

CONTENTS

8.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	8-3
8.1	Executive Summary	8-3
8.2	Introduction	8-3
8.3	Scope of Appraisal	8-3
8.4	Consultation	8-4
8.5	Methodology	8-5
8.6	Baseline Conditions	8-6
8.7	Potential Impacts	8-7
8.8	Mitigation	8-8
8.9	Summary	8-8

Figures

Figure 8.1: Cultural Heritage Assets

Appendix

Appendix 8.1: Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Sites

Rev							
	Prepared By		Checked By		Approved By		Date of Issue
0.1.0	CD		TW				05.09.2022
0.2.0	CD		TW				04.10.2022

8. CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 Executive Summary

8.1.1 This Chapter provides the results of an assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets and archaeological features.

8.1.2 Within a 3 km study area a total of three designated assets were identified, consisting of two scheduled monuments and one listed building. Two non-designated assets were identified within a 100 m buffer (100 m either side) of the Proposed Development, one of local and one of regional significance. The potential for unidentified archaeological remains is considered to be low to insignificant.

8.1.3 Mitigation to protect the archaeological record is recommended for one site during the construction phase.

8.2 Introduction

8.2.1 This Chapter addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the Cultural Heritage of the immediate area, which is taken to include:

- Designated assets: Scheduled Monuments (SMs), listed buildings, inventory gardens, designed landscapes and inventory battlefields; and
- Non-designated assets: recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites and areas of archaeological, historical or cultural significance within the study area, previously unevaluated policies and designed landscapes; and other elements of Cultural Heritage.

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

8.2.3 The assessment has been undertaken by field archaeologist and cultural heritage consultant Catherine Dagg who is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

8.3 Scope of Appraisal

8.3.1 A study area appropriate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development is shown on **Figure 8.1** and set out below, and the assessment considers cultural heritage features within this area. The study area is defined as the extent to which the Proposed Development has the potential to give rise to significant impacts.

Inner Study Area: direct impacts

8.3.2 The inner study area to locate and define archaeological features with the potential for direct impacts was formed by the location of the Proposed Development infrastructure and set as a broad corridor up to 100 m either side of the centreline of the OHL and UGC elements of the Proposed Development.

Outer Study Area: Indirect Impacts

8.3.3 All sites identified with statutory protection in the broad development area of the scheme were considered for potential indirect, visual impacts during the construction phase. The outer study area for indirect impacts was 3 km from the OHL elements of the Proposed Development. Following reinstatement, UGC sections of the Proposed Development would have negligible indirect impacts on sites with statutory protection, and are not included in the outer study area.

8.4 Consultation

8.4.1 **Table 8-1** sets out the comments received from consultees in relation to cultural heritage and the actions taken to address them within this appraisal.

Table 8-1: Consultee Responses

Consultee	Response	Comment
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	<p>HES did not identify any potential significant effects from Route Option 1. Scheduled monuments and category A listed buildings in the area surrounding the proposed OHL include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM 4567) Dundreggan Farm, note 35m SW of (SM 11875) Caledonian Canal (SM 6497) Glenmoriston, Torgoyle Bridge over River Moriston (LB 14996) 	<p>Noted. The Proposed Route has since been identified as Route Option 1, which has comparable constraints with Route Option 1A in relation to Cultural Heritage. The noted designated sites have been taken into account during the selection of alignment options and EA appraisal.</p>
	<p>Option 1 is now the preferred route which, as noted above, HES have suggested previously is unlikely to have significant effects for its interests and this continues to be the case. One possible alignment diversion (Diversion 1) would take the new OHL closer to Dundreggan Farm, motte (SM 11875) by around 200 m or so. However, Diversion 1 would still be more than 500 m from the scheduled monument and the proposed OHL on this route would be unlikely to have significant impacts on the asset's setting. Consequently, HES do not have any further detailed comment to make on the diversion options because none are likely to have significant impacts for our interests.</p>	<p>Noted. The Proposed Development makes partial use of Diversion Option 1 in the area northwest of Bhlaraidh but passes the Dundreggan Farm, motte on Alignment Option 1, on the far side of the River Moriston.</p>
	<p>Direct impacts on assets within HES' remit are unlikely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely that impacts on the setting of designated assets within HES' remit in the surrounding area will be significant. Potential for impacts on undesignated assets should be discussed with Local Authority historic environment advisors. <p>Assessment of impact on historic environment, including impacts on the setting of assets in the surrounding area to confirm the potential effects and determine effects on undesignated assets to be submitted with the application.</p>	<p>Noted. Likely impacts on cultural heritage interests will be explored as part of the EA, with Screening consultations carried out with the local planning authority and HES.</p>
THC	<p>THC's Historic Environment Team have stated that they are satisfied that there will be no potential significant effects from the Preferred Route.</p> <p>The non-designated assets identified within the Preferred Route can mostly be avoided by mitigation. Specific mitigation required is likely to include monitoring (and reinstatement where possible) of any historic banks and dykes where impacts cannot be</p>	<p>Noted. Appropriate mitigation for non-designated assets along the Proposed Development are set out within the EA. Monitoring of groundworks will be carried out at appropriate points along the alignment where there is</p>

Consultee	Response	Comment
	avoided. It is not considered that monitoring of groundworks would be required along the majority of the route as the potential for buried remains to survive is considered to be low.	greater potential for buried remains to survive.

8.5 Methodology

Desk-Based Evaluation

8.5.1 The desk-based evaluation consisted of all databases available online including:

- Highland Historic Environment Record;
- CANMORE database of Historic Environment Scotland;
- Census Returns for the years 1841-1901;
- British Newspaper Archive; and
- Historical Ordnance Survey maps and pre-Ordnance Survey maps held in the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland.

8.5.2 Due to COVID restrictions, more detailed archive material was not accessible. However, it is unlikely that further archival research would have altered the conclusions of this evaluation.

Field survey

8.5.3 The section of the Proposed Development located north of the A887 lies within the survey area for the Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Environmental Statement (HER Ref. EHG4495) and Bhlaraidh Extension Wind Farm Environmental Statement¹ and was not revisited for this evaluation. No archaeological features were located within the corridor of the Proposed Development in the previous survey.

8.5.4 The section of the Proposed Development located south of the A887 was subjected to a walkover survey carried out in July 2020. All archaeological features within a broad corridor of all route options considered at Stage 2 were noted. For the most part, these have since been scoped out as they are outwith the study area for the Proposed Development.

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

Sensitivity / Importance

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

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

¹ Available at: <https://her.highland.gov.uk/Event/EHG4495> (last accessed 03/10/22)

a well-preserved relict, archaeological or historical landscape, or bearing historical or cultural associations, would fall into this category.

Magnitude of Direct Impact

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

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

Significance of Direct Impact

8.5.8 The predicted significance of impact is determined by consideration of a Site's importance in conjunction with the magnitude of impact predicted on it. **Table 8-2** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of a direct impact. An effect of Moderate or Major is considered to be significant.

Table 8-2: Significance of Effect

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

8.6 Baseline Conditions

Designated Sites

8.6.1 Two Scheduled Monuments and one listed building are located within the 3 km indirect impacts study area of the Proposed Development (see **Figure 8.1**) and the potential for indirect, visual impact is considered to be low.

8.6.2 Two non-designated sites are located within 100 m of the Proposed Development and the potential for direct impact is considered to be low.

Scheduled Monuments

SM4567 Levishe Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050 m NE of

8.6.3 Although this monument has been listed as a small hill fort, presumably dating to the Iron Age, doubt has been cast on this interpretation due to its small size, lack of structure and lack of associated contemporary settlement in the vicinity. However, it is notable that the site commands excellent views in both directions along Glen Moriston and it is fairly certain that it was located with this consideration, possibly for defensive purposes. Any modern development which crosses these lines of sight should therefore be considered to have a negative impact on the setting of the monument. However, it should be noted that extensive coniferous plantations on

both sides of the glen have altered the setting and the potential lines of sight to the extent that the latter cannot now be established with certainty.

SM11875 Dundreggan farm, motte, 35 m SW of

- 8.6.4 The monument is now almost entirely devoid of any elements of its original setting, with 19th century farm buildings to the north and modern developments to the east and west, including a large car parking area associated with a visitor centre. As a Designated Site of national significance, it would have a high sensitivity to changes in its setting, however, its present setting is so altered from its original state its sensitivity is considerably lower.

Listed Buildings

LB14996 Glenmoriston, Torgyle Bridge over River Moriston

- 8.6.5 Built in 1808-1811 by Thomas Telford, this bridge now carries traffic on the A887 road. Although Designated for its historical interest, the structure is functional and associated with transport and communication with no consideration of the aesthetic of its setting or requirement for lines of sight or vistas. As such, it has to be concluded that it has a lower sensitivity to visual impact.

Non-Designated sites

Site 1: Dyke at NH 36995 16175, part of recorded site MHG22910 Glenmoriston, Enclosure

- 8.6.6 Within the coniferous plantation are the uncertain remains of a section of what was originally a large irregularly shaped enclosure, measuring 1 km east-west and rising 600 m from the River Moriston. This structure is noted on early mapping and is recorded on the Highland Historic Environment Record as MHG22910. Its function is unclear, given the lack of potential for cultivation at this location

- 8.6.7 This feature is considered to be a minor feature of local interest

Site 2: Bridge at NH 32397 13542, not previously recorded

- 8.6.8 This attractive stone bridge, of probable mid-19th century date, originally carried the public road to Inverwick farm, but is now bypassed by the recently constructed access road. It remains as a monument to the 19th century farming landscape and although a minor feature could be considered to be of regional interest.

Unknown archaeological sites

- 8.6.9 The potential for unknown archaeological sites, unidentifiable during field survey, within the study area is considered to be very low, given the steep nature of the landscape and limited potential for settlement and agriculture. Damage from extensive coniferous planting is likely to have completely removed minor features such as enclosure boundary dykes or banks.

8.7 Potential Impacts

Direct Impacts

- 8.7.1 There would be no direct impacts on Designated sites. Potential direct impact on non-designated sites are as follows:

- Site 1: Glenmoriston Enclosure: One proposed pole location, Pole 42, is set almost directly on the archaeological feature. A working corridor along the route of the Proposed Development would effectively remove any above ground structure for the full width of the corridor.

The significance of this potential impact is considered to be **Minor**. The feature is of Local interest, and the magnitude of the impact would be Low to Imperceptible.

- Site 2: Inverwick bridge: Two poles, 108 and 109, are placed either side of the stream immediately south of the bridge. Use by construction traffic may weaken the structure.

The significance of this potential impact is considered to be **Minor**. The feature is of Local interest, and the magnitude of the impact would be Medium to Low.

Indirect Impacts

8.7.2 Indirect, visual impacts on all three Designated sites are predicted to be minimal and of **Minor** significance.

SM4567 Levishe Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050 m NE of

8.7.3 At its closest point (3 km west of this monument) the Proposed Development is for the most part screened from view by topography or reduced to a very narrow arc of visibility as it recedes westwards along the valley bottom.

SM11875 Dundreggan farm, motte, 35 m SW of

8.7.4 At a distance of just under 1 km from the Proposed Development at its nearest point, this monument is for the most part screened by bands of maturing deciduous trees. Any visible sections of the Proposed Development would be set against a background of rising ground and mature coniferous planting and would occupy the same visible area as the existing OHL.

LB14996 Glenmoriston, Torgyle Bridge over River Moriston

8.7.5 The bridge is almost entirely surrounded by mature deciduous trees, leaving attractive views up and downstream to distant hills but is unlikely to be exposed to any visibility of the proposed OHL.

8.8 Mitigation

8.8.1 Site 1 as it is a linear feature of over 400m in length of which only a small section may be affected. It is a local feature with low sensitivity which has already been affected by the surrounding plantation woodland. As such no mitigation is proposed.

8.8.2 Mitigation is recommended to protect the structure of the small bridge at Inverwick, Site 2, from accidental damage. It is recommended that the bridge not be used by construction traffic. Construction traffic should instead use the newer stone track bridge to the north. In addition to raising site workers awareness of the sensitivity of the asset through toolbox talks, signage noting its sensitivity and temporary fencing is also recommended.

8.9 Summary

8.9.1 An assessment has been made of the predicted significance of effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage interests. This assessment identified no significant residual effects, assuming application of the proposed mitigation measures noted above.