Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks
TRANSMISSION

CONTENTS

8. CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 Executive Summary

8.1.1 Desk-based assessment and walkover field surveys have been carried out to assess the effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Aberdeenshire Council Archaeology Service (ACAS) who are the historic environment advisors to Moray Council.

8.1.2 A total of 37 heritage assets (sites and features) have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities, although one site is known to be a prehistoric burial site and one other a medieval hospice.

8.1.3 There is potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on ten heritage assets. In addition, eight heritage assets lie within the micrositing allowance and could be affected by the micrositing of proposed poles or access routes. Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted effects.

8.1.4 The assessment has resulted in the identification of a low magnitude effect on the setting of one Scheduled Monument (Church of Dundurcas (SM 5621)) and a negligible magnitude effect on the setting of a second Scheduled Monument (Rothes Castle (SM 2455)), for the duration of the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The predicted effects would not adversely affect the cultural significance of either Scheduled Monument.

8.2 Introduction

8.2.1 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 EA (**Chapters 1-3**).

8.2.2 The assessment has been carried out by an associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ACIfA) from CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA), a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA).

8.2.3 This Chapter is supported by a series of figures and appendices which are referenced in the text where relevant.

8.3 Scope of Appraisal

8.3.1 This Chapter considers effects on:

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

8.3.2 For effects scoped out see Paragraph 8.3.6.

8.3.3 The assessment is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 3: The Proposed Development.**

8.3.4 The scope of the assessment has been informed by 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 4 (NPF4) (2023)

- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (published 2019, finalised amended 2020).
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2/2011).
- Moray Local Development Plan 2020:
  - EP 8 – Historic Environment.
  - EP 9 – Conservation Areas.
  - EP 10 – Listed Buildings.
- Standards and guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (CIfA, 2014; updated 2020).
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (CIfA, 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 (SNH[1]) & HES, 2018)
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment in the UK (IEMA et al, 2021).
- UK Forestry Standard: The Governments Approach to Sustainable Forestry (Forestry Commission, 2017).
- UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and Historic Environment (Forestry Commission Scotland[2], 2011).
- 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

8.3.5 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 comprises a 200 m wide corridor centred on the proposed 132 kV overhead line (OHL) and the sections of underground cable (UGC) to the east and west ends of the Proposed Development (refer to **Appendix 1.1**). A gazetteer of heritage assets within the Inner Study Area is provided as **Appendix 8.1** and they are shown on **Figure 8.1a-e**.
- An Outer Study Area: the study area for consideration of impacts affecting the settings of designated heritage assets extends 2 km either side of the centre line of the proposed 132 kV OHL. The 2 km study area has been agreed as being appropriate by HES and ACAS (see details in Table 8.1). Details on the methodology and parameters used to generate the ZTV are provided in **Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. The Proposed Development together with a 2.5 km ZTV, and the locations of heritage assets within 2 km (the study area agreed with HES and ACAS) from which there could be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development are shown on **Figure 8.2**. A gazetteer of these heritage assets is provided as **Appendix 8.2**, which also provides a tabulated assessment of the predicted impacts on their settings.

Effects Scoped Out

8.3.6 Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on World Heritage Sites, Inventory Historic Battlefields (HB), and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDL) has been scoped out. There are no assets with these designations within 2 km of the Proposed Development.

8.3.7 Listed Buildings (LB) within urban settings in Rothes and Keith are scoped-out of assessment as these all have localised settings defined by their surrounding townscapes and their place within the built environment.

8.3.8 Impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets arising from underground cable installation are scoped out on the basis that underground cables would not give rise to any such effects. Such effects are therefore not discussed further in this Chapter or in **Appendix 1.1**.

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

[2] Forestry Commission Scotland changed its name to Forestry and Land Scotland as of 1 April 2019.

8.3.9 Cumulative effects as might arise from this Proposed Development in combination with other proposed or foreseeable developments, as listed in **Chapter 4**: **Landscape and Visual (Table 4.8: Cumulative Baseline Scenario)**, are scoped out. No heritage assets that would be potentially affected by the construction of the Proposed Development would be directly affected by construction works related to the identified cumulative schemes. The presence of the Proposed Development in combination with these cumulative schemes would not be likely to give rise to a significant effect on the setting of any cultural heritage assets.

8.4 Consultation

8.4.1 The consultation process for the Proposed Development is described in **Chapter 1: Introduction and Background, Section 1.6**. A summary of consultation responses received that are relevant to this Chapter are presented in **Table 8.1**.

Table 8.1 Consultation responses

Organisation	Consultee Response	Applicant Action
HES 30 June 2020	HES were content that it may be possible to accommodate the preferred OHL route with appropriate mitigation, to avoid direct impacts on designated assets and significant adverse impacts to setting.	This was noted. The study areas used for the assessment are set out in **Section 8.3** of this Chapter. The assessment methodology is set out in **Section 8.5** of this Chapter.
	HES observed that other route options considered incorporate greater numbers of designated assets, requiring assessment in the event of further consideration of an alternative alignment.	This was noted. The assessment in this Chapter is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 3: The Proposed Development.**
ACAS 25 May 2022	ACAS were content that the methodology proposed for the assessment is appropriate, that the proposed approach for the field survey is acceptable and that the proposed study areas are adequate.	This was noted. The study areas used for the assessment are set out in **Section 8.3** of this Chapter. The assessment methodology and field survey approach are set out in **Section 8.5** of this Chapter.
HES 2 June 2022	HES were content that the methodology proposed for the assessment is appropriate and that the proposed study areas are adequate.	The study areas used for the assessment are set out in **Section 8.3** of this Chapter. The assessment methodology is set out in **Section 8.5** of this Chapter.
	HES were content that the proposed visualisation (bare-earth wirelines) locations are acceptable, and no additional locations are recommended.	Visualisations (bare-earth wirelines) are provided for two Scheduled Monuments (Rothes Castle (SM 2455) and Church of Dundurcas (SM 5621)) from locations agreed with HES (**Figures 8.3 and 8.4**). These are referenced where applicable in **Appendix 8.2** and in the assessment in **Section 8.7** of this Chapter.

8.5 Methodology

Desk Study

8.5.1 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 from appropriate sources on the locations and extents of heritage assets with statutory protection and non-statutory designations within the study areas adopted. Sources included:

- Moray Council Historic Environment Record (HER): a digital HER database extract was obtained in May 2019 for all assets within 2 km of the Proposed Development to guide design of the Proposed Development;
- National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) Scotland online database (Canmore) (HES, 2022a[3]): checked for any information additional to that contained in the HER;
- Historic Environmental Scotland Spatial Data Warehouse (HES, 2022b[4]): 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, 2022c[5]): 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.

8.5.2 Details of the sources consulted during the desk-based assessment are provided in **Appendix 8.1**.

Field Survey

8.5.3 Targeted reconnaissance walk-over field survey (as approved by ACAS) was carried out along the alignment of the Proposed Development in specific areas identified as having archaeological potential or sensitivity. Most of the alignment passes through arable or improved pasture farmland and desk-based assessment identified very few sites that have any visible above ground components. Sites within this farmland environment or within commercial forestry/woodland that were identified from existing records, historic maps, or aerial photography were visited to record their baseline character. An area of unimproved, rough grazing and moorland, between the Speyburn Distillery at Rothes and the Rothes III Wind Farm on-site substation, at the west end of the route, was subject to a full walk-over as there was considered to be some potential in these areas for hitherto unrecorded sites or features to be present.

8.5.4 The field survey was undertaken over the period 24 to 27 May 2022 with the following aims:

- to assess the present baseline condition of the heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment;
- to identify any further features of cultural heritage interest not detected from the desk-based assessment that could be affected by the Proposed Development; and
- to assess the Inner Study Area for its potential to contain currently unrecorded, buried archaeological remains

8.5.5 The field survey was undertaken by a team of two competent archaeologists who hold current CIfA membership and sufficient experience of surveying. All data was 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.

[3] HES (2022a) Historic Environment Scotland's National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE) database (Canmore), available at: http://pastmap.org.uk (Accessed May 2022)
[4] HES (2022b) Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads (Accessed May 2022)
[5] HES (2022c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAmap), available at: http://hlamap.org.uk (Accessed May 2022).

8.5.6 Site visits to assess the character and sensitivity of the setting of selected heritage assets in the Outer Study Area (**Figure 8.2**) were also undertaken during 24 to 27 May 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 from analysis of the ZTV, including those identified by consultees as requiring assessment).

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

Cultural Heritage Visualisations

8.5.8 Two designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area were identified where visualisations would aid the assessment of and demonstrate effects on their settings. Preliminary assessment of their locations and character determined that the assets were potentially sensitive to changes to their settings arising as a result of the Proposed Development.

8.5.9 The heritage assets and locations to be represented by visualisations (bare-earth wirelines) (**Figures 8.3 and 8.4**) were agreed through consultation with HES and ACAS (see **Table** 8.1, for consultation responses).

Limitations and Assumptions

8.5.10 The desk-based assessment drew on the records in the Moray Council HER, provided in a digital Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset acquired in May 2019 ahead of the field survey. It is assumed that the data provided was up to date at the time it was acquired. It is unlikely that there have been significant changes to the dataset since it was acquired, other than as augmented by the results of this field survey, and it is assumed to be a reliable and accurate reflection of the recorded cultural heritage for the purpose of the study.

8.5.11 Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 8.2**) have been identified from the HES database and downloaded from the HES website[6] in May 2022. This data is assumed to have been accurate and up to date at the time of its acquisition.

Method of Assessment

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

8.5.13 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

8.5.14 Cultural heritage assets are attributed importance through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised and protected by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the laws and policies that apply to it (HES, 2019[7]).

[6] Historic Environment Scotland (HES) GIS downloader, available at http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/spatialdownloads (Accessed May 2022)

[7] Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (2019) *'Designation Policy and Selection Guidance'*, Edinburgh.

8.5.15 **Table 8.2** summarises the relative sensitivity of those heritage assets (and their settings) relevant to the Proposed Development, excluding in this instance Word Heritage Sites and Marine Resources.

Table 8.2 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

8.5.16 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) are presented in **Table 8.3**.

Table 8.3 Description of spatial impact magnitudes

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

Assessing Effects on Setting

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

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

8.5.18 HES 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".

8.5.19 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".

8.5.20 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.

8.5.21 The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018[8]) Appendix 1, paragraph 43 advises that:

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

8.5.22 Following these recommendations, the ZTV has been used to identify those heritage assets within the Outer Study Area from which there would be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration has also been given to designated heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development 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 those views.

8.5.23 Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas within the Outer Study Area, where present within the ZTV, are included in the assessment. These assets are included in the tabulated assessments in **Appendix 8.2**, using the parameters set out in **Table 8.2**, and they are shown on **Figure 8.2**.

8.6 Baseline Conditions

Current Baseline

Inner Study Area

8.6.1 Within the Inner Study Area, 37 heritage assets have been identified. Full descriptions, and an assessment of their heritage value/sensitivity, are provided in **Appendix 8.1**. Numbers in brackets in the following text, refer to asset numbers shown on **Figure 8.1**.

Designated Heritage Assets

8.6.2 There are two listed buildings that lie within the Inner Study Area:

- the Tollhouse (LB 2324), built in 1830 by William Robertson, is Category A Listed, assessed as having heritage value at the national level and to be of high sensitivity.
- the Boat o' Brig Railway Viaduct (LB 15849), first constructed in 1858 by Joseph Mitchell is Category B Listed, assessed as having heritage value at the regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

[8] SNH & HES (2018) '*Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook*'. Available at https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf

8.6.3 There are no Scheduled Monuments (SM) within the Inner Study Area and the Inner Study Area does not cross any Conservation Area (CA), Inventory Historic Battlefields (HB), or Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes (GDL).

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Prehistoric

8.6.4 The HER records a short-cist burial (22), found 1.2 m below the ground surface in 1868 on a prominent rise to the west of Auchroisk Distillery. The site is now destroyed and artefacts from the burial are stored at the National Museum of Scotland. As such, the findspot itself is assessed as having little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity. However, the burial may indicate the presence of previously unrecorded buried prehistoric archaeological remains in the vicinity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Farmsteads

8.6.5 The remains of several unoccupied farmsteads lie to the west of Rothes: at Meikle Bawd (1), Little Bawd (2), Hunt Hill (3), Brauchhill (5) and Deerstack (6). Within the area of rough pasture, to the north-east of the Hill of Stob, Meikle Bawd (1) and Little Bawd (2) survive as turf-covered footings for buildings with adjoining enclosures and field systems, in moderately good condition. The surviving remains at Brauchhill (5) comprise poorly preserved footings for a mill building, field clearance and a raised track. The footings of a building and adjoining enclosure at Hunt Hill (3) are situated within commercial forestry and have been disturbed by planting operations. No upstanding remains survive on a level terrace at Deerstack (6). The farmstead remains, enclosures and field systems (1-3 and 5) represent constituent elements of a former historic farming landscape along the Burn of Rothes, and they are likely to retain archaeological evidence of domestic life and farming practices in the 18th and 19th centuries. In addition to any surviving buried remains at Deerstack (6), they are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.6 Three other farmsteads, at Crofts (11-12), Dundurcas (16), and Mulben (27), are depicted on Roy's Military Survey of Scotland map (1747-1755) and on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map (1874). They are currently occupied, working farms that retain some elements of their historical development, such as mill lades, structures and ponds. These farmsteads are constituent elements of the historic agrarian landscape and are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.7 Four former farmsteads, at Brauchhill (4), Deerstack (6), Craighead (26), and Hyndstack (32), have been removed by modern development or commercial forestry and no longer survive. Faint traces of former mill ponds and lades are visible but they are poorly preserved (26 and 32). Due to the impact of prior development on their integrity, they are assessed as having little residual heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Buildings

8.6.8 The site of a medieval hospice, St Nicholas' Hospital (21), at Boat o' Brig is noted in the HER as being dedicated in the early 13th century. The New Statistical Account of Scotland (1845) states that the ruins and many human remains were cleared away for the eastern approach to the 19th-century bridge, which stood in the same location as the modern road bridge. Field survey recorded a length of drystone wall in poor condition, situated on the bank south of the Tollhouse (LB 2324), which may be a surviving element of the former hospital. Due to the potential for human remains and buried evidence relating to a medieval ecclesiastical institution, the site is assessed as having heritage value at a regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

8.6.9 Two building complexes are depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1874) and remain in use. They include Auchroisk garden complex (24) and two cottages at Cullieshangan (30). As historic buildings that are constituent elements of the historic landscape they are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.10 Three small, rectangular, roofed buildings and two associated enclosures are depicted on historic maps but appear to have had short-lived occupancy. Two have been demolished and no traces remain: at Auchroisk Toll (23) and The Tam (29). Field survey recorded the reduced rubble footings of a third rectangular structure: at Craighead (25a) with a poorly

preserved enclosure wall (25b) incorporating a circular rubble pen (25c). Buried structural remains may survive within a pasture field at the Tam (29) and are considered to have heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity. As the remaining sites (23 and 25a-c) either no longer survive or are substantially degraded, they are assessed as having little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Enclosures

8.6.11 RCAHMS aerial photography (1977) shows cropmarks of two enclosures at Braes of Collie. The first (17) is a square, ditch-defined enclosure with faint crop marks to the east and south. It likely corresponds to a posited moated residence, referenced in the Scottish Castle Survey (1988), and noted in the HER as 'Dundurcas Castle'. As a cropmark site with potential archaeological remains pertaining to the medieval period, it is assessed as having heritage value at the regional level and to be of medium sensitivity. The second enclosure (18), of uncertain origin or date, lies in the corner of a cultivated field, just north of a shelterbelt woodland. It is assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.12 A series of three adjoining field enclosures (7), shown on the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map abutting the Back Burn, are no longer visible and have likely been eroded by the burn. As no longer surviving relicts of the historic pastoral farming landscape, the enclosures are assessed as having little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Railways

8.6.13 Sections of the Great North of Scotland Railway (formerly Morayshire Railway), running north-east to Orton (15 and 19) and north-west (9) from Rothes Station, are intersected by the Inner Study Area. The north-west line (9) was recorded as a raised embankment, accessible as a footpath up to 7 m wide. Field survey found no trace of the Orton section (15) where it passes to the west and south of Dundurcas farm, beneath a modern farm track. Upon entering a pasture field near Garbity, the route (19) is visible as a 7 m wide hollow-way below a western escarpment, becoming a raised embankment to the north-east. As a variably surviving relict feature of historic rail links in the area, the former railway is assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

Medieval/post-medieval: Miscellaneous

8.6.14 A weir and sluice (28), part of the Mains of Mulben (27) mill lade system, lie within the channel of the Burn of Mulben. Two mill lades are depicted on the 1st and 2nd edition Ordnance Survey maps (1874 and 1905), from the Burn of Sourden to Dundurcus farm (14), and from the Burn of Rosarie to Rosarie Farm (31). Both were observed during field survey lying within woodland, surviving only as slight infilled ditches. An access track south of Rosarie has truncated the mill pond and part of the lade (31). As relict features of the local agrarian economy, which may still have evidence of their structure, they are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.15 A series of seven boundary stones (10) lie along a straight line at Teindland Hill and probably marked the boundary between two estates. Field survey recorded a linear boundary bank spanning the study area within woodland, but no marker stones were observed in the section surveyed. As elements of historic land division, the boundary bank and any boundary stones that may survive are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

8.6.16 Several features and structures recorded in the HER, or in Canmore entries, no longer survive, or have been previously affected by commercial forestry or woodland. As minor relict or former features, they are assessed as having little heritage value and to be of negligible sensitivity. They include:

- A small, rectangular, roofed building (8) labelled on the Ordnance Survey 2nd edition map (1905) as 'Reservoir (Rothes Water Works)', which has been demolished.
- A gravel quarry scoop (13) depicted on the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map (1905) to the north of Crofts farm, overgrown in woodland with steep relief.
- The site of a wooden bridge (20) over the River Spey at Boat o' Brig, maintained from the 13th century up to the Reformation, after which it was allowed to decay and was swept away.

- A short section of bank (33) recorded in Canmore, at the southern extremity of a field at Jocksleys, that is no longer visible in dense woodland plantation.
- A stray find of 80-100 silver coins (34), given a very general grid reference at Douglasbrae.
- The remains of a disused quarry and lime kilns (35) at Braehead, now occupied by a modern residence and scrapyard.

Archaeological Potential

8.6.17 The Inner Study Area runs along the lower slopes of Brauchhill to the west of Rothes and crosses the River Spey at Boat o' Brig, before running south of Glen Orchill to follow the line of the A95, terminating south of Keith at Blackhillock substation. HLAMap (HES, 2022c[9]) records that much of the Inner Study Area comprises arable or improved pasture farmland, with some rough grazing to the south-west of Rothes, along with areas of 20th century commercial forestry plantation present at the Burn of Rothes, Teindland Hill, Cummings Wood, and Gowk Hill (**Figure 8.1a-e**). That assessment was borne out by the field survey which found that most of the route of the Proposed Development passes through modern arable and pasture farmland, with limited sections passing through rough grazing ground and/or commercial forestry.

8.6.18 No prehistoric settlement remains have been identified within the Inner Study Area, although, the remains of a Bronze Age short cist burial (22) were found to the west of Auchroisk Distillery in 1868. No further prehistoric remains have been recorded within the immediate area, however. A prehistoric field system, hut circle and cairns recorded at Stoney Hill, around 3 km north-west of Rothes, constitute the relatively scarce evidence of prehistoric activity in the surrounding landscape.

8.6.19 The remains of a medieval hospice, St Nicholas' Hospital (21), survive within the Inner Study area, funded by the tolls from a former medieval bridge (20) at Boat o' Brig which no longer survives. Later settlement, dating to at least the 18th century, is recorded throughout the Inner Study Area and depicted as frequent arable fields and farmsteads on Roy's Military of Scotland map (1747-55): such as those at Brauchhill, Dundurcas, Auchroisk, and Mulben. These farming settlements have developed through the 19th century and continue to be occupied in the modern day. The remains of 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 remains), survive in rough pasture areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century. Examples include the remains at Meikle Bawd (1), Little Bawd (2), and Hunt Hill (3). All of these remains indicate that there has been activity and settlement within the local area from the medieval period onwards.

8.6.20 Several of the farmsteads throughout the Inner Study Area feature have developed mill lade systems with sluices, mill dams, and weirs. These features are depicted on historic maps at farmsteads at Brauchhill, Dundurcas, and between Mulben and Hyndstack, and date to at least the mid-19th century. While the mill lades are commonly now infilled or silted up, they remain visible (14, 26 and 31) as relict features of the historic farming landscape and demonstrate the continued development and expansion of the farmsteads throughout the 19th century.

8.6.21 Mid-19th century developments in the Inner Study Area are demonstrated by the sections of the Great North of Scotland Railway, constructed in c. 1860 from Rothes Station to Elgin (9) and Orton (15 and 19). The Boat o' Brig Railway Viaduct (LB 15849) was constructed at the same time and survives as a Category B listed building, whereas the railway sections have been removed and are now used as footpaths and farm tracks.

8.6.22 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 has 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

[9] HES (2022c) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAmap), available at: http://hlamap.org.uk (Accessed May 2022).

forestry harvesting, are likely to have disturbed or destroyed the integrity of any surviving buried archaeological deposits that may have been present in these areas.

8.6.23 In those areas that have seen little modification or development since the 19th century, it is considered that there is a low potential for further buried archaeology to survive, with an increased potential for buried remains to survive particularly where the Proposed Development passes Meikle Bawd (1). It is also considered that there is a low potential for buried remains of prehistoric date to survive in the vicinity of the previously recorded short cist (22) to the west of Auchroisk Distillery. There is a medium potential for buried remains of medieval date to survive at the site of St Nicholas' Hospital graveyard at Boat o' Brig (21).

Outer Study Area

8.6.24 Based on analysis of the Bare-Earth ZTV, and as shown on **Figure 8.2** and detailed in **Appendix 8.2**, there are 76 designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, including:

- Two Scheduled Monuments (with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Three Category A Listed Buildings (two with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Forty-one Category B Listed Buildings (23 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Twenty-eight Category C Listed Buildings (12 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development); and
- Two Conservation Areas (both with predicted theoretical visibility)

Sensitive Receptors

8.6.25 A summary of the receptors identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development and which have been 'scoped in' to the assessment is given in **Table 8.4** together with the justification for their inclusion.

Table 8.4 Summary of Sensitive Receptors Scoped-In

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
Scheduled Monuments up to 2 km from the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in **Appendix 8.2** along with their relative sensitives.	High	These are monuments protected by statute. The consent of the 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 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.
Category A Listed Buildings up to 2 km from the Proposed Development; except for those that lie within urban settings and in built-up areas.	High	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).

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
A list of these is provided in **Appendix 8.2** along with their relative sensitives.		Planning authorities and the 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.
Category B and C Listed Buildings up to 2 km from the Proposed Development; except for those that lie within urban settings and in built-up areas. A list of these is provided in **Appendix 8.2** along with their relative sensitivities.	Medium to Low	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 the 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.
Conservation Areas up to 2 km from the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in **Appendix 8.2** along with their relative sensitives.	Medium	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.
Other non-designated historic environment assets within the Proposed Development LOD. A list of these is provided in **Appendix 8.1** along with their relative sensitivities.	Low 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.

8.7 Potential Impacts

8.7.1 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.

Potential Construction Impacts

Assumptions for Potential Construction Impacts

8.7.2 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.

8.7.3 The potential, adverse, permanent, and irreversible direct impacts identified below would result primarily from ground disturbance associated with erection of the OHL poles and construction of, or upgrading of, access tracks close to recorded heritage assets shown on **Figure 8.1a-e**.

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

- where heritage assets lie within 25 m of proposed trident pole locations (to allow for working areas);
- where heritage assets lie along proposed new or upgraded access routes, including where the proposed access route runs along the line of the proposed OHL (a nominal 6 m wide corridor is allowed); and
- where heritage assets lie within proposed forestry felling areas (see **Chapter 3: The Proposed Development**)

Micrositing / Limit of Deviation

8.7.5 It is the intention that the Proposed Development would be subject to a Limit of Deviation (LoD) of 50 m in either direction along the Proposed Alignment, measured from each pole centre. New and upgraded access tracks would be subject to an LoD of 30 m. This permits detailed design and construction activities to avoid environmental constraints or physical features as required (see **Chapter 3: The Proposed Development**). 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).

8.7.6 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 consultation with the Council Archaeologist to agree appropriate mitigation where potential impacts may result.

Potential Construction (Direct) Effects: Inner Study Area

8.7.7 As previously stated, 37 heritage assets have been identified within the Inner Study Area. It is assessed that there is potential, in the absence of mitigation, for construction works to result in direct impacts on ten of these. These are:

- Structures (1c, 1d, 1f and 1i) and field banks (1a, 1b and 1h), within the post-medieval farmstead at Meikle Bawd (1), lie within the workings areas for poles between and including Pole 5 to Pole 8. Further elements could potentially be impacted if these poles or associated access are moved north. Construction works for the Proposed Development and vehicular access between the poles would disturb the upstanding features and affect the integrity of the field system and farmstead as a whole. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effects, on individual elements of Meikle Bawd (1), of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effects are set out in **Section 8.8**.
- The remains of a track (5c) atop a raised embankment lies within the working areas for Pole 46 and Pole 47, and would be crossed by access between Pole 45 and Pole 47. Construction works for the Proposed Development and vehicular access would disturb some sections of the raised bank along which the trackway runs. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude. Mitigation measures to reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 8.8** (paragraph 8.8.7).

- The site of the former farmstead at Deerstack (6) lies within the working area for Pole 47. Construction works for the Proposed Development could disturb any surviving structural remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 8.8**.
- A section of the former railway from Rothes Station toward Elgin (9) lies within the proposed tree felling area between Pole 66 and Pole 67. The built embankment could potentially be further affected by any deviation in the proposed access route to Pole 67, or if Pole 66 is moved north. Tree-felling works between Pole 66 and Pole 67 could also disturb a section of the embankment. However, none of these potential impacts seem likely to arise given that the former rail track runs along an embankment. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of negligible magnitude and no mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset.
- The estate boundary bank (10) lies within the proposed tree-felling corridor between Pole 78 and Pole 79. Vehicular access along the proposed OHL route and tree-felling works would likely disturb a small section of the bank. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude. Mitigation measures to reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 8.8** (paragraph 8.8.7).
- The line of the former Orton railway (15) lies within the working areas for Poles 101 to 105 and Poles 109 to 121. Construction works for the Proposed Development would likely disturb any surviving below-ground remnants of the railway in these sections, although it is unlikely that there will be any buried remains of the former railway trackbed. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset that is overall of low sensitivity, would be of negligible magnitude. No mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset between Pole 101 and Pole 121.
- The demarcated area for a cropmark enclosure (18) at Braes of Collie lies partly within the working area for Pole 122; although that part is partially covered by woodland. Construction works for the Proposed Development (Pole 122) and tree-felling activity could possibly disturb the cropmark site. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, is likely to be of low magnitude. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce and offset the predicted effect are set out in **Section 8.8**.
- Earthwork remains of the former Orton railway (19) lie within the working area for Pole 124. Construction works for erection of Pole 124, and vehicular access across the field, would likely result in disturbance of the integrity of the embankment at this localised position. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset that is overall of low sensitivity, would be of negligible magnitude. No mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset at Pole 124.
- The site of a former building at The Tam (29) lies within the working area for Pole 190. Construction works for the Proposed Development could disturb any structural remains of the building that may survive as buried deposits. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the predicted effect are set out in **Section 8.8**.
- The former mill lade and dam at Rosarie (31) lies within the proposed tree-felling area between Pole 212 and Pole 213. Construction works and tree-felling activity for the Proposed Development could impact a section of the lade. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the direct effect, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude. No mitigation is recommended in respect of the predicted effect on this asset.

8.7.8 If proposed poles or access tracks were to be relocated within the LOD, it is possible that there could be direct adverse impacts on a further eight of the identified heritage assets or features within the inner study area and in proximity to access routes. In each case assessed above, it is unlikely that micrositing would be required to the extent that the Proposed Development would impinge on the recorded remains. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are set out in **Section 8.8** 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 or damaged as a result of construction work, where appropriate.

8.7.9 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. This is most likely to occur where new, permanent tracks are to be constructed or existing tracks upgraded by widening. Assuming that on-line access between pole locations is likely to be temporary and not require excavation of topsoil deposits, no adverse impacts on buried deposits are likely to occur.

8.7.10 Based on the evidence acquired, 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 no more than medium sensitivity (where the Proposed Development passes close to the findspot of a prehistoric short cist burial (22) and a medieval hospital graveyard (21)). Measures are proposed in **Section 8.8** to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately addressed.

Setting Impacts During Construction

8.7.11 Construction activity such as pull-through and pole erection machine positions, scaffolding, and temporary access tracks have the potential to indirectly affect the settings of sites of heritage assets both within the Outer Study Area. These construction activities would however be temporary and would have no permanent effects. Therefore, temporary impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets have not been assessed on a site-by-site basis.

Potential Operational Impacts

Direct Operational Impacts

8.7.12 There are no heritage assets likely to receive 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 any such works as may be required.

Setting Impacts During Operation

8.7.13 The Proposed Development could result in adverse effects on the settings of designated cultural heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the OHL. At distances greater than 2 km, it is considered that, in most instances, the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter characteristics of the setting of the heritage assets that contribute to their cultural significance, neither would it appreciably alter how the heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.

8.7.14 **Appendix 8.2** contains tabulated assessments of the predicted effects on the settings of designated heritage assets from which there is some degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development based on analysis of the ZTV (**Figure 8.2**).

8.7.15 There are no heritage assets beyond 2 km from the Proposed Development that have been identified through appraisal of the wider ZTV or notified through consultation with HES and ACAS that require consideration of potential impacts on their settings.

8.7.16 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 8.2**. For the methodology used for assessment of potential effect magnitude refer to **Section 8.5**.

8.7.17 Effects from the Proposed Development on the settings of two scheduled monuments (Rothes Castle and Church of Dundurcas) agreed with HES as requiring detailed assessment are discussed below.

Rothes Castle (SM 2455) (Figure 8.4a-e)

8.7.18 The monument comprises the ruined remains of a curtain wall for the 13th century castle, isolated by a dry moat to the south-west, and situated on the western edge of Rothes. This single surviving fragment is all that remains of the curtain wall that once surrounded a keep several storeys in height. The wall fragment is predominantly a single-phase structure,

attributed to a request c. 1200 by King William the Lion that Petrus de Pollock build a castle at Rothes. Much of the remaining building material has been robbed and used in the construction of the 18th century village. The site holds a commanding view to the west, overlooking the valley of the Burn of Rothes, from where it guarded an important highway in the medieval period. To the north-east, the site of Aikenway Castle, on the banks of a loop in the River Spey, would likely have been visible from Rothes Castle. That castle served as a residence for the brother of Earl Leslie when the family had their seat at Rothes Castle. The remains of Rothes Castle are now largely encircled by a belt of trees that screen views of the monument from the wider landscape (other than to the east and south-east) and also screen views of its surroundings from the monument in directions other than that to the east and south-east.

8.7.19 The proposed overhead line would pass 1.8 km to the west of Rothes Castle, running south-west to north-east across open pasture on the foot of Brauchhill (**Figure 8.2**). **Figure 8.4a-e** provides a bare-earth wireline visualisation of the Proposed Development as viewed from the Castle's location. From these images it can be seen that, in the absence of the screening afforded by trees that currently surround the Castle remains, distant visibility of the Proposed Development would be possible in an arc from the west to the north-east (**Figure 8.4b-e**). Views between Rothes Castle and the contemporary site of Aikenway Castle on the east bank of the River Spey would not be interrupted (**Figure 8.4e**). It would remain possible for any visitor to Rothes Castle to understand the monument and its relationships to other sites in the surrounding landscape and to the Spey valley and Rothes village, and to appreciate and experience its defensive setting.

8.7.20 Overall, considering the nature of the Proposed Development and the scale of the OHL support poles as they might be seen from the monument, it is assessed that there would be a negligible magnitude effect on the setting of Rothes Castle. The cultural significance of the Castle remains would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

Church of Dundurcas (SM 5621) (Figure 8.3a-e)

8.7.21 The monument consists of the remains of an 18th century church which are likely to overlie the remains of an earlier church. The parish of Dundurcas dates to the early 12th century and is recorded as a 'vicarage' in 1274. The present building and graveyard are located on the summit of a knoll which may have been utilised as a defensive site in the past, as there is a slight ditch on the south-west side of the mound. The church is rectangular in plan, rubble-built, with a bellcote on the west gable. It measures 15.6 m east-north-east to west-south-west by 8.1 m north-north-west to south-south-east, with walls 0.7 m thick. The church is situated on the floodplain of the west bank of the River Spey, with an open aspect overlooking arable fields and the river to the south-east. This open aspect includes views of existing vertical electricity transmission infrastructure along the alignment of the Proposed Development. Views to contemporary monuments and settlements, namely west to Aikenway Castle and north-east to the medieval river crossing at Boat o' Brig, are obscured by trees in the foreground and managed woodland along the River Spey.

8.7.22 The proposed overhead line would pass within 150 m of the church (**Figure 8.2**), running south-west to north-east along a farm track that overlies the Orton section of the former Great North of Scotland Railway. **Figure 8.3a-e** provides a bare-earth wireline visualisation of the Proposed Development as viewed from the church. Where it passes closest to the church (**Figure 8.3c-d**), the Proposed Development would be viewed backdropped by modern arable fields and the River Spey, and beyond the pre-existing overhead transmission lines. Where the OHL recedes to the north-east (**Figure 8.3b**) and west (**Figure 8.3e**), it would be screened by a shelterbelt woodland that lies in the foreground in views from the church. Principal views of the surrounding landscape, across the River Spey to Ben Aigan, would not be interrupted. It would remain possible for any visitor to the church to understand the monument, and to appreciate and experience the church's rural, and largely enclosed setting.

8.7.23 Overall, considering the nature of the Proposed Development and the scale of the OHL support poles as seen from the monument, it is assessed that there would be only a low magnitude adverse effect on the setting of the Church of Dundurcas. The cultural significance of the church and graveyard would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

8.8 Mitigation

8.8.1 Historic Environmental Policy for Scotland (HEPS) requires the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment and the emphasis in Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2) is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible. The mitigation measures presented below take this policy advice and planning guidance into account and provide various options for protection or recording and ensuring that, where practical, surviving assets are preserved intact to retain the present historic elements of the landscape.

8.8.2 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or where appropriate during, the construction of the Proposed Development. The scope of works would be detailed in one or more Written Scheme(s) of Investigations (WSI) developed in consultation with (and subject to the agreement of) ACAS, acting on behalf of Moray Council.

8.8.3 A professionally qualified Archaeological Contractor would be appointed to act as an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) as required during the development works (forestry felling works and construction phase). The role of the ACoW would be to provide advice to the appointed Contractor regarding micrositing 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 (ACAS). The activities of the ACoW would be carried out according to the scope of work and terms specified under the WSI approved by ACAS.

8.8.4 Mitigation proposals are set out on a site-by-site basis in **Appendix 8.1**.

Mitigation During Construction

Preservation in situ

8.8.5 Should micro-siting be required, poles and associated infrastructure would be located, where possible, away from heritage assets. Forestry tree felling, where required, would be directed away from known heritage assets, in accordance with standard forestry management practices.

8.8.6 Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, around ground-breaking works at proposed pole positions, and along proposed access routes, as far as reasonably practicable and as advised by an ACoW. This would be achieved through marking out the locations of assets to be avoided using high visibility markers placed a minimum of 2 m from the outermost edge of the identified features but noting that some assets may require a larger protection buffer. It may also be appropriate to employ tracking mats over earthworks and to define access corridors so as to minimise disturbance to linear features such as field boundary banks and tracks.

8.8.7 Where linear assets survive as upstanding features (principally field banks and walls), such as the track (5c) and estate boundary bank (10), access tracks would be routed, as far as practicable, through any existing gates or through broken or less well-preserved sections of banks or walls wherever possible, within the consented LOD. Disturbance to tracks, field banks and walls would be kept to a minimum necessary to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact. Tracking mats would be employed where required access utilises or crosses historic trackways (5c) and boundary banks (10). In the case of upstanding drystone walls breached to facilitate access, these would be made good upon completion of the works using traditional drystone walling techniques.

8.8.8 The following heritage assets would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase:

- Farmstead elements (1a-i, 1l-n, 1p, 1r, 3, 6 and 29)
- Mill lades/ponds (12, 26, 31)
- Cropmark sites (17 and 18)
- Wall footings (21) of former medieval hospital.

8.8.9 Construction contractors would be made aware of the need to avoid these assets during construction works and any markers would be removed upon completion of the Proposed Development.

Micrositing

8.8.10 In order to mitigate potential impacts on identified heritage assets, no micrositing would take place without prior consultation with the appointed ACoW. Any identified heritage asset or feature that falls within or close to a revised working area or access route would be marked out and avoided in line with the mitigation outlined above in paragraphs 8.8.5 – 8.8.6.

Watching Briefs

8.8.11 The Applicant will agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with ACAS 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 work on site, including any required enabling works.

8.8.12 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:

- Meikle Bawd farmstead (1): where construction works and access routes lie in close proximity to several structures (1c, 1d, 1f and 1i). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works for Poles 5 to 7, to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered. Establishment of vehicular access corridors across the area would also be monitored to ensure below-ground deposits are not disturbed or that any disturbance is kept to a minimum.
- Deerstack farmstead (6): where construction works and access routes lie in close proximity to the site of former buildings (6). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works for Pole 47, to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered. Establishment of vehicular access corridors across the area would also be monitored to ensure below-ground deposits are not disturbed.
- St Nicholas' Hospital (21): where construction works lie in close proximity to the site of a medieval hospital and graveyard. An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works for Pole 132, to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered. If possible human remains are encountered special measures will need to be taken to report and recover any such material.
- Auchroisk short cist (22): where construction works lie in close proximity to the recorded findspot of a prehistoric burial. An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works for Poles 139 to 141, to identify and record any potential remains that may be encountered. If possible human remains are encountered special measures will need to be taken to report and recover any such material.
- The Tam (29): where construction works are proposed within the footprint of the former building and enclosure. An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works for Pole 190, to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered.

8.8.13 Where buried remains (including any possible human remains) are encountered during archaeological monitoring of groundworks, further mitigation may be required to the approval of ACAS. The preferred mitigation will be preservation in situ.

- Where topsoil removal is required for the purposes of constructing access tracks or establishing compounds or laydown areas, preservation of any exposed archaeological deposits could be achieved by recording the locations and extents of any features identified and retaining them unexcavated beneath a geotextile membrane placed on the subsoil surface and beneath the track or compound make up layer.
- Where disturbance of the remains is unavoidable (for example, where pole foundations are required) allowance will be made for the excavation of any features encountered to a scheme to be agreed with ACAS under the terms of the WSI.

Post-Excavation Assessment and Reporting

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

Construction Guidelines

8.8.15 Written guidelines will be set out in the WSI, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines will 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.

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

Mitigation During Operation

8.8.17 Construction of any new temporary access tracks required for maintenance during the operation of the Proposed Development would take into account cultural heritage assets based on the constraints mapping provided (**Figure 8.1a-e**).

8.9 Summary

8.9.1 A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey have been carried out for the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments from, and information supplied by, HES and ACAS (historic environment advisors to Moray Council).

8.9.2 A total of 37 heritage assets (sites and features) have been identified within the Inner Study Area. The majority of these are associated with medieval or later settlement and agricultural activities, although one site is known to be a prehistoric burial site and one other a medieval hospice.

8.9.3 There is potential for construction works within the Inner Study Area to result in direct effects on ten heritage assets. In addition, eight heritage assets lie within the micrositing allowance (LoD) and could be affected by micrositing of the poles or access track routes.

8.9.4 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid or reduce the predicted effects. The proposed mitigation includes the demarcation of assets for preservation in-situ and the implementation of watching briefs during ground-breaking works and establishment of access requirements across specified areas with increased potential for the presence of archaeological features or deposits. If significant discoveries are made during the watching briefs and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to a programme to be agreed in writing with ACAS.

8.9.5 The assessment has resulted in the identification of a low magnitude effect on the setting of one Scheduled Monument (Church of Dundurcas (SM 5621)) and a negligible magnitude effect on the setting of a second Scheduled Monument (Rothes Castle (SM 2455)). The Proposed Development would constitute a minor addition to the foreground of views from Church of Dundurcas, in the context of existing overhead transmission infrastructure. Distant visibility of the Proposed Development from Rothes Castle would be almost entirely screened by the surrounding woodland. It would remain possible for any visitor to these monuments to understand and appreciate the monuments and their settings. As such the integrity of the setting of the monuments and their capacity to inform and convey their cultural significance, would not be compromised. The effects, which would not adversely affect the cultural significance of the assets, would last for the duration of the operational phase of the Proposed Development.