (2018) (excluding, in this instance, World Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Conservation Areas, Inventory Historic Battlefields, and maritime heritage assets, of which there are none within the study areas).

Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity	Definition / Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: • Scheduled Monuments; • Category A Listed Buildings; and • Non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designations.
Medium	Assets valued at the regional level, including: • Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks); and • Category B Listed Buildings.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: • Archaeological sites that that have local heritage value; • Category C Listed Buildings; and • Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics.
Negligible	Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value, including: • Artefact find-spots (where the artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain); and • Poorly preserved examples of particular types of minor historic landscape features (e.g., quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc).

15.5.5. ASSESSING MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT

The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) has been assessed in the categories high, medium, low, and negligible as described in **Table 15.3**.

Table 15.3: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Definition / Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
High	Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near-complete loss of the asset's cultural significance. Changes that substantially detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Preservation of a heritage asset in situ where it would otherwise be completely or almost completely lost. Changes that appreciably enhance the cultural significance of a heritage asset and how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.

Magnitude of Impact	Definition / Criteria Adverse	Beneficial
Medium	Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is appreciably altered. Changes that appreciably detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Changes to important elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting, resulting in its cultural significance being preserved (where this would otherwise be lost) or restored. Changes that improve the way in which the heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.
Low	Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is slightly altered. Changes that slightly detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting detracting from its cultural significance being removed. Changes that result in a slight improvement in the way a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.
Negligible	Changes to fabric or setting of a heritage asset that leave its cultural significance unchanged and do not affect how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	

15.5.6. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON SETTING

The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) Appendix 1, paragraph 42 advises that:

"*In the context of cultural heritage impact assessment, the receptors are the heritage assets and impacts will be considered in terms of the change in their cultural significance*."

Historic Environment Scotland's guidance document, 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES, 2016b), notes that:

"*Setting can be important to the way in which historic structures or places are understood, appreciated and experienced. It can often be integral to a historic asset's cultural significance.*"

"*Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or 'curtilage' of an individual historic asset into a broader landscape context*."

The guidance also advises that:

"*If proposed development is likely to affect the setting of a key historic asset, an objective written assessment should be prepared by the applicant to inform the decision-making process. The conclusions should take into account the significance of the asset and its setting and attempt to quantify the extent of any impact. The methodology and level of information should be tailored to the circumstances of each case*."

The guidance recommends that there are three stages in assessing the impact of a development on the setting of a historic asset or place:

- Stage 1: identify the historic assets that might be affected by the Proposed Development;

- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated and experienced; and
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative impacts can be mitigated.

The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) Appendix 1, paragraph 43 advises that:

"*When considering setting impacts, visual change should not be equated directly with adverse impact. Rather the impact should be assessed with reference to the degree that the proposal affects those aspects of setting that contribute to the asset's cultural significance*."

Following these recommendations, the bare-earth ZTV for the Proposed Development was used to identify those heritage assets from which there could be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

15.5.7. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

A cumulative impact on a heritage asset results from a change to its baseline condition, caused by new development in conjunction with other consented and proposed developments in the surrounding areas, as identified in **Chapter 5: EIA Process and Methodology** (see also **Volume 2, Figure 5.1**).

Volume 2, Figure 5.1 shows the Proposed Development along with the locations and extents of the cumulative developments that lie within the Outer Study Area and that are relevant to the cumulative assessment of impacts on heritage assets.

The assessment set out in **Section 15.9.3** takes into account the relative scale of the identified developments, their distance from the affected assets, and the potential degree of visibility of the various developments from the assets under consideration.

15.5.8. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE

The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 15.2**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 15.3**) are used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect (direct effect, indirect effect, effect on setting, or cumulative effect), summarised using the formula set out in the matrix in **Table 15.4**. The matrix employs a graduated scale of significance (from Negligible to Major effects) and where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement supported by reasoned justification, has been used to determine the level of significance.

Table 15.4: Significance of Effects

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

In the assessment that follows, Major and Moderate effects are considered to be Significant for the purposes of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations). Minor and Negligible effects are considered 'Not Significant'.

Where a significant effect on the setting of an asset is predicted as a result of change within its surroundings, using the approach outlined above, an assessment has been made as to whether that effect would result in a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the setting (NPF4 Policy 7(h)ii). For the purpose of the assessment, the integrity of the setting is considered to be maintained if the setting's contribution to the cultural significance of the monument, and its capacity to convey that significance to visitors, would not be compromised by the Proposed Development either alone or cumulatively.

15.6. Baseline

This section provides a summary of the current and predicted future cultural heritage baseline within the Inner and Outer Study Areas.

Numbers in brackets in this section refer to heritage asset numbers depicted on **Volume 2, Figure 15.1** and **Figure 15.2** and listed in **Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area** and **Appendix 15.2: Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area**.

15.6.1. CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN THE INNER STUDY AREA

Two heritage assets (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.1**) have been recorded within the Inner Study Area: Category A Listed Sloy Awe Hydro Scheme, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers (1) and a section of former military road (2).

Category A Listed Sloy Power Station (1) was constructed in the late 1940s following World War II and opened in 1950. It was the first of the large hydro-electric schemes of the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board (Payne 1988). It was designed by architect Harold Ogle Tarbolton, one of North of Scotland Hydro Boards (NoSHEB) most significant architects. It is a notable example of bold modernist design and is highly significant as it set the precedent in terms of design and construction for all of the future work by the NoSHEB on development of schemes throughout the rest of Highland Scotland (HES Statutory List: https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/LB43188). The power station is of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity. The listing includes the power station buildings, an office block, a dam, a valve house and penstocks, and the power station boundary wall and gate piers.

A former 18th century military road (2), recorded in the HER, is depicted on historic maps (1747-55, 1776, 1777 and 1864) and is visible on aerial photographs from 1946-1954. Field survey identified the well-preserved remains of a section of the old military road surviving immediately north of Sloy Power Station (1) (see also **Volume 2, Figure 15.1)** The surviving section is cut into a south facing slope forming a 5m wide linear terrace. The west-southwest end of the road appears to peter out at NN 32153, 09880 although at this point the road is obscured by dense rhododendron cover. The road does not survive to the south of the fenced boundary of the existing Sloy Power Station (1) having been completely destroyed during the associated construction works in the 1940s. As a section of former 18th century military road, it is assessed as being of heritage value at the local level, and of low sensitivity.

15.6.2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL OF THE INNER STUDY AREA

Inveruglas was the stronghold of the Clan Macfarlane until the 17th century when Cromwell destroyed Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264). Today the remains of the castle still survive on a small island just off the west shore of Loch Lomond and close to Sloy Power Station (1).

Examination of historic maps indicates that the area surrounding the existing power station has been settled from at least the mid-18th century (Roy's Military Map of Scotland 1747-55). At least three townships ('fermtouns') surrounded by rig and furrow cultivation are depicted on Roy's map to the south of the PDA. Further possible medieval or later settlement in the area is also indicated by the presence of a township at 'Port A' Chaipull' depicted on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1864), around 800m to the south of the PDA.

The area continued as pastureland, principally surrounding the early 19th century Inveruglas farmstead which lies around 500m southwest of the Proposed Development, until the mid-20th century when the existing power station was constructed.

Further evidence for post-medieval activity in the area is indicated by the presence of a section of mid-18th century military road (2). This section of the road survives within an undeveloped woodland area to the northeast of the existing power station.

The Proposed Development (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.1**) lies within the footprint of the existing power station grounds. Most of the proposed site establishment and rock storage area lies within an area previously disturbed by the construction of the existing power station (**Plates 15.1 and 15.2**). However, vertical aerial photographic evidence indicates that a small part of the area proposed for site establishment may not have been affected by construction of the existing power station.

Taking into account the known and recorded cultural heritage resources within the PDA and within the wider landscape the potential for buried archaeological remains to be encountered during the construction of the Proposed Development is judged generally to be low. There is a slightly higher probability that buried remains may be present within part of the area proposed for site establishment and rock storage in the wooded area to the north of the existing power station, which has not previously been developed and where the remains of an old military road survive (**Volume 2, Figure 15.1).**

Plate 15.1: View of Sloy Power Station construction works from the west (c.1940)

Plate 15.2: View of Sloy Power Station construction works from the east (c.1940)

15.6.3. CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN THE OUTER STUDY AREA

There is one Scheduled Monument within the Outer Study Area, Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264), the ruins of a small medieval tower house standing on Inveruglas Isle. The Scheduled Monument is of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity (**Volume 2, Figure 15.2**).

In addition, there are six Listed Buildings within the Outer Study Area (**Volume 2, Figure 15.2**), including one within the Inner Study Area, described above. Excluding the Listed Building, Sloy Power Station (LB 43189) described above, the Listed Buildings comprise:

- Category B Listed Creag-An-Arnain Railway Viaduct (LB 864), early 19th century viaduct carrying the West Highland Railway.
- Category C Listed Sloy Power Station Bridge (LB 43189), c.1950s bridge carrying the A82 public road over Inveruglas Burn where it runs from Sloy Power Station into Loch Lomond.
- Category C Listed Sloy Power Station, Bungalow (LB 43190), c.1950s workman's lodge for Sloy Power Station.
- Category C Listed Inveruglas Steading (LB 43187), a 19th century farmhouse and associated steading.
- Category C Listed Inveruglas Barn (LB 43186), early 19the century barn.

The Category B Listed Building Creag-An-Arnain Railway Viaduct (LB 864) is of heritage value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity. The Category C Listed Buildings are all of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.

15.7. Potential Effects

The assessment of potential effects has been carried out with reference to the Proposed Development layout shown on **Volume 2**, **Figure 15.1, Figures 4.1-4.3** and described in **Chapter 4**: **Description of Development**.

15.7.1. POTENTIAL CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS

Any ground-breaking activities associated with construction of the Proposed Development have the potential to disturb or destroy heritage assets. Other construction activities, such as vehicle movements, soil and overburden storage, and landscaping also have the potential to cause direct, permanent, and irreversible effects on heritage assets.

- The proposed construction access route through the grounds of the existing power station would directly affect the gates, gate piers and a short section of existing boundary wall at the northern entrance off the A82. The boundary wall, gates and gate piers are Category A Listed along with the rest of the existing power station. The proposed works will temporarily dismantle the gates, gate piers and adjacent sections of boundary wall (see Volume 4, Appendix 4.1: Design Statement), during the construction phase and will reinstated upon completion of the construction. Overall, It is assessed that without mitigation, the direct effects, on an asset of high sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (**not significant**). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 15.8**.
- The construction of new buried pipelines, new pumped supply pipes and new thrust blocks would directly affect the existing boundary (rubble) wall adjacent to the existing penstocks, the existing penstocks themselves and the land immediately north of the existing power station. The existing penstocks and boundary wall are all Category A Listed as part of the existing power station. Only a small part of the penstocks would be affected by construction work. The boundary wall will be reinstated upon completion of construction works with only a small section of the existing wall being lost where the new pumped supply pipe cuts directly through the wall (see Volume 4, Appendix 4.1: Design Statement). Overall, it is assessed that without mitigation, the direct effects, on an asset of high sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (**not significant**). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 15.8**.
- The proposed construction compound / site establishment area and spoil management area would be present to the north of the existing power station and any felling works could directly affect the route of an old military road (2) that survives within the existing woodland. It is assessed that without mitigation, the direct effects on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (**significant**). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 15.8**.

In addition to the effects identified above, there is the possibility that any ground disturbance excavations associated with the construction of the Proposed Development could have an adverse impact on any unrecorded, buried archaeological remains present in affected areas.

The existing power station area was subject to major construction activities when the power station was built and it is extremely unlikely that any sites of archaeological interest remain within the area of the proposed pumphouse building and the area to the north, which was used during the construction activities (See **Plates 15.1 and 15.2**).

A small area of the proposed site establishment area immediately west of the A82 which is covered with woodland, may not have been disturbed during previous construction works and there is potential for buried remains, possibly associated with the old military road (2), to survive in this area. (**Volume 2, Figure 15.1**). Construction works could have a high magnitude direct adverse effect on hitherto undiscovered remains likely to be of medium magnitude resulting in a moderate significance (significant) adverse effect prior to adoption of any mitigation. Measures are proposed in **Section 15.8** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately addressed.

15.7.2. POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL EFFECTS

The assessment of operational effects on the settings of heritage assets has been carried out with reference to the layout of the Proposed Development and locations of the cultural heritage assets, shown on **Volume 2, Figure 15.1**. The criteria detailed in **Tables 15.3** and **15.4** have been used to assess the nature and magnitude of the effects which are set out in summary form in **Volume 4, Appendix 15.2: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area**.

Cross-reference is made to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and Visualisation Locations (VLs) where appropriate. Details of the VLs cross-referenced within the following assessment are provided in **Chapter 4: Description of Development**.

The following discussion details the assessment findings for those assets identified by HES as requiring detailed consideration (See **Table 15.1**):

- Category A Listed Sloy Awe Hydro Electric Scheme, Sloy Power Station (LB 43188), and
- Scheduled Monument, Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264).

The other Listed Buildings within the Outer Study Area are all buildings that have localised settings that are constrained to and defined by, their immediate surroundings, and which have no intended long views out to the wider landscape that form key elements of their settings. It is assessed that the Proposed Development will have a **negligible** effect (not significant) on the four Category C Listed Buildings: Inveruglas Barn (LB 43186), Inveruglas Steading (LB 43187), Sloy Power Station Bridge (LB 43189) and Sloy Power Station, Bungalow (LB 43190).

There is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from Category B Listed Creag-An-Arnain Railway Viaduct (LB 864) and there would be no impact on the setting of this Listed Building from the Proposed Development.

15.7.2.1. Sloy AWE Hydro Electric Scheme, Sloy Power Station (LB 43188)

This 1950s power station is a Category A Listed Building, of heritage value at the national level. As one of the first hydro-schemes of the North Scotland Hydro-Electric Board (NoSHEB) and a prominent example of the bold modern design by NoSHEB, it is assessed as being of high sensitivity.

The power station forms part of a wider hydroelectric scheme which includes a dam on Loch Sloy and a valve house and associated penstocks which run down the southeastern slopes of Ben Vorlich. The existing power station, including the turbine hall, stands close to the west shore of Loch Lomond in close proximity to areas of woodland and rough pasture. A structure was built over the tailrace in the early 2000s, as part of a spray reduction facility, and the surrounding landscape has been modified over the last decade with the construction of the Inveruglas Visitor Centre to the northeast on the opposite side of the A82. The public road (A82) runs past the eastern side of the existing power station.

Although the proposed pump hall would be underground, a new glass and stone structure to house the electrical switchgear, pump infrastructure and gantry crane would be built above ground to the northeast end of the existing power station turbine hall. Together these elements are referred to as the proposed pumphouse. The glass and stone structure would be a similar height to the existing power station (**Volume 2, Figures 4.1-4.3**) and would be seen together with the existing power station in views from the A82 and from wider views, such as those from the loch.

A photomontage visualisation from the A82 to the south of the existing power station (**Volume 3, Figure 4.6a-c**) shows that in views from the south, the proposed pumphouse would be seen projecting in front of the main elevation of the existing turbine hall and control room. Although a new element in this view, the introduction of the new pumping station would not be out of proportion to the existing

building and would not significantly detract from the character of the existing power station. It would still be possible for any visitor to understand the existing power station, its lochside location and its surrounding landscape, in these views.

When approaching from the north along the A82, views of the existing power station are largely screened by intervening topography and woodland along the roadside with clear views of the existing power station only being possible once you have reached the northern entrance gates of the site (for example see **Volume 3, Figure 4.4.5a-c**). The proposed pumphouse would slightly obscure the views to the existing power station whilst approaching from the north, so that clear views of the main elevation would then be seen from the bridge over the tailrace. This slight restriction in the view of the existing power station whilst traveling south along the A82, would not however significantly reduce the ability of any visitor to understand or appreciate the existing power station or its lochside location.

The proposed pumphouse would also be seen as an addition to the existing power station complex in the wider landscape views from both the immediate Inveruglas Bay area (**Volume 3, Figure 4.4.5a-c**) and from the opposite side of Loch Lomond (**Volume 3, Figure 4.8a-c**). The proposed pumphouse would be seen together with the existing power station in these views but would not dominate the existing power station nor interrupt views to the main elevation of the existing buildings. Although a new element in these views, the introduction of the new pumping station would not significantly detract from the character of the existing power station nor affect the ability of any visitor to understand and appreciate the architectural merits of the existing power station or its wider landscape setting.

The construction compound / site establishment would be visible to the north of the existing power station, immediately north of the A82, and the secondary construction compound / site establishment area and vehicle holding area, would be visible in the overflow car park to the north of the Inveruglas Visitor Centre car park. The construction areas and activities to the north of the existing power station would also be visible in views, along with the power station, from boats approaching Inveruglas pier and whilst traveling along the A82. These are temporary features, only required for the duration of the construction of the Proposed Development and would result in only short-term effects on the setting of the existing power station and would be removed, and the areas regraded / reinstated once construction works have been completed.

Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the existing power station is assessed, using the criteria set out in **Table 15.4** and professional judgment, as being of low magnitude on those aspects of the setting that contribute to appreciation of its cultural significance, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (**not significant**). The character, special architectural and historic interest of the existing power station would remain intact and undiminished.

15.7.2.2. Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264)

This monument comprises the ruins of a medieval tower house, two additional buildings and a stone jetty all of which are located on a small island off the western shore of Loch Lomond, around 250m southeast of the PDA. As the remains of a medieval tower house, in a strategic position, it has the potential to provide information on settlement activity and social status during the medieval period. The Castle is a Scheduled Monument, of heritage value at the national level, and is assessed as being of high sensitivity.

The Castle, positioned on Inveruglas Isle, stands in a strategic position and would have been prominent from many vantage points in the surrounding landscape, in particularly from the loch shore at Inveruglas Bay, from the opposite side of Loch Lomond, and on approach by boat from the north and south travelling along the loch. The location of the Castle provides a good vantage point to view the surrounding area and gives extensive views to the loch shore approach from the north and south,

eastwards across Loch Lomond and towards the northwestern and southern approach along Loch Lomond. It would have controlled movement in and out of Inveruglas Bay and controlled movement along Loch Lomond, standing out as a high-status dwelling. The key characteristics of the monument's setting that contribute to its cultural significance are its loch shore position, especially its proximity to and control of access to the landing place at Inveruglas Bay, the extensive views that can be gained along and across Loch Lomond, together with its prominent visibility from the western shoreline, the loch approaches and from across Loch Lomond.

The immediate loch shore to the west and north of the island on which the Castle stands has changed dramatically during the mid / late 20th century. Sloy Hydroelectric Power Station was constructed on the shores of Loch Lomond immediate northwest of the castle during the 1940s, a modern visitor's centre and car park have been constructed around 300m north of the Castle, and a major public road (A82) runs along the loch shore to the west.

The proposed development, as described in **Section 15.7.2.1,** would be visible in views from the island on which the castle stands towards the loch shore (**Volume 3, Figure 4.9**) (wireline only); although views from the castle itself to the loch side are screened by dense vegetation that surround the castle ruins. The proposed pumphouse would, however, be visible in views along with the Castle from boats approaching Inveruglas pier and from the east shore of the loch (**Volume 3, Figure 4.8a-c**).

The construction areas and activities would also be visible in views along with the Castle from boats approaching Inveruglas pier. These are temporary features, only required for the duration of the construction of the Proposed Development and would result in only a short-term effect on the setting of Inveruglas Castle and would be removed, and the areas regraded / reinstated once construction works have been completed.

The Proposed Development would be a new element to the wider landscape surroundings of the Castle, but the new pumphouse would be seen in the context of the existing power station and would not give rise to a noticeable change to the overall setting of the monument. It would not interrupt or disrupt any of the key views to or from the Castle that contribute to understanding of its cultural significance. The views from the Castle to the western loch shore would not be interrupted, views from the Castle over Loch Lomond would not be affected and views of the Castle from Loch Lomond would be retained. It would remain possible for any visitor to understand the Castle, its strategic position and its loch surroundings. The presence of the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter the way in which the Castle and its setting are experienced and appreciated.

Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Inveruglas Castle is assessed, using the criteria in **Table 15.4** and professional judgement, as being one of low magnitude on those aspects of the setting of the Castle that contribute to appreciation of its cultural significance, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor** significance (**not significant**).

15.8. Mitigation

Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) requires the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment and the emphasis in PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2) is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible.

The mitigation measures presented below take this policy advice and planning guidance into account and provide various options for protection or recording and ensuring that, where practical, surviving assets are preserved intact to retain the present historic elements of the landscape.

All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or where appropriate, during, the construction of the Proposed Development. The scope of works would be detailed in one or more Written Scheme(s) of Investigations (WSI) developed in consultation with (and subject to the agreement of) WoSAS, as archaeological advisors to LLTNPA.

15.8.1. MITIGATION BY DESIGN

The iterative design of the Proposed Development has taken into account comments from HES through scoping and post-scoping consultation and has sought to design the Proposed Development so that it sympathetic to the design and scale of the existing power station. For further information see **Volume 4, Appendix 4.1: Design Statement.**

15.8.2. CONSTRUCTION PHASE MITIGATION

15.8.2.1. Preservation in Situ

All visible surviving remains of the former military road (2) would be avoided by the proposed pumphouse. The remains of the military road (2) would be marked out for avoidance during forestry felling and construction works. The asset would be identified by placing high visibility markers from the outer limits of the visible remains, facing the working area. A stand-off buffer of 5m would be applied from the outer limits of the military road remains. Tree felling would be directed to steer timber away from the marked remains, and any trees required to be felled in close proximity to the military road remains would be removed by hand.

15.8.2.2. Evaluations and Excavation

Any requirements for archaeological monitoring through pre-construction trenching evaluation or construction phase monitoring of works through watching briefs would be agreed in advance with WoSAS.

15.8.2.3. Post-excavation Assessment and Reporting

If new, archaeologically significant discoveries are made during archaeological monitoring, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered remains in situ, provision will be made for their excavation where necessary. The provision will include the consequent production of written reports on the findings, with post-excavation analysis and publication of the results of the works, where appropriate.

15.8.2.4. Listed Building Consent

Listed Building Consent (LBC) will be required from the LLTNPA for modification of the fabric of the Category A Sloy Awe Hydro Electric Scheme, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers (LB 43188).

A photographic record would be made of the Category A Listed Gates, Gate Piers and Boundary Wall of Sloy Power Station prior to their dismantling to enable site access. This work would be sufficient to provide record of the existing power station northern entrance and to inform the restitution works at the end of the construction phase. A similar record would be made of the rubble wall surrounding the existing penstocks.

15.8.2.5. Protection of Listed Building

Protection of Category A Listed Sloy Awe Hydro Electric Scheme, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers (LB 43188) would be required during the construction phase to prevent potential accidental damage from plant and vehicle movement during construction activities. The scope and details of required protection would be agreed through consultation with LLTNPA in advance of development works and would be set out in a WSI.

15.8.2.6. Monitoring

Post-construction monitoring would be carried out to:

- check that marking out of the military road (2) within the PDA has been effective and that the asset has not been disturbed during forestry felling / construction works.
- check that all markers have been removed from the military road following completion of the Proposed Development.
- Check that the Category A Listed Sloy Power Station (LB 43188) Gates, Gate Piers and Boundary Wall have been reinstated to the required standard and in accordance with the Listed Building Consent. The fabric and character of the reinstated gates, gate piers and boundary wall would be recorded by photographic and written record. A similar record would be made of the rubble wall surrounding the penstocks to the rear of the existing substation.

15.8.3. OPERATIONAL PHASE MITIGATION

As the as-built infrastructure would be used to facilitate maintenance and repair activities, no mitigation is required within the Inner Study Area in relation to cultural heritage during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development.

If any works are required that involve modification to the Category A Listed Sloy Power Station (LB 43188) Gates, Gate Piers and Boundary Wall, during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the same mitigation requirements as for the construction phase will apply.

15.9. Residual Effects

15.9.1. CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS

For heritage assets within the Inner Study Area, completion of the programme of archaeological mitigation works set out in **Section 15.8** would avoid, minimise, or offset the loss of any archaeological remains that may occur from construction of the Proposed Development.

Taking account of the mitigation proposals set out above, the following residual construction effects have been identified.

- Residual effects of negligible significance on Category A Listed Sloy Power Station (LB 43188).
- No residual effects are predicted on the remains of a section of military road (2).

15.9.2. OPERATIONAL EFFECTS

During its operational lifetime, the residual effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be the same as the predicted effects. See **Volume 4, Appendix 15.2: Cultural Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area** for a tabulated assessment of the predicted operational effects.

Two impacts, affecting the setting of one Scheduled Monument (Inveruglas Castle (SM 9264)) and one Category A Listed Building (Sloy Power Station (LB 41388)), both of national importance and high sensitivity, have been assessed as being of **minor** significance (**not significant**).

Four impacts, affecting the settings of four Category C Listed Buildings (Inveruglas Barn (LB 43186), Invergulas Steading (LB 43187), Sloy Power Station Bridge (LB 43189), and Sloy Power Station Bungalow (LB 43190)), all of local importance and low sensitivity, have been assessed as being of **negligible** significance (**not significant**).

There is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from Category B Listed Creag-An-Arnain Railway Viaduct (LB 864) and there would be no residual effect on the setting of this Listed Building from the Proposed Development.

15.9.3. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

15.9.3.1. Construction Effects

Cumulative construction effects may arise from the Proposed Development in combination with other developments that have the potential to directly impact the same heritage assets.

Given the distance between the cumulative developments and the extent of the heritage assets there is no potential for cumulative construction effects from the Proposed Development in combination with other developments predicted.

15.9.3.2. Operational Effects

The assessment of likely cumulative effects focuses upon the residual operational effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments agreed with consultees and outlined in **Chapter 5: EIA Process and Methodology**.

The cumulative developments considered within this assessment are:

- Sloy Transformer Replacement Project (pre-application phase): replacement of the four power station transformers currently located at the rear of the existing power station with a new substation c.300m to the south-southeast.
- Cruach Tairbert Forestry Works: forest felling and associated track construction works over a 5-year period (2022 - 2027) to deal with *Phytothorum ramorum* in larch.

The proposed Sloy Transformer Replacement Project would be located c.0.4km to the southeast of the Proposed Development, located on the west side of the A82. Screening provided by intervening woodland that bounds the western side of the A82 would largely, if not entirely, screen visibility of the proposed Transformer from heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. Taking this into account, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, Sloy Transformer development on the settings of these heritage assets would be of no more than of negligible magnitude and of **negligible** significance (**not significant**).

The ongoing Cruach Tairbeirt Forestry Works lie around 0.8km to the south of the Proposed Development. These forestry works are located on the west side of the A82 and on the south side of Inveruglas Bay to the heritage assets identified within the Outer Study Area. The forestry felling and restocking works would alter the forestry cover currently present along the lower slopes of Cruiach Tairbert and result in a change to the wider landscape surroundings of the heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. The forestry works would however be visible in a different arc of view to the Proposed Development from those heritage assets and would therefore not interact cumulatively with the Proposed Development in the same view. Taking this into account, it is assessed that the

cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, Cruach Tairbert Forestry Works would be of no more than negligible magnitude and of **negligible** significance (**not significant**).

15.10. Summary and Conclusion

A desk-based assessment has been carried out for the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments from, and information supplied by, HES, LLTNPA and WoSAS.

Two heritage assets (sites and features) have been identified within the Inner Study Area: Category A Listed Sloy Awe Hydro Scheme, Sloy Power Station including Boundary Walls, Gates and Gate Piers and a section of former military road. There is potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on both these heritage assets.

Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted effects. The proposed mitigation includes the demarcation of the section of former military road for preservation in-situ and a photographic record of the Category A Listed Sloy Power Station Gates, Gate Piers and Boundary Wall prior to their dismantling to enable construction access.

The findings of the assessment indicate that there is a low potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains within the PDA. The proposed pumphouse lies within the footprint of the existing power station grounds and most of the PDA lies within an area previously disturbed by construction of the existing power station. A small part of the area proposed for site establishment, within the wooded area to the north of the existing power station may not have been affected by construction of the existing power station and there is a slightly higher probability that buried remains may be present within part of this area.

Any requirement for archaeological monitoring through pre-construction trenching evaluation or construction phase monitoring of works through watching briefs would be agreed in advance with WoSAS. If significant discoveries are made during the watching briefs and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to a programme to be agreed in writing with WoSAS.

Within the 1km (Outer Study Area) of the PDA there is one Scheduled Monument, one Category A Listed Building, one Category B Listed Building and four Category C Listed Buildings.

Overall, the assessment concludes that the Proposed Development would have no more than a **minor** effect (**not significant**) on the settings of designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings) within the 1km Outer Study Area.

The cumulative effects of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity is considered to be **not significant**.

15.11. References

Argyll and Bute Council (2015) Local Development Plan (LDP)

Argyll and Bute Council (2016) Local Development Plan: Supplementary Guidance

Argyll and Bute Council (*forthcoming*) Local Development Plan 2 (Proposed Plan)

CIfA (2014) Code of Conduct, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. (Revised 2022).

CIfA (2014) Standard and Guidance for a Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, Chartered Institute for Archaeologist, Reading (Updated 2020).

CIfA (2014) Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment (Updated 2020)

Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and HES, 2018)

HES (2016) Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Updated 2020), Edinburgh.

HES (2019a) Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) Edinburgh.

HES (2019b) Designation Policy and Selection Guidance, Edinburgh (Updated 2020).

HES (2023) Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment, Edinburgh.

HES (2024a) Historic Environment Scotland Spatial Data Warehouse, available at: https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads, accessed March 2024.

HES (2024b) National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore), available at: https://pastmap.org.uk/map, accessed March 2024.

HES (2024c) Scotland's Historic Land-Use Map (HLAMap), available at: https://hlamap.org.uk/, accessed March 2024.

IEMA (2021) 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK'.

Payne, P.L (1988) The Hydro: A Study of the Development of the Major Hydro-Electric Schemes undertaken by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, Aberdeen.

Scottish Government (2011) Planning Advice Note 2/2011 (PAN 2): Planning and Archaeology, Edinburgh.

Scottish Government (2013) Planning Advice Note 1/2013 (PAN 1): Environmental Impact Assessment, Edinburgh.

Scottish Government (2023) National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) (2023)

The Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (2017) Local Development Plan, 2017-2021