

7 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This chapter assesses the potential effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests (hereafter ‘heritage assets’) associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This chapter (and its associated Figures and Appendices) is not intended to be read as a standalone assessment and reference should be made to the introductory chapters of this EIA Report (**Volume 2, Chapters 1-5**).

7.1.2 The assessment has been carried out by Mhairi Hastie BSc (Hons) MSc FSA Scot MCIFA of CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA), a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), based in Musselburgh, East Lothian. Miss Hastie is a Senior Consultant with CFA and is a member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA). She has over 15 years’ full time experience of producing Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for renewable energy developments and electricity transmission infrastructure, and for other industrial and commercial development across the UK.

7.1.3 This chapter is supported by the following figures and technical appendices:

- Volume 3a: Figures
 - **Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area;** and
 - **Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area.**
- Volume 3b: Visualisations
 - **Figure 6.9a-d: Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower;**
 - **Figure 7.3a-d: Viewpoint CH1: Carloonan Dovecot;**
 - **Figure 7.4a-d: Viewpoint CH2: Inveraray Castle;**
 - **Figure 7.5a-b: Viewpoint CH3: Inverary Castle;**
 - **Figure 7.6a-d: Viewpoint CH4: Aray Bridge;**
 - **Figure 7.7a-d: Viewpoint CH5: Society School, Glen Aray;**
 - **Figure 7.8a-b: Viewpoint CH6: Kilmun Glen Aray, Chapel and Burial Ground;** and
 - **Figure 7.9a-b: Viewpoint CH7: Drimfern, Long Cairn.**
- Volume 4: Technical Appendices
 - **Technical Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area;**
 - **Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area;** and
 - **Technical Appendix 7.3: Photos.**

7.1.4 Figures and technical appendices are referenced in the text where relevant.

7.2 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Scope of the Assessment

7.2.1 This chapter considers direct and indirect effects on:

- Scheduled Monuments (SM) and other archaeological features;
- Listed Buildings (LB) and other buildings of historic or architectural importance;
- Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDL); and
- Conservation Areas (CA).

7.2.2 The chapter also assesses cumulative effects as arising from the addition of the Proposed Development to other cumulative developments. **Figure 15.1: Cumulative Developments, Volume 3a** illustrates the Proposed

Development along with other cumulative developments recorded as consented (under construction or not yet constructed), those in planning and those within the public domain, deemed reasonably foreseeable, within 15 km of the Proposed Development.

7.2.3 The assessment is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 4: Description of the Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2)**.

7.2.4 The scope of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses summarised in **Table 7-1** and the following guidelines/policies:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011).
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).
- National Planning Framework for Scotland 3 (NPF3) 2014.
- Draft National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4).
- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) 2014 (paragraphs 135-151).
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (published 2019, finalised amended 2020).
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2/2011).
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2015:
 - LDP 3 – Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of our Environment.
 - LDP 6 – Supporting the Sustainable Growth of Renewables.
 - LDP 9 – Development Setting, Layout and Design.
 - SG LDP ENV 15 – Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
 - SG LDP ENV (16A) – Development Impact on Listed Buildings.
 - SG LDP ENV 19 – Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
 - SG LDP ENV 20 – Development impact of Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 (Proposed Plan).
- Policy 15: Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment.
- Policy 16: Listed Buildings.
- Policy 17: Conservation Areas.
- Policy 19: Scheduled Monuments.
- Policy 20: Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
- Policy 21: Sites of Archaeological Importance.
- Standards and guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA, 2014; updated 2020).
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021).
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019)
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment (HES, 2016)
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH1) & HES, 2018)
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment (IEMA, 2021).
- UK Forestry Standard: The Governments Approach to Sustainable Forestry (Forestry Commission, 2017).
- UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2011).

¹ Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) has changed its name to NatureScot as of 24th August 2020.

- Forests and Historic Environment: Information and Advice (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2016).
- Scotland's Woodlands and the Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland, 2008).

Extent of the Study Area

7.2.5 Two Study Areas have been employed for the cultural heritage assessment:

- An Inner Study Area: the Study Area for consideration of potential direct impacts upon heritage assets, comprising a 200 m wide corridor (LOD) centred on the Proposed Alignment and a 200 m wide corridor (LOD) centred on the proposed access track routes. A gazetteer of heritage assets within the Inner Study Area is provided as **Technical Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 4)** and are shown on **Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**.
- An Outer Study Area: the Study Area for consideration of impacts affecting the setting of heritage assets, employs a 5 km Standard Tower Height (60 m) Bare-Earth Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) from the centre line of the Proposed Alignment. The 5 km Study Area has been agreed as being appropriate with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (see **Table 7-1**). Details on the methodology and parameters used to generate the ZTV are provided in **Chapter 6: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (EIAR Volume 2)**. The Proposed Development together with the Bare-Earth ZTV, and the locations of heritage assets within 5 km are shown on **Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**. A gazetteer of these heritage assets is provided as **Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4)**, which also provides a tabulated assessment of the predicted impacts on their settings.

Consultation Undertaken to Date

- 7.2.6 A summary of consultation responses received at the time of the writing that are relevant to this chapter are presented in **Table 7-1**. Further information can be found in **Technical Appendix 4.3: Consultation Register (EIAR Volume 4)**.
- 7.2.7 No response was received from West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS).

Table 7-1: Scoping Responses and Other Consultations of Relevance to Chapter 7

Organisation	Type of Consultation	Response	How response has been considered
HES	Pre-Scoping, April 2022	Content that the methodology proposed for the assessment is appropriate and that the proposed study areas are adequate.	Noted The methodology and Study Areas used for the assessment are set out in Section 7.2 .
		Content that the proposed visualisation viewpoints are acceptable and no additional viewpoints are recommended.	Noted Visualisations (photomontages, photo-wirelines and/or wirelines) are provided for each of these assets from locations agreed with HES (Figures 7.3-7.9, EIAR Volume 3b). A list of visualisations, along with details of their locations and visualisation type, is provided in Table 7-6 . These are referenced where applicable in Technical Appendix 7.2 (EIAR Volume 4) and in the assessment in Section 7.4 .
HES	Scoping Response, April 2022	Content that the scope and methodology proposed for the assessment as set out in the Scoping Report is appropriate.	Noted The methodology and Study Areas used for the assessment are set out in Section 7.2 .
Argyll and Bute Council	Scoping Response, June 2022	Welcome that additional baseline surveys would be undertaken in accordance with recognised methodology, and that the effects of the Proposed Development (direct indirect, and cumulative impacts) on heritage assets would be assessed and mitigation measures, where appropriate, would be proposed to prevent, reduce, or offset any likely significant effect identified. Noted that in respect of these matters the Planning Authority will defer to the views of HES.	Noted The methodology used for the assessment is set out in Section 7.2 .
ECU	Scoping Opinion, June 2022	Welcome that additional baseline surveys would be undertaken in accordance with recognised methodology, and that the effects of the Proposed Development (direct indirect, and cumulative impacts) on heritage assets would be assessed and mitigation measures, where appropriate, would be proposed to prevent, reduce, or offset any likely significant effect identified.	Noted The methodology used for the assessment is set out in Section 7.2 .

Effects Scoped Out

- 7.2.8 The Proposed Development would not have a fixed operational life as it is assumed to be operational for 50 years or more. Effects associated with the construction phase can be considered to be representative of the worst-case decommissioning effects and therefore decommissioning effects have been scoped out.
- 7.2.9 Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on World Heritage Sites and Inventory Historic Battlefields (BLT) have been scoped out. There are no assets with these designations within 5 km of the Proposed Development.

Data Collation

Desk Study

Inner Study Area

- 7.2.10 A detailed desk-based assessment was conducted for the Inner Study Area using a range of documentary, archival and bibliographic sources. Up-to-date information was obtained on the locations and extents of heritage assets with statutory protection and non-statutory designations within the Study Area. Sources consulted include:
- Argyll and Bute Council (ABC) Historic Environment Record (HER): a digital database extract for all asset within 5 km of the Proposed Development was obtained initially in August 2021, ahead of the field survey; updated data was then acquired in July 2022 and checked against the original data.
 - National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) Scotland online database (Canmore) (HES, 2021a²): checked for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
 - HES Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2021b³): provided up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and Historic Battlefields.
 - Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap; HES, 2021c⁴): for information on the historic land use character of the Inner Study Area:
 - National Library of Scotland Map Library: for Ordnance Survey maps (principally 1st and 2nd edition) and other historic maps;
 - Modern aerial photographic imagery available through Google Earth and Bing Maps; and
 - Relevant bibliographic references and on-line historic resources, consulted to provide background and historic information.
- 7.2.11 Details of the sources consulted during the desk-based assessment are provided in **Technical Appendix 7.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Outer Study Area

- 7.2.12 Up-to-date information was obtained from HES and ABC HER on statutory and non-statutory designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area.
- 7.2.13 The Standard Tower Height (60 m) Bare-Earth ZTV map generated for the Proposed Development was utilised to identify those designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area that would have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

Field Survey

- 7.2.14 A walk-over field survey was carried out for the whole of the Inner Study Area where the Proposed Development crosses areas of open moorland, rough and improved pasture, and woodland. Targeted field survey was carried out to inspect previously recorded heritage assets identified during the desk-based assessment that are now located in areas of commercial forestry, where access was possible.
- 7.2.15 The field survey was undertaken between 25-29 October 2021, 14-18 March 2022 and 13-14 June 2022, with the following aims:
- Assess the baseline condition of the known heritage assets identified by the desk-based assessment;

² HES (2021a) Historic Environment Scotland's National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore), available at: <http://pastmap.org.uk> [Accessed March 2022]

³ HES (2021b) Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> [Accessed March 2022]

⁴ HES (2021c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap), available at: <http://hlamap.org.uk> [Accessed March 2022]

- Identify any further features of cultural heritage interest not detected from the desk-based assessment that could be affected by the Proposed Development; and
- Identify areas with the potential to contain currently unrecorded buried archaeological remains.

7.2.16 No intrusive archaeological interventions have been carried out as part of this assessment.

7.2.17 The field survey was undertaken by a team of two competent professional archaeologists who hold current ClfA membership and sufficient experience of surveying. All data were captured electronically using a Spectra Geospatial SP20 Handheld GNSS with sub-metre accuracy. The baseline condition of identified assets was recorded on pro-forma monument recording sheets and by digital photography.

7.2.18 Site visits to assess the character and sensitivity of the setting of selected heritage assets in the Outer Study Area (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) were also undertaken between the 25-29 October 2021 and 14-18 March 2022. The site visits focused on those heritage assets with the most potential to receive significant effects on their settings (i.e., those closest to the Proposed Development and those considered, on preliminary analysis, to potentially be the most sensitive to change within their settings, including those identified by consultees as requiring assessment).

Cultural Heritage Viewpoints

7.2.19 Seven viewpoints (**Figures 7.3-7.9, EIAR Volume 3b**) were identified for designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, where the assets were considered to be potentially sensitive to changes to their settings arising as a result of the Proposed Development. Details on the locations and visualisations type of each viewpoint is provided in **Table 7-6**.

7.2.20 The heritage assets and viewpoint locations to be represented were agreed through consultation with HES (see **Table 7-1**) and from site visits. In addition, cross-reference is made to the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment (SLVIA) viewpoints (VPs) where appropriate (details of SLVIA VPs cross referenced within the following assessment are provided in **Table 7-6**).

Limitations and Assumptions

7.2.21 The desk-based assessment draws on the records in the ABC HER, provided in digital Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset acquired initially in August 2021 ahead of the field survey. It is assumed that the data provided was accurate and up to date at the time it was acquired. Updated data was acquired in July 2022 and checked against the original data; no discrepancies were identified.

7.2.22 The field survey did not include areas in current use as commercial forestry plantation. In such areas, ploughing and drainage, tree planting and subsequent root growth, and tree throw and felling activities are often such that previously unknown sites or features of archaeological and cultural heritage interest are not preserved intact and in undisturbed condition. Where sites or features were identified during the course of the desk-based assessment are now located in such commercial forestry plantations, access was sought to review their baseline condition. It is not considered that the omission of survey within commercial forestry plantation has in any way detracted from the validity of the assessment presented below.

7.2.23 Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) have been identified from the HES database and downloaded from the HES website⁵ in March 2022. This data is assumed to have been up to date at the time of its acquisition.

Method of Assessment

7.2.24 The effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets have been assessed on the basis of their type (direct effects, effects on setting and cumulative impacts) and nature (adverse or beneficial). The assessment

⁵ Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads> [Accessed March 2021]

takes into account the value/sensitivity of the heritage asset and its setting and the magnitude of the predicted impact.

- Adverse effects are those that detract from or reduce cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets; and
- Beneficial effects are those that preserve, enhance, or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

7.2.25 The assessment of significance of effects has been undertaken using two key criteria: the sensitivity of the cultural heritage asset and the magnitude of the predicted impact, which measures the degree of change to the baseline condition of an asset resulting from the Proposed Development.

Sensitivity of Receptor

7.2.26 Cultural heritage assets are given weight through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and its laws and policies (HES, 2019⁶).

7.2.27 **Table 7-2** summarises the relative sensitivity of those heritage assets (and their settings) relevant to the Proposed Development, excluding in this instance World Heritage Sites and Marine Resources.

Table 7-2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

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

Magnitude of Impact

7.2.28 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) are presented in **Table 7-3**.

⁶ HES (2019) 'Designation Policy and Selection Guidance', Edinburgh.

Table 7-3: Magnitude of Impact

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

Assessing Effects on Setting

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

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

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

7.2.30 The guidance also advises that:

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

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

- Stage 1: identify the historic assets that might be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated, and experienced; and
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any adverse impacts can be mitigated.

7.2.32 The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) provides additional helpful guidance in relation to setting impact assessments, in Appendix 1, paragraphs 42 and 43.

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

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

7.2.33 Following these recommendations, the Standard Tower Height (60 m) Bare-Earth ZTV for the Proposed Development has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be theoretical visibility of one or more elements of the Proposed Development and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration was also given to heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility from the asset but where views of, or across, the asset are important factors contributing to its cultural significance. In such cases, consideration was given to whether the Proposed Development could appear in the background of views.

Cumulative Effects

7.2.34 The assessment of cumulative effects on heritage assets is based upon consideration of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of assets with statutory designations and non-statutory designations and NSR sites within the Outer Study Area, in addition to the likely effects of cumulative developments. **Figure 15.1: Cumulative Developments, EIAR Volume 3a** illustrates the Proposed Development along with other cumulative developments within 15 km of the Proposed Development.

7.2.35 Operational, under construction developments, and existing grid infrastructure elements, are considered as part of the baseline and taken to be such for the assessment of effects on the settings of heritage assets.

7.2.36 Other cumulative developments which are consented (not yet constructed), at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable (including the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL Connection, and Creag Dhubh Substation Temporary Diversion and Tie-In (ITE/ITW Connection from existing 132 kV Taynult to Inveraray OHL), and Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection) are considered as being potential additions to the baseline and considered in the cumulative impact assessment (for details on Cumulative Developments considered within this assessment see **Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects (EIAR Volume 2)**).

7.2.37 The assessment takes into account the relative scales (i.e., size, number of turbines, etc) of the various development, their distance from the affected asset, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets of the various developments.

Significance Criteria

7.2.38 The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 7-2**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 7-3**) are used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect (direct effect or effect on setting), summarised using the formula set out in the matrix in **Table 7-4**. The matrix employs a graduated scale of significance (from Negligible to Major effects) and where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement, supported by reasoned justification, has been used to determine the level of significance.

Table 7-4: Significance Criteria

Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity of Asset			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible

Medium	Major / Moderate	Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor / Negligible
Low	Moderate / Minor	Moderate / Minor	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Minor / Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

- 7.2.39 Major and Moderate effects are considered to be significant for the purposes of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations). Minor and Negligible effects are considered to be ‘not significant’.

7.3 Baseline Conditions

Current Baseline

Inner Study Area

- 7.3.1 In total, 47 heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area.
- 7.3.2 Numbers in brackets in the following text, refer to asset numbers shown on **Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**.
- 7.3.3 Full description, and an assessment of their value/sensitivity, are provided in **Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 7.3.4 The southern end of the Inner Study Area intersects the northern edge of one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), Inveraray Castle GDL (HA38/GDL 223), which forms the setting for Category A Listed Inveraray Castle (LB 11552) and associated Listed Buildings. The Inventory records that the GDL is one of the most grandly conceived and culturally significant designed landscapes in Scotland and is an archetypal example of the ‘Sublime’ Scottish landscape. It reflects over 300 years of landscape intervention and evolution by the Earls and Dukes of Argyll, with the parklands, woodland plantations, and key buildings within the policies having been orchestrated around the castle to take full advantage of the natural topography and inland sea setting. The Castle, associated Listed Buildings, and garden features all lie outwith the Inner Study Area. As an important designed landscape, the GDL is considered to be of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity.
- 7.3.5 There are no SMs, or LBs within the Inner Study Area and the Inner Study Area does not cross any CA or Inventory Historic Battlefields (HB).

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Prehistoric

- 7.3.6 The HER noted the presence of a probable prehistoric burial cairn (HA26) that was recorded just north of Kilmun farm in 2009 during forestry activity. Field survey identified the burial cairn, which stands approx. 50 m south of Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24), in what is now an area of recently felled commercial forestry at Ordnance Survey Grid Reference (OSGR) 207945, 712992. The cairn is aligned north west to south east and measures approx.15 m long by 10 m wide, and 1.5 m high; it is covered in tree brash from forestry felling activities.
- 7.3.7 The remains of possible second burial cairn (HA25) were identified by the field survey approx.45 m north west of burial cairn (HA26) and approx.10 m south west of Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24). The cairn was covered in tree brash, and its full extent could not be distinguished, however, it appears to be roughly oval in plan, measuring approx.5 m long by 3 m wide and standing to 0.5 m high.

- 7.3.8 As the remains of prehistoric burials which can provide information on the design and construction of burial monuments and the nature of prehistoric burial practices, the cairns (HA25 and HA26) are both assessed as being of heritage value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity.

Medieval Ecclesiastical Remains

- 7.3.9 The HER and Canmore entries record that the remains of former chapel and associated burial ground (HA24) stand in an area of commercial forestry to the north of Kilmun. Field survey identified the chapel remains present on the edge of what is now an area of recently felled commercial forestry and cited on a flat upland plateau. The chapel, which survives as stone footings (0.5 m - 0.7 m high), is aligned east to west and surrounded by a D-shaped enclosure defined by a tumbled drystone wall. A turf covered stone mound (HA24c) of unknown function is present adjacent to north east corner of the chapel. The whole site is covered in dense bracken which limited search for grave markers. Given the layout of the chapel and its associated enclosure, it is considered that it is likely to be of early medieval origin. As a consequence, the chapel site is classed as a Non-Statutory Register (NSR) Site in the HER and considered to be of heritage value at the national level and of high sensitivity.

Medieval and Later Land Use Features

Settlement Remains

- 7.3.10 The remains of a former township (HA27) are present within the Inner Study Area, to the west of Kilmun farm. Field survey identified the remains of four drystone buildings (HA27a-d), a possible associated enclosure (HA27e) and three clearance cairns (HA27f-h) in an area of rough pasture. The buildings are as shown on the first edition map (1874). The township is depicted on Roy's Military Map of Scotland (1747-55) suggesting at least an 18th century origin for the settlement.
- 7.3.11 In addition to the townships, field survey recorded the presence of eight individual buildings (HA9, HA10a, HA11, HA18, HA19, HA31, HA36 and HA46) within the Inner Study Area. The buildings survive in varying conditions, generally measuring 9 m - 10 m long by 5 m wide with walls 0.3 m - 0.9 m high. Two of the buildings (HA9 and HA10a) survive as turf footings, and building (HA46) abuts the eastern side of an enclosure or yard.
- 7.3.12 The township remains and other buildings are all component elements of a former historic farming landscape within Glen Aray and they are likely to retain archaeological evidence of domestic life and farming practices in the 18th and 19th centuries. As such, the township remains (HA27) and the generally well-preserved buildings (HA9, HA10a, HA11, HA18, HA31, HA36 and HA46) are all assessed as being of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity. The building (HA19) is very poorly preserved, and this is considered to be of lesser heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.
- 7.3.13 An additional farmstead, High Balantyre (HA45) and two buildings at Three Bridges (HA47) are located within the Inner Study Area. Both the farmstead (HA45) and the buildings (HA47) are currently occupied. As elements of local historic settlement in the area, they are considered to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.
- 7.3.14 A group of nine sheiling huts (HA2), is depicted on the first and second edition maps (1874) to the north west of Taynafead and close to a tributary of the River Aray. Field survey identified only one of the possible sheiling huts depicted on the first edition map; none of the other sheiling huts depicted could be identified within what is now an area of commercial forestry and it is likely that pre-forestry ploughing and forestry felling, and replanting has disturbed or destroyed the remains of these sheiling huts. Six additional sheiling huts and a small structure, possibly a store or lambing pen, were identified during the field survey spread over an area approx.200 m by 200 m to the west of a tributary of the River Aray.

- 7.3.15 An additional shieling hut (HA20) was recorded by the field survey in an area of rough pasture to the west of South Tullich and just north of an unnamed watercourse. The remains of the hut are poorly preserved, surviving only as the faint footings of an oval turf- and stone-built structure.
- 7.3.16 Shieling huts are usually associated with medieval or post-medieval summer grazing activity and are components of the local historical landscape, as such they are assessed to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.
- Agrarian and Other Associated Features
- 7.3.17 Field survey identified the remains of numerous turf and stone banks along with areas of relict rig and furrow cultivation remains (HA14) within areas of rough pasture to the west of North Tullich and South Tullich townships (WoSAS refs: 44186 and 44187) and which collectively likely formed a former field system associated with the former townships. In total 25 field banks, or sections of field banks, were identified spread along the lower slopes of Mullach nam Maol. The banks vary in condition, ranging from 0.2 m - 1 m high and 1 m - 3 m wide. They appear to have originally defined a series of irregular shaped fields which likely formed the infields (best cultivated land) associated with the townships.
- 7.3.18 The remains of a short section of track (footpath) (HA15) were identified at the north end of the field system (HA14). The track which is aligned north to south runs for 60 m before petering out an unnamed watercourse. It is c.1 m wide and what may be the remnants of a possible bank are visible partially running along its east side. The north end of the track, just south of the watercourse, has been revetted slightly to form a low terrace.
- 7.3.19 Field survey identified the remains of a former head dyke (HA23) surviving in an area of recently felled forestry just north of Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24). The head dyke (measuring 2 m wide and 0.5 m high) would have originally separated the agricultural land of Kilmun township (HA27) from the more upland rough pasture. The head dyke remains have been disturbed in placed by forestry felling activity.
- 7.3.20 Four sheepfolds (HA13, HA17, HA21 and HA42) are depicted on the Ordnance Survey first (1874) and second (1900) edition maps. Sheepfolds (HA13, HA17 and HA21) survive within areas of pastureland, while sheepfold (HA42) is now located in an area of recently felled commercial forestry. The sheepfolds are all in generally good condition. The height of the walls (upstanding to 2 m high) of sheepfold (HA13) northern compartment suggests that this was formerly roofed, as shown on the first edition map, and may have originally been a small farmstead or barn.
- 7.3.21 Field survey identified the footings of two small enclosures (HA12 and HA28). The first enclosure (HA12) is rectangular in plan (measuring 13 m by 7 m) and stands just south of an unnamed watercourse, in pastureland to the west of Carness. The enclosure was likely associated with a building (HA11) the remains of which survive approx. 60 m south west of the enclosure. The footings of the second enclosure (HA28) survive in an area of woodland just north of the allt Criche; it is rectangular in plan (measuring 23 m by 8 m) and abuts the east side of a field wall.
- 7.3.22 Field survey recorded the presence of a large roughly rectangular stone platform (HA30) at the northern edge of an improved pasture field and just west of building (HA31). The platform measures 13 m long by 10 m wide and 1.2 m (max) high. It is comprised of rough boulders and is likely a massive clearance cairn, although it may have been used as a dry storage area for hay.
- 7.3.23 A small quarry scoop (HA7a) and a section of turf and stone bank (HA7b) were identified just west of the A819 public road. The quarry scoop is cut into the west side of a natural bedrock knoll. The bank (1.5 m - 2 m wide and 1 m high) runs from the north edge of the quarry before turning 90 degrees and terminating at the River Aray.
- 7.3.24 Field survey recorded the presence of five fragmentary and tumbled stone walls (HA16, HA29 and HA32-HA34) within pastureland to the west of North Tullich (HA16) and east of High Balantyre (HA29 and HA32-HA34). The walls define the edges of improved pasture fields surrounding these farmsteads.

7.3.25 An area of relict peat cuttings (HA6) was identified during the field survey to the west of a tributary of the River Aray. As a minor features of the historic landscape, the peat cuttings are assessed as being of lesser heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

7.3.26 All of the above are surviving elements of former historic farming landscape within Glen Aray and are mostly (HA7, HA12-HA14, HA17, HA21, HA23, HA28, HA30, HA42) assessed as being of local heritage value and of low sensitivity. Poorly preserved features (HA6, HA16, HA29 and HA32-HA34) are assessed as being of little heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

Former Roads/Trackways and Footpaths

7.3.27 The HER and Canmore entries record that the route of a former drove road (HA3) is shown on a map of the Duke of Argyll's estate dating to 1734 (Cowley, 1734⁷) running along Glen Aray from Inveraray Castle to Loch Awe. It appears that the drove road follows the same route as the later, mid-18th century Dumbarton to Tyndrum Military Road (HA4), shown on Roy's map (1747 to 1755). As the route of a former military road (formerly the route of the earlier drove road (HA3)) and still discernible on the ground, the military road (HA4) is assessed as being of value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity. It is likely that construction of the current forestry access track where it follows the route of the former drove road/military road has disturbed the remains of the former road, although there remains the possibility that buried remains may still survive below the present forestry track surface.

7.3.28 The route of a former footpath (HA1), is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first and second edition maps (1874 and 1897) running north from Taynafead to Ardbrecknish, crossing the Inner Study Area with a north east to south west orientation. No remains of this former footpath were visible during the field survey, in what is now a commercial forestry plantation. It is considered to be of little or no heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

Miscellaneous

7.3.29 A parish boundary (HA5) is depicted on both the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874) and second edition map (1900) running just south of Taynafead. The boundary is marked by a drystone wall (1.1 m high by 0.6 m wide) which follows the alignment of the parish boundary as shown on the Ordnance Survey maps. As the marker of the parish boundary the wall is considered to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity.

7.3.30 Field survey recorded the remains of a concrete platform (HA8) at the edge of a pasture field approx. 45 m west of the A819 public road. The platform is likely the footings of a farm barn or similar structure. No buildings are shown at this location on the Ordnance Survey first or second maps and it is likely that the platform is modern in date. It is considered to be of little or no heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

7.3.31 A footbridge (HA22), crossing the Allt Barain, is depicted on the Ordnance Survey first edition map (1874). All that remains of the footbridge is a wooden post spanning the watercourse and a mound of stone on the southside of the watercourse. It is considered to be of little heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

7.3.32 The HER entries record that there are three bridges, one crossing the Allt Bail a' Ghobhainn (HA35), one crossing the Quakers Burn (HA37), and the third crossing an unnamed watercourse at Toiseach Nam Marbh (HA41). These bridges originally formed part of the former military road (HA4) that ran to Inveraray on the west side of the River Aray. Field survey in 2018 (Hastie, 2018) recorded that bridge (HA35) comprises a low single arched stone bridge located at OSGR 208410, 710660, while the second bridge (HA37) no longer exists having been replaced by a modern culvert. Field survey for this assessment confirmed that bridge (HA35) still survives and is as described previously. The third bridge (HA41) survives at OSGR 208700, 714900) and comprises of a single stone arch located immediately west of the modern public A819 road. Bridges (HA35

⁷ Cowley, J (1734) 'A map of such part of his Grace the Duke of Argyll's heritable dukedom, and justiciary territories, islands, superiorities & jurisdictions as lye contiguous upon the western Coast of North Britain, within the now united shires of Inverary and Tarbat'.

and HA41) survive in good condition and are considered to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity. Bridge (HA37), which no longer exists, is considered to be of negligible sensitivity.

- 7.3.33 The HER and Canmore entries record that a spring at OSGR 209000, 716220 or a public trough at OSGR 209130, 716670, shown on the first edition map (1874) is 'Tobar an Easbuig' or the 'Bishop's Well' which is said to be the best water in Glen Aray, but there is no tradition to explain the name (Campbell and Sandeman, 1964⁸). Field survey carried out in 1982 (Morris & Morris, 1982⁹) and for this assessment could not locate any remains consistent with the description of a well. The locations recorded by the HER and Canmore relate to small watercourses, both of which run through modern culverts where they cross under the A819 public road and there was no evidence for any 'public trough' at OSGR 209130, 716670. As no remains now survive of the well, it is considered to be of little or no heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.
- 7.3.34 The HER and Canmore entries record that a locally known 'court-hill' (HA40) is located at Tom na Cuirte, comprising of a flat-topped kerbed mound with a possible stone setting near the centre of the mound, bounded on its east and west sides by a earth and stone bank, and with a natural amphitheatre in the bank to the north, which is said to have been where the jury sat. In addition, the HER and Canmore entries record that criminals were said to have been buried at a patch of marshy land at Toiseach nam Marbh (MacIntyre, 1909¹⁰; Campbell and Sandeman, 1964¹¹). Field survey identified the mound (HA40a) and a section of turf and stone bank (HA40b) running around the east side of the mound. There was no stone setting visible within the centre of the mound, as previously noted by the HER and Canmore. An area of marshy land was recorded to the north of a watercourse at Toiseach nam Marbh (HA40c), as previously noted by the HER (see above). As the remains of a possible 'court-hill' the mound is considered to be of heritage value at the local level and of low sensitivity. Although there is no above ground evidence for any burials in this area, the possible presence of burials associated with proceedings at the court hill elevates the archaeological sensitivity of this locality. Any burials would be likely to be of heritage value at a regional level and of at least medium sensitivity.

Archaeological Potential

- 7.3.35 The Inner Study Area runs along the western side of Glen Aray to the north of Inveraray and encompasses the lower slopes of Mullach nam Moal, Tom nam Buachaillean, Carn Odar and Cruach a'Bheannain. The HLAMap (HES, 2022c¹²) records that much of the Inner Study Area comprises rough pasture with no evidence for recent agricultural improvement, along with small areas of 20th century commercial forestry plantation, present at Taynafead (Creag Dhubh Plantation) and Creag a Chaibeil/Barr Mor (Three Bridges Plantation) (**Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**).
- 7.3.36 No prehistoric settlement remains have been identified within the Inner Study Area. However, the remains of a Bronze Age burial cairn (HA26) and one other potential burial cairn (HA25), have been identified just north of Kilmun. Additional prehistoric remains have been recorded within the immediate area, including the remains of a probable Neolithic chambered cairn (WoSAS 1582) at Drimfern, and a Late Bronze Age armlet and two cup-ended ornaments (WoSAS 1570) discovered at Tullich in the mid-1960s. These remains indicate that there has been some early prehistoric (Neolithic to Bronze Age) activity within Glen Aray.
- 7.3.37 The remains of a likely early medieval chapel and associated burial ground are present within the Inner Study Area, just north of Kilmun. The chapel is dedicated to St Mundu who died in AD635 (Campbell and Sandeman, 1964). The remains of several pre-improvement townships and 18th/19th century buildings along with the remains of their associated field systems (field banks, sheepfolds, enclosures, rig and furrow cultivation

⁸ Campbell, M and Sandeman, M (1964) 'Mid Argyll: an archaeological survey', Proc Soc Antiq Scot, Vol. 95, 1961-2. p84.

⁹ Morris, R and Morris, F (1982) 'Scottish healing wells: healing, holy, wishing and fairy wells of the mainland of Scotland'. p57.

¹⁰ MacIntyre, P (1909) 'Inveraray: Its scenery and associations'.

¹¹ Campbell, M and Sandeman, M (1964) 'Mid Argyll: an archaeological survey', Proc Soc Antiq Scot, Vol. 95, 1961-2. p90.

¹² HES (2021c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap), available at: <http://hlamap.org.uk> [Accessed March 2022]

remains) also survive in rough pasture areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century, principally at North/South Tullich, Kilmun and High Balantyre. All of these remains indicate that there has been activity and settlement within the local area from the early medieval period onwards.

7.3.38 In areas where the Proposed Development crosses modern commercial forestry plantation the survival of both the historic character of the landscape and any hitherto unknown features in these areas would have been appreciably compromised. The potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to survive in these areas is considered to be negligible. Forestry ploughing and drainage works, as well as subsequent tree root growth, and the effects of wind-throw and forestry harvesting, are likely to have disturbed or destroyed the integrity of any surviving buried archaeological deposits that may have survived in these areas, except in discrete areas around shieling huts (HA2), the early medieval chapel/burial ground (HA24), and two prehistoric burial cairns (HA25 and HA26).

7.3.39 In those areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century, it is considered that there is a low to moderate potential for further buried archaeology to survive, with an increased potential for buried remains to survive particularly where the Proposed Development passes Kilmun township (HA27) and an area of ground historically recorded as a potential burial ground (HA40c) associated with a court-hill.

Outer Study Area

7.3.40 There are 134 designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, as shown on Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a) and detailed in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a):

- 12 Scheduled Monuments (four with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- 32 Category A Listed Buildings (24 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- 56 Category B Listed Buildings (45 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- 32 Category C Listed Buildings (26 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- One Conservation Area (with predicted theoretical visibility); and
- Two Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (with some degree of predicted visibility).

7.3.41 In addition, there are 17 non-statutory heritage assets (four with predicted visibility of the Proposed Development) within the Outer Study Area, including one within the Inner Study Area (described above), that are classed in the HER as NSR sites and recorded as being potentially of national importance and of schedulable quality.

Future Baseline

7.3.42 If the Proposed Development was not to proceed, there would likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets that presently exist within the Inner and Outer Study Areas. Current agricultural land-use would most likely continue and there would be no change to the character of the heritage assets, other than the erosion of features through natural processes and agricultural activities. The current rough pasture and moorland land-use (on higher ground) would also likely continue, limiting the potential for disturbance to heritage assets, and only natural decay (weathering and erosion) would affect the surviving upstanding remains.

7.3.43 Commercial forestry land-use would also be likely to continue on a cyclical felling and replanting basis, with some potential for the extension of areas covered by forestry and for new areas of woodland planting to be identified. The forestry land-use regime would be subject to the normal requirements of UK Forestry Standards and would result in limited potential for disturbance to identified historic assets and could result in new heritage assets being brought to light and added to the archaeological record. It is probable that only natural decay through erosion or arising from tree planting would occur to surviving remains within forested areas.

Sensitive Receptors

7.3.44 A summary of the receptors identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development and which have been 'scoped in' to the assessment are given in **Table 7-5**, together with the justification for inclusion.

Table 7-5 Summary of Sensitive Receptors Scoped-In

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
<p>Scheduled Monuments up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.</p>	High	<p>These are monuments protected by statute.</p> <p>The consent of Scottish Ministers is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a Scheduled Monument. In addition, effects of the Proposed Development works upon the setting of a Scheduled Monument form an important consideration in the granting or refusal of planning consent to conduct development works.</p>
<p>Category A Listed Buildings up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.</p>	High	<p>Buildings which are statutorily protected as buildings of special architectural or historic interest. They are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (1997 Act). Planning authorities and Scottish Ministers are required to have special regard for the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings and any features of special architectural or historic importance they possess.</p>
<p>Category B and C Listed Buildings up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.</p>	Medium to Low	<p>Buildings which are statutorily protected as buildings of special architectural or historic interest. They are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (1997 Act). Planning authorities and Scottish Ministers are required to have special regard for the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings and any features of special architectural or historic importance they possess.</p>
<p>Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.</p>	High	<p>The impact of a development on a designated Garden or Designed Landscape listed in 'An Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland or its Supplements' (Inventory; published by HES) is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, although the designation is non-statutory in effect. Under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992 (1992 Order), planning authorities must consult HES on any development that may affect a site contained in the Inventory.</p>
<p>Conservation Areas up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.</p>	Medium	<p>Areas proposed by Local Development Plans as areas of special architectural or historic interest and contain key features which it is desirable to conserve, sustain and enhance. Planning authorities are required to consider planning applications affecting the appearance, character or setting of Conservation Areas.</p>
<p>NSR Sites up to 5 km from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the</p>	High	<p>NSR Sites which are considered by the local planning authority (WoSAS) to be potentially of schedulable quality (NSR Sites Code V and C).</p>

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.		
Other non-designated historic environment assets within the Proposed Development LOD. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 4) along with their relative sensitivities.	Medium to Negligible	A range of other non-designated archaeological sites, monuments and areas of historic interest which do not have statutory protection but are curated by the local planning authority.

7.4 Assessment of Effects

7.4.1 Taking account of the findings of the desk-based assessment and field survey, potential effects on cultural heritage associated with the construction and/or operation of the Proposed Development include:

- Direct (physical) effects on non-designated cultural heritage sites or features within the Proposed Development LOD.
- Physical disturbance of known hitherto undiscovered sites or features, including unforeseen buried remains of archaeological interest.
- Effects on the settings of cultural heritage assets, resulting from intervisibility between the asset and the Proposed Development.
- Cumulative effects on the settings of cultural heritage assets from the Proposed Development in combination with other proposed developments in the locality.

Mitigation by Design

7.4.2 The results of the desk-based assessment and field survey were digitised as GIS data, showing the locations (and where relevant, the extent) of heritage assets. The layout of the Proposed Development, including the positioning of proposed towers and the siting of other infrastructure, has subsequently been designed to avoid or minimise direct effects and to minimise effects on the settings of heritage assets as far as possible. The layout shown on **Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)** therefore embeds design mitigation into the siting of the proposed towers and the ancillary infrastructure.

Potential Effects

Potential Construction Effects

Assumptions for Potential Construction Effects

7.4.3 Any ground-breaking activities or ground disturbance associated with construction of the Proposed Development have the potential to disturb or destroy features of cultural heritage interest. Other construction activities, such as vehicle movements, storage of construction materials, and soil and overburden storage, also have the potential to cause permanent and irreversible impact on heritage assets.

7.4.4 The potential, adverse, permanent, and irreversible direct impacts identified below would result primarily from ground disturbance associated with erection of the OHL towers and construction and/or upgrading of existing access tracks close to recorded heritage assets shown on **Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**.

7.4.5 It is considered that there is potential for direct impacts on heritage assets in the following circumstances:

- Where heritage assets lie within 50 m of proposed section tower locations and within 80 m for angle towers;

- Where heritage assets lie alongside, or are close to, proposed access track locations, including where the proposed access track routes run along the line of the Proposed Alignment; and
- Where heritage assets lie within proposed forestry felling areas (see **Figure 2.2: Land Take and Forestry Removal, EIAR Volume 3a**).

Micrositing / Limit of Deviation

- 7.4.6 It is the intention that the Proposed Development would be subject to a Limit of Deviation (LOD) of 100 m in either direction along the Proposed Alignment, measured from each pole centre, and 100 m around proposed access tracks. This permits detailed design and construction activities to avoid environmental constraints or physical features as required (see **Chapter 2: Description of Proposed Development, EIAR Volume 2**). Movement of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be dependent upon consideration of identified constraints in the micrositing area and subject to advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). No micrositing of infrastructure or proposed felling areas would be undertaken where this could potentially affect cultural heritage interests without consultation with an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW), who would advise on the acceptability of any proposed realignments, and in consultation with the Council Archaeologist to agree appropriate mitigation where there are potential impacts as a result.

Potential Construction (Direct) Effects: Inner Study Area

- 7.4.7 Forty-seven non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area and it is assessed that there is potential, in the absence of mitigation, for construction works to result in direct impacts on nine heritage assets:
- The remains of shieling huts (HA2), of low sensitivity, lie within the proposed forestry felling area between Towers T3 and T5 and forestry felling activities could potentially disturb the shieling hut remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
 - The route of a former military road (HA4) (and former drove road (HA3)) which underlies an existing forestry access track at Creag Dhubh forestry (access to Towers T1 and T2: between OSGR 209917, 719892 and OSGR 209806, 719224) and at Quaker's Burn (access to Tower T38; between OSGR 208376, 710565 and OSGR 208451, 710293) that require upgrading as part of the Proposed Development. No visible remains of the former road(s) survive along this section of existing forestry track but there is some potential that buried remains may survive below the present track surfaces. Any remains present could potentially be exposed or disturbed by upgrading/road widening works along the existing forestry tracks. Overall, it is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effects, on an asset of medium sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, if buried remains survive, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
 - A section of a former military road (HA4) (and former drove road (HA3)), of medium sensitivity, would be crossed by the proposed access track route to Tower T11. Construction works along the proposed access track route would disturb a short section of the former military road, which survives as a green track (between OSGR 209192, 716847 to OSGR 209007, 716269). It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, the full length of which runs from Dalmally to Inveraray, and the disturbance to the integrity of the remains, as a whole, would be minimal, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
 - The route of a parish boundary (HA5), demarcated by a drystone wall, of low sensitivity, would be intersected by the proposed access track route between Towers T4 and T5. Construction works along the proposed access track route would disturb a small section of the drystone wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of no more than of negligible

magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance (not significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.

- An area of relict peat cuttings (HA6), of negligible sensitivity, lies within the 50 m working area around the proposed section tower for Tower T6 and is intersected by the proposed access track route to Tower T6. Construction works for the Proposed Development would disturb the peat cuttings. It is assessed that without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of negligible sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance (not significant). No mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset.
- The remains of a building (HA11), of low sensitivity, would be crossed by the proposed access track route between Towers T8 and T9. Construction works along the proposed access track route would, without mitigation, disturb the building remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
- The remains of a former field system (HA14), comprising of several sections of turf and stone bank and small areas of relict rig and furrow cultivation remains, lie within the 50 m working areas for Towers T14 and T15, and Towers T18 to T21, and are intersected by the proposed access track routes between Towers T13 and T16, and Towers T17 and T22. Construction works for the Proposed Development would disturb small sections of the former field system. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effects, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
- Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24), of high sensitivity, lies within the 50 m working area for Tower T29. Construction works for the proposed tower would disturb the former chapel site. It is assessed that without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of high sensitivity, would be of high magnitude resulting in an adverse effect of **major** significance (significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.
- Area of ground historically recorded as potential burial ground (HA40c) associated with court-hill (HA40a-b), of medium sensitivity, lies in close proximity to the proposed access track route to Towers T20 and T21. Possible impact on any burials (HA40c) associated with the proceedings at the court-hill that may be present and may come to light as a result of construction of the access track route is assessed as being of high magnitude resulting in an adverse effect of **major** significance (significant). Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 7.5**.

7.4.8 If proposed towers or proposed access track routes were to be relocated within the LOD, there are 22 additional heritage assets that could potentially fall within working areas around revised tower positions and be directly affected by construction operations. These are:

- A quarry scoop (HA7a) and associated section of bank (HA7b) could be potentially affected if Tower T17 was moved north east. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- A concrete platform (HA8) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route between Towers T7 and T8 is moved south. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance (not significant).
- The remains of a building (HA9) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route between Towers T8 and T9 is moved south. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude of an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- The remains of an enclosure (HA12) could potentially be affected if Tower T9 and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T8 and T9 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).

- A sheepfold (HA13) could potentially be affected if Tower T10 is moved either west or south east, and/or the proposed access track route to Tower T10 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- The remains of a trackway (HA15) could potentially be affected if Tower T13 is moved south, if Tower T14 is moved north east, and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T13 and T14 is moved east or west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- The remains of a field wall (HA16) could potentially be affected if Tower T17 is moved south east, and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T16 and T18 is moved south east. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- The remains of a possible building (HA18) could potentially be affected if Tower T17 is moved south south east, and or the proposed access track route between Towers T17 and T18 is moved north west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- The remains of a possible building (HA19) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route between Towers T18 and T19 is moved south east. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- The remains of a shieling hut (HA20) could potentially be affected if Tower T18 is moved south west, and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T187 and T19 is moved north west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude of an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- A sheepfold (HA21) could potentially be affected if Tower T22 is moved west, and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T22 and T23 is moved north west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- The poorly preserved remains of a former footbridge (HA22) could be affected if Tower T23 is moved north west, and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T22 and T23 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance (not significant).
- A head dyke (HA23) could potentially be affected if Tower T29 is moved north west and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T28 and T29 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of low magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- A possible burial cairn (HA25) could potentially be affected if Tower T29 is moved west south west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of medium sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **major** significance (significant).
- A burial cairn (HA26) could potentially be affected if Tower T29 is moved south west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of medium sensitivity resulting in an effect of **major** significance (significant).
- Elements of a former township (HA27d-h) could potentially be affected if Tower T30 and/or the proposed access track route between Towers T30 and T31 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of medium magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).

- The remains of a poorly preserved field wall (HA29) could potentially be affected if Tower T33 and/or the proposed access track route to Tower T33 are moved south. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of low magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance (not significant).
- The remains of a building (HA31) could potentially be affected if Tower T33 and/or the proposed access track route to Tower T33 are moved south. The possible impact is assessed as potentially being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an effect of **moderate** significance (significant).
- The remains of a field wall (HA33) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route between Towers T33 and T34 is moved west. The possible impact is assessed as being of low magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an effect of negligible significance (not significant).
- The remains of a field wall (HA33) could potentially be affected if Tower T34 is moved north. The possible impact is assessed as being of medium magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance (not significant).
- A possible court-hill (HA40a-b) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route to Towers T20 and T21 is moved north. The possible impact is assessed as being of high magnitude on an asset of medium sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **major** significance (significant).
- The remains of a sheepfold (HA42) could potentially be affected if the proposed access track route to Tower T28 is moved south. The possible impact is assessed as being of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant).

7.4.9 In each case, it is unlikely that micrositing would be required to the extent that the Proposed Development would impinge on these recorded remains. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are set out in **Section 7.5** to ensure that, where practical, the recorded heritage assets are avoided, and where direct impacts are unavoidable measures are put in place to either minimise the direct effects or to record any assets lost as a result of construction work, where appropriate.

7.4.10 In addition to the impacts identified above, there is the possibility that any ground disturbance works in areas required for construction of the Proposed Development could disturb or destroy hitherto unrecorded buried archaeological remains present in affected areas.

7.4.11 It is assessed that there is only limited potential that construction works associated with the Proposed Development could have a high magnitude direct adverse effect on hitherto undiscovered remains likely to be of high sensitivity (where the Proposed Development passes close to: an early medieval chapel/burial ground (HA24) and two prehistoric burial cairns (HA25 and HA26)) resulting in a **major** (significant) adverse effect prior to adoption of any mitigation. Measures are proposed in **Section 7.5** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately addressed.

Setting Effects during Construction

7.4.12 Construction activity such as pull-through / machine positions, erection of scaffolding and creation of temporary access tracks and working areas, have the potential to indirectly affect the setting of heritage assets both within the Inner Study Area (LOD) and the Outer Study Area. These construction activities, would be temporary, resulting in short-term, low magnitude impacts, and would have no permanent effect on the settings of heritage assets within the Inner and Outer Study Areas. Therefore, indirect temporary impacts have not been assessed on a site-by-site basis.

Potential Operational Effects

7.4.13 It is noted that the Proposed Development, as described in **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2)** includes horizontal and vertical limits of deviation to allow for micrositing and variation of tower heights. The Proposed Development would be subject to a horizontal LOD of 100 m either

direction along the Proposed Alignment and the vertical LOD of up to 20% of the Actual Tower Heights (as set out in the tower schedule (refer to **Technical Appendix 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**).

Direct Operational Effects

- 7.4.14 There are no heritage assets likely to encounter a direct effect during operation of the Proposed Development as any required maintenance or replacement works would use the as-built tracks and infrastructure to facilitate these works.

Setting Effects during Operation

- 7.4.15 The Proposed Development could result in adverse effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets, both within the Inner Study Area and in the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the Site. At distances greater than 5 km, it is considered that, in most instances, the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter features of the setting of the heritage assets that contribute to their cultural significance, neither would it appreciably alter how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.
- 7.4.16 **Technical Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4)** contains tabulated assessments of the predicted effects on the settings of designated and non-designated heritage considered to be of national heritage importance in the HER (NSR Sites Code C and V) from which there is some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development based on analysis of the Standard Tower Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**).
- 7.4.17 There are no heritage assets beyond 5 km from the Proposed Development that have been identified through appraisal of the Bare-Earth ZTV or notified through consultation with HES and WoSAS that require consideration of potential impacts on their settings.
- 7.4.18 The assessment of operational effects on the settings of heritage assets has been carried out with reference to the layout of the Proposed Development and the locations of the cultural heritage assets shown on **Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**.
- 7.4.19 The following discussion addresses those assets where potentially significant adverse effects have been identified through the tabulated assessment and those assets identified by HES as requiring detailed consideration, even where the significance of the predicted effect is assessed as being not significant in EIA terms. The assessments are supported with cultural heritage visualisations (**Figures 7.3-7.9, EIAR Volume 3b**) and by reference to the SLVIA photomontages listed in **Table 7-5**. The visualisations are referenced in the tabulated assessment set out in **Appendix 7.2: Cultural Heritage Assets in the Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 4)**, where relevant, and are referenced in the assessment below. The visualisations have been produced to show theoretical views of the Proposed Development from each asset, based on the Actual Tower Heights provided in **Technical Appendix 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**. Further explanation of the method used in generating these visualisations is included within **Chapter 6: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (EIAR Volume 2)**.
- 7.4.20 Category A Listed Inveraray Castle (LB 11552), Carloonan Dovecot (LB 11540), Aray Bridge (LB 11545) and Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower (LB 11543) all form integral parts of Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) and the impact of the Proposed Development on the individual Listed Building, and the GDL as a whole, are discussed below.

Table 7-6: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints¹³

Figure Ref.	Figure Title – Asset Name (& Ref No)	Status	Viewpoint grid Co-ordinate	Visualisation Type and Viewpoint Location
Figure 7.3a-d, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH1: Carloonan Dovecot (LB 11540)	Category A Listed forms integral part of Inveraray castle GDL (GDL 223)	209276, 709882	Photomontage Viewpoint location looking north towards the dovecot from the northern end of the Oak Avenue.
Figure 7.4a-d, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH2: Inveraray Castle (LB 11552)	Category A Listed forms integral part of Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223)	209640, 709268	Photomontage Viewpoint from courtyard in front of main entrance to castle.
Figure 7.5a-b, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH3: Inveraray Castle (LB 11552)	Category A Listed forms integral part of Inveraray castle GDL (GDL 223)	209589, 709245	Wireline Viewpoint from west corner tower upper floor (16 m viewer height)
Figure 7.6a-d, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH4: Aray Bridge (LB 11545)	Category A Listed forms integral part of Inveraray castle GDL (GDL 223)	209589, 709245	Photomontage Viewpoint from Listed Building.
Figure 7.7a-d, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH5: Society School, Glen Aray (LB 11523)	Category B Listed	208778, 713947	Photomontage Viewpoint from Listed Building.
Figure 7.8a-b, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH6: Kilmun, Chapel and Burial Ground (1581)	HER NSR Site	207934, 713064	Wireline Viewpoint from Chapel ruins.
Figure 7.9a-b, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint CH7: Drimfern Long Cairn (1582)	HER NSR Site	208729, 714714	Viewpoint from monument.
Figure 6.9a-d, EIAR Volume 3b	Viewpoint 3:Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower (LB 11543)	Category A Listed forms integral part of Inveraray castle GDL (GDL 223)	210007, 710135	Photomontage Viewpoint from Listed Building.

Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) (Figures 7.3-7.6 and Figure 6.9, EIAR Volume 3b)

7.4.21 Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) forms the setting for Category A Listed Inveraray Castle and other associated Listed Buildings, including Category A Listed Carloonan Dovecot (LB 11540), Aray Bridge (LB 11545) and Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower (LB 11543). The designed landscape comprises areas of parkland and pasture extending outward from the castle, across the naturally low-lying land into Glen Aray, Glen Shira and the Fisherlands, and edged by woodland policies including Balantyre wood, Brackley wood and the plantations at Sron-ghabh's and Tan-breac, which form key components of the designed landscape. North west of the castle are the steep slopes and summit of Dun na Cuaiche which is a dominant part of the natural topography surrounding the castle and makes a significant contribution to the setting of the castle. The Castle, Carloonan Dovecot, Aray Bridge, Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower and the GDL are heritage assets of value at the national level, as significant historic buildings and associated designed landscape, and they are assessed as being of high sensitivity.

¹³ Visualisations have been produced to show the predicted visibility of the proposed towers based on the Actual Tower heights provided in **Technical Appendix 2.1: Detailed Tower Schedule (EIAR Volume 4)**.

- 7.4.22 The main focus of the GDL is the Category A Listed Inveraray Castle (LB 1552) which stands at the mouth of the River Aray on the west shores of Loch Fyne. The Castle was constructed in the mid-18th century and at the time the original castle gardens were re-planned within an elaborate network of pathways and avenues running across the gardens and parkland surrounding the castle, with formal rides radiating out through the established woodland from the focal point of the castle. The layout was informed by the surrounding topography bringing in the wider countryside into the scope of the garden. Throughout the late-18th century a number of important buildings were carefully sited throughout the designed landscape to accentuate the natural elements of the landscape, including the rustic Watch Tower (LB 11543) on the summit of Dun na Cuaiche, the large circular tower Carloonan dovecot (LB 11540) and the Garron Bridge (LB 11550) at the mouth of the River Shira. Many of the earlier formal planned avenues and ridings throughout the woodland policies were allowed to grow out and re-naturalise in the picturesque fashion of the period. A number of lodges and Ossianic follies were added to accentuate the romanticized view of the natural landscape, while new formal gardens were laid out on the axis of the castle.
- 7.4.23 There are numerous important vistas and views laid out throughout the landscape. The Lime Avenue, the historical approach to the castle, is orientated on the south west axis and extends across the Wintertown Park; this is no longer used as an approach but is still a feature of the present designed landscape. The Town Avenue runs parallel to the shore and was originally the approach to the castle from the south west. The Oak Walk Avenue is the primary co-axial route northwards across the policies extending over the garden bridge towards Carloonan. The Grand Approach (c. 1775) began at the Garron Lodge 2 km to the north east of the castle meandering around the lower slopes of Dun na Cuaiche and emerging from woodland alongside the River Aray passing over the Garden Bridge. Today the main approach to the castle is via the Wintertown Gate at the north end of the town's Front Street and across the Wintertown Park to the west of the castle. The designed landscape contributes significantly to the surrounding scenery particularly in views from the opposite side of Loch Fyne (around St Catherines).
- 7.4.24 Principal views throughout the designed landscape include:
- The high ground viewpoint of the castle from the Watch Tower (LB 11543) which stands on the summit of Dun na Cuaiche to the north east of the castle. The watchtower was designed to give the impression of a building of antiquity and is a prominent landmark feature in the surrounding landscape; long panoramic views are gained from the watch tower taking in the castle, Inveraray town, parklands and plantations which form the designed landscape and surrounding moorland and hill slopes.
 - Views to Carloonan dovecot (LB 11540) present at the northern end of the parkland to the north of the castle. The dovecot, which is an important element of the designed landscape, stands at the end of the Oak Walk Avenue and is visible from the Garden Bridge 2 km south at the end of the avenue drawing the eye to the furthest reaches of the parkland.
 - Views from Aray Bridge (LB 11545) which carries the A83 public road across the mouth of the River Aray to the south of the castle, with views overlooking the castle and the town frontage from the summit of the bridge.
 - Long views from the Garron Bridge (LB 11550) and Garron Lodge (LB 11548) located 2 km to the east of the castle at the mouth of the River Shira looking across Loch Fyne and towards Inveraray town.
- 7.4.25 An existing 275 kV steel lattice electricity overhead line (SEEN Inveraray to Crossaigs connection) currently passes through the northern edge of the designed landscape c.2.5 km from Inveraray Castle (LB 11552).
- 7.4.26 The Proposed Development would be at its nearest c.2.8 km from Inveraray Castle itself, present to the north west of the Castle just outside the northern periphery of the castle's designed landscape. The Proposed Development would cross upland moorland running north through commercial forestry at Creag a'Chaibeil and away from the Castle.
- 7.4.27 Views of the proposed towers from the lower floors of the Castle would be screened by closely planted trees and shrubs which are present throughout, and edge, the formal gardens that surround the Castle. Glimpses

of the proposed towers, in views to the north east, may however be gained from the upper storeys of the castle. A bare-earth wireline produced to show the potential views from the upper floor of the western tower (**Figure 7.5a-b: Viewpoint CH3: Inveraray Castle, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that there would be theoretical visibility of ten proposed towers in distant views from the upper floor. The towers would be seen backclothed against hillslopes and beyond and at a slightly greater distance than the existing 275 kV Inveraray to Crosssais OHL Connection. In practice, woodland trees that edge the GDL and forestry along the high ground of Bile Gharbh are likely to provide additional screening of the proposed towers, even from the upper levels of the Castle. The Proposed Development would not be a prominent landscape feature in views from the immediate surroundings of the Castle and at over approx. 2.5 km away the proposed towers would only be perceptible as a distant minor addition to the upper storey views in the north west. The immediate setting of the Castle within its formal gardens and surrounding parkland would not be affected by the presence of the Proposed Development.

- 7.4.28 The Proposed Development would not be seen from any of the principal views out from the Castle itself, including the views to the Watch Tower (LB 11543), to the north east, and along the Lime Avenue, to the south west. A photomontage for a viewpoint from the courtyard in front of main entrance to castle (**Figure 7.4a-d: Viewpoint CH2: Inveraray Castle, EIAR Volume 3b**), shows that six towers would potentially be visible in views to the north from the Castle entrance, however the proposed towers would be largely screened by intervening topography and surrounding woodland policies, from this view.
- 7.4.29 A photomontage taken from a viewpoint at the northern end of the Oak Avenue, looking north towards the dovecot (**Figure 7.3a-d: Viewpoint CH1: Carloonan Dovecot, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that the Proposed Development would be entirely screened by intervening topography and mature woodland that edges the GDL and the Proposed Development would not affect this principal landscape view within the GDL.
- 7.4.30 Throughout the GDL itself views to the Proposed Development would be largely screened by surrounding woodland policies, which edge the designed landscape. The Standard Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) suggests that proposed towers would be visible from key views within the designed landscape, including Aray bridge (LB 11545) and the Watch Tower (LB 11543). The Proposed Development would not be visible from the Garron Bridge (LB 11550) nor its immediate environs.
- Aray Bridge (LB 11545) (**Figure 7.6a-d: Viewpoint CH4: Aray Bridge, EIAR Volume 3b**): a photomontage from the Category A Listed Bridge looking towards Inveraray Castle (LB 11552), shows that there would be theoretical visibility of five towers, these seen in distant views beyond the Castle and backdropped by hillslopes, however, the photomontage (**Figure 7.6a, EIAR Volume 3b**) shows that in practice the towers would be screened from view by woodland policies that edge the GDL, and their presence would not significantly affect the key views from Aray Bridge to Inveraray Castle or the GDL.
 - Watch Tower (LB 11543) (**Figure 6.9a-d: Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower, EIAR Volume 3b**): the Proposed Development would be visible in panoramic views from the Watch Tower seen crossing the eastern slopes of Creag na h-Iolairee, Creag Dhubh and Sron Reithe and running around the outer north western edge of the designed landscape at High Balantyre. A photomontage (**Figure 6.9a-b: Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that the Proposed Development would be backclothed against hillslopes and partially screened in places by woodland through which the towers would pass. The proposed towers would be seen together with an existing 275 kV steel lattice tower OHL (Inveraray to Crosssais Connection), although at a greater distance. Although a new feature in these wide landscape views from the Watch Tower and Inveraray GDL, the presence of the Proposed Development would not significantly affect the ability of any visitor to the Watch Tower to understand and appreciate Inveraray Castle or its wider landscape setting.
- 7.4.31 Wide views of Inveraray Castle, Inveraray town and the designed landscape are also afforded from the opposite side of Loch Fyne, at St Catherines, however, the Standard Tower Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure**

7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a) shows that the Proposed Development would not be visible in these views.

- 7.4.32 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) and its associated Listed Buildings, is assessed as being one of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect, based on professional judgement, to be of minor significance (not significant). The presence of the Proposed Development would not affect the ability to understand the siting of the castle and its relationship with Inveraray town and other associated buildings and structures within the designed landscape. The character and cultural significance of the GDL, and its associated Listed Buildings, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Society School, Glen Aray (LB 11545) (Figure 7.7a-d: Viewpoint CH5: Society School, Glen Aray, EIAR Volume 3b)

- 7.4.33 This late 18th century school stands on the south bank of an unnamed watercourse and close to its confluence with the River Aray. The school, which comprises the ruins of a 2-storey building with outhouse, a secondary later schoolhouse, and an associated barn, was built just inside the policies for Inveraray Castle in 1781 by the Argyll Estates and remained in use until 1935. The main 2-storey schoolhouse is built in the 'Gothick' style and its design mimics that of the Argyll Estate lodges. The building is a Category B Listed Building, of heritage value at the regional level and is assessed as being of medium sensitivity.
- 7.4.34 The school stands between the A819 public road and the River Aray, set down in the valley bottom, and standing in an area of mature deciduous woodland. Views from the school are largely restricted by rising topography and by surrounding trees, although glimpses along the river valley can be gained to the north and south. Glimpses of the school can also be gained whilst travelling along the A819 public road that passes to the west side of the school. The school has a localised setting focusing on the river valley, and long distance views either to, or from, the school do not contribute appreciably to its setting.
- 7.4.35 The Proposed Development would run past the school on its west side, at its closest being 1.2 km away. The Standard Tower Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) analysis indicates that, from the school and its immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of 24 towers, running in an arc from the north to the south east, west of the school, although the bare-earth ZTV does not take into consideration surrounding woodland, which would largely screen views of the Proposed Development from the school.
- 7.4.36 A photomontage (**Figure 7.7a-d: Viewpoint CH5: Society School, Glen Aray, EIAR Volume 3b**) showing the predicted view of the Proposed Development from the school, indicates that there would be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development where it crosses the lower slopes of Tom na Buachaillean/Creag a' Chaibeil, with proposed towers visible at a higher elevation than the school. However, in practice, mature woodland surrounding the school and edging the A819 public road, and commercial forestry through which the Proposed Development passes, would largely screen views of the proposed towers from the school (**Figures 7.7a-b: Viewpoint CH5: Society School, Glen Aray, EIAR Volume 3b**).
- 7.4.37 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the school is assessed as being of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect, based on professional judgement, as being of minor significance. It would remain possible for any visitor to understand and appreciate the school within its valley setting and its historical association with Glen Aray valley and the Inveraray Castle Estate. The character and cultural significance of the school in its valley bottom setting would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Kilmun Chapel Burial Ground (1581) (Figure 7.8a-b: Viewpoint CH6: Kilmun Glen Aray, Chapel and Burial Ground, EIAR Volume 3b and Technical Appendix 7.3: Photos, EIAR Volume 4)

- 7.4.38 This monument comprises the footings of a small chapel and associated burial ground of likely early medieval origin. The chapel remains are located on the west side of Glen Aray sited on a small upland plateau, just

south of a rocky outcrop known as ‘Creag a’Chaibeil’ (crag of the burial place) and north of Kilmun farm. The monument survives as the drystone footings of a small rectangular building standing towards the centre of a D-shaped enclosure. The monument is recorded in the HER as being potentially of national importance and is therefore assessed as being of high sensitivity. As the remains of an early medieval chapel, it has the potential to provide information on ecclesiastical and burial practices during this period.

- 7.4.39 The chapel remains were until recently enclosed within commercial forestry, but the surrounding forest has now been felled and the aspect opened out. The monument, in its current condition, surviving as low-profile turf-covered stone footings, overgrown with bracken, is not readily visible from any great distance and is a site best appreciated at close quarters (**Technical Appendix 7.3:Photos, EIAR Volume 4**). High ground to the north directs views from the chapel remains to the south, along Glen Aray and towards Loch Fyne, and the chapel would have been most readily visible in this view when approaching the chapel site during its occupation. A possible entrance to the chapel is recorded at the east end of the south wall indicating that views gained on exiting the chapel, during its use, would be directed southwards.
- 7.4.40 An existing 275 kV steel lattice tower OHL (Inveraray to Crossaigs Connection) passes the chapel on its south side, at around 1.5 km away and is visible from the monument crossing lower slopes in views to the south (**Technical Appendix 7.3:Photos, EIAR Volume 4**).
- 7.4.41 The Standard Tower Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 7.2.a-b: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) analysis indicates that, from the chapel remains and their immediate vicinity, there would be theoretical visibility of six towers, running from the east to the south of the chapel site. The nearest Proposed Tower (T29) being 40 m to the east of the monument.
- 7.4.42 A wireline showing the predicted view of the Proposed Development looking southwards from the chapel remains (**Figure 7.8a-b: Viewpoint CH6: Kilmun Glen Aray, Chapel and Burial Ground, EIAR Volume 3b**) indicates that the proposed towers would be visible from the chapel remains and would be a noticeable addition to the baseline by introducing additional steel lattice towers in the open aspect views to the east and south east of the chapel site, with towers in close proximity to the chapel remains and crossing views from the monument to the south. The proposed towers would be seen together with the existing 275 kV Inveraray to Crossaig Connection, with the existing steel lattice towers visible beyond the Proposed Development and at a greater distance from the chapel remains.
- 7.4.43 The Proposed Development would be a new, modern addition to the immediate surroundings of the chapel remains and would result in a discernible change to its surroundings, such that its baseline would be partly altered. However, it would remain possible for any visitor to understand and appreciate the remains of the chapel, its position in the landscape, and its setting within the Glen Aray valley.
- 7.4.44 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the chapel remains is assessed as being of medium magnitude, resulting from the proximity of the Proposed Development and the presence of proposed towers. The resulting adverse effect is assessed, based on professional judgement, to be of **moderate** significance (significant). However, the character and cultural significance of the chapel remains in their valley setting, would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

Drimfern Long Cairn (1582) (Figure 7.9, EIAR Volume 3b and Technical Appendix 7.3:Photos, EIAR Volume 4)

- 7.4.45 The remains of this likely early prehistoric burial cairn stand in a flat improved pasture field immediately west of the River Aray. It measures approx. 40 m long by 0.6 m high, is aligned north north east to south south west and what maybe the remains of a burial chamber are visible at its southern end. The monument is recorded in the HER as being potentially of national importance and is therefore assessed as being of high sensitivity. As the remains of an early prehistoric burial cairn, it has the potential to provide information on early burial practices.
- 7.4.46 The burial cairn stands between the A819 public road and the River Aray, set down in the valley bottom (**Technical Appendix 7.3:Photos, EIAR Volume 4**). Views out from the cairn are largely restricted by rising

topography and mature deciduous woodland that edges the A819 public road. Views from the monument are concentrated along the River Aray to the north and south. The burial cairn in its narrow valley setting is unlikely to have been a visually prominent feature of the landscape. It is likely that its close association with the River Aray and the views along the river are important aspects of its setting.

- 7.4.47 The Proposed Development would run past the burial cairn on its west side, at its closest being 900 m away. The Standard Tower Height Bare-Earth ZTV (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR volume 3a**) analysis indicates that, from the cairn, and its immediate vicinity there would be visibility of 25 towers.
- 7.4.48 A wireline (**Figure 7.9a-b: Viewpoint CH7: Drimfern, Long Cairn, EIAR Volume 3b**) showing the predicted 'bare-earth' view of the Proposed Development from the cairn, indicates that the proposed towers would be visible running in an arc from the north to the south west, to the west of the monument. The Bare-Earth ZTV does not however take into consideration surrounding woodland, which would largely screen views of the Proposed Alignment from the cairn.
- 7.4.49 Overall, the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the burial cairn is assessed as being of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect, based on professional judgement, as being of **minor** significance. The key relationships between the burial cairn with the River Aray and views from the burial cairn along the river would be unaffected. The character and cultural significance of the cairn in its valley bottom setting would not be diminished by the presence of the Proposed Development.

7.5 Mitigation

- 7.5.1 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental impact assessment (PAN1/2013) describes mitigation as a hierarchy of measures: prevention, reduction, and compensatory (offset) measures. Prevention and reduction measures can be achieved through design, whilst compensatory measures offset effects that have not been prevented or reduced.
- 7.5.2 Historic Environmental Policy for Scotland (HEPS) required the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment and the emphasis in PAN 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2) is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible. The mitigation measures presented below take this policy advice and planning guidance into account and provides various options for protection or recording and ensuring that, where practical, surviving assets are preserved intact to retain the present historic elements of the landscape.
- 7.5.3 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or where, appropriate, during, the forestry felling works and construction of the Proposed Development. The scope of works would be detailed in one or more Written Scheme (s) of Investigations (WSI) developed in consultation with (and subject to the agreement of) WoSAS, acting on behalf of ABC.
- 7.5.4 A professionally qualified Archaeological Contractor would be appointed to act as an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) for the duration of the development works (forestry felling works and construction phase). The role of the ACoW would be to provide advice to the appointed Construction Contractor regarding micro-siting of development components, where there is a possibility of intersecting with identified heritage assets, and to undertake archaeological monitoring of topsoil stripping operation in areas designated and approved by the Council's Archaeological Advisors (WoSAS). The activities of the ACoW would be carried out according to the scope of work and terms specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.
- 7.5.5 Mitigation proposals are set out on a site-by-site basis in **Technical Appendix 7.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Mitigation During Construction

Preservation in Situ

- 7.5.6 Should micrositing be undertaken, forestry felling works, towers and associated infrastructure would be located, where possible, away from heritage assets.
- 7.5.7 Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, ground-breaking works at proposed tower positions and proposed access track locations, as far as reasonably practicable and as advised by an ACoW.
- 7.5.8 Known heritage assets and archaeologically sensitive areas, would not be used for storage of material or as parking areas for vehicles or machinery.
- 7.5.9 Where linear assets survive as upstanding features (principally field banks and walls) access tracks would be routed through any existing gates or through broken or less well-preserved sections of banks or walls wherever possible, within the LOD. Disturbance to field banks, walls, relict rig and furrow cultivation remains and relict peat cuttings would be kept to a minimum necessary to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact.
- 7.5.10 The following heritage assets (below) would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase.
- Shieling huts (HA2 and HA20);
 - Buildings (HA9, HA18, HA19 and HA31);
 - Enclosures (HA12);
 - Possible burial cairns (HA25 and HA26);
 - Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24);
 - Elements of township (HA27): building (HA27d), enclosure (HA27e) and clearance cairns (HA26f-h); and
 - Possible 'court-hill' (HA40).
- 7.5.11 The assets would be identified by placing high visibility markers from the outer limits of the visible remains, facing the working area:
- A stand-off buffer of 20 m would be applied to Kilmun chapel and burial ground (HA24), in recognition of it being considered to be of national importance. The monument would be excluded from working areas for the Proposed Development. The 50 m working area around Tower T29 and the proposed access track route between Towers T28-T30 would be kept to the north side of the Proposed Alignment and away from the chapel and burial site. The chapel and burial ground would be avoided by any proposed forestry felling works in the immediate area. Felling would be directed to steer timber away from the marked remains, and any trees required to be felled in close proximity to the chapel and burial ground would be removed by hand felling.
 - A stand-off buffer of 5 m would be applied to all other heritage assets (HA2, HA9, HA12, HA18-HA20, HA25-HA27, HA31 and HA40) requiring to be marked-off during forestry felling and construction works (see above). Felling would be directed to steer timber away from the marked out remains.
- 7.5.12 The upstanding/visual remains of four additional sites (sheepfolds (HA13, HA21 and HA42) and the section of former military road (HA4) located at OSGR 208729,714955 (where it lies in close proximity to the proposed access track route to Towers T20/T21) would be avoided during construction works.
- 7.5.13 Any required micrositing of access tracks or proposed tower positions would be managed to avoid the visible remains and the demarcated areas, as advised by the ACoW.

Post-Felling Survey

- 7.5.14 Post felling survey to be carried out at the site of former shieling huts (HA2) in order to record any additional remains that may survive within the current commercial forestry and which was not visible in dense vegetation/commercial woodland during the walkover field survey for this assessment. If additional remains are identified during the post felling survey these should be marked off and avoided during the construction works for the Proposed Development.

Archaeological Investigations

- 7.5.15 Two heritage assets, route of former military road (HA4), where it survives as a green track, and remains of building (HA11), would be directly affected by construction of proposed access track routes; effects that warrant offsetting by archaeological investigations and recording.
- Former military road (HA4): the military route would be investigated and excavated to a strategy and standard acceptable to WoSAS. This may require excavation of sections across the road remains that runs between OSGR 209192, 716847 to OSGR 209007, 716269. The purpose of the investigations would be to investigate and record the method of construction of the road and recover any material that may help date the road.
 - Building (HA11): the building remains would be excavated to a strategy and standard acceptable to WoSAS. This may require full excavation of the building or sections across the building remains. The purpose of the investigation would be to investigate and record the function and method of construction and to recover any material that may help to date the building.
- 7.5.16 Investigations and recording of these features would result in the acquisition of archaeological knowledge and result in preservation by record, thereby offsetting the predicted effects and reducing the significance of the predicted adverse impacts.

Watching Briefs

- 7.5.17 The Applicant would seek to agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with WoSAS in advance of development works (forestry felling activity and construction phase). The scope of the agreed works would be confirmed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be signed-off prior to commencement of the development work, including enabling works.
- 7.5.18 Taking account of the avoidance through design, and the character of the identified cultural heritage baseline, it is recommended that watching briefs be carried out at the following locations:
- Former Drove Road (HA3) / Military Road (HA4): where the existing access track to Towers T1 and T2, that requires upgrading, follows the route of a former drove road (HA3) and military road (HA4). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works along the access track where it follows the route of the former drove / military road (**Figure 7.1a: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**), to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered.
 - Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (HA24): a watching brief would be carried out on ground-breaking works for Tower T29 and for proposed access track routes between Towers T28 and T30 where they pass close to the chapel site (**Figure 7.1c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) to identify and record any potential surviving associated remains that may be encountered.
 - Possible Prehistoric Burial Cairns (HA25 and HA26): a watching brief would be carried out on ground-breaking works for proposed access track routes between Towers T29 and T30 where they pass close to the burial cairns (**Figure 7.1c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**) to identify and record any potential surviving associated remains that may be encountered.
 - Kilmun Township (HA27): a watching brief would be carried out on ground-breaking works along the proposed access track route between T30 and T31 where it passes close to the remains of the former

township (**Figure 7.1c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**), to identify and record any potential surviving associated remains that may be encountered.

- Possible 'Court-Hill' (HA40c), potential burial ground: a watching brief would be carried out on ground-breaking works along the proposed access track route to Towers T20-T21 where it passes an area of ground at Toiseach nam Marbh historical identified as the potential burial ground for former criminals (**Figure 7.1b: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**), to identify, record and recover any potential surviving burials that maybe encountered.

7.5.19 If significant discoveries are made during the watching briefs and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to be agreed in writing with WoSAS.

7.5.20 Based on the results of the desk-based study and the field survey, there are no other specific areas where construction works are expected to encounter buried archaeological remains. It has though, been assessed that there is a low to moderate potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to be present within the Inner Study Area and it may be that the Council would require archaeological monitoring in areas other than those identified above. Therefore, if required under the terms of a condition of consent, the scope of any other required archaeological watching brief(s) would be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and would be set out in the WSI.

Post-excavation Assessment and Reporting

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

Construction Guidelines

7.5.22 Written guidelines would be set out in the WSI, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines would set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional support if buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc.) should be discovered during any construction activities.

7.5.23 The guidelines would make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.

Monitoring

7.5.24 Post-construction monitoring would be carried out to:

- check that marking out of heritage assets within the Proposed Development Site has been effective and that none of the heritage assets have been disturbed during forestry felling/construction works; and
- check that all markers have been removed from heritage assets following completion of the Proposed Development.

Mitigation During Operation

7.5.25 Construction of any temporary access tracks for required maintenance during the operation of the Proposed Development would take into account cultural heritage assets based on the constraints mapping provided (**Figure 7.1a-c: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**).

7.6 Residual Effects

Residual Construction Effects

- 7.6.1 Construction residual effects are set out on a site-by-site basis in **Technical Appendix 7.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.
- 7.6.2 Taking account of the mitigation proposals set out above, the following residual construction effects have been identified.
- Minor residual effects are predicted on four heritage assets (the remains of a quarry scoop and associated bank (HA7), field system (HA14), head dyke (HA23), field wall (HA33)) as a consequence of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development.
 - A minor residual effect is predicted on a former drove road / military road (HA3 / HA4) the impact of the Proposed Development on any surviving buried remains being offset by archaeological investigations and recording to a standard acceptable to WoSAS.
 - A minor residual effect is predicted on the remains of a building (HA11) the impact of the Proposed Development on the building remains being offset by archaeological investigations and recording to a standard acceptable to WoSAS.
 - A minor residual effect is predicted on an area of ground historically recorded as a potential burial ground (HA40c) associated with a court-hill (HA40a) the impact of the Proposed Development on the building remains being offset by archaeological investigations and recording to a standard acceptable to WoSAS.
 - Negligible residual effects are predicted on the remains of a parish boundary (HA5), relict peat cuttings (HA6), concrete platform (HA8), a section of trackway (HA15), three field wall (HA16 and HA29), and the remains of a former footbridge (HA22).
- 7.6.3 Where upstanding heritage assets (shielings huts (HA2 and HA20), five buildings (HA9, HA18, HA19 and HA31), enclosures (HA12 and HA28), three sheepfolds (HA13, HA21 and HA42), a former chapel and burial site (HA24), two possible burial cairns (HA25 and HA26), the remains of former township (HA27), a possible 'court-hill' and associated bank (HA40a-b) that lie close to the Proposed Development, or within the proposed LOD, would be marked off and avoided for the duration of the construction works. Consequently, no residual effects are predicted on these assets.

Residual Operational Effects

- 7.6.4 During its operational lifetime, the residual effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be the same as the predicted effects. See **Technical Appendix 7.2 (EIAR Volume 4)** for a tabulated assessment of the predicted operational effects.
- 7.6.5 One impact, affecting the setting of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Site (HA24/1851), classified in the HER as of national importance and thus of high sensitivity, has been assessed as being of **moderate** significance. This effect would not lead to any diminishing of the cultural heritage asset. It would remain possible for any visitor to the monument to understand and appreciate the asset and its setting.
- 7.6.6 All other impacts, affecting the settings of heritage assets in the surrounding landscape, would give rise to effects that are either of minor or negligible significance (not significant).

7.7 Cumulative Effects

Construction Effects

- 7.7.1 Cumulative construction impacts arise from the Proposed Development in combination with developments that have the potential to impact the same heritage assets.
- 7.7.2 It is predicted that two heritage assets, former military road (HA4) and the route of a former drove road (HA3), of medium sensitivity would be potentially affected by the Proposed Development would also be

potentially directly impacted by ground disturbance works relating to both the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL connection and the Creag Dhubh Substation, which would utilise the same access track alignment which follows an existing forestry track that overlies the former military (drove) road route.

- 7.7.3 The schemes in-combination would result in potential direct impacts to a short section of the former military (drove) road which runs from Dalmally to Inveraray, and the disturbance to the integrity of the remains, as a whole, would be minimal. The cumulative impact from ground disturbance works would therefore be of no more than low magnitude, resulting in an effect of minor significance (not significant).
- 7.7.4 No other cumulative impacts from the Proposed Development in combination with other developments are predicted.

Operational Effects

- 7.7.5 The presence of the Proposed Development in combination with other proposed developments may have an adverse cumulative effect on the setting of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area.
- 7.7.6 The identification of likely cumulative effects focuses upon the residual operational impacts of the Proposed Development on the setting of cultural heritage assets in combination with cumulative developments. The cumulative developments considered within this assessment are restricted to those that are consented (not yet constructed), at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable. Those developments that are operational or under construction have been considered as part of the current baseline conditions.
- Blarghour Wind Farm (consented) and Carr Dubh Wind Farm (in scoping): these cumulative development would be at the closest approx. 3.5 km from the nearest heritage asset within the Outer Study Area (Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground, 1581: **Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area (EIAR Volume 3a)**) predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development and would likely be visible within views to the west of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (1581) and Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223).
 - In views from Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (1581) the cumulative wind farms would be visible in views to the west, at around 3 km away, visible in a different arc of view to the Proposed Development. The cumulative developments would likely be largely screened from view from the chapel and burial ground by rising topography at Sron Reithe and Sgornach Ruadh. The Proposed Development would be visible in close proximity to the monument, on its east side, the nearest proposed tower standing within approx. 40 m of the remains of chapel and burial ground and would exert the greater effect on the setting of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, Blarghour and Carr Duhb Wind Farms on the setting of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground would be no different from that of the Proposed Development alone; that is, an impact of medium magnitude and **moderate** significance (significant). The Proposed Development contributing the greater effect to the cumulative impact than the cumulative wind farms.
 - In views from Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) the cumulative wind farms would be visible in views to the west from the higher slopes within the GDL (for example **Figure 6.9a-d: Dun na Cuaiche Watch Tower, EIAR Volume 3b**), the closest towers being 3 km away and visible against the skyline although partially screened from view by intervening topography. The Proposed Development would be seen in the same arc of view as the Blarghour and Carr Dubh Wind Farms, although offset from the cumulative developments and at a closer distance to the GDL. The proposed towers would, however, be backclothed in these views and partially screened in places by woodland through which the towers would pass, and the Proposed Development would be much less visible in these views than the cumulative wind farms developments. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with Blargour and Carr Dubh Wind Farms on the setting of Inveraray Castle GDL would be one of no more than low magnitude and of minor significance (not significant), with the Proposed Development contributing less to the cumulative impact than the Blarghour and Carr Dubh Wind Farms.

- An Suidhe Substation (consented): this cumulative development would be c.6 km from the nearest heritage asset within the Outer Study Area predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development. At this distance the proposed substation would not be prominent in the surrounding landscape, and as a result, it is considered that no cumulative effects on the setting of heritage assets would arise from the operation of the Proposed Development in combination with An Suidhe Substation.
- Ladyfield Wind Farm (in scoping): this cumulative development would be at the closest c.1 km from the nearest heritage asset within the Outer Study Area predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development and would likely be visible within views to the north east of Glen Aray School (LB 11523), Drimfern, Long Cairn (1582) and Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (1581) (**Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area, EIAR Volume 3a**), the cumulative development would also potentially be visible in distant views to the north from Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223).
 - In views from the Society School, Glen Aray (LB 1523 and Drimfern, Long Cairn (1582) the cumulative wind farm would be visible in views to the north east from these heritage assets and seen in a different arc of view to the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would likely be much less visible from these two heritage assets than the proposed Ladyfield Wind Farm, screened from view by the topography of rising ground, and surrounding mature woodland present along the west side of Glen Aray. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with Ladyfield Wind Farm would have no more than a low magnitude impact on the settings of these cultural heritage assets resulting in cumulative effects of minor significance (not significant), with the Proposed Development being largely screened from view from the heritage assets and contributing less to the cumulative impact than the proposed Ladyfield Wind Farm.
 - In views from Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (1581) the cumulative wind farm would be visible in views to the north east seen beyond the Proposed Development and at a greater distant from the monument than the Proposed Development, with proposed turbines visible on the opposite side of Glen Aray at around 2 km away. The Proposed Development would be visible in close proximity to the monument, the nearest proposed tower standing within c.40 m of the remains of chapel and burial ground and would exert the greater effect on the setting of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, Ladyfield Wind Farm on the setting of Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground would be no different from that of the Proposed Development alone that is, an impact of medium magnitude and **moderate** significance (significant). The Proposed Development contributing the greater effect to the cumulative impact than the proposed Ladyfield Wind Farm.
 - In views from Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) glimpses of the cumulative wind farm would be visible in distant views to the north from the GDL (for example **Figure 7.3a-d: Viewpoint CH1: Carloonan Dovecot, EIAR Volume 3b**). The Proposed Development would be seen in the same arc of view as the proposed Ladyfield Wind Farm and at around a similar distance, where it crosses the lower slopes of Mullach nam Maol and Crag nam Fitheach. The Proposed Development would, however, be much less visible in these views, to the north from the GDL, the proposed towers being largely screened from view by intervening topography and surrounding mature woodland. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with Ladyfield Wind Farm on the setting of Inveraray Castle GDL would be one of no more than low magnitude and of minor significance (not significant), with the Proposed Development being largely screened from view from the heritage assets and contributing less to the cumulative impact than the proposed Ladyfield Wind Farm.
- Creag Dhubh to Dalmally connection, ITE/ITW connection to Creag Dhubh Substation and Blarghour Wind Farm connection (reasonably foreseeable): Intervening topography would largely screen views of the proposed Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV OHL connection, the proposed ITE/ITW connection to Creag

Dhubh Substation, and the proposed Blarghour Wind Farm Connection from heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. There could potentially be cumulative impacts on the settings of a small number of heritage assets located around Ardanaiseig. This would apply to two Scheduled Monuments (SM 4105 and SM 4198), and to Ardanaiseig GDL (GDL 18), resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with these three cumulative developments. Combined views of the three cumulative developments, which would be located at their closest 5 km from the heritage assets, in combination with the Proposed Development, maybe visible from these assets where all of the proposed OHL connections tie in with Creag Dhubh substation to the south of Ardanaiseig, and on the opposite side of Loch Awe. In views from the heritage assets, where the proposed OHL connections would be seen in combination, the proposed Creag Dhubh to Inveraray connection would be visible in the foreground seen at a closer distance than the Proposed Development from the heritage assets; while the proposed ITE/ITW connection and the Blarghour Wind Farm connection would be seen at a similar distance to the Proposed Development. Taking this into consideration, it is assessed that the cumulative effect of the addition of the Proposed Development to, and in combination with, the Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV connection, the ITE/ITW connection to Creag Dhubh Substation and the Blarghour Wind Farm Connection, would have no more than a low magnitude impact on the settings of these cultural heritage assets resulting in cumulative effects of no more than minor significance (not significant), with the Proposed Development better screened from view from the heritage assets and contributing less to the cumulative impact than the Creag Dhubh to Dalmally 275 kV connection.

- Creag Dhubh Substation (reasonably foreseeable): there is no predicted visibility of the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation, from any of the heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets arising from the operation of the Proposed Developments in combination with the proposed Creag Dhubh Substation.
- Other cumulative developments, including the consented Ladyfield Forest Meteorological Mast, consented Telecommunications Tower east of Keeper's Cottage, and the consented River Aray Hydropower Scheme (see **Figure 15.1: Cumulative Developments (EIAR Volume 3a)** for details): these cumulative developments are all small-scale developments, which are considered unlikely to represent significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets when combined with the Proposed Development with these two cumulative developments.

7.8 Summary

- 7.8.1 A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey have been carried out for the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by HES, and ABC.
- 7.8.2 A total of 47 heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities, although potential prehistoric remains (burial cairns) are recorded within recently felled commercial forestry just north of Kilmun farm.
- 7.8.3 The Inner Study Area comprises rough pasture with no evidence for recent agricultural improvement, along with small areas of 20th century commercial forestry plantation, present at Taynafead (Creag Dhubh Plantation) and Creag a Chaibeil/Barr Mor (Three Bridges Plantation). It is considered that where the Proposed Development crosses modern commercial forestry plantation the survival of both the historic character of the landscape and any hitherto unknown features in these areas would have been appreciably compromised and the potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to survive in these areas is considered to be negligible, except in discrete areas around: shieling huts at Taynafead (HA2), an early medieval chapel and burial ground (HA24) and two prehistoric burial cairns (HA25 and HA26). In those areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century, it is considered that there is a low to moderate potential for further buried archaeology to survive, with an increased potential for buried remains to survive particularly where the Proposed Development passes Kilmun township (HA27) and an area of ground historically recorded as a potential burial ground (HA40c) associated with a court-hill (HA40a).

- 7.8.4 There is potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on nine heritage assets. In addition, 22 heritage assets lie within the micro-siting allowance (LOD) and could be affected by micro-siting of proposed towers or proposed access track routes. In the absence of mitigation, four of these (chapel and burial site (HA24), two possible prehistoric cairns (HA25 and HA26) and a possible burial ground (HA40c)) are assessed as being potentially of **major** significance (significant) and twelve (shieling huts (HA2), three buildings HA9, HA11, HA18 and HA31), one enclosure (HA12), a shieling hut (HA20), two sheepfolds (HA13, HA21 and HA42), township (HA27) and possible court-hill (HA40a-b)) are assessed as being potentially of **moderate** significance (significant). The other impacts are assessed as not being significant.
- 7.8.5 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted effects and residual construction effects of no more than minor significance (not significant) have been identified.
- 7.8.6 Twelve Scheduled Monuments, 24 Category A Listed Buildings, 45 Category B Listed Buildings, 26 Category C Listed Buildings, two Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), one Conservation Area and four NSR Sites have been identified within the 5 km Outer Study Area, from which there is theoretical visibility of one or more elements of the Proposed Development.
- 7.8.7 The assessment has resulted in the identification of a **moderate** significant effect (significant) on the setting of one NSR Site (Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground (1581)). The Proposed Development would result in discernible changes to the surroundings of this heritage asset, although the monument would not be isolated from its surroundings, and its setting would not be appreciably fragmented. It would remain possible for any visitor to the monument to understand and appreciate its setting. As such the integrity of the setting of the monument and its capacity to inform and convey its cultural significance, would not be compromised. The effect, which would not adversely affect the cultural significance of the asset, would last for the duration of the operational phase of the Proposed Development but would be subsequently removed following decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
- 7.8.8 The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development in combination with other cumulative developments in the vicinity is considered to be not significant.

Table 7-7: Summary of Potential Significant Effects of the Proposed Development

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/Residual Effect
Construction			
Major adverse effect on the remains of a former chapel and burial site (HA24).	<p>Mark off and avoid during construction works.</p> <p>Chapel / burial site to be excluded from working areas.</p> <p>Working area for Tower T29 and proposed access track route between Towers T28 and T30 to be kept to the north side of the Proposed Alignment and away from the chapel/burial site.</p> <p>The chapel and burial ground would be avoided by any proposed forestry felling works in the immediate area. Felling would be directed to steer timber away from the marked remains, and any trees required to be felled in close proximity to the</p>	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None (assets would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/Residual Effect
	chapel and burial ground would be removed by hand felling. Watching brief to be carried out on any ground breaking for Tower T29 and proposed access track route between Towers T28 and T30 where they lie in close proximity to the chapel/burial site.		
Major adverse effect on two possible burial cairns (HA25 and HA26).	Mark off and avoid during construction works. Watching brief to be carried out on any ground breaking for proposed access track route between Towers T29 and T30, where they pass the cairns.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None (assets would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Major adverse effect on a possible court-hill (HA40a), associated bank (HA40b) and an area of ground historically recorded as a burial ground associated with the court-hill (40c).	Mark-off and avoid the court-hill (mound) (HA40a) and associated bank (HA40b). Watching brief to be carried out on any ground breaking for the proposed access track to Tower T11 where it passes the potential burial ground.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Moderate adverse effect on shieling huts (HA2).	Mark off and avoid during felling and construction works. Felling would be steered away from the marked off heritage assets. Post felling survey to record the baseline of any additional upstanding remains associated with the shieling huts. If any additional remains are identified during the post felling survey these should be marked off and avoided for the duration of the construction works.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None Asset would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Moderate adverse effect on three buildings (HA9, HA18 and HA31), one enclosures (HA12), and a shieling hut (HA20).	Mark off and avoid during construction works.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None (assets would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Moderate adverse effect on three sheepfolds (HA13, HA21 and HA42).	Upstanding / visual remains would be avoided.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None (assets would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Moderate adverse significant effect on the	Mark off elements of township (building (HA27d),	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/Residual Effect
remains of a former township (HA27).	enclosure (HA27e) and clearance cairns (HA27f-h)) and avoid during construction works. Watching brief to be carried out on any ground breaking for proposed access track route between Towers T30 and T31. where they pass the cairns.		(asset would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Minor adverse effect on route of former drove/military road (HA3 and HA4).	Watching brief to be carried out during any ground breaking works along existing access tracks where it follows the route of the former drove / military road. Archaeological investigation of a section of the former military road that survives as a green track between OSGR 209192, 716847 to OSGR 209007, 716269 to investigate and record the method of construction of the road and to recover any material that may help date the road.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Moderate adverse effect on the remains of a former building (HA11).	Archaeological investigation to establish the nature, character and date of the feature.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Minor adverse effect on a quarry scoop and associated bank (HA7), former field system (HA14), a trackway (HA15), a head dyke (HA23), and two field walls (HA16, HA33).	Keep disturbance to a minimum.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Minor adverse effect on the remains of a building or shieling hut (HA19).	Mark off and avoid for duration of construction works.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	None (asset would be avoided for the duration of the construction works)
Minor adverse effect on the remains of a concrete platform (HA8).	None recommended.	N/A	Not significant
Negligible adverse effect on a parish boundary (HA5), and two field walls (HA16 and H29).	Keep disturbance to a minimum.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Negligible adverse effect on area of relict peat cuttings (HA6), and	None recommended	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/Residual Effect
former footbridge (HA22).			
Operation			
Moderate adverse indirect effects on the setting of Kilumn Chapel and Burial Ground (NSR Site - 1582).	None Proposed	N/A	Significant adverse residual effect.
Minor adverse effects on the settings of five heritage assets (1582, 1735, LB 11543, LB 11523 and GDL 223).	None Propsoed	N/A	Not Significant
Negligible adverse effects on the settings of five Scheduled Monuments, 91 Listed Buildings, one Conservation Area and one GDL.	None Proposed	N/A	Not significant
Cumulative Construction			
Minor cumulative adverse effect on the route of a former drove road (HA3) and military road (HA4).	Watching brief to be carried out during any ground breaking works along the existing access track where it follows the route of the former drove / military road.	Scope of work specified under the WSI approved by WoSAS.	Not significant
Cumulative Operation			
Moderate cumulative adverse effect on the setting of Kilmun Church and Burial Ground (1581).	None Proposed	N/A	Significant adverse residual effect.
Minor cumulative adverse effects on the settings of two Monuments (SM 4105 and SM 4198).	None Proposed	N/A	Not significant
Minor cumulative adverse effect on the setting of Category B Listed Society School, Glen Aray (LB 1523).	None Proposed	N/A	Not significant
Minor cumulative adverse effect on the setting of Drimfern, Long Cairn (1582).	None Proposed	N/A	Not significant
Minor cumulative adverse effects on the settings of two GDLs, Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL 223) and	None Propsoed	N/A	Not significant

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/Residual Effect
Ardanaiseig GDL (GDL 18).			