

# 7 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

## Contents

7.1	Executive Summary	7-1
7.2	Introduction	7-1
7.3	Legislation, Policy and Guidelines	7-2
7.4	Consultation	7-4
7.5	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	7-6
7.6	Baseline Conditions	7-13
7.7	Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment	7-13
7.8	Standard Mitigation	7-15
7.9	Likely Effects	7-15
7.10	Additional Mitigation and Enhancement	7-23
7.11	Residual Effects	7-24
7.12	Cumulative Assessment	7-24
7.13	Summary	7-24
7.14	References	7-27

This page is intentionally blank.

# 7 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

## 7.1 Executive Summary

- 7.1.1 This chapter assesses the potential for settings effects on heritage assets resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development. Assessment for the potential for direct effects upon archaeological remains during the construction phase have been scoped out with the agreement of The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (THC HET).
- 7.1.2 Potential operational effects on the settings of designated heritage assets within the 5km and 10km Study Areas and Urquhart Castle within 15km of the Site have been considered in detail as part of this assessment. No significant effects have been predicted upon the setting of such assets.
- 7.1.3 The possibility of cumulative effects has been considered and assessed and no significant cumulative effects are expected.

## 7.2 Introduction

- 7.2.1 This chapter considers the issues associated with the potential cultural heritage effects of the Proposed Development at Bhlairaidh, Invermoriston. The Proposed Development is for a wind farm of up to 18 turbines with a maximum tip height of up to 180m and is described in detail in EIA Report Chapter 2 (Design Iteration and Proposed Development).
- 7.2.2 This chapter has been produced by AOC Archaeology Group which is a Registered Organisation of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). The assessment has been undertaken by Lynn Fraser and overseen by Victoria Oleksy. Victoria Oleksy is an Assistant Director and Consultancy Sector Head with 16 years of experience working on cultural heritage assessments. Victoria specialises in EIAs, Archaeological Impact Assessment and Conservation Management Plans and has appeared as an expert witness for planning appeals and called-in planning applications. Lynn Fraser is a Project Officer with 11 years of experience working on a range of EIAs, desk-based assessments and large walkover survey projects.
- 7.2.3 This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the standards of professional conduct outlined in the CIfA Code of Conduct (CIfA, 2019a) and Regulations for Professional Conduct (CIfA, 2019b), as well as the CIfA Standard and guidance for commissioning work on, or providing consultancy advice on, archaeology and the historic environment (CIfA, 2014a); Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (CIfA, 2017); field evaluations (CIfA, 2020) and other relevant guidance. The potential for direct physical effects upon archaeological remains has been scoped out of this assessment with agreement of consultees. As such this assessment will focus on the potential for operational and cumulative setting effects upon designated heritage assets. Where appropriate and if necessary, measures to mitigate or offset such impacts will be identified. An assessment of the significance of residual effects following the implementation of any mitigation will also be made.
- 7.2.4 This chapter is supported by the Figures and Appendices presented in Table 7.1. All site numbers referred to in the text and Figures relate to heritage assets listed in the Site Gazetteer (Appendix 7.1).

**Table 7.1 List of Figures and Appendices**

Document Title	Document Description
Volume 2	
Figure 7.1	Designated Heritage Assets within Study Areas & Urquhart Castle
Figure 7.2	Designated Heritage Assets within Study Areas & Urquhart Castle with ZTV

Document Title	Document Description
Figure 7.3	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint Locations
Volume 3a	
Figure 7.4.a-c	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Cumulative Wireline from Levishie Cottage (Site 2)
Figure 7.5	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 – Wireline from Levishie Cottage (Site 2)
Figure 7.6	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Cumulative Wireline from Loch Ness approximating views from the Loch towards Urquhart Castle (Site 25)
Figure 7.7	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Wireline from Loch Ness approximating views from the Loch towards Urquhart Castle (Site 25)
Volume 4	
Appendix 7.1	Site Gazetteer

## 7.3 Legislation, Policy and Guidelines

7.3.1 Relevant legislation, policy and guidelines have been taken into consideration during this assessment.

### **Legislation**

7.3.2 The statutory framework for heritage in Scotland is outlined in:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended);
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended);
- The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006;
- Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011;
- Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014; and
- The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (as amended).

### **Planning Policy**

7.3.3 Planning policy relevant to this chapter is contained within:

- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (Scottish Government 2020);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES 2019a);
- The adopted Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (The Highland Council (THC) 2012)

7.3.4 SPP expresses the following policy principles:

*“The planning system should:*

- *promote the care and protection of the designated and non-designated historic environment (including individual assets, related settings and the wider cultural landscapes) and its contribution to sense of place, cultural identity, social well-being, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning; and*
- *enable positive change in the historic environment which is informed by a clear understanding of the importance of the heritage assets affected and ensure their future use. Change should be*

*sensitively managed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the fabric and setting of the asset, and ensure that its special characteristics are protected, conserved or enhanced” (Scottish Government 2020, Para 137).*

7.3.5 HEPs (HES, 2019a) sets out the Scottish Government’s policy for decision making that affects the historic environment. It contains six policies for managing the historic environment, all of which favour protection, understanding and promotion of the historic environment as well as the preservation of the benefits of the historic environment for future generations. Historic environment policies 3 and 4 both state *“if detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be in place”* (HES, 2019a). The following historic environmental policies are relevant to this assessment:

- HEP1  
*“Decisions affecting any part of the historic environment should be informed by an inclusive understanding of its breadth and cultural significance.”*
- HEP2  
*“Decisions affecting the historic environment should ensure that its understanding and enjoyment as well as its benefits are secured for present and future generations.”*
- HEP3  
*“Plans, programmes, policies and strategies, and the allocation of resources should be approached in a way that protects and promotes the historic environment.*  
*If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored and mitigation measures should be put in place.”*
- HEP4  
*“Changes to specific assets and their context should be managed in a way that protects the historic environment. Opportunities for enhancement should be identified where appropriate.*  
*If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be put in place.”*

7.3.6 THC’s approach to proposals that affect the historic environment is set out in Policy 57 of the HwLDP which states that:

*“development proposals will be assessed taking into account the level of importance and type of heritage features, the form and scale of the development, and any impact on the feature and its setting”.*

### **Guidance**

7.3.7 Recognition has been taken of the following best practice guidelines/guidance in preparing this assessment:

- THC Supplementary Guidance: Historic Environment Strategy (2013);
- PAN2/2011 ‘Planning and Archaeology’ (Scottish Government 2011);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CIfA 2017) and Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment (CIfA 2014);
- HES "Managing Change in the Historic Environment" guidance note series, particularly Historic Environment Scotland's Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2020);

- NatureScot’s published guidance for ‘Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments’ (SNH 2012); and
  - NatureScot & Historic Environment Scotland’s Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5 (SNH & HES 2018).
- 7.3.8 HES’s setting guidance defines setting as ‘*the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced*’ (HES 2020). The guidance further notes that “*planning authorities must take into account the setting of historic assets or places when drawing up development plans and guidance, when considering various types of environmental and design assessments/statements, and in determining planning applications*” (ibid). It advocates a three-stage approach to assessing potential impacts upon setting:
- Stage 1: identify the historic asset.
  - Stage 2: define and analyse the setting.
  - Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes.
- 7.3.9 THC’s Supplementary Guidance on the historic environment (2013) supports the policy on the historic environment and provides a definition of THC’s approach to the protection of the historic environment through the planning process. This strategy is implemented through strategic aims. Those relevant to this assessment are:
- Strategic Aim 6: That listed buildings within Highland are protected from harmful developments...which may affect their special architectural and historic interest or their setting.
  - Strategic Aim 13: That scheduled monuments – and their setting – within Highland are protected from harmful developments that may affect their national importance.
  - Strategic Aim 17: To ensure no asset or its setting is lost or altered without adequate consideration of its significance and of the means available to preserve, record and interpret it in line with national and local policy.
- 7.3.10 NatureScot and HES published guidance on the EIA process in 2018 in their Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (SNH et al., 2018). Appendix 1 of the handbook sets out guidance specifically related to cultural heritage impact assessments, and this has been followed throughout this assessment.

## 7.4 Consultation

- 7.4.1 Table 7.2 summarises the responses from consultation undertaken in preparation of this assessment and notes where this is addressed in the EIAR.

**Table 7.2 – Consultation**

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and How Addressed
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	HES provided pre-application advice on 11 <sup>th</sup> June 2019 when they recommended that the potential impacts on Levishe Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM 4567) and Urquhart Castle (SM90309) should be assessed as part of the EIA process and that visualisations should be provided to support the assessment conclusions.  In their response to the Scoping Report, dated 9 <sup>th</sup> August 2019, HES confirmed that	An assessment of the potential for effects upon the setting of Levishe Cottage (Site 2) is set out in Paragraph 7.9.5 and this is supported by wirelines (Figures 7.4a-c & 7.5).  An assessment of the potential effects upon the setting of Urquhart Castle (Site 25) is set out in Paragraph 7.9.28. The

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and How Addressed
	<p>the scope of the proposed assessment was appropriate for their historic environment interests. It was also confirmed that, at that stage, no additional heritage assets had been identified for assessment. A detailed ZTV would assist in identifying any further assets likely to receive impacts on their setting.</p> <p>HES were consulted directly regarding proposed viewpoints for assessment of impacts upon cultural heritage receptors. On 21<sup>st</sup> September 2020, HES confirmed they would welcome a wireline from Levishie Cottage (Site 2). With regard to Urquhart Castle (Site 25) they noted that viewpoint on the eastern/southern side of the Loch Ness may be sufficient approximation to assess the potential impact upon the castle but also recommended consideration be given producing a viewpoint from the centre of the loch to approximate views which would be obtainable from cruise boats.</p> <p>In their response to the Gatecheck Report on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2020, HES reiterated their recommendation that a viewpoint from the loch be considered and also requested a viewpoint taken from the north of Urquhart Castle which would include both the castle and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Following further direct consultation HES confirmed, on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021, that LVIA Viewpoint 4, would satisfy their request for a viewpoint taken from the north side of the loch and incorporating Urquhart Castle. On 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021 HES agreed that a wireline from Loch Ness, on the approximate route of the Jacobite Cruise ships, would be sufficient to assess the potential impacts upon the setting of Urquhart Castle, along with the LVIA viewpoints noted here.</p>	<p>assessment has been made with reference to LVIA Viewpoints 4 (Figures 8.12.3 &amp; 8.12.4), 8 (Figures 8.15.3 &amp; 8.15.4) and 17 (Figures 8.25.3 &amp; 8.25.4) which illustrate views which will include both Urquhart Castle and the Proposed Development. Cultural Heritage wirelines (Figures 7.6 &amp; 7.7), illustrating the potential views towards Urquhart from approach on a Jacobite Cruise ship are also included to inform the assessment.</p> <p>The potential for effects on the setting of other heritage assets has been undertaken and has been informed by ZTV analysis and site visits. The results of this assessment are presented in Section 7.9.</p>
Highland Council Historic	In their response to the Scoping Report HET noted the requirement to identify all designated assets with the potential to be affected directly or indirectly by the Proposed	The potential for effects on the setting of other heritage assets has been undertaken and has been informed by ZTV analysis

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and How Addressed
Environment Team (HET)	<p>Development. They noted that the assessment should contain a full appreciation of the setting the assets and the likely impact on their settings.</p> <p>Direct consultation was undertaken with HET regarding the need to consider the potential for direct effects upon heritage assets as part of the EIAR and the need to carry out a walkover survey on the Site. HET responded on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2020, confirming that direct effects could be scoped out of the EIAR and that a walkover survey was not required to inform the assessment.</p> <p>Direct consultation was undertaken with HET on the visualisations proposed to support the EIAR. HET did not respond to this consultation.</p>	<p>and site visits. The results of this assessment are presented in Section 7.9.</p> <p>Direct effects upon cultural heritage assets have been scoped out of this EIAR.</p>

## 7.5 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

### **Consultation**

- 7.5.1 EIA Scoping Responses were received from HES on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2019 and THC HET on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2019, and further direct consultation was undertaken. Detail regarding consultation responses and how points raised by consultees are addressed is presented in Table 7.2 above.

### **Study Area**

- 7.5.2 Two Study Areas were identified for this assessment:
- A 5km Study Area for assessment of potential effects on the settings of all designated heritage assets including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes; Inventoried Battlefields and Conservation Areas (Figure 7.1)
  - A 10km Study Area for the assessment of potential effects on the settings of all nationally important designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventoried Battlefields and World Heritage Sites (Figure 7.1).
- 7.5.3 In addition to the above the potential for effects upon the setting of Urquhart Castle (Site 25), located c. 13.8km from the Site has also been considered at the request of HES.
- 7.5.4 Each heritage asset referred to in the text is listed in the Gazetteer in Technical Appendix 7.1. Each has been assigned a 'Site No.' unique to this assessment, and the Gazetteer includes information regarding the type, period, grid reference, NRHE number, HER number, statutory protective designation, and other descriptive information, as derived from the consulted sources.



## **Desk Study**

- 7.5.5 The following sources were consulted for the collation of data:
- The Highland Council Historic Environment Record as available online, given that direct impacts were scoped out of the assessment.
  - The walkover survey data and heritage assessment undertaken for the Operational Development (SSE Renewables 2012).
  - The National Record for the Historic Environment (NRHE) as held by HES; and
  - Spatial data and descriptive information for designated assets held on Historic Environment Scotland Data website.

## **Site Visits**

- 7.5.6 Site visits were made to designated heritage assets on 15<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020. Weather conditions were dry and sunny giving good visibility.

## **Assessment of Likely Effect Significance**

- 7.5.7 This assessment distinguishes between the term ‘impact’ and ‘effect’. An impact is defined as a physical change to a heritage asset or its setting, whereas an effect refers to the significance of this impact. The first stage of the assessment involves establishing the significance and importance of the heritage assets and assessing the sensitivity of those assets to change (impact). Using the proposed design for the Proposed Development, an assessment of the impact magnitude is made and a judgement regarding the level and significance of effect is arrived at.

## **Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**

- 7.5.8 The definition of cultural significance is readily accepted by heritage professionals both in the UK and internationally and was first fully outlined in the Burra Charter, which states in article one that ‘cultural significance’ or ‘cultural heritage value’ means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations (ICOMOS 2013, Article 1.2). This definition has since been adopted by heritage organisations around the world, including HES. HEPS notes that to have cultural significance an asset must have a particular “*aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations*” (HES 2019a). Heritage assets also have value in the sense that they “*...contribute to sense of place, cultural identity, social wellbeing, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning*” (Scottish Government 2020, 33).
- 7.5.9 All heritage assets have significance; however, some heritage assets are judged to be more important than others. The level of that importance is, from a cultural resource management perspective, determined by establishing the asset’s capacity to contribute to our understanding or appreciation of the past (HES 2019b). In the case of many heritage assets their importance has already been established through the designation (i.e. Scheduling, Listing and Inventory) processes applied by HES.
- 7.5.10 The rating of importance of heritage assets is first and foremost made in reference to their designation. For non-designated assets importance will be assigned based on professional judgement and guided by the criteria presented in Table 7.3, which itself relates to the criteria for designations as set out in Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b) and Scotland’s Listed Buildings (HES 2019c).

**Table 7.3 – Criteria for Establishing Importance of Heritage Assets**

<b>Importance</b>	<b>Receptors</b>
Very High	World Heritage Sites (As protected by SPP, 2020);

Importance	Receptors
	Other designated or non-designated assets with demonstrable Outstanding Universal Value.
High	<p>Scheduled Monuments (as protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (the "1979 Act");</p> <p>Category A Listed Buildings (as protected by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997) (the "1997 Act");</p> <p>Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011);</p> <p>Inventory Battlefields (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the 2011 Act);</p> <p>Outstanding examples of some period, style or type;</p> <p>Non-Designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, 2020).</p>
Medium	<p>Category B and C Listed Buildings (as protected by the 1997 Act);</p> <p>Conservation Areas (as protected by the 1997 Act);</p> <p>Major or representative examples of some period, style or type; or</p> <p>Non-designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, 2020);</p>
Low	<p>Locally Listed assets;</p> <p>Examples of any period, style or type which contribute to our understanding of the historic environment at the local level.</p>
Negligible	<p>Relatively numerous types of features;</p> <p>Findspots of artefacts that have no definite archaeological remains known in their context.</p> <p>The above non-designated features are protected by Paragraph 137 of SPP, 2020.</p>

7.5.11 Determining cultural heritage significance can be made with reference to the intrinsic, contextual and associative characteristics of an asset as set out in HEPS (HES 2019a) and its accompanying Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b). HEPS Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019b) indicates that the relationship of an asset to its setting or the landscape makes up part of its contextual characteristics. The Xi'an Declaration (ICOMOS 2005) set out the first internationally accepted definition of setting with regard to heritage assets, indicating that setting is important where it forms part of or contributes to the significance of a heritage asset. While SPP does not differentiate between the importance of the asset itself and the importance of the asset's setting, HES's Managing Change Guidance, in defining what factors need to be considered in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place, states that the magnitude of the proposed change should be considered "*relative to the sensitivity of the setting of an asset*" (HES 2020, 11); thereby making clear that assets vary in their sensitivity to changes in setting and thus have a relative sensitivity.

- 7.5.12 The EIA Handbook suggests that cultural significance aligns with sensitivity but also states that “*the relationship between value and sensitivity should be clearly articulated in the assessment*” (HES and SNH 2018, 184). It is therefore recognised (ibid) that the importance of an asset is not the same as its sensitivity to changes to its setting. Elements of setting may make a positive, neutral, or negative contribution to the significance of an asset. Thus, in determining the nature and level of effects upon assets and their settings by the development, the contribution that setting makes to an asset’s significance and thus its sensitivity to changes to setting need to be considered.
- 7.5.13 This approach recognises the importance of preserving the integrity of the setting of an asset in the context of the contribution that setting makes to the understanding, appreciation and experience of a given asset. It recognises that setting is a key characteristic in understanding and appreciating some, but by no means all, assets. Indeed, assets of High or Very High importance do not necessarily have high sensitivity to changes to their settings (e.g. do not necessarily have a high relative sensitivity). An asset’s relative sensitivity to alterations to its setting refers to its capacity to retain its ability to contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past in the face of changes to its setting. The ability of an asset’s setting to contribute to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it and its significance also has a bearing on the sensitivity of that asset to changes to its setting. While heritage assets of High or Very High importance are likely to be sensitive to direct effects, not all will have a similar sensitivity to effects on their setting; this would be true where setting does not appreciably contribute to their significance. HES’s guidance on setting makes clear that the level of effect may relate to “*the ability of the setting [of an asset] to absorb new development without eroding its key characteristics*” (2020, 11). Assets with Very High or High relative sensitivity to settings effects may be vulnerable to any changes that affect their settings, and even slight changes may erode their key characteristics or the ability of their settings to contribute to the understanding, appreciation and experience of them. Assets whose relative sensitivity to changes to their setting is lower may be able to accommodate greater changes to their settings without having key characteristics eroded.
- 7.5.14 The criteria used for establishing an asset’s relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is detailed in Table 7.4. This table has been developed based on AOC’s professional judgement and experience in assessing setting effects. It has been developed with reference to the policy and guidance noted above including SPP (Scottish Government 2020), HEPS (HES 2019a) and its Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b), the Xi’an Declaration (ICOMOS 2005), the EIA Handbook (SNH & HES 2018) and HES’s guidance on the setting of heritage assets (HES 2020).

**Table 7.4 - Criteria for Establishing Relative Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to Changes to its Setting.**

Relative Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	An asset, the setting of which, is critical to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it should be thought of as having Very High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, make an essential direct contribution to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES, 2019b, Annex 1)).
High	An asset, the setting, of which, makes a major contribution to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it should be thought of as having High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, contribute directly to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES, 2019b, Annex 1)).
Medium	An asset, the setting of which, makes a moderate contribution to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it should be thought of as having

Relative Sensitivity	Criteria
	Medium Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset for which setting makes a contribution to significance but whereby its value is derived mainly from its other characteristics (HES 2019b).
Low	An asset, the setting of which, makes some contribution to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Low Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This may be an asset whose significance is predominantly derived from its other characteristics.
Negligible	An asset whose setting makes minimal contribution to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Marginal Sensitivity to changes to its setting.

7.5.15 The determination of a heritage asset’s relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is first and foremost reliant upon the determination of its setting and the key characteristics of setting which contribute to its cultural significance and an understanding and appreciation of that cultural significance. This aligns with Stage 2 of the HES guidance on setting (2020, 9). The criteria set out in Table 7.4 are intended as a guide. Assessment of individual heritage assets is informed by knowledge of the asset itself; of the asset type if applicable and by site visits to establish the current setting of the assets. This will allow for the use of professional judgement and each asset is assessed on an individual basis.

**Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact**

7.5.16 Potential impacts, that is changes to asset settings, in the case of the Proposed Development relate to the placement of new features within their setting during the operational phase.

7.5.17 The magnitude of the impacts upon heritage assets caused by the Proposed Development is rated using the classifications and criteria outlined in Table 7.5.

**Table 7.5 - Criteria for Classifying Magnitude of Impact**

Impact Magnitude	Criteria
High	Major alteration of an asset’s baseline setting, which materially compromises the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset and erodes the key characteristics (HES 2020) of the setting.
Medium	Alteration of an asset’s baseline setting that effects the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset to a degree but whereby the cultural significance of the monument in its current setting remains legible. The key characteristics of the setting (HES 2020) are not eroded.
Low	Alterations to the asset’s baseline setting, which do not affect the observer’s ability to understand, appreciate and experience the contribution that setting makes to the asset’s overall significance.

Impact Magnitude	Criteria
Negligible	A marginal alteration to the asset's baseline setting.
None	No effect predicted.

#### Criteria for Assessing Significance

- 7.5.18 The predicted level of effect on each heritage asset is then determined by considering the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity in conjunction with the predicted magnitude of the impact. The method of deriving the level of effect is provided in Table 7.6.

**Table 7.6 - Level of Effect based on Inter-Relationship between the Importance and/or Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset and/or its setting and the Magnitude of Impact.**

Magnitude of Impact	Importance and/or Sensitivity				
	<i>Negligible</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Very High</i>
<i>High</i>	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major	Major
<i>Medium</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major
<i>Low</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Minor	Minor	Moderate
<i>Negligible</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Minor	Minor

- 7.5.19 The level of effect is judged to be the interaction of the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity (Tables 7.3 and/or 7.4) and the magnitude of the impact (Table 7.5). In order to provide a level of consistency, the assessment of importance and relative sensitivity, the magnitude of impact and the assessment of level of effect are guided by pre-defined criteria. However, a qualitative descriptive narrative is also provided for each asset to summarise and explain each of the professional value judgements that have been made in establishing importance and/or sensitivity and magnitude of impact for each individual asset.
- 7.5.20 Using professional judgment and with reference to the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment (as updated) (IEMA 2017), and the EIA Handbook (2018), the assessment considers moderate and greater effects to be significant (shaded grey in Table 7.6), while minor and lesser effects are considered not significant.

#### Integrity of Setting

- 7.5.21 SPP notes that where there is potential for a proposed development to have an adverse effect on a Scheduled Monument or on the integrity of its setting, permission should only be granted where there are 'exceptional circumstances' (Scottish Government 2020, para 145). Adverse effects on integrity of setting are judged here to relate to whether a change would seriously adversely affect the asset's key attributes or elements of setting which contribute to an asset's significance to the extent that the setting of the asset can no longer be understood or appreciated. In terms of effects upon the setting of heritage assets, it is considered that only those effects identified as 'significant' in the assessment will have the potential to adversely affect integrity of setting. Where no significant effect is found it is considered that the integrity of an asset's setting will remain intact. This is because for many assets, setting may make a limited contribution to their significance and as such changes would not affect integrity of their settings. Additionally, as set out in Table 7.5, lower ratings

of magnitude of change relate to changes that would not obscure or erode key characteristics of setting.

- 7.5.22 Where significant effects are found, a detailed assessment of adverse effects upon integrity of setting is made. Whilst non-significant effects are unlikely to affect integrity of setting, the reverse is not always true. That is, the assessment of an effect as being 'significant' does not necessarily mean that the adverse effect to the asset's setting will harm its integrity. The assessment of adverse effect upon the integrity of an asset's setting, where required, will be a qualitative one, and will largely depend upon whether the effect predicted would result in a major impediment to the ability to understand or appreciate the heritage asset and therefore reduce its cultural significance.

#### **Cumulative Effect Assessment**

- 7.5.23 It is necessary to consider whether the effects of other schemes in conjunction with the Proposed Development would result in an additional cumulative change upon heritage assets, beyond the levels predicted for the Proposed Development alone. The in-combination effect also needs to be considered. However, only those assets which are judged to have the potential to be subject to significant cumulative effects will be included in the detailed cumulative assessment provided.
- 7.5.24 The cumulative assessment will have regard to the guidance on cumulative effects upon heritage assets as set out in Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook V5 (SNH & HES 2018) and will utilise the criteria used in determining effects from the Proposed Development as outlined in Tables 7.2 to 7.6 above. The assessment of cumulative effects will consider whether there would be an increased impact, either additive or synergistic, upon the setting of heritage assets as a result of adding the Proposed Development to a baseline, which may include operational, under construction, consented or proposed developments as agreed with THC.
- 7.5.25 In determining the degree to which a cumulative effect may occur as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline a number of factors are taken into consideration including:
- the distance between wind farms;
  - the interrelationship between their Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV);
  - the overall character of the asset and its sensitivity to wind farms;
  - the siting, scale and design of the wind farms themselves;
  - the way in which the asset is experienced;
  - the placing of the cumulative wind farm(s) in relation to both the individual proposal being assessed and the heritage asset under consideration; and
  - the contribution of the cumulative baseline schemes to the significance of the effect, excluding the individual proposal being assessed, upon the setting of the heritage asset under consideration.
- 7.5.26 This assessment is based upon a list of operational or consented developments along with developments where planning permission has been applied for. While all cumulative developments have been considered, only those which contribute to, or have the possibility to contribute to, cumulative effects on specific heritage assets are discussed in detail in the text. Additionally, given the emphasis NatureScot place on significant effects, cumulative effects have only been considered in detail for those assets where the impact on setting from the Proposed Development, alone, has been judged to be of low magnitude or greater. The setting of assets which would have a magnitude of impact of negligible or less are judged to be unlikely to reach the threshold of significance as defined in Table 7.6.

### ***Requirements for Mitigation***

- 7.5.27 National and local planning policies and planning guidance outlined in Section 7.3 of this report, require a mitigation response that is designed to take cognisance of the possible impacts upon heritage assets by a proposed development and avoid, minimise, or offset any such impacts as appropriate. The planning policies and guidance express a general presumption in favour of preserving heritage remains in situ [wherever possible]. Their ‘preservation by record’ (i.e. through excavation and recording, followed by analysis and publication, by qualified archaeologists) is a less desirable alternative (SPP 2020, paras 137, 150).
- 7.5.28 Where possible, impacts upon the setting of heritage assets have been avoided or minimised during the iterative design process.

### ***Assessment of Residual Effect Significance***

- 7.5.29 The residual effect is what remains following the application of mitigation and management measures, and construction has been completed and is thus the final level of impact associated with the Proposed Development. The level of residual effect is defined using criteria outlined in Tables 7.3 to 7.6 above. No direct mitigation, beyond embedded mitigation by design, is possible for setting effects of the Proposed Development and therefore residual effects on the setting of heritage assets will be the same as predicted without mitigation.

### ***Limitations to Assessment***

- 7.5.30 This assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives as described in the Data Sources in Section 7.5.5. NRHE data and HES Designation data was downloaded from HES in September 2020 and checked in February 2021. This assessment does not include any records added or altered after this date.

## **7.6 Baseline Conditions**

### ***Designations***

- 7.6.1 Within 5km from the Site, there is one Scheduled Monument, a prehistoric fort 1.19km north-east of Levishe Cottage (Site 2), and one Category A Listed Building, Invermoriston Home Farm and former barn (Site 18). There are a further seven Category B Listed Buildings (Sites 14-15, 17, 19-22) and two Category C Listed Buildings (Sites 16 & 23).
- 7.6.2 Between 5km and 10km from the Site, there are a further seven Scheduled Monuments (Sites 1 & 3-8), which include prehistoric dwellings and burial monuments, a medieval motte, and a post-medieval illicit whisky still. There are also five Category A Listed Buildings (Sites 9-13).
- 7.6.3 Although outwith the 10km Study Area, Urquhart Castle (Site 25) is judged to be sensitive to changes in its setting.

## **7.7 Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment**

- 7.7.1 Within 10km of the Site there are eight Scheduled Monuments (Sites 1-8). ZTV analysis indicates that there will be no visibility from five of these assets:
- Dun Scriben (Site 1);
  - Corrimony chambered cairn (Site 4);
  - Cherry Island crannog (Site 5);
  - Dundreggan Farm motte (Site 6);
  - Comar Wood dun (Site 7); and
  - Badger Fall Still (Site 8).

7.7.2 Of the six Category A Listed Buildings identified within 10km of the Site, ZTV analysis indicates that there will be no visibility from four of these assets:

- the power station at Foyers (Site 10);
- the power station at Glen Affric (Site 11);
- a barn at Corrimony (Site 13) and
- the Invermoriston, Home Farm and Barn to rear (Site 18).

7.7.3 There are nine Category B and C Listed Buildings with 1km and 5km of the Site. ZTV analysis indicates that only the Category B Listed Alltsaigh House (Site 14) will not be intervisible with the Site.

7.7.4 Given the findings outlined above, the following assets have been carried forward for detailed assessment:

**Table 7.7 - Assets Brought Forward for Assessment**

Site Number & Name	Designation	Distance to nearest proposed turbine
Site 2 Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of	Scheduled Monument	1.19km southeast of
Site 3 Dell Farm, burial mounds 350m NE of	Scheduled Monument	9.28km southeast of
Site 9 Whitebridge, old bridge over River Foyers	Category A Listed Building	10.22km southeast of
Site 12 Torgoyle Bridge over the River Moriston	Category A Listed Building	10.76km southwest of
Site 15 "Barracks" and Servants' Tunnel to former Mansion	Category B Listed Building	4.61km to southeast of
Site 16 Cottage and Pottery Studio (by Old Bridge) (Old Smithy Cottage)	Category C Listed Building	4.10km to southeast of
Site 17 Gazebo (in Policies of Invermoriston House)	Category B Listed Building	4.28km to southeast of
Site 19 Invermoriston, Church of Scotland	Category B Listed Building	3.80km to southeast of
Site 20 Invermoriston, Burial Ground and 2 pairs of Gate Piers	Category B Listed Building	4.20km to southeast of
Site 21 Old Bridge over River Moriston	Category B Listed Building	4.12km southeast of



Site Number & Name	Designation	Distance to nearest proposed turbine
Site 22 Road Bridge over River Moriston	Category B Listed Building	4.17km southeast of
Site 23 Loch Ashlaich, Shooting Box and Bothy	Category C Listed Building	2.02km northeast of
Site 25 Urquhart Castle	Scheduled Monument	14.03km northeast of

## 7.8 Standard Mitigation

7.8.1 National planning policies and planning guidance as well as the local planning policies require that account be taken of potential effects upon heritage assets by proposed developments and that where possible such effects are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible effects should be minimised or offset.

### ***Development Design***

7.8.2 The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 8) discusses the measures taken to reduce the appearance or visual presence of the turbines within the wider landscape. The Proposed Development has been designed to present a clearly structured, balanced arrangement which responds positively to key landscape features and local topography. Steps have been taken to promote a simple balanced composition that minimises overlapping turbines, skyline effects and back-grounding (see Chapter 2 (Design Iteration and Proposed Development) for further details). Consideration has also been given to other design issues, including turbine colour, size and siting; the design and form of the substation building; and the alignment of access tracks to ensure these proposed features relate to the key characteristics of the landscape. As setting effects largely result from the visual presence of the turbines within the landscape the same mitigation measures apply to setting effects on cultural heritage assets.

## 7.9 Likely Effects

### ***Construction***

7.9.1 During construction, setting impacts have the potential to occur due to the introduction of construction machinery on site, additional construction traffic and construction of compounds. Settings impacts relating to construction are usually limited to those assets in close proximity to the proposed works. Given the nearest heritage asset under consideration, Levishe Cottage (Site 2), is 1.19km from the nearest turbine and located beyond the substantial ridge of Carn a Tuairneir no significant construction setting effects are anticipated. Any effects of construction activities upon setting would be temporary, short term and reversible.

### ***Operation***

7.9.2 Operational phase effects have the potential to impact upon the settings of assets such as Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings. ZTV analysis and mapping have been used to identify those assets that could potentially be affected by changes to their settings during the operational phase of the Proposed Development and the assets that have been carried forward for detailed assessment have been outlined in Section 7.7. The detailed assessments have included a review of the contextual characteristics of each asset using information drawn from their designation documentation, supplemented by observations on the morphology, condition and character of each asset and the nature of their settings made during site visits undertaken in September 2020.

7.9.3 The settings assessment found that the effect of the Proposed Development upon the setting of the designated assets would not be significant as the effect levels would range from **neutral** to **minor**. A summary of the effects is presented below in Table 7.8. This is followed by a detailed qualitative assessment for each asset.

**Table 7.8 - Summary of setting effects arising during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.**

Site Number	Site Name	Number of Theoretically Visible Turbines	Distance to Nearest Turbine	Other Factors Affecting Visibility	Relative Sensitivity	Magnitude of Setting Impact	Level of Effect
2	Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork	0-5	1.19km	On a south-facing slope overlooking the River Moriston valley and Loch Ness. Its setting is related to the valley setting. The ridge line of Car an Tuairneir lies to the northwest and between the asset and the Site and the ZTV indicates that visibility will be largely limited to the southern central portion of the Scheduled area.	High	Negligible	Minor
3	Dell Farm, burial mounds	0-5	9.28km	The site is located in a topographical bowl on the east side of Loch Ness. The ZTV indicates that visibility would only be possible from the northeast corner of the Scheduled area.	Medium	Negligible	Negligible
9	Old Bridge, Whitebridge – Category A	1-5	10.22km	Tree-lined riverbanks either side of the bridge.	Low	Negligible	Neutral
12	Torgoyle Bridge – Category A	6-15	10.76km	The riverbanks to either side of the bridge are heavily wooded with mature trees.	Low	Negligible	Neutral
15	‘Barracks’ and servants’ tunnel to former mansion, Invermoriston – Category B	1-5	4.61km	The site is located in a semi-wooded area.	Low	Low	Negligible
16	Cottage and Pottery Studio by Old Bridge, Invermoriston – Category C	1-5	4.10km	The site is located between the A82 and the River Moriston and surrounded by mature trees.	Low	Negligible	Neutral
17	Gazebo (in policies of Invermoriston	1-5	4.28km	The site sits on a terrace on the riverbank surrounded by mature trees	Medium	Low	Minor

Site Number	Site Name	Number of Theoretically Visible Turbines	Distance to Nearest Turbine	Other Factors Affecting Visibility	Relative Sensitivity	Magnitude of Setting Impact	Level of Effect
	House), Invermoriston – Category B						
19	Church of Scotland, Invermoriston – Category B	1-5	3.80km	The site sits on a small terrace immediately above the A887 and is surrounded by large mature trees.	Low	Negligible	Neutral
20	Burial Ground and two pairs of gate piers – Category B	1-5	4.20km	The outer gate piers are located adjacent to the A82. The burial ground has mature trees within it.	Low	Low	Negligible
21	Old Bridge, Invermoriston – Category B	Blades of 3 turbines visible from LVIA viewpoint 2	4.12km	Surrounded by mature trees.	Low	Negligible	Negligible
22	Road bridge over River Moriston, Invermoriston – Category B	1-5	4.17km	Tree-lined riverbanks either side of the bridge.	Low	Negligible	Neutral
23	Loch Ashlaich, shooting box and bothy – Category C	1-5	2.02km	The site sits within a topographical bowl in an extremely remote location.	Low	Low	Negligible
25	Urquhart Castle	0 visible from Urquhart Castle itself; between 1 and 8 turbines tips visible from LVIA viewpoints 4, 8 and 17.	14.03km	Situated on a promontory on the northern shore of Loch Ness with sharply rising ground to the west.	High	Low	Minor

### **Levishie Cottage, Fort and Earthwork 1050m NE of (Site 2)**

- 7.9.4 The Scheduled fort and earthwork (Site 2), approximately 1km to the northeast of Levishie Cottage, comprises a fort measuring about 35m N-S by 20m, together with a stretch of linear earthwork to the northeast, is located 1.19km to the southeast of the nearest proposed turbine. The fort occupies a slight terrace on a south-facing slope overlooking Glen Moriston with extensive views of Loch Ness to the southeast through to the southwest end of the Glen. There is a rising hillside, comprised of Carn an Tuairneir, Carn Mor and Sgor Gaoithe, circling behind the fort from the northwest round to the northeast. Turbines are visible in the far distance to the southwest, on the opposite side of the Glen, and the access track to the Operational Development is also visible to the southwest in the mid-ground. The fort has been positioned to be a prominent feature in the local landscape, with good natural defences and views of the surrounding landscape. As such, the fort was clearly built with its vertical and visual planes in mind and is considered to be of high relative sensitivity to change.
- 7.9.5 The tips of two turbines of the Operational Development are visible from the fort. Figures 7.4a and 7.5 provide wirelines from the fort indicating the extreme tips of three turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible from the fort. The ZTV indicates that these would largely only be visible from the southern central portion of the fort and that no turbines would be visible from the northern portion. The visibility of the proposed turbines would be restricted due to the rising land between the fort and the Proposed Development. Given the limited number and proportion of turbines visible from the fort, the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to understand and appreciate the vertical location of the hill fort in the landscape, nor would it impede the ability of the viewer to understand its defensive advantages. The near, and key, views from the hillfort to the west, south and east would be unchanged. As such there is judged to be a negligible magnitude of setting impact from the Proposed Development. Overall, there is considered to be a **minor** level of effect, which is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

### **Dell Farm, Burial Mounds 350m NE of (Site 3)**

- 7.9.6 A group of Scheduled burial mounds (Site 3), approximately 350m northeast of Dell Farm on the east side of Loch Ness, are located 9.28km to the southeast of the nearest proposed turbine. They are located on a relatively level plateau of improved pasture between the River Fechlin and the Allt an Loin. They comprise at least three round and four oblong or trapezoidal burial mounds, at least five small round cairns, and small enclosures and small banks dating to the first millennium AD. The burial mounds sit in a natural low point in the landscape and may have been visible to other structures in the immediate vicinity. The burial mounds have a high sensitivity to changes within their immediate environment as defined by the watercourses which surround them, but they are less sensitive, of medium relative sensitivity, to change in the wider landscape.
- 7.9.7 The ZTV indicates that between one and five of the Proposed Development turbines will be visible from the mounds but only from the extreme northeast corner of the Scheduled area with no visibility from the rest of the asset. The majority of turbines which would be screened by low hills to the northwest and higher hills in the distance. As the turbines would be located beyond what is understandable as the setting of the mounds, their immediate environment defined by the two watercourses, the magnitude of impact would be negligible, and the overall level of effect would be **negligible**. This level of effect is not considered significant in EIA terms.

### **Whitebridge, old bridge over River Foyers (Site 9)**

- 7.9.8 The old bridge at Whitebridge (Site 9) is a Category A Listed high single span humpback bridge built by General Wade in 1732. It spans the River Foyers in a picturesque setting, with dense mature trees lining the riverbanks either side of the bridge. These trees limit views towards the Proposed Development. Although no longer used for vehicular traffic, the bridge owes its location in the landscape to functional considerations associated with making the river crossing and, as such, the elements of setting that contribute to an understanding of it are its relationship to the predecessor to the B862, of which it formed part, and the River Foyers, over which it carried the road. On this basis, it is judged to be of low sensitivity to changes to its wider landscape setting.

The Proposed Development is located 10.2km northwest of the bridge. The ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines will be visible from the bridge. The bridge is currently surrounded by mature trees, which will likely obscure these views completely. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible. This would result in a **neutral** effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

#### **Torgoyle Bridge (Site 12)**

7.9.9 Torgoyle Bridge (Site 12) is a Category A Listed large, three span bridge that was built by Joseph Mitchell in 1823 to replace an earlier Thomas Telford bridge destroyed by flooding in 1818. It spans the River Moriston in a picturesque setting, with dense mature trees lining the riverbanks near the bridge. These trees limit views to the northeast and towards the Proposed Development. The bridge owes its location in the landscape to functional considerations associated with making the river crossing and, as such, the elements of setting that contribute to an understanding of it are its relationship to the A887, of which it forms part, and the River Moriston, over which it carries the road. On this basis, it is judged to be of low sensitivity to changes to its wider landscape setting.

7.9.10 The nearest Proposed Development turbine is located 10.76km northeast of the bridge. The ZTV indicates that between 6 and 15 turbines will be visible from the bridge though eight are theoretically visible, as per the ZTV, from the majority of the bridge. However, the mature trees along the northeast bank of the River Moriston are likely to obscure these views. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible and the overall effect **neutral**. This is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **'Barracks' and Servants' Tunnel to Former Mansion, Invermoriston (Site 15)**

7.9.11 The 'barracks', or servants' quarters, and servants' tunnel (Site 15), Listed Category B, located within the grounds of Invermoriston House comprises a single storey building over a basement, constructed in about 1810, together with a sunken forecourt and servants' tunnel that passes under the driveway. The basement fronts the sunken forecourt and former entrances to the rear basement service area of an earlier Invermoriston House. The most important setting elements for these structures is how they relate to the house they were built to service. That link has been broken; the earlier Invermoriston House, of various builds, has now been demolished. The present house dates from 1956. Whilst the barracks and tunnel are sensitive to changes in their immediate environment, they are of low sensitivity to changes in the wider landscape.

7.9.12 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.61km to the northwest of the asset. While the ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines will be visible from the barracks and tunnel, it is likely that the mature trees that surround the grounds of Invermoriston House will obscure these views. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be low and the overall effect **negligible**, which is not significant in EIA terms.

#### **Cottage and Pottery Studio by Old Bridge, Invermoriston (Site 16)**

7.9.13 The cottage and studio extension comprising the old smithy (Site 16) are Category C Listed Buildings constructed in the early 19th century. They are situated between the River Moriston and the A82, adjacent to the Old Bridge (Site 21) and are surrounded by mature trees. The most important setting elements for these structures is how they relate to each other, the Old Bridge, and the road. The smithy owes its location in the landscape to functional and economic considerations; the nearby water for use in the forge, and the proximity of the road and the travellers who passed along it. On this basis, they are judged to be of low sensitivity to changes in the wider landscape setting.

7.9.14 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.10km northwest of the old smithy. While the ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines would be visible from the cottage and studio, the mature trees on the bank of the River Moriston are likely to obscure these views completely. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible. This will result in a **negligible** effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

#### **Gazebo, Invermoriston (Site 17)**

7.9.15 The Category B Listed gazebo (Site 17) within the policies of Invermoriston House sits on a small, rocky ledge on the edge of the River Moriston's bank with a steep drop to the water. Built in the early-19th century and influenced by the Romantic era and notions of the sublime, the nine-sided

single storey gazebo was situated to overlook one of the waterfalls on the river with a view towards the Old Bridge (Site 21) and beyond. The gazebo was deliberately positioned in such a way to allow its visitors to experience the awe and danger of the river and waterfall, and the beauty of the river setting. As such, the gazebo has a high relative sensitivity to changes within its immediate designed setting, which lessens to medium sensitivity beyond these defined features.

- 7.9.16 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.28km northwest of the gazebo; turbine tips from the Operational Development are visible. The ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines from the Proposed Development would be visible from the gazebo. As the turbines would be located beyond what is understandable as the setting of the gazebo, the magnitude of impact would be low and the overall level of effect **minor**. This level of effect is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **Church of Scotland (Site 19)**

- 7.9.17 The Category Listed B Church of Scotland, Invermoriston (Site 19), was constructed in 1913 replacing an earlier building. It sits on a small terrace immediately above the A887, which lies to the west-southwest. The church is unused and becoming derelict. It is surrounded by large mature trees on all sides, although there is an opening to the south-southeast where the church is approached from the access road leading from the A887. The access road continues uphill to the Old Manse. The trees are beginning to encroach on the church, and vegetation is growing from the fabric of the building. The entrance faces southwest towards the River Moriston. The most important element of setting for the church is how it relates to the associated manse and surrounding village. It is considered to be sensitive to changes within these immediate environs, although the mature trees surrounding it have helped to divorce it from those as well, but of low sensitivity to changes in the wider landscape.

- 7.9.18 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 3.80km northwest of the church. The ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines will be visible from the church. It is, however, almost surrounded by large mature trees which will likely obscure these views completely. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible. This would result in a **neutral** effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

#### **Burial Ground and Gate Piers, Invermoriston (Site 20)**

- 7.9.19 The burial ground and gate piers at Invermoriston (Site 20), a Category B Listed Building, is situated on the south side of the A82 near the centre of the village. It is most likely the site of an earlier church. The square, rubble-walled burial ground sits in an undulating grass field with spaced, mature trees within its boundary wall which provide some screening to the northwest and thus towards the Proposed Development. The entrance to the burial ground is flanked by simple monolithic piers; three turbines from the Operational Development are visible down to the hub from this gate. A tree-lined driveway leads to the main road where a similar pair of simple monolith gate piers flank the entrance. The most important elements of setting for a burial ground are how it relates to an associated church and other offices. In this case, that link has been weakened with the original church no longer being extant, and the Church of Scotland (Site 19), 420m to the northwest, not being built until 1913, quite some time after the inception of the burial ground. The burial ground is sensitive to changes in its immediate environs that would affect its rural character but is of low sensitivity to changes in the wider landscape.

- 7.9.20 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.20km northwest of the burial ground and, as previously noted, three turbines from the Operational Development are visible down to the hub. The ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines of the Proposed Development will be visible from the asset. As the turbines will be located beyond the elements of setting which directly contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the burial ground, the magnitude of impact would be low. This would result in a **negligible** level of effect, which is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **Old Bridge, Invermoriston (Site 21)**

- 7.9.21 The Old Bridge at Invermoriston (Site 21) is a Category B Listed two span bridge that spans the River Moriston in a picturesque setting with mature trees lining the riverbanks nearby. Although commonly believed to have been built by Thomas Telford, and undoubtedly incorporated into the

road built by Telford in 1808-11, the bridge appears structurally to be of mid-18th century date. Although no longer used for vehicular traffic, the bridge owes its location in the landscape to functional considerations associated with making the river crossing and, as such, the elements of setting that contribute to an understanding of it are its relationship to the predecessor to the A82, of which it formed part, and the River Moriston, over which it carried the road. On this basis, it is judged to be of low sensitivity to changes to its wider landscape setting.

- 7.9.22 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.12km northwest of the bridge, with the ZTV indicating that between one and five turbines would be visible from the bridge. A wireline from LVIA Viewpoint 2 (Figure 8.10.3) shows that the blades of three Proposed Development turbines would be visible, together with the blade tips of three Operational Development turbines. However, the photomontage from LVIA Viewpoint 2 (Figure 8.10.4) shows that the mature trees along the northwest bank of the river obscure the views of the Operational Development. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible and the overall effect **negligible**. This is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **Road Bridge Over River Moriston (Site 22)**

- 7.9.23 The Invermoriston road bridge (Site 22) is a Category B Listed single span concrete bridge constructed in 1933 to replace the Old Bridge (Site 21). It spans the River Moriston close to the Old Bridge and enjoys the same picturesque setting. The bridge owes its location in the landscape to functional considerations associated with making the river crossing and, as such, the elements of setting that contribute to an understanding of it are its relationship to the A82, of which it forms part, and the River Moriston, over which it carries the road. On this basis, it is judged to be of low sensitivity to changes to its wider landscape setting.

- 7.9.24 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 4.17km northwest of the bridge. While the ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines would be visible from the bridge, the mature trees along the northwest riverbank are likely to obscure these views. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be negligible and the overall effect **neutral**. This is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **Shooting Box and Bothy, Loch Ashlaich (Site 23)**

- 7.9.25 Loch Ashlaich shooting box and bothy (Site 23) are Category C Listed wooden structures situated at the head of the River Coiltie. The shooting box sits on a small island in the loch, while the bothy is located on the shore. Both were built for the 7th Earl of Seafield, along with a since removed boat house, coal shed and pier. The Earl resided in the shooting box for two weeks every September until his death in 1881. The buildings sit in a basin within the landscape with the highest hills arcing round from the southeast to the southwest with both buildings facing approximately northwest, towards a gap in the hills. The most important elements of setting for the buildings are their remoteness and views out to the west, which would have supported sporting opportunities, and association with each other. The association with the other buildings has been partially broken with the removal of the boat house, coal shed and pier. The shooting box and bothy are sensitive to changes in their immediate environs that would affect their sense of remoteness, and in the wider landscape to the west that would interrupt the views in this direction. However, the lengthy walk to the loch plays more of a role in giving a sense of remoteness than the immediate surroundings of rolling hills. The scenic aspect enjoyed by the location does not include views towards the Proposed Development. The assets relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is judged to be low.

- 7.9.26 The nearest Proposed Development turbine would be located 2.02km south to southwest of Loch Ashlaich. The ZTV indicates that between one and five turbines will be visible from the loch. The hills immediately to the southeast round to southwest of the loch will provide screening for the majority of the Proposed Development and, as such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be low and the overall effect **negligible**. This is not considered significant in EIA terms.

#### **Urquhart Castle (Site 25)**

- 7.9.27 Urquhart Castle (Site 25) is a Scheduled Monument comprising the remains of a complex medieval castle situated on a promontory on the northern shore of Loch Ness 13.82km northeast of the Proposed Development. The north end of the castle is marked by a 16<sup>th</sup> century tower which,



although lacking much of its south side, still rises to its full height. Other buildings in the castle, such as the great hall and kitchens, chapel, gatehouse, smithy, and dovecot, are not so well preserved. The castle will have been located for strategic and defensive purposes, and its location on the promontory contributes to an understanding and appreciation of it as such. Views of the castle also would have been important in conveying the power of the inhabitants and their control over the surrounding loch and its associated communication corridor. Given its position on the bank of Loch Ness and its deliberate siting to have strategic views over this routeway and to provide a defensive position above it; the castle is considered to be of high sensitivity to changes to its setting.

- 7.9.28 The castle and much of the area immediately around it lies outwith the ZTV and no views of the Proposed Development would be possible from the castle itself. Nor would there be any views of the castle which would include the turbines in close proximity to the castle. There is potential for views of the castle which would also include the Proposed Development from the southern/eastern side of the loch and from limited locations from the north of the castle and from Loch Ness itself.
- 7.9.29 LVIA Viewpoint 4 (Figures 8.12.3 & 8.12.4), from Achtuie Road near Creag Nay, indicates the tips of seven turbines would be visible in a view towards the Proposed Development which includes the castle with visibility restricted due to rising land between the viewpoint and the Proposed Development.
- 7.9.30 LVIA Viewpoint 8 (Figures 8.16.3 & 8.16.4) was taken from the Lochside picnic layby on the B852 and shows views across the loch towards the castle which also include the Proposed Development. This visualisation indicates, in addition to turbines from the Operational Development, the extreme tips of two turbines and one blade of another would be visible; that visibility would be restricted by rising land from the loch side to the Proposed Development.
- 7.9.31 LVIA Viewpoint 17 (Figures 8.25.3 & 8.25.4) on the B862 south of Dores, which indicates eight turbines would be visible. Two turbines would be visible at hub height and the rest would be visible only as blade tips. Visibility is restricted by rising land.
- 7.9.32 A wireline modelled to show a view of the castle from the upper deck of the ‘Jacobite Warrior’ cruise boat on Loch Ness (Figures 7.6 & 7.7) indicate that, in addition to the extreme tips of three turbines from the Operational Development, the extreme tip of one turbine from the Proposed Development would be visible; overall visibility would be restricted by rising ground.
- 7.9.33 Given the limited number and proportion of turbines visible from the viewpoints, the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to understand and appreciate the location of the castle in the landscape, nor would it impede the ability of the viewer to understand the strategic and defensive advantages of that location. In all cases turbines would be offset from the castle and not seen directly behind it. The turbines would clearly be located beyond the area of Loch Ness to which the castle’s setting relates. As such, the magnitude of impact is judged to be low and the overall effect **minor**. This is not considered Significant in EIA terms.

### ***Decommissioning***

- 7.9.34 The Applicant is seeking a 50 year consented life for the Proposed Development. In the event of decommissioning, or replacement of turbines, it is anticipated that the levels of effect would be similar but of a lesser level than those predicted during construction. Decommissioning would be undertaken in line with best practice processes and methods at that time and will be managed through an agreed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.

## **7.10 Additional Mitigation and Enhancement**

- 7.10.1 Direct construction effects have been scoped out of this assessment and as such no mitigation for construction effects is deemed necessary. No significant operational setting effects have been identified, setting effects will range from neutral to minor, on this basis no additional mitigation or enhancement measures, beyond those embedded in the design, are deemed necessary.

## 7.11 Residual Effects

### **Construction**

7.11.1 No significant residual impacts are anticipated.

### **Operation**

7.11.2 The predicted residual impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets will be the same as assessed for the operational and cumulative effects.

7.11.3 No significant residual operational effects are anticipated.

### **Decommissioning**

7.11.4 No significant residual effects are anticipated.

## 7.12 Cumulative Assessment

7.12.1 With regard to the likely significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets, the assessment considers operational, consented and within-planning wind farm developments at distances up to 45 km from the Proposed Development. The location of cumulative developments is shown on Figure 8.7.2. Developments at the scoping stage are not considered. A full list of the cumulative developments is included in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual).

7.12.2 All the heritage assets which have intervisibility with the Proposed Development have settings which are focused on Loch Ness and its associated glen, with the exception of Torgoyle Bridge whose setting relates to the River Moriston and the glen within which it sits. Whilst there is potential for operational, consented and within-planning developments to also be seen from these assets, they will clearly be located outwith these valley settings and in most cases will not appear in the same view as the Proposed Development. On this basis no significant cumulative effects are expected on the majority of the assets.

7.12.3 Given the High sensitivity of Urquhart Castle, consideration is given to the potential cumulative effects arising from the addition of the Proposed Development to the Operational Bhlaraidh Wind Farm. Neither the Proposed Development nor the Operational Development are visible from Urquhart Castle itself. Operational Development turbines are, and Proposed Development turbines would be, visible in views of Urquhart Castle from Loch Ness and its opposite shore. LVIA Viewpoints 8 and 17 indicated that the Proposed Development would slightly increase the spread of turbine tips seen beyond the hills to the southwest of the castle. However, turbines will all be offset from the castle, largely only visible as tips and clearly located beyond the glen setting of castle. As such, the additive and in combination impact of the Proposed and Operational Development together is considered to be Low and the cumulative effect **minor** and not significant.

7.12.4 Similarly, the addition of the Proposed Development to the Operational Development when considered from the Scheduled Levishe Cottage, fort (Site 2) would not materially increase the impact upon the asset's setting. Only extreme tips of turbine blades would be visible from select areas within the monument. As such, the additive and in combination impact of the Proposed and Operational Development together is considered to be Low and the cumulative effect **minor** and not significant.

## 7.13 Summary

7.13.1 This chapter assesses the potential for settings effects on heritage assets resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development. Assessment for the potential for direct effects upon archaeological remains during the construction phase have been scoped out with the agreement of The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (THC HET).

7.13.2 Potential operational effects on settings of designated heritage assets within the 5km and 10km Study Areas, and Urquhart Castle within 15km of the Proposed Development, have been considered

in detail as part of this assessment. **Minor** and no significant adverse effects have been predicted upon the setting of Levishe Cottage fort (Site 2), Dell Farm burial mounds (Site 3), Gazebo, Invermoriston (Site 17) and Urquhart Castle (Site 25). **Negligible** and not significant effects have been predicted upon the setting of the barracks and servant's tunnel, Invermoriston (Site 15); Burial Ground, Invermoriston (Site 20); and the shooting box and bothy, Loch Ashlaich (Site 23). **Neutral** and not significant effects have been predicted upon the setting of the old bridge at Whitebridge (Site 9); Torgoyle Bridge (Site 12); the Cottage and Pottery Studio, Invermoriston (Site 16); Church of Scotland, Invermoriston (Site 19); Old Bridge, Invermoriston (Site 21); and the road bridge, Invermoriston (Site 22).

- 7.13.3 The possibility of cumulative effects has been considered and assessed and no significant cumulative effects have been identified.

**Table 7.9 - Summary of Effects**

Description of Effect	Significance of Likely Effect		Mitigation Measure	Significance of Residual Effect	
	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse		Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Construction					
No effects expected					
Operation					
Effects on the settings of designated assets (Sites 2, 3, 9, 12, 15-17, 19-23 & 25).	Neutral to minor level effects and not significant.	Adverse	N/A	Neutral to minor level effects and not significant.	Adverse
Decommissioning					
No effects expected					

**Table 7.10 – Summary of Cumulative Effects**

Receptor	Effect	Cumulative Developments	Significance of Cumulative Effect	
			Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork (Site 2)	Settings Effect	Proposed Development and Operational Bhlaraidh	Minor and not significant.	Adverse
Urquhart Castle (Site 25)	Settings Effect	Proposed Development and Operational Bhlaraidh	Minor and not significant.	Adverse

## 7.14 References

- CIfA (2014). *Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. Published December 2014. Available at: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf). Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- CIfA (2017). *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. Published December 2014. Updated January 2017. Available at: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_3.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf). Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2019a) '*Historic Environment Policy for Scotland* 'HEPS'. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2019b) *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance*. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2019c). *Scotland's Listed Buildings*. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=34c90cb9-5ff3-45c3-8bc3-a58400fcbc44>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- Historic Environment Scotland, (2020). *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- ICOMOS (2005). *Xi'an Declaration*. Available at: <https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/xian-declaration.pdf>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- ICOMOS. (2013). Burra Charter. Available at: <https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>. Accessed on: 1 December 2020.
- Scottish Government (2006). *Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2006/17/contents>.
- Scottish Government (2011). *Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents/enacted>.
- Scottish Government (2011), PAN 2/2011 *Archaeology and Planning*, available at: <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/355385/0120020.pdf>.
- Scottish Government (2014). *Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2014/19/contents/enacted>.
- Scottish Government (2017). *Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/102/contents/made>

Scottish Government (2020), *Scottish Planning Policy*, available at:

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-planning-policy/pages/7/>

Scottish Natural Heritage (2012). *Assessing the Cumulative Impact Of Onshore Wind Energy Developments* Available at: [https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2017-](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2017-09/Guidance%20note%20%20-%20Assessing%20the%20cumulative%20impact%20of%20onshore%20wind%20energy%20developments.pdf)

[09/Guidance%20note%20%20-](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2017-09/Guidance%20note%20%20-%20Assessing%20the%20cumulative%20impact%20of%20onshore%20wind%20energy%20developments.pdf)

[%20Assessing%20the%20cumulative%20impact%20of%20onshore%20wind%20energy%20developments.pdf](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2017-09/Guidance%20note%20%20-%20Assessing%20the%20cumulative%20impact%20of%20onshore%20wind%20energy%20developments.pdf).

Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (2018). *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5*. Available at: [https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf)

[05/Publication%202018%20-](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf)

[%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf](https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf).

SSE Renewables 2012. *Bhlairaidh Wind Farm Volume 2 Environmental Statement*. Available at:

[https://librarylink.highland.gov.uk/LLFiles/290020/full\\_290020.pdf](https://librarylink.highland.gov.uk/LLFiles/290020/full_290020.pdf)

The Highland Council 2012. *Highland-wide Local Development Plan*. The Highland Council, Inverness.

The Highland Council 2013. *Supplementary Guidance: Historic Environment Strategy*. The Highland Council, Inverness.

UK Government (1979). *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended)*.

Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>.

UK Government (1997) *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended)*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents>.