

VOLUME 1: CHAPTER 10: CULTURAL HERITAGE

10.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	
10.1	Executive Summary	10-1
10.2	Introduction	10-1
10.3	Scope of Assessment	10-2
10.4	Consultation	10-3
10.5	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	10-4
10.6	Methodology	10-5
10.7	Baseline Conditions	10-8
10.8	Embedded Mitigation	10-10
10.9	Assessment of Likely Significant Effects	10-10
10.10	Cumulative	10-12
10.11	Summary and Conclusions	10-12
10.12	References	10-12

Figures (Volume 2 of this EIA Report)

Figure V1-10.1: Cultural Heritage

Appendices

There are no appendices associated with this Chapter.

This page is intentionally blank.

10. CULTURAL HERITAGE

10.1 Executive Summary

10.1.1 This Chapter assesses the potential for both direct and indirect impacts on cultural heritage assets from both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development with the Proposed Alignment and reaches conclusions as to the predicted likely significance of effects. The effects associated with the construction phase can be considered to be representative of worst-case decommissioning effects, and therefore no separate assessment of decommissioning has been undertaken as part of this assessment. However, dismantling works associated with the redundant parts of the existing OHL have been considered as part of this assessment.

Cultural Designated Sites

10.1.2 Within a 3 km outer study area of the Proposed Alignment, 14 designated heritage sites were identified, which are of National heritage importance (high sensitivity) to indirect visual impacts or impacts on setting. The designated heritage sites identified comprise of 11 listed buildings and three scheduled monuments. The majority of these designated heritage sites would not be subject to visibility of the Proposed Alignment or are in practical terms of low sensitivity to indirect impacts and as such have been scoped out of detailed assessment, as agreed with statutory consultees, and are therefore not addressed in this Chapter. Potential indirect impact on one Category A Listed Building (Bighouse Garden Pavilion and Walled Garden) has been examined in more detail, and the assessment has concluded that indirect effects on this designated site as a result of construction or operation of the Proposed Alignment would be **Minor Adverse and not significant**.

Cultural Heritage Assets

10.1.3 Seven non-designated heritage assets were identified within or immediately outside an inner study area, defined by the Limits of Deviation of the Proposed Alignment. These heritage assets date from the prehistoric period to the era of commercial sheep farming in the early 19th century. The potential for unidentified archaeological remains is considered to be low to negligible. A number of minor features of Local or Negligible heritage importance (low or negligible sensitivity) were identified within the inner study area, comprising dykes and areas of peat cutting, but are not addressed in this evaluation as any indirect impact from the Proposed Alignment would be considered to be of negligible significance.

10.1.4 The assessment concluded that there would be **no significant direct or indirect effects** on any of the heritage assets identified within or immediately outside the inner study area as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Alignment. Nevertheless, the implementation of best practice mitigation measures would still be applied to ensure the heritage assets are not vulnerable to accidental damage during construction.

10.2 Introduction

10.2.1 This Chapter assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Alignment on designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets and reaches conclusions as to the predicted likely significance of effects. It details the results of desk-based and field survey and draws on information and comments provided by Historic Environment Scotland and The Highland Council during the scoping process.

10.2.2 The Proposed Development with the Alternative Alignment is assessed in **Volume 5: Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage – Alternative Alignment**.

10.2.3 The assessment considers the potential for both direct impacts, meaning those that have potential to physically disturb or damage heritage features within or immediately outside an inner study area, defined by the Limits of Deviation of the Proposed Alignment. It also considers indirect impacts, meaning those which can adversely

affect the historic setting of heritage features via the Proposed Alignment's visibility from each feature or its curtilage (within the inner and outer study areas).

- 10.2.4 The assessment has been undertaken by field archaeologist and cultural heritage consultant Catherine Dagg who is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. A table presenting relevant qualifications and experience of key staff involved in the preparation of this Chapter is included in **Volume 4: Appendix V1-5.1: EIA Team Details**.

10.3 Scope of Assessment

- 10.3.1 This Chapter considers effects on designated sites which are taken to include Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Inventory gardens; Designed landscapes; and Inventory battlefields. It also considers non-designated heritage assets which are taken to include recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites and areas of archaeological, historical and cultural significance; previously unevaluated policies and designated landscapes; and other elements of cultural heritage.

Study Area

- 10.3.2 Two study areas appropriate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Alignment have been adopted for the cultural heritage assessment, as shown on **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1: Cultural Heritage** and set out below. The inner study area considers both direct and indirect effects, whilst the outer study area considers indirect effects only.

Outer Study Area

- 10.3.3 Following review of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) model for the Proposed Alignment, the outer study area for indirect effects (i.e. effects on setting) extends to 3 km either side of the OHL. This was considered appropriate to identify those heritage sites with statutory or non-statutory designations that could have their setting adversely affected by the Proposed Alignment.

Inner Study Area

- 10.3.4 The inner study area, to locate and define archaeological features with the potential for direct impacts, was formed by the location of the Proposed Alignment infrastructure and set as a corridor within the defined Limits of Deviation, as set out in **Volume 1: Chapter 3 – The Proposed Development**. This includes 100 m overhead line (OHL) LoD (50 m either side of the centreline of the OHL), 50 m access track LoD (25m either side of the centreline of proposed new access tracks), 100 m cable sealing end (CSE) compound LoD (from the outer edge), and 100 m underground cable (UGC) LoD (50 m either side of the centreline of the UGC).
- 10.3.5 The potential for previously unrecorded minor features of land use within the inner study area, which may be associated with recorded cultural heritage assets, but are located immediately outside the inner study area has been taken into account in the assessment.

Effects Scoped Out of Assessment

- 10.3.6 The Scoping Report (see **Volume 4: Appendix V1-4.2: Scoping Report – March 2024**) proposed that an assessment of indirect impacts on several designated heritage sites identified within the outer study area be scoped out of this Chapter, as detailed below. Historic Environment Scotland (HES) agreed with this approach, as set out in **Table V1-10.1: Consultation Responses**.
- 10.3.7 While there are 11 Listed Buildings and three Scheduled Monuments within the outer study area, as illustrated on **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1**, intervening terrain means that, according to the ZTV, many of these designated heritage sites would receive no or insignificant visibility of the Proposed Alignment. These would include Strathy Former Church of Scotland (LB7143), Bighouse Barracks (LB7161), Bighouse garden walls and west pier gates

(LB7159), Strath Halladale Mission Church (LB7142), Smiegal Bridge (LB12915), Smiegal Mill (LB7141), Baligill Mill (SM4265) and Baligill Burn Limekilns (SM4290). The majority of those with the potential for insignificant indirect, visual impact, are domestic or industrial, placed in the landscape for practicalities of proximity to population or access to resources and would not be considered to be particularly sensitive to alterations to their setting. In this category would be Strathy Former Free Church, School and Manse (LB7144, LB7146, LB7145) and Bighouse Mains Steading (LB7140).

10.3.8 The Hut Circle settlement at Halladale Bridge (SM3304) is also domestic in nature, placed in the landscape to exploit resources and possibly enjoying a significant visual relationship with Loch Mor Broch. The visual relationship would not be crossed by the Proposed Alignment and thus SM3304 is scoped out.

10.3.9 There is one designated heritage site; Bighouse Garden Pavilion and Walled Garden (LB7160), with potential to receive adverse indirect effects, and this heritage site is included in the detailed assessment set out in Section 10.9 of this Chapter.

10.3.10 The cultural heritage asset Connagill Township (MHG10555) is located in proximity of the Proposed Alignment near Connagill 275/132 kV substation, see **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1**. However, the only remains of this heritage asset following construction of Connagill 275/132 kV substation and its associated access track is downslope to the west and north of the access track and would not be affected by the Proposed Alignment. This heritage asset has therefore been scoped out of further assessment.

10.4 Consultation

10.4.1 Full details of the consultation process and responses are included in **Volume 1: Chapter 4: Scope and Consultation** and associated appendices.

10.4.2 **Table V1-10.1** sets out the comments received from consultees in relation to cultural heritage and the actions taken to address them within this assessment.

Table V1-10.1: Consultation Responses

Organisation & Date	Summary of Consultation Response	EIA / Design Response to Consultee
The Highland Council [Historic Environment Team] 21 st May 2024	The Council's Historic Environment Team have confirmed that they are satisfied with the process and the study area detailed in the Scoping Report and are content that this will adequately address the required impact assessment for this proposal.	This has been noted
Historic Environment Scotland 26 th April 2024	HES welcome that potential impacts on the historic environment has been scoped into the assessment. HES welcome that the assessment will include the potential for direct impacts, impacts on setting of assets and the potential cumulative impact of the proposals.	This has been noted.
	HES strongly recommend that 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' Guidance Note on Setting is used to inform setting assessments and further information on good practice in cultural heritage assessment can be found in Appendix 1 of the EIA Handbook (2018).	The guidance documents recommended have been used to inform the assessment.

Organisation & Date	Summary of Consultation Response	EIA / Design Response to Consultee
	HES are content that a 3 km study area for identifying assets within [their] remit which may receive impacts to their setting is adequate given the scale of the proposed development.	This has been noted.
	HES are satisfied with the lists of assets within [their] remit to be scoped in and scoped out of further detailed assessment.	This has been noted.
	HES welcome that the [scoping] report indicates that recommendations for mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects will be provided where necessary. Should mitigation measures be required, [HES] would be happy to discuss further.	This has been noted.

10.5 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

10.5.1 The key legislation, policy and guidance listed below has been considered in the assessment:

Legislative Context

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011; and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).
- The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

Policy Context

- National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4) (Scottish Government, 2023);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES, 2019a, finalised amended 2020);
- Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013) (Scottish Government, 2013, revised 2017);
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN 2/2011) (Scottish Government, 2011);
- Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (THC, 2012):
 - Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage;
 - Policy 69: Electricity Transmission Infrastructure; and
- Appendix 3: Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features;
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019).

Technical Guidance

- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA, 2017);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016; updated 2021);
- Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work (THC, 2012);
- Highland Historic Environment Strategy: Supplementary Planning Guidance (THC, 2013);
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and ClfA, 2021);

- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES), 2018); and
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021).

10.6 Methodology

10.6.1 This assessment has been prepared using the following methodology:

Desk Based Evaluation

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

- The Highland Historic Environment Record (HER).
- CANMORE database of Historic Environment Scotland.
- Historical Ordnance Survey maps and pre-Ordnance Survey maps held in the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland.
- Previous survey reports covering recent developments in the vicinity and accessible online through the Highland HER website¹, the most relevant being:
 - Strath Halladale to Dallangwell 132kV Grid Connection;
 - Strathy North Wind Farm;
 - Strathy South Wind Farm; and
 - Strathy Wood Wind Farm.

Field Survey

10.6.3 A field survey carried out in August 2023 targeted areas under consideration for development that had not been covered by previous survey work for other developments in the near vicinity (as referenced above in paragraph 10.6.2).

10.6.4 A further walkover was carried out in February 2024 primarily focused on two recorded heritage assets (Site 3; Airigh an Leathaid farmstead and Site 5: Havaig Fort). The purpose of the visit was to identify any visible minor features associated with these two particular heritage assets, and assess the potential for sub-surface remains, in order to advise on the careful placement of infrastructure for the Proposed Alignment.

10.6.5 No further archaeological features other than those of negligible sensitivity such as areas of peat cuttings and associated access tracks were identified within the inner study area during the 2023 and 2024 survey work. The present condition of the archaeological features listed in Section 10.7 was compared with previously recorded information and potential impacts of the Proposed Alignment identified.

Determining Magnitude of Change and Sensitivity of Receptors

10.6.6 This section explains criteria for evaluating the impact of the Proposed Alignment on cultural heritage receptors.

Direct Impacts

10.6.7 The significance of a direct impact depends upon the sensitivity / importance of a cultural heritage asset, combined with the magnitude of the impact.

Sensitivity / Importance

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

¹ Highland Historic Environment Record (HER). Available at: <https://her.highland.gov.uk/map> [Accessed December 2024]

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

Magnitude

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

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

Significance of Direct Impact

10.6.10 The predicted significance of impact is determined by professional judgement, considering an archaeological site's importance in conjunction with the magnitude of impact predicted on it. **Table V1-10-2** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of a direct impact. An effect of Moderate or Major is considered to be significant (as highlighted in **Table V1-10.2**).

Table V1-10.2: Significance of a Direct Impact

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

Magnitude of Impact	Importance / Sensitivity		
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible

Indirect Impacts

10.6.11 An indirect impact is related to the potential impact of a development on the setting of a cultural heritage site or asset. The significance of an indirect impact depends upon the importance of a cultural heritage site, combined with the magnitude of the impact.

Sensitivity / Importance

10.6.12 The sensitivity or importance of a site is set out in **Table V1-10.3**.

Table V1-10.3: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting:

Sensitivity	Guideline Criteria
High	The site has a clearly defined setting that is readily appreciable and is considered vital to its character and the appreciation of this. The site will generally be visible within the landscape.
Medium	The site's character and the appreciation of this relate to some extent to its setting. The site will generally be visible on the ground.
Low	The site's surroundings have little relevance to its character and the appreciation of this. The site is difficult to identify on the ground or its original setting features are difficult to appreciate.
Imperceptible	The site is imperceptible in the landscape and its character and appreciation do not relate to its surroundings.

Magnitude of Indirect Impact

10.6.13 Criteria to assess the magnitude of visual impact on the setting of a cultural heritage feature are provided below:

- **High Impact:** a fundamental material impact obviously changing the surroundings of an asset, such that its baseline is substantially altered;
- **Medium Impact:** an impact discernibly changing the surroundings of an asset, such that its baseline setting is partly and materially altered;
- **Low Impact:** a slight, but detectable, impact that does not materially alter the baseline setting of the asset; and
- **Imperceptible:** a very slight and barely distinguishable change from baseline conditions.

Significance of Indirect Impact

10.6.14 **Table V1-10.4** summarises the criteria for assessing the significance of an indirect impact upon the setting of each cultural heritage feature which was determined by considering its visual sensitivity in conjunction with the magnitude of visual impact predicted on it. A moderate or major effect is considered to be significant. Where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement supported by reasoned justification has been applied to determine the level of significance.

Table v1-10.4: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Sensitivity of a Cultural Heritage Feature to Changes to its Setting:

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

10.7 Baseline Conditions

Overview

- 10.7.1 The Proposed Alignment would be located within three distinct areas in terms of cultural heritage assets. The western and eastern extents of the Proposed Alignment are located within sheltered and relatively fertile river valleys which were settled continuously from the prehistoric period but mostly depopulated in the 19th century, the lack of subsequent development leaving a relict landscape of monuments and settlements. The higher moorland between the two straths has provided little opportunity for historic land use other than summer grazing and peat cutting.
- 10.7.2 The western strath, that of the River Strathy, provides a relatively narrow corridor of settlement where both prehistoric structures, in the form of hut circle settlements dating back to the Bronze Age, and Early Modern townships, occupy the same ground, exploiting the same resources. This pattern is repeated on the east side of the strath, that of the Halladale River. By contrast, the western slopes of Strath Halladale have, for the most part, been avoided by early Modern settlement, but allow for scattered prehistoric remains including defensive sites such as Melvaig Broch (CANMORE id. 6904) and Havaig Fort (CANMORE id. 6898), which were both strategically located to control movement through the strath. A mediaeval cross slab (CANMORE id. 6929) is located on the hillside to the west of the River Strathy indicating a mediaeval Christian presence but with no associated ecclesiastical structures or traditions.
- 10.7.3 The central section of high moorland contains, in terms of cultural heritage, a small number of individual shieling structures, generally constructed of turf and poorly defined within the landscape, large areas of peat cuttings and associated peat tracks and ephemeral turf dykes which probably date to the 19th century period of commercial sheep farming. Only one heritage site, at Airigh an Leathaid (CANMORE id. 86986), suggests a possibly short-lived attempt to utilise the moorland for cultivation.
- 10.7.4 After the clearance of the population of both straths to make way for commercial sheep farming, only shepherd's cottages were established and occupied, contemporary with stells, fanks, enclosures and the many long banks and dykes that rise from the rivers to divide the higher ground. Subsequent to this, the only impact on this landscape has been afforestation with the first commercial forestry block at Strathy North planted in the early 1970s. While most of the archaeological record relating to the periods of settlement and land use listed above survive outwith the planted areas, some minor features have been completely covered by coniferous planting. However, the archaeological landscape of the two straths, and the high ground between, survives for the most part in open ground, unaffected by more modern development.
- 10.7.5 The mid-18th century mansion house of Bighouse, with its associated formal gardens and other features, was built for the Mackays of Strath Halladale and Bighouse at a date when social ostentation became more important than defence. The formal placing of garden features would possibly have incorporated a relationship with features in the wider natural landscape.

Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

10.7.6 As discussed in paragraphs 10.3.7 – 10.3.8, although there are 14 designated sites within the 3 km outer study area, the majority of these sites have been scoped out of detailed assessment as they either would have no direct or insignificant visibility of the Proposed Alignment, or are considered to be of low practical sensitivity to indirect impacts, being place in the landscape for practical purposes such as accessibility of resources (hut circle settlement), or proximity to the local population (schools, churches, manse). The exception to these criteria has been identified as:

- **Bighouse, Garden Pavilion and Walled Garden** Listed Building, Category A (LB7160): This small building, located on the east wall of the walled garden associated with Bighouse, has a west-facing front facade and there may have been an original purpose to include vistas towards the hills to the west into its design. However, these vistas are now almost entirely screened by later buildings and mature trees. National importance and high sensitivity.

Non-Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

10.7.7 All recorded heritage assets located within or just outside the inner study area are listed below and displayed on **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1**.

- **Site 1: Bowside Lodge**, cairnfield (CANMORE id. 6930). An area of prehistoric cultivation consisting of approximately ten disturbed field clearance piles with no associated hut circle or other settlement features, centred on NC 8312 6094. Local importance and low sensitivity.
- **Site 2: Clais Fearna**, hut circle (MHG 9673 and CANMORE id. 6921). One isolated prehistoric hut circle prominently located on a slight knoll on the hillside rising from the Alltan nam Muc, at NC 8352 6207. Scattered features of cultivation in the form of small field clearance piles have been noted to the north of the hut circle. Regional importance and medium sensitivity.
- **Site 3: Airigh an Leathaid**, farmstead (MHG 13407 and CANMORE id 86986). Substantial footings of three rectangular drystone buildings at NC 8419 6230 with a low length of field boundary wall extending eastwards and an area of improved ground to the north. The possible presence of a corn kiln would suggest year-round Early Modern occupation although an alternative interpretation would be an early 19th century shepherd's station. Regional importance and medium sensitivity.
- **Site 4: Allt na h'Eaglais**, cairnfield (MHG 9697 and CANMORE id. 6897). Area of prehistoric cultivation marked by scattered field clearance cairns centred on NC 8843 6105. There are no associated hut circles or other contemporary features. Local importance and low sensitivity.
- **Site 5: Havaig² Fort** (MHG 9696 and CANMORE id.6898). Occupying the southern end of a narrow ridge are the faint traces of walling of a possibly Iron Age fortification. This would appear to be prominently placed to control Strath Halladale, with clear intervisibility with Melvaig broch to the north and a distant view of Ben Grian Beag hillfort to the south. The small internal area would suggest a signalling station rather than an occupied fort. Regional importance and medium sensitivity.
- **Site 6: Allt na h'Eaglais**, field system (MHG 19731). Located on a relatively steep east facing slope immediately to the west of the existing access track, is an unusual set square and rectangular field enclosure. There is no known parallel to this type of field system in the Highland region and the site is of unknown date. As a non-designated asset it would be assigned a category of Regional importance and medium sensitivity, but the potentially unique nature of the feature would give it a potential National importance, and high sensitivity to direct impacts.

² Referred to as Loch A' Bhealach on the Canmore database

- **Site 7: Kirkton** township, enclosure, burial ground and chapel site³ (Canmore id. 86996 and MHG 18610). Early mapping would suggest there was a township in this general location although the visible archaeology is probably all 19th century or later. This broad area would be considered to be of Regional importance and medium sensitivity to both direct and indirect impacts.

10.7.8 A number of other minor features of Local or Negligible heritage importance (low or negligible sensitivity) were identified within the inner study area, as displayed on **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1**. These heritage assets comprise dykes (boundaries) and areas of peat cutting. However, any direct impact from the Proposed Alignment on these features is considered to be of negligible significance and they are not considered further.

10.8 Embedded Mitigation

10.8.1 Embedded mitigation in the form of avoidance of direct damage to the cultural heritage assets listed in Section 10.7 has been incorporated during the design stages of the Proposed Alignment. This mitigation has not been applied to Site 1: Bowside Lodge and Site 4: Allt na h'Eaglais which are considered to be of local importance and low sensitivity to negative impacts. Design work has taken into consideration the key north vista of Site 5: Havaig Fort with the intention of sensitively siting towers to reduce obstruction of this vista, where possible (see **Volume 1: Chapter 2: The Routeing Process and Alternatives**).

10.8.2 Protection of heritage assets (including Site 2: Clais Fearnna, Site 3: Airigh an Leathaid and Site 5: Havaig Fort) from accidental damage during the construction phase is recommended in the form of identifying and clearly marking off with some form of barrier and appropriate signage. The exclusion zones should extend as far as practicable out from the visible features of the heritage assets. This measure would prevent temporary parking and laydown of materials during construction.

10.8.3 Protection of Site 6: Allt na h'Eaglais field system, from damage during upgrade of the existing access track is recommended in the form of any required widening of the track being on the east side, avoiding any excavation into the bank to the west. An exclusion zone is recommended between the points NC 8917 6115 and NC 8915 6101, which should be clearly marked with some form of barrier and appropriate signage.

10.8.4 In addition, awareness of site workers to the significance and sensitivity of the archaeological exclusion zones should be raised through on-site toolbox talks.

10.8.5 These mitigation measures should be carried out by, or under the supervision of, a qualified archaeologist or Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) using the baseline information provided in this EIA. The archaeologist should also be on call in case of any unanticipated archaeological discoveries or concerns.

10.8.6 Subsequent sections of this Chapter assume that the embedded mitigation described above will be fully implemented.

10.9 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

Direct Impacts - Inner Study Area

10.9.1 The potential for direct impacts on non-designated cultural heritage assets during the construction phase of the Proposed Alignment are set out below:

10.9.2 **Site 1: Bowside Lodge** and **Site 4: Allt na h'Eaglais**. Both heritage assets represent areas of prehistoric cultivation with no associated settlement, considered to be of local importance and low sensitivity to direct impacts. The Proposed Alignment would pass directly through these two areas and it is assumed that there may be a degree of direct damage to some visible features of these heritage assets. Any damage to these two

³ **Volume 1: Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual** is of relevance to this asset because it identifies and assesses potential visual effects on Kirkton Cemetery.

heritage assets would be considered to be of Low magnitude and the significance of potential direct impact is considered to be **Negligible** and **not significant**.

- 10.9.3 **Site 2: Clais Fearna** (hut circle) and **Site 3: Airigh an Leathaid** (farmstead) are located immediately outwith the inner study area and no direct impacts are predicted for these regionally important (with medium sensitivity) heritage assets during construction or operation of the Proposed Alignment. As such the significance of potential direct impact is considered to be **Negligible** and **not significant**. There is potential that minor unrecorded associated features (in the form of cultivation) with these two heritage assets may be located within the inner study and there may be potential for a degree of direct damage to some of these features during construction of the Proposed Alignment. Therefore, the implementation of best practice mitigation measures (as detailed in Section 10.8) would still be applied to Sites 2 and 3 to ensure heritage assets are not vulnerable to accidental damage during construction.
- 10.9.4 **Site 5: Havaig Fort** is of Regional importance and therefore medium sensitivity and is located outwith the inner study area. As direct damage or destruction is not anticipated, the magnitude of impact is therefore considered to be negligible. Nevertheless, the implementation of best practice mitigation measures (as detailed in Section 10.8) would still be applied to ensure this heritage asset is not vulnerable to accidental damage during construction. The significance of this potential impact is considered to be **Negligible** and **not significant**.
- 10.9.5 **Site 6: Allt na h'Eaglais** field system is located immediately to the west of an existing access track proposed to be upgraded. This heritage asset is considered to be potentially of national importance and high sensitivity, and thus the significance of any direct impact would be Major and significant. However, implementation of mitigation measures, as detailed in Section 10.8, would ensure that direct impacts are avoided and the significance of potential direct impacts is therefore considered to be **Negligible** and **not significant**.
- 10.9.6 **Site 7: Kirkton** township, enclosure, burial ground and chapel site located near an existing track proposed to be upgraded. The likelihood of sub-surface features being located along the area proposed for the track upgrade is considered to be low. This heritage asset is considered to be of Regional importance and medium sensitivity and therefore the significance of potential direct impact is considered to be **Minor** and **not significant**. However, the potential for archaeological remains in the broader area is higher and any use of this area, particularly to the east near the burial ground and chapel site, has greater potential for negative direct impact on sub-surface features and indirect, visual impact on the setting of the burial ground.
- 10.9.7 No direct impacts on cultural heritage assets are anticipated from the dismantling works of the redundant parts of the existing Strathy North 132 kV trident 'H' wood pole OHL.

Indirect Impacts – Inner Study Area

- 10.9.8 There may be a degree of indirect visual impact on the setting of **Site 5, Havaig Fort**, from built elements of the Proposed Alignment during the operational phase. Vistas northwards from the fort to Melvaig broch (CANMORE 6904) have been identified as key elements in the setting of this heritage asset. This was taken into consideration during the design stage when considering the siting of individual towers to minimise impacts. While the vista northwards would be narrowed, it would not be directly obstructed by the location of towers 56 and 57 to the north of the fort, and towers would be located at a lower elevation (see **Volume 2: Figure V1-10.1**). Havaig Fort is considered to be of Regional importance (medium sensitivity) to indirect impacts. The magnitude of this potential indirect impact is considered to be Low. The significance of potential indirect impact is considered to be **Minor Adverse** and **not significant**.

Indirect Impacts – Outer Study Area

- 10.9.9 One designated site, Bighouse Garden Pavilion and Walled Garden (LB7160) is of high sensitivity to indirect effects and has been considered for potential visual impact. However, it is considered that views towards the Proposed Alignment are adequately screened by intervening buildings and vegetation. The magnitude of

indirect impact is therefore considered to be negligible and the significance of impact **Negligible and not significant**.

10.10 Cumulative

10.10.1 Cumulative effects would only be considered in relation to significant visual impacts and impacts on the setting of designated assets and heritage assets. However, as no designated site or heritage asset would be impacted either directly or indirectly, a cumulative assessment has been scoped out of this assessment.

10.11 Summary and Conclusions

10.11.1 An assessment has been made of the predicted significance of effects of the Proposed Development with the Proposed Alignment on cultural heritage interests. This assessment identified no significant direct or indirect effects, assuming the application of best practice mitigation measures.

10.12 References

CFA Archaeology Ltd (2006). Cultural Heritage, Strathy North Wind Farm Environmental Statement. Prepared for Scottish and Southern Energy Generation Limited.

Headland Archaeology Ltd (2011). Cultural Heritage, Strathy Wood Wind Farm Environmental Statement. Prepared for RWE Renewables

Dagg C. (2012). Cultural Heritage, Strathy North Wind Farm. Prepared for Scottish and Southern Energy Generation Limited.

Dagg C. (2013). Strathy South Wind Farm Environmental Statement. Prepared for Scottish and Southern Energy Generation Limited.

Dagg C. (2012) Strath Halladale to Dallangwell 132 kV OHL. Prepared for Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission plc