TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

9 CULTURAL HERITAGE

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of likely significant effects with respect to Cultural Heritage associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

9.1.2 A heritage asset is any element of the historic environment which has cultural significance. Both discrete features, and extensive landscapes defined by a specific historic event, process or theme, can be defined as heritage assets; assets may overlap or be nested within one another. Designated assets include Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields and Historic Marine Protected Areas. Other assets may also be locally designated through policies in the Local Development Plan.

9.1.3 The majority of heritage assets are not designated. Some non-designated assets are recorded in Historic Environment Records (HER) maintained by local authorities and other agencies. Many heritage assets are currently unrecorded, and the information contained in HERs is not definitive, since they may include features which, for instance, have been entirely removed, or are of uncertain location, dubious identification, or negligible importance. The identification of non-designated heritage assets is therefore to some extent a matter of professional judgement.

9.1.4 Some heritage assets may coincide with visual receptors or landscape character areas in terms of the potential for effects of the proposed development on visual experiences. In such cases, it is important to recognise the difference in approach between these two topics. The cultural heritage assessment addresses effects on the cultural heritage significance of heritage assets, which may result from, but are not equivalent to, visual impacts. The **Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, Volume 2, Chapter 5** focuses more on subjective present experience and amenity, while cultural heritage has a focus on understanding of cultural significance, both intellectually and emotionally, across past, present and future generations. An effect on a landscape character area does not therefore equate to an effect on the cultural significance of heritage assets within it.

9.1.5 The objectives of the chapter are to:

- Describe the baseline; the location, nature and extent of any known heritage assets or areas of archaeological potential which may be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the assessment;
- Describe the potential effects, including cumulative effects;
- Describe the mitigation measures proposed to address likely significant effects (if required); and
- Assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation (if required).

9.1.6 This chapter is supported by the following figures and technical appendices which provide further information and are referenced throughout the chapter:

- EIA Report **Volume 3a: Figures**
  - **Figure 9.1a and Figure 9.1b** Known Heritage Assets within the Application Boundary.
  - **Figure 9.2** Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the Outer Study Area (OSA) and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Development.
- EIA Report **Volume 3: Cultural Heritage Visualisations**
  - **CHVP01 Figure 9.3** Photomontage: GDL00019 / SM13644 / LB4715 Ardchattan Priory / Ardchattan House Garden and Designed Landscape, Scheduled Monument, Category B Listed Building. View from southern side of GDL
  - **CHVP02 Figure 9.4** Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. View towards monument on approach from west
  - **CHVP03 Figure 9.5** Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. 360 view from monument
  - **CHVP04 Figure 9.6** Photomontage: SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of. 360 view from monument
  - **CHVP05 Figure 9.7** Photomontage: SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh. 360 view from monument
  - **CHVP06 Figure 9.8** Photomontage: SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of. View from monument
  - **CHVP07 Figure 9.9** Photomontage: SM3888 Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of. View from eastern cairn
- EIA Report **Volume 4: Technical Appendices**
  - **Technical Appendix 9.1**: Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment
  - **Technical Appendix 9.2**: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer

9.2 Statutory and Planning Context

Legislation

9.2.1 Relevant legislation and guidance documents have been taken into account as part of this Cultural Heritage assessment.

9.2.2 Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings are protected by statute:

- Legislation regarding Scheduled Monuments is contained within The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
- Legislation regarding Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas is contained in The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

9.2.3 The 1979 Act makes no reference to the settings of Scheduled Monuments.

9.2.4 The 1997 Act places a duty on the consenting authority with respect to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and their settings. Section 59 of the 1997 Act states:

"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, a planning authority or the Scottish Ministers, as the case may be, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

9.2.5 Section 64 of the 1997 Act states:

"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under [the planning Acts]..., special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

9.2.6 The Proposed Development does not include buildings or other land in a conservation area, so section 64 does not apply in this case.

9.2.7 The Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014 defines the role of the public body, Historic Environment Scotland (HES), and the processes for the designation of heritage assets, consents and rights of appeal.

Planning Policy

9.2.8 The historic environment is defined as "…the physical evidence for past human activity. It connects people with place, and with the traditions, stories, and memories associated with places and landscapes' in 'Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment' (2023, 10) and in National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) as "the physical evidence for human activity that connects people with place, linked with the associations we can see, feel and understand" (Annex F – Glossary of definitions). These documents present the Scottish Government's strategy for the protection and promotion of the historic environment.

9.2.9 National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) Part 1 A National Spatial Strategy for Scotland 2045 describes how the future spatial development of Scotland can contribute to planning outcomes. It shows where there will be opportunities for growth and regeneration, investment in the low carbon economy, environmental enhancement, and improved connections across the country.

9.2.10 Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, HES, 2019a) defines the Historic Environment and Scottish Government Policy. It sets out the vision and key principles on how to care for and protect Scotland's historic environment including designations of ancient monuments, principles for scheduling and listing, contexts for conservation areas, marine protected areas, gardens and designated landscapes, historic battlefields and consents and advice.

NPF4 – Part 2: Historic Assets and Places Policy 7

9.2.11 The Scottish Government's planning policies in relation to the historic environment are set out in NPF4 Part 2 National Planning Policy (The Scottish Government, February 2023). Policy 7: Historic assets and places states:

"Policy Intent: To protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places."

9.2.12 NPF4 Policy 7 applies its principles to designated and non-designated assets. Those relevant to the current assessment are as follows:

"a) Development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places will be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change.

Proposals should also be informed by national policy and guidance on managing change in the historic environment, and information held within Historic Environment Records.

c) Development proposals for the reuse, alteration or extension of a listed building will only be supported where they will preserve its character, special architectural or historic interest and setting. Development proposals affecting the setting of a listed building should preserve its character, and its special architectural or historic interest.

i) Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact on important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.

h) Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:

i. direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;

ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided; or

iii. exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.

o) Non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible. Where there is potential for non-designated buried archaeological remains to exist below a site, developers will provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource at an early stage so that planning authorities can assess impacts. Historic buildings may also have archaeological significance which is not understood and may require assessment.

Where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised. Where it has been demonstrated that avoidance or retention is not possible, excavation, recording, analysis, archiving, publication and activities to provide public benefit may be required through the use of conditions or legal/planning obligations.

When new archaeological discoveries are made during the course of development works, they must be reported to the planning authority to enable agreement on appropriate inspection, recording and mitigation measures."

Local Planning Policy

9.2.13 Argyll and Bute Council's Local Development Plan (LDP2; 2024) covers all of Argyll and Bute; it provides the planning framework and guides the future use and development of land in towns, villages and the rural area.

9.2.14 The following Policies of LDP2 relate to the historic environment:

- Policy 15: Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment
- Policy 16: Listed Buildings
- Policy 19: Scheduled Monuments
- Policy 20: Gardens and Designed Landscapes
- Policy 21: Sites of Archaeological Importance

9.2.15 These Policies are set out in full in Table 2 of the Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**). The only heritage assets identified as affected by the Proposed Development in this chapter are Scheduled Monuments: as Policy 19 of the 2024 LDP2 states that '*New development on sites affecting the settings of scheduled monuments must respect their architectural, historic and other special qualities and conform to the national policies and guidance*' NPF4 therefore forms the central policy tests applied in this chapter.

Guidance

9.2.16 The methodology for this cultural heritage impact assessment is consistent with the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (v5 NatureScot & HES 2018), guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland, Appendix 1.

9.2.17 HES also provides guidance in a series of documents entitled 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' (MCHE). These provide guidance to planning authorities and stakeholders regarding key issues relating to development, the planning process, and key issues pertaining to the historic environment. Most relevant to this assessment are the guidance notes covering Setting (June 2016 updated 2020), Works on Scheduled Monuments (2016 updated 2020), and Gardens and Designed Landscapes (2016 updated 2020).

9.2.18 HES published Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (DPSG, 2019b) to accompany HEPS. DPSG outlines the policy and selection guidance used by HES when designating sites and places of national importance.

9.2.19 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology provides technical advice to planning authorities and developers on dealing with archaeological remains. Among other issues it considers the balance in planning decisions between the preservation in situ of archaeological remains and the benefits of development; setting; the circumstances under which developers can be required to provide further information, in the form of a field evaluation to allow planning authorities to reach a decision; and measures that can be taken to mitigate adverse impacts.

9.2.20 Standards and Guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) have been followed in preparing this assessment, in particular the 'Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment' (2014, updated 2020) and the 'Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment' (2014, updated 2017 & 2020).

9.2.21 This assessment has also been prepared with reference to IEMA, IHBC and CIfA's July 2021 publication 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK'. This document presents good practice for assessment of the impact of a development proposal on cultural heritage assets which is consistent with the Principles.

9.2.22 The cultural heritage visualisations supporting this chapter have been produced by the Landscape and Visual team according to NatureScot's 2017 guidance 'Visual Representations of Wind Farms'; the methodology for preparing these is described in **Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: LVIA Assessment Criteria.**.

9.3 Consultation Undertaken

9.3.1 Throughout the scoping process, and subsequently during the ongoing EIA process, relevant organisations were contacted with regards to the Proposed Development. **Table 9.1** outlines the consultation responses received in relation to Cultural Heritage.

Table 9.1: Summary of consultation responses relevant to this chapter

Consultee	Issued Raised	Response/Action Taken
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Scoping Response Case ID 300059981 08 Sept 2023	*'It is proposed to scope out of the EIA the decommissioning of the existing windfarm, as ground disturbance will not extend beyond the construction footprint and residual operation setting effects would be reversed. We also note that the Scoping report suggests the construction phase setting effects would be short-lived and therefore not significant in EIA terms.* *We are content with this approach.'*	Decommissioning of the existing wind farm and assessment of construction phase setting effects is scoped out of the assessment in this chapter.
	'The study areas proposed are the site, to identify potential direct (physical) impacts; and the Outer Study Area (OSA) based on a bare earth ZTV to identify assets beyond the site that may be affected through development within their setting. *We are content with these two study areas.'*	These study areas have been adopted for the assessment in this chapter.
	'The EIA Report should assess all the nationally important heritage assets identified in the Scoping Report.'	HES was consulted on the heritage assets proposed for detailed assessment in the EIAR through submission of **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.1** Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (23/10/23) and also regarding the suitability of proposals for supporting visualisations. See row below.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Detailed consultation Case ID 300059981 21 Nov 2023	*'At this stage we are content with the list of assets to be scoped in and the list of assets to be scoped out, with the exception of the scheduled monuments known as Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of (SM3891) and Glenamachrie, cairns 65m E & 300m WNW of (SM3888) which should be retained for further assessment.* *We are also content with the location of the proposed visualisations but would expect photomontages rather than wireframes for all of the scoped in assets in due course.'*	Heritage assets agreed for assessment of direct and indirect physical effects is presented in **Table 9.5** of this chapter. The agreed list of heritage assets proposed for detailed setting assessment is: o CHVP01 Photomontage: GDL00019 / SM13644 / LB4715 Ardchattan Priory / Ardchattan House Garden and Designed Landscape, Scheduled Monument, Category B Listed Building. View from southern side of GDL o CHVP02 Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. View towards monument on approach from west

Consultee	Issued Raised	Response/Action Taken
		o CHVP03 Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. 360 view from monument o CHVP04 Photomontage: SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of. 360 view from monument o CHVP05 Photomontage: SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh. 360 view from monument o CHVP06 Photomontage: SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of. View from monument o CHVP07 Photomontage: SM3888 Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of. View from eastern cairn For photomontages for agreed cultural heritage viewpoints (CHVPs) see **Volume 3: Cultural Heritage Visualisations CHVP01 – 07**.
	'…we note from scoping stage that access to the site will be taken directly off the A85 and routed through Fearnan Forest, which lies to the north of Glen Lonan. The access would therefore need to cross Glen Lonan, and potentially pass close to several scheduled monuments. Setting impacts as a result of the access route infrastructure do not appear to have been considered. We would recommend that this is considered as soon as possible.'	Construction phase setting effects of the proposed Site Access is scoped into the assessment in this chapter (see section **9.8)**.
The West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS)		WoSAS, advisors to Argyll and Bute Council, was consulted at Scoping and subsequently to agree the heritage assets proposed for detailed assessment in the EIAR through submission of **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1** Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (23/10/23) and also regarding the suitability of proposals for supporting visualisations. No responses were received from WoSAS.
The West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) and Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	N/A	On 6th May 2025, cultural heritage consultees were informed of the change in the Proposed Development design, reduced from 11 turbines (149.9 m to tip) to seven turbines (149.9 m to tip). As the current proposal falls entirely within the physical and visual envelope of that previously consulted upon, the viewpoints as previously agreed remain unchanged for the assessment in this cultural heritage chapter.

9.4 Approach to the Assessment

Scope of Assessment

9.4.1 The approach to assessment in this chapter, described in detail below, is in accordance with relevant guidance on cultural heritage impact assessment provided by: 'Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook' (NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland, 2018), 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020), and the 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK' (IEMA, IHBC and CIfA, 2021).

9.4.2 This assessment is concerned with impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets. It identifies assets that may be affected by the Proposed Development by considering cultural significance including the contribution made by its setting. If an asset's setting is found to make a substantive contribution to its cultural significance, and this contribution is likely to be affected as a result of the Proposed Development, the asset is considered to be 'sensitive'. Assets that are found to be sensitive to the predicted changes in their setting may experience a higher magnitude of impact than an asset that is less sensitive to changes in its setting.

9.4.3 The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of an asset is diminished or enhanced by a proposed development. As above, the sensitivity of a heritage asset to change within its setting is considered and reflected in the conclusions regarding the magnitude of any identified impact upon its cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate or experience this cultural significance. This definition of magnitude of impact, and the assessment methodology as a whole, apply to likely effects resulting from changes to the setting of heritage assets as well as likely physical effects. The EIA significance of this effect is determined by comparing the predicted magnitude of impact with the level of importance assigned to the specific asset (reflecting the greater protection in policy afforded to assets of higher importance).

9.4.4 The cultural heritage assessment has been carried out in the following stages:

- Definition of baseline conditions, comprising desk-based study and visits to heritage assets, leading to the identification of the cultural significance and importance of heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development;
- Assessment of the magnitude of impacts (physical, indirect, setting and cumulative) during construction and operation of the Proposed Development on the cultural significance of heritage assets, informed by baseline information, site visits, Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping, wireframes and photomontages;
- Assessment of the significance of effects, broadly a product of the asset's importance and the magnitude of the impact;
- Proposal of mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or offset significant adverse effects where necessary; and
- Presentation of residual effects and any monitoring proposals.

Baseline Methodology

Desk Study and Field Surveys

Study Areas

9.4.5 The Application Boundary has been used to gather baseline data on the known and potential archaeological resource to inform the EIA (**Volume 3a, Figure 9.1**). Within the Site, all heritage assets are considered for construction and operational effects. Heritage assets within 1 km of the Site have been identified and considered to inform the assessment of archaeological potential.

9.4.6 Heritage assets have been included in the assessment for nested Outer Study Areas (OSA) based on their level of importance (see Table 9.2) to ensure that likely significant effects are identified. The OSA reflects the fact that the more important the asset, the more likely significant effects could be generated over greater distances. Therefore, the following study area boundaries have been applied:

- Up to 2 km from proposed turbines: Category C Listed Buildings;
- Up to 5 km from proposed turbines: Category B Listed Buildings;
- Up to 10 km from proposed turbines: Inventory Historic Battlefields, Conservation Areas, and non-designated heritage assets including Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes (NIDLs); and
- Up to 20 km from proposed turbines: Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

9.4.7 In addition, beyond the OSA as defined above, any other designated assets which are within the ZTV are included in the assessment where a significant impact is considered possible as a result of the Proposed Development i.e. an asset is considered exceptionally important and/or sensitive to visual change within its setting, and/or where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to contribute to cultural significance in the opinion of the assessor or consultees. This screening exercise is based on the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2016 updated 2020) and supplemented through scoping and further consultation with statutory consultees. In the case of this Proposed Development, based on the opinion of the assessor and agreed with consultees, one listed building located beyond the defined 5 km OSA for Category B Listed Buildings is included in the assessment: LB4715 Ardchattan House is located in the 10 km OSA and is assessed as an important element of GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory (**Volume 3a, Figure 9.2**).

Data Sources

9.4.8 The baseline for the assessment has been informed by a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**) based on all readily available documentary sources, following the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) 'Standard and Guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment'. The following sources of information were referred to:

- Designation data downloaded from the Historic Environment Scotland website in October 2023;

- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), including the Canmore database and associated photographs, prints/drawings and manuscripts held by HES;
- Historic Environment Record (HER) data, digital extract received from West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), in February 2022;
- Historic Landscape Assessment (HLA) data, viewed through the HLA Map website (https://hlamap.org.uk/);
- The National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP);
- Geological data available online from the British Geological Survey (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html);
- Historic maps held by the National Library of Scotland (https://maps.nls.uk/);
- Unpublished maps and plans held by the National Records of Scotland;
- Relevant internet resources, including Google Maps, Google Earth, Bing satellite imagery and PastMap;
- Readily available published sources and unpublished archaeological reports;
- Findings of other environmental topics (LVIA, peat depth, ground conditions, noise and vibration);
- A zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) and photomontage and wireline visualisations; and
- Field surveys.

9.4.9 A visual field survey of the Site was undertaken on 24th – 25th May 2023 in clear weather conditions. Notes were made regarding site characteristics, any visible archaeology and geographical/geological features which may have a bearing on previous land use and archaeological survival, as well as those which may constrain subsequent archaeological investigation. Records were made regarding extant archaeological features, such as earthworks or structural remains, any negative features, local topography and aspect, exposed geology, soils, watercourses, health and safety considerations, surface finds, and any other relevant information.

9.4.10 Field visits for the purposes of setting assessment were undertaken on the 21st – 22nd September 2023 in mixed and predominantly overcast weather conditions with moderate long-distance visibility. This was sufficient for the inspection and assessment of the settings of the selected heritage assets.

9.4.11 Designated heritage assets are discussed in this EIA Report chapter with the List Entry reference number assigned by HES. Non-designated assets are discussed with their reference number assigned by the HER. Previously unrecorded heritage assets within the site have been assigned a number (prefixed HA for Heritage Asset). A single asset number can, for convenience, refer to a group of related features, which may be recorded separately in the HER and other data sources.

9.4.12 The full list of known heritage assets within the Study Areas is presented in the Gazetteer (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2**). Known heritage assets within the Site are shown on **Volume 3a, Figure 9.1**, with detailed descriptions in the Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**). Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the OSA are shown on **Volume 3a, Figure 9.2,** with the Proposed Development Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV).

Potential for Unknown Heritage Assets in the Site

9.4.13 The likelihood that undiscovered heritage assets may be present within the Site is referred to as archaeological potential. Overall levels of potential can be assigned to different areas of the Site, while recognising that the archaeological potential of any area will relate to particular historical periods and types of evidence. The following factors are considered in assessing archaeological potential:

- The distribution and character of known archaeological remains in the vicinity, based principally on an appraisal of data in the HER;
- The history of archaeological fieldwork and research in the surrounding area, which may give an indication of the reliability and completeness of existing records;
- Environmental factors such as geology, topography and soil quality, which would have influenced land-use in the past and can therefore be used to predict the distribution of archaeological remains;
- Land-use factors affecting the survival of archaeological remains, such as ploughing or commercial forestry planting; and
- Factors affecting the visibility of archaeological remains, which may relate to both environment and land-use, such as soils and geology (which may be more or less conducive to formation of cropmarks), arable cultivation (which has potential to show cropmarks and create surface artefact scatters), vegetation, which can conceal upstanding features, and superficial deposits such as peat and alluvium which can mask archaeological features.

9.4.14 In the Archaeological Potential section of this assessment, the likelihood that the Site may contain undiscovered heritage assets, their likely location and potential density, and their likely level of importance is assessed, described, and justified.

Cultural Significance

9.4.15 Cultural heritage impact assessment is concerned with effects on cultural significance, which is a quality that applies to all heritage assets, and as defined by Historic Environment Scotland (Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, NatureScot & HES 2018, v5 Appendix 1 page 175), relates to the ways in which a heritage asset is valued both by specialists and the public. The cultural significance of a heritage asset will derive from factors including the asset's fabric, setting, context and associations. This use of the word 'significance', referring to the range of values attached to an asset, should not be confused with the unrelated usage in terms of the conclusions reached on the significance of likely environmental effects in accordance with the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

9.4.16 Cultural significance is assessed in relation to the criteria in DPSG Annexes 1-6, which are intended primarily to inform decisions regarding heritage designations but may also be applied more generally in identifying the 'special characteristics' of a heritage asset, which contribute to its significance (intrinsic, associative, or contextual as outlined below). DPSG Annex 1 is widely applicable in assessing the cultural significance of archaeological sites and monuments, for instance, while the criteria in Annex 2 can be used in defining the architectural or historic interest of buildings, whether listed or not. Cultural significance of assets is considered in terms described in DPSG Annex 1:

- Intrinsic Characteristics - those inherent in the monument i.e., "*how the physical remains of a site or place contribute to our knowledge of the past*";

- Associative Characteristics – subjective associations, including those with current or past aesthetic preferences i.e., "*how a site or place relates to people, practices, events and/or historic and social movements*"; and
- Contextual Characteristics – those relating to the monument's place in the landscape or in the body of existing knowledge i.e., "*how a site or place relates to its surroundings and/or to our existing knowledge of the past*".

Contribution of Setting to Cultural Significance

9.4.17 The characteristics which contribute to an asset's cultural significance may include elements of its setting. Setting is defined in 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES 2016 updated 2020, Section 1) as "the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced". The setting of a heritage asset is defined and analysed according to Stage 2 of the three-stage approach promoted in 'MCHE: Setting', with reference to factors listed on pages 9-10, as follows:

- *"Current landscape or townscape context;*
- *Views to, from and across or beyond the historic asset or place;*
- *Key vistas: for instance, a 'frame' of trees, buildings or natural features that give the historic asset or place a context, whether intentional or not);*
- *The prominence of the historic asset or place in views throughout the surrounding area, bearing in mind that sites need not be visually prominent to have a setting;*
- *Aesthetic qualities;*
- *Character of the surrounding landscape;*
- *General and specific views including foregrounds and backdrops;*
- *Views from within an asset outwards over key elements in the surrounding landscape, such as the view from the principal room of a house, or from a roof terrace;*
- *Relationships with other features, both built and natural;*
- *Non-visual factors such as historical, artistic, literary, place name, or scenic associations, intellectual relationships (e.g. to a theory, plan, or design), or sensory factors; and*
- *A 'sense of place': the overall experience of an asset which may combine some of the above factors."*

9.4.18 The relevance of these factors to the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset determines how, and to what extent, an asset's cultural significance derives from its setting. All heritage assets have settings; however, in some cases, setting may contribute very little to the asset's significance, or only certain elements of the setting may be relevant. The above range of factors were taken into consideration when determining which assets are sensitive to change within their setting and thus may be impacted by the Proposed Development.

9.4.19 Operational and/or under-construction wind energy developments (and any other existing developments that may also be relevant) are described as part of the existing baseline in the impact assessment section.

Integrity

9.4.20 In relation to scheduled monuments, NPF4 Policy 7(h) states that:

'Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where: ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided.'

9.4.21 NPF4 does not define 'integrity' in the context of Policy 7(h), therefore for the purposes of the assessment, HES recommend that the following shared definition for the concept of integrity of setting is used:

'*changes to factors of setting that contribute to cultural significance such that the understanding, appreciation and experience of an asset are not adequately retained will affect the integrity of setting.'*

Importance of Heritage Assets

9.4.22 The importance of a heritage asset is the overall value assigned to it based on its cultural significance, reflecting its statutory designation or, in the case of non-designated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (Table 9.2).

9.4.23 Heritage Assets are defined as "*Features, buildings or places that provide physical evidence of past human activity identified as being of sufficient value to this and future generations to merit consideration in the planning system*" (NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5, p.122). Thus, any feature which does not merit consideration in planning decisions due to its cultural significance may be said to have negligible (cultural heritage) importance; in general, such features are not considered as heritage assets and are excluded from the assessment (see accompanying Cultural Heritage Baseline Desk-based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**).

Table 9.2: Criteria for assessing the importance of heritage assets

Importance	Criteria
Very High	Assets valued at an international level, e.g. World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal international importance that contribute to international research objectives.
High	Assets valued at a national level, e.g. Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Battlefields, Historic Marine Protected Areas, some conservation areas and non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designation in the opinion of the assessor. Category B or C-listed buildings where the existing designation does not adequately reflect their value, in the opinion of the assessor.
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, e.g. Category B Listed Buildings, some conservation areas and non-designated assets of similar value in the opinion of the assessor. Category C-listed buildings where the existing designation does not adequately reflect their value, in the opinion of the assessor.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, e.g. Category C Listed Buildings, some conservation areas and non-designated assets of similar value in the opinion of the assessor.

Source: NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, Figure 2

Assessment Methodology

Effects of the Proposed Development

9.4.24 Effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment can arise through direct physical impacts, indirect impacts, or impacts on setting:

- Direct physical impacts describe those activities of the Proposed Development that directly cause damage to the fabric of a heritage asset. Typically, these activities are related to construction works and will only occur within the Application Boundary.
- Indirect impacts describe secondary processes, triggered by the Proposed Development, that lead to the degradation or preservation of heritage assets. For example, changes to hydrology may affect archaeological preservation; or changes to the setting of a building may affect the viability of its current use and thus lead to dereliction.
- An impact resulting from change within the setting of a heritage asset may occur when the presence of the Proposed Development changes the surroundings of a heritage asset in such a way that it affects (beneficially or adversely) the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the cultural significance of that asset. The magnitude of the impact will be increased for heritage assets that are sensitive to change within their setting; conversely, heritage assets that gain little cultural significance from the contribution made by their setting may not be impacted at all. Visual impacts are most commonly encountered but other environmental factors such as noise, light or air quality can be relevant in some cases. Impacts may be encountered at all stages in the life cycle of a development from construction to decommissioning but they are only likely to lead to significant effects during the prolonged operational stage of the Proposed Development.

9.4.25 Likely significant direct or indirect effects on known and unknown heritage assets are discussed in terms of the risk that a significant effect could occur. The level of risk depends on the level of archaeological potential combined with the nature and scale of disturbance associated with construction activities and may vary between high and negligible for different elements or activities associated with a development, or for the Proposed Development as a whole.

9.4.26 Likely significant effects on the settings of heritage assets are identified from an initial desk-based appraisal of data from HES and the HER, and consideration of current maps and aerial images. Photomontage, photowire and wireline visualisations have been prepared to illustrate changes to key views, and to aid assessment where potential setting effects have been identified (**Volume 3a, Figures 9.3 – 9.9**). The visualisations have been produced by the Landscape and Visual team and the methodology for preparing these is described in **Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: LVIA Visualisation Methodology**.

Cumulative Effects

9.4.27 A cumulative effect occurs where the magnitude of the combined effect of two or more developments is greater than that of the developments considered individually.

The impact assessment for the Proposed Development on its own merits, identifies the impact of that development alone upon cultural significance of heritage assets relative to a baseline scenario that includes all operational and under-construction wind farms. The

cumulative impact assessment, using the same criteria of impact magnitude (as defined in

9.4.28 Table 9.3 below), assesses the impact of the Proposed Development combined with the impact of wind farm developments that are consented but not yet built, and those that are currently at scoping or application stage (for which sufficient detail is known) relative to the baseline scenario.

9.4.29 Cumulative effects are considered in this chapter for heritage assets where an effect of **minor** or greater significance has been identified as a result of the Proposed Development. The purpose of this threshold is to ensure that the assessment remains proportionate and focused on those cases where there is potential for a significant effect (in EIA terms) to arise were the Proposed Development to be consented.

9.4.30 Developments considered as part of the cumulative assessment are identified from the agreed list presented in **Chapter 5: LVIA**. Visualisations supporting this chapter from an agreed suite of cultural heritage viewpoints (CHVPs) include cumulative developments (**Volume 3a, Figures 9.3 – 9.9**).

Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Significance

9.4.31 The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of a heritage asset will potentially change as a result of the Proposed Development (NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, para 42).

9.4.32 Conclusions of the assessed magnitude of impacts are a product of the consideration of the elements of an asset and its setting that contribute to its cultural significance and the degree to which the Proposed Development would change these contributing elements. The assessment therefore reflects the varying degrees of sensitivity of different assets to change brought about by different types or scale of possible developments. The extent to which a heritage asset is sensitive to change within its setting, and thus the extent to which its cultural significance may be impacted through change to this setting, will be reflected in findings regarding the magnitude of impact.

9.4.33 This definition of magnitude and assessment methodology applies to likely impacts resulting from change in the setting as well as likely physical impacts on the fabric of an asset.

9.4.34 The methodology adopted for the identification and assessment of potential impacts resulting from change in setting follows the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2016 updated 2020) and the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (NatureScot & HES, 2018, v5 Appendix 1). The guidance sets out three stages in assessing the impact of development on the setting of a heritage asset or place as follows:

- *"Stage 1: Identify the historic assets that might be affected by a 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 potential effect of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative effects can be mitigated."*

9.4.35 It is important to draw a distinction between Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and assessment of the setting of a heritage asset. In LVIA, magnitude of impact would be directly related to the level of visual change, whereas cultural heritage assessment is concerned with visual change only where it affects the contribution that setting makes to an asset's cultural significance. As a result, there is no simple relationship between change and impact on setting and this is reflected in the advice given in Stages 2 and 3 in HES's 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' guidance (2020, pages 9-10). It is necessary to understand how setting contributes to significance (Stage 2) before assessing how change would impact on setting (Stage 3). Therefore, the magnitude of an impact resulting from change within setting is not a direct measure of the visual prominence, scale, proximity or other attributes of the Proposed Development itself, or of the extent to which the setting itself is changed. Moreover, it is necessary to consider whether, and to what extent, the characteristics of the setting which would be changed contribute to the asset's cultural significance. This methodology is in accordance with NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, paras 42 and 43.

Magnitude of impact on cultural significance of heritage assets is assessed as large/medium/small/negligible/no impact, and adverse or beneficial, using the criteria in

9.4.36 Table 9.3 as a guide. In assessing the likely effects of a development, it is often necessary to take into account various impacts which affect an asset's cultural significance in different ways. For instance, there may be adverse effects on an asset's fabric and beneficial effects on cultural significance resulting from change in setting arising from a development which would not otherwise occur in a 'do-nothing' scenario; a heritage asset that might otherwise degrade over time could be preserved or consolidated as a consequence of a development. The impact assessment identifies beneficial and adverse impacts for consideration separately.

Table 9.3: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impacts on cultural significance of heritage assets

Magnitude	Summary
Large Beneficial	Preservation of the asset in situ where it would be completely or almost completely lost in the do-nothing scenario.
Medium Beneficial	Changes to key elements of the asset's fabric or setting that result in its cultural significance being preserved, where they would otherwise be lost, or restored.
Small Beneficial	Changes that result in elements of the asset's fabric or setting that detract from its cultural significance being removed.
Negligible / No Impact	Changes to fabric or setting that leave significance unchanged.
Small Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of the heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this is slightly altered
Medium Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of the heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this is substantially altered

Large Adverse	Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of its cultural significance, such that it may no longer be considered a heritage asset

Source: NatureScot & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, v5 Appendix 1, Figure 1

Mitigation

9.4.37 Assessment of impacts is an iterative part of the design process. For any identified effect the preferred mitigation option is always to avoid or reduce effects through design (embedded mitigation), or through precautionary measures such as fencing off heritage assets during construction works to avoid accidental direct effects (additional mitigation). Details of the design iteration process are contained within **Chapter 2: Proposed Development and Design Evolution**.

9.4.38 Effects which cannot be mitigated by design may lead to adverse direct or indirect physical effects which may be mitigated by an appropriate level of survey, excavation, recording, analysis and publication of the results, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (NPF4 Policy 7(o) and PAN2/2011 sections 25-27) (additional mitigation).

Determination of Effect Significance

9.4.39 The significance of an effect ('EIA significance') on the cultural significance of a heritage asset, resulting from a direct or indirect physical effect or an effect on its setting, is assessed by weighting the magnitude of the impact and the importance of the heritage asset.

9.4.40 EIA significance may be described on a continuous scale from **none** to **major**. The matrix in Table 9.4 provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the asset importance or effect magnitude levels are not clear or are borderline between categories. Where the matrix methodology indicates that effects potentially fall between two levels of significance i.e. moderate/minor it will be determined by professional judgement.

Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effect

9.4.41 The predicted significance of effect is determined through a standard method of assessment, moderated by professional judgement. It considers the assessed importance of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact upon cultural significance as detailed in Table 9.4.

9.4.42 Following the Importance of Heritage Assets methodology presented above, any feature of negligible importance is excluded from the assessment of effect, as a significant effect in EIA terms is not possible.

Table 9.4: Criteria for assessing the significance of effects on heritage assets

Heritage Asset Importance	Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Significance			
	Large	Medium	Small	Negligible/ No Impact
Very High	Major	Major	Major/Moderate	Negligible/None
High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Negligible/None
Medium	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Negligible/None
Low	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible/None

9.4.43 In this assessment **major** and **moderate** effects are considered "significant" in EIA terms.

9.4.44 Effect significance conclusions are expressed in the assessment as 'beneficial' or 'adverse', following from the impact magnitude.

9.4.45 Where relevant, effects are identified as 'short-term', medium-term', or 'long-term' and 'temporary' or 'frequent'.

9.4.46 Conclusions are also expressed in the context of NPF4 Policy 7 tests. Effects that are identified as "significant" in EIA may not necessarily contravene policy.

Difficulties and Uncertainties

9.4.47 Information held by public data sources is generally considered to be reliable; however, the following general points are noted:

- LiDAR data is not available from the Remote Scottish Sensing Portal for the areas of proposed impact within the Site;
- Documentary sources are rare before the medieval period;
- Wherever such documentary sources are used in assessing archaeological potential professional judgment is used in their interpretation;
- HER records can be limited because opportunities for research, fieldwork and discovery depend on the volume and frequency of commercial development and occasional research projects, rather than the result of a more structured research framework. A lack of data within the HER records does not necessarily equal an absence of archaeology;
- Where archaeological assets have been identified solely from aerial imagery without confirmation from archaeological excavation or supporting evidence in the form of find-spots for example, it is possible the interpretation may be revised in the light of further investigation;
- The significance of heritage assets can be difficult to identify from HER records, depending on the accuracy and reliability of the original source;
- There can often be a lack of dating evidence for archaeological assets; and
- Any archaeological field visit has inherent limitations, primarily because archaeological remains below ground level may have no surface indicators.

9.5 Existing Environment

Existing Baseline

9.5.1 The full list of known heritage assets within the Study Areas is presented in the Gazetteer (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2**). The cultural significance of these assets is

discussed by period in the Statement of Significance and Importance section of the Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**).

Geology and Geomorphology

9.5.2 The Application Boundary is underlain by rocks of the Devonian period interspersed with lamphroitic sills and dolorite dykes, in particular by quartz-feldspar-granulite with schist inclusions. The surface of this bedrock is compact but decomposed and weathered. Over most of the area, it is covered by up to 2.4 m of peat deposits, although in places this peat cover has been removed or reduced by erosion. The majority of uneroded areas have peat depth of between one and two meters. No other significant superficial deposits occur. Where peat is thin or absent such as on ridge tops or eroded areas, there is a thin mineral soil, sometimes with peat remains mixed in an organic upper horizon (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

Overview of the Historic Environment

Application Boundary

9.5.3 There are no designated heritage assets located within the Application Boundary.

9.5.4 The Argyll and Bute HER managed by WoSAS indicates there are six non-designated heritage assets within the Application Boundary. One lies within the Site Access, a charcoal burning platform. The remaining assets lie within the Site and include four undated dykes (stone walls) that are likely associated with post-medieval grazing. The remaining asset, a sheiling, also relates to post-medieval pastoral activities. This assessment has identified one additional feature within the Site: a modern memorial sculpture (HA01).

Outer Study Area

9.5.5 Within the 2 km OSA, including the Site, there are two Scheduled Monuments and 25 non-designated heritage assets identified within the Argyll and Bute HER maintained by WoSAS with a further three non-designated heritage assets identified within the NRHE.

9.5.6 Within the 2 - 5 km OSA there are 10 Scheduled Monuments, one Category B Listed Building and 136 non-designated heritage assets within the Argyll and Bute HER.

9.5.7 Within the 5 - 10 km OSA there are three Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, one Conservation Area, 51 Scheduled Monuments, five Category A Listed Buildings, two Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes and 429 non-designated heritage assets within the Argyll and Bute HER.

9.5.8 Within the 10 - 20 km OSA there is one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape, 125 Scheduled Monuments and 23 Category A Listed Buildings.

9.5.9 In the case of this Proposed Development, one Category B Listed Building has been identified beyond the defined OSAs and in the ZTV requiring consideration in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment: LB4715 Ardchattan House is located in the 10 km OSA and is assessed as an important element of GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory.

9.5.10 No further heritage assets within the ZTV and beyond the defined OSAs have been identified where its importance, significance and contribution made by setting (including long-distance views), or sensitivity to visual change is such that a significant impact is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development.

9.5.11 See Part 6.2 of the Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**) and the Gazetteer (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2**) for detailed consideration of heritage assets within the OSA.

Archaeological Potential

9.5.12 The Site Access comprises existing forestry tracks to be upgraded with some re-alignment undertaken. The route of the existing track having been disturbed, with plantation to either side previously subjected to deep-ploughing, is assumed to have no archaeological potential.

9.5.13 The Site comprises open moorland across steep and rocky hills. Resources including rivers and streams and areas of lower and relatively flatter ground in the glens are located outwith the Site to the north and east. Plantation and lochs are present to the south. Accordingly, the known non-designated heritage assets within the Site demonstrate predominantly post-medieval to modern agricultural pastoral practice with settlement activity mainly occurring across the lower ground close to water courses and established communication routes. The boundary of the Site does not represent the boundary of these activity trends, as is demonstrated by the presence of similar known remains within the OSA. The prehistoric activity appears to be concentrated close to water courses, with a predominance towards areas of lower ground, such as is seen to the north and south east of the OSA. The prehistoric activity is based on an almost equal mix of funerary features and small settlements associated with duns and forts. None of these sites are situated on the higher areas of the hills or any of the steep slopes. It is likely that these areas were too remote and therefore unsuitable for settlement or erecting funerary monuments. The later pastoral activity in the area is more common on the higher hills, the dykes, sheilings and sheepfolds indicating a willingness to utilise these remote areas where possible for summer grazing.

9.5.14 Excluding the areas already disturbed by the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, which have no archaeological potential, areas of proposed impact from the Proposed Development have remained undisturbed during recent centuries indicating the likelihood that any hitherto unknown remains are likely to not have been disturbed. As a result of this lack of disturbance into the 20th century, it is reasonable to expect that any additional prehistoric assets would have been mapped or would potentially still be visible to some extent. As no such additional features have been identified across the Site, the potential for further prehistoric stone-built assets to exist is considered to be negligible.

9.5.15 Any hitherto unknown Prehistoric remains that may be preserved beneath the ground surface within the Site can be considered as being of medium importance. Below ground remains that have been damaged by later/modern activities are more likely to be of low importance.

9.5.16 There is a negligible potential for previously unrecorded remains associated with medieval/post-medieval upland grazing and settlement to exist within the Site due to the remoteness and unsuitability of the area to sustain anything other than a low level of annual grazing. Based on extant remains of this period in similar elevations within the

OSA and as recorded in HLA, these are likely to have comprised dykes, sheilings and sheepfolds. It is considered that any features relating to this period, if present, would still be visible to some extent. Any previously unrecorded remains of medieval or earlier date, if present within the Site, would be presumed to be of at least medium importance for their intrinsic value as the physical evidence of previously unknown activity that would contribute to the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework. Below-ground and earthwork remains of post-medieval date (most likely shielings or dykes) would be presumed to be of low importance for their intrinsic interest.

Heritage Assets Considered for Setting Effects

9.5.17 A 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment has been carried out to consider whether further detailed assessment would be required for heritage assets within the OSA, based on whether it is likely that their cultural significance could be harmed through development within their setting. Summary results are presented in Part 6.2 of the Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**) and detailed assessment is provided in the Gazetteer (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2).**

9.5.18 The 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment methodology considers each heritage asset in the Site and the OSA in turn to identify those assets in the ZTV which have a wider landscape setting that contributes to their cultural significance and whether it is likely that cultural significance could be materially harmed by the Proposed Development (**Volume 3a, Figure 9.2).** Where heritage assets are located outwith the ZTV, viewpoints located within the ZTV which may provide a culturally significant view towards the heritage asset and the Proposed Development were considered.

9.5.19 Following consultation, the 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment found that there may be effects through changes within their setting on the cultural significance of one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape, one Category B Listed Building, and six Scheduled Monuments. These eight heritage assets are assessed in detail in this chapter, supported with photomontage and/or wireline visualisations as appropriate (**Volume 3a, Figures 9.3 – 9.9**):

- **CHVP01 Figure 9.3** Photomontage: GDL00019 / SM13644 / LB4715 Ardchattan Priory / Ardchattan House Garden and Designed Landscape, Scheduled Monument, Category B Listed Building. View from southern side of GDL
- **CHVP02 Figure 9.4** Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. View towards monument on approach from west
- **CHVP03 Figure 9.5** Photomontage: SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie. 360 view from monument
- **CHVP04 Figure 9.6** Photomontage: SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of. 360 view from monument
- **CHVP05 Figure 9.7** Photomontage: SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh. 360 view from monument
- **CHVP06 Figure 9.8** Photomontage: SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of. View from monument
- **CHVP07 Figure 9.9** Photomontage: SM3888 Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of. View from eastern cairn

9.6 Embedded Mitigation

Design Considerations

9.6.1 See design evolution and the embedded mitigation measures by design in **Chapter 2: Proposed Development and Design Evolution**. Direct (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets within the Application Boundary have been minimised through the design process. The proposed infrastructure layout has been designed to avoid all known heritage assets within the Site identified through the Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**).

Best Practice Measures

9.6.2 This assessment has been prepared with reference to IEMA, IHBC and CIfA's July 2021 publication 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK'. This document presents good practice for assessment of the impact of a development proposal on cultural heritage assets which is consistent with the Principles.

9.6.3 The preferred mitigation option in respect of direct, physical impacts is always to avoid or reduce impacts through design. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid known heritage assets within the Application Boundary.

9.6.4 Through the iterative design process described in **Chapter 2**:Proposed Development and Design Evolutionhas been reduced from an initial layout of 20 turbines to seven turbines. As a result, a previously concluded adverse effect of **minor significance** upon one Scheduled Monument 'SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of' has been reduced, with an impact assessment of 'no impact' concluded in this chapter.

9.6.5 The A CEMP will be prepared which will include best-practice measures to mitigate any direct physical impacts upon hitherto unknown heritage assets, or accidental impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site during construction. Further details are provided in Chapter 2: Proposed Development and Design Evolution.

9.6.6 Good practice guidance in Part 6 (Historic Environment/Archaeology) of NatureScot's Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction (NatureScot, 2019) is also adhered to in the mitigation proposals for the Proposed Development.

9.7 Predicted Effects

Decommissioning of the Existing Wind Farm

9.7.1 With the agreement of HES, decommissioning of the existing wind farm is scoped out of the EIA as ground disturbance will not extend beyond the construction footprint and any residual operational setting effects would be reversed.

Potential Construction Effects

9.7.2 Development activities within the Application Boundary have the potential to truncate or remove buried archaeological remains, resulting in a direct impact on these assets. Direct physical impacts may occur during construction as a result of intrusive groundworks, comprising enabling works including habitat management, any areas of cut and fill, bulk excavation and topsoil stripping, site compound establishment, and excavations for turbine and crane footings, access tracks and utilities.

9.7.3 Accidental direct physical impacts within the Application Boundary may arise should activities such as, but not limited to, ancillary drainage works and uncontrolled plant movement take place in the vicinity of heritage assets. The micro-siting tolerances of 50 m for the Proposed Development infrastructure is also used as a proportionate study area/proximity for the assessment of possible accidental impacts upon heritage assets during the construction phase.

9.7.4 Indirect impacts describe secondary processes, triggered by the Proposed Development, that lead to the degradation or preservation of heritage assets. For example, changes to hydrology may affect archaeological preservation.

Direct and Indirect Physical Impacts within the Application Boundary

Known Heritage Assets

9.7.5 There are seven known heritage assets located within the Application Boundary (Table 9.5).

Table 9.5: Known heritage assets within the Application Boundary

Ref	Name	Description	E	N	Status	Period	Impor-tance
Site Access							
43332	Am Barr	(Possible charcoal burning) Platforms	197706	728969	Non-designated	Historic	Low
Site							
20180a	Barguillean	Dyke (Period Unassigned)	198620	726070	non-designated	Historic	Low
21233	Carn Gaibhre	Shieling Hut(s) (Post Medieval)	197520	726680	non-designated	Historic	Low
20181a	Barguillean	Dyke (Period Unassigned)	198400	726070	non-designated	Historic	Low
20181b	Beinn Ghlas / Barguillean	Dyke	198300	726190	non-designated	Historic	Low
20180b	Beinn Ghlas / Barguillean	Dyke	198670	726130	non-designated	Historic	Low
HA01	Deirdre Shieling (memorial)	Sculpture commissioned by a local resident in 2017, to memorialise the characters in the story of Deirdre and Naoise	197784	726045	non-designated	Modern	Low

9.7.6 All known heritage assets are avoided by the Proposed Development infrastructure within both the Site and the Site Access and no direct physical construction impacts are anticipated (**Volume 3a, Figure 9.1**).

9.7.7 The location of known heritage assets is considered in the Outline Biodiversity Enhancement and Habitat Management Plan (OBE-HMP), **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 6.10**. All known heritage assets considered in the EIA are avoided in the OBE-HMP for any proposals potentially involving ground-breaking works and therefore with a potential for a direct (physical) impact upon surface or subsurface archaeological remains (i.e. tree planting or lochan creation etc) (see **Chapter 6: Ecology**). No direct physical impacts are anticipated as a result of the OBE-HMP proposals.

9.7.8 The infrastructure layout has been designed to avoid or minimise impact on blanket bog habitats and deep peat, and has been an iterative process to design around these constraints., **Volume 3, Technical Appendix 8.3**. No waterlogged deposits or deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential are identified that may be indirectly affected by hydrological changes.

Accidental Impacts and Micro-siting

9.7.9 There are four known heritage assets within the Site boundary that lie within the 50 m micro-siting tolerance for the Proposed Development (**Volume 3, Figure 9.1**). There is potential for a direct construction impact on these heritage assets as a result of micro-siting or accidental impact:

- 43332 – Am Barr, possible charcoal burning platforms, located 40 m north east of a new track required for the Site Access. An asset of low importance, if impacted due to micro-siting or accidental impact during construction, this may result in a direct physical impact of up to large magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**.
- HA01 – the Deirdre Shieling Memorial is a modern memorial sculpture, located 13 m north of the existing internal access track between the existing Turbines 3 & 4. The memorial was constructed in 2017, since the construction of the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm (1999). An asset of low importance, if impacted due to accidental impact during construction, this may result in a direct physical impact of up to large magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**. 20181 – a stone wall (dyke) located 34 – 103 m west of the proposed internal access track between the proposed site compound 2 and proposed turbine T1. An asset of low importance, if impacted due to micro-siting or accidental impact during construction, given the linear nature of the feature, only a small part of it would be likely to be removed for the proposed access track; this may result in a direct physical impact of up to small magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **negligible significance**, which is **not significant**.
- 20180 – a stone wall (dyke) located 32 - 55 m west of the proposed substation. An asset of low importance, if impacted due to micro-siting or accidental impact during construction, given the linear nature of the feature, only a small part of it would be likely to be removed; this may result in a direct physical impact of up to small magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **negligible significance**, which is **not significant**. As the substation is proposed on an area of existing hardstanding, micro-siting is considered very unlikely.

Archaeological Potential

9.7.10 The Site is considered to hold negligible archaeological potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains of all periods. Direct physical construction impacts on previously unknown heritage assets in the Site is very unlikely. Effect significance cannot be fully assessed for unknown heritage assets, as neither the cultural significance of the asset nor the magnitude of the impact can be known. This assessment uses the precautionary principal, and although archaeological potential is negligible, it is not zero as the land within the Site has not all been disturbed. The assessment assumes an occurrence of unexpected archaeological remains in a reasonable worst-case scenario. Consequently, an assessment of construction effects upon archaeological potential is considered.

9.7.11 The assessment of archaeological potential has identified that any remains may be of up to medium importance. If such unexpected remains are present and discovered during construction phase groundworks, this may result in an adverse construction-phase physical impact of up to large magnitude. Without mitigation, any adverse effect resulting from a physical impact upon unexpected archaeological remains discovered during construction-phase may be of up to **moderate significance**, which is **significant**. Mitigation to minimise the effect significance is therefore proposed.

Construction Phase Setting Effects

9.7.12 Construction phase setting effects of the proposed turbines within the Site will be temporary and are not considered to be significant in EIA terms due to their short duration. With the agreement of HES during Scoping, assessment of these is scoped out of the EIA.

9.7.13 The excepted requirement, specified by HES during subsequent consultation, is assessment of construction phase traffic upon the setting of heritage assets along the proposed Site Access.

9.7.14 The proposed Site Access boundary at its closest point passes 50 m to the south-east of the monument, with groundworks for proposed new track construction located 140 m to the east of SM3930 'Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of'. No other heritage assets have been identified as likely to be affected by proposed construction traffic (the next-closest designated heritage asset, SM3887 Duntanachan, cairn SW of, is located over 1 km to the west and significant construction phase impacts are considered very unlikely).

SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.7.15 The cultural significance of SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of is considered in detail in Potential Operational Effects, below. In summary, the dun is constructed in a prominent position at the eastern end of Glen Lonan, potentially to monitor and control passage through it and access to nearby resources. Intervisibility with other prominent and likely contemporary monuments in the glen also contribute to its significance. Views from the monument towards Loch Etive (north) and Ben Cruachan Hills (north east) are striking and whilst aesthetically pleasing, it is unclear if these views contributed to the siting of the dun. The setting in the vicinity of the dun is affected by buildings associated with Barguillean Farm, increasing its modern character.

9.7.16 It is considered that construction traffic of the Proposed Development would increase the modern character of the vicinity of the dun further, and would adversely impact upon the

appreciation and experience of cultural significance. It is considered this would have no impact on an understanding of cultural significance, however, merely presenting a temporary distraction through the noise and movement of vehicles.

9.7.17 It is therefore considered that during construction the Proposed Development would have a small magnitude impact on the cultural significance of SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun, an asset of high importance, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**. Construction phase setting effects will be temporary and short-term. Following construction, the residual effect would be **no impact**, which is **not significant**.

9.7.18 In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h), the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

Potential Operational Effects

9.7.19 As agreed with HES through submission of **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**, Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape, one Category B Listed Building, and six Scheduled Monuments are assessed in detail in this section.

9.7.20 Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) agreed with HES and illustrative of views towards, across or from heritage assets considered for setting effects are shown on **Volume 3a, Figure 9.2**: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the Outer Study Area (OSA) and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Assessments are supported with photomontages, the locations of which were also agreed with HES (**Volume 3a, Figures 9.3 – 9.9**).

9.7.21 All other heritage assets within the OSA are proportionately considered for potential operational effects in Gazetteer **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2**. No likely significant effects are anticipated and these assets are not considered further in this chapter.

Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes

GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory / SM13644 Ardchattan Priory / LB4715 Ardchattan House

9.7.22 Ardchattan comprises a number of designated assets whose settings are nested within one another, with shared significance and group value. Ardchattan Priory, the remains of a Medieval priory, burial ground and carved stones are designated as a Scheduled Monument; the priory includes surrounding gardens. Ardchattan House, located directly adjacent to the scheduled remains, comprises an augmented priory building converted into a house in the middle of the 19th century using other reclaimed priory materials, and is designated as a Category B Listed Building. The Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL), set out in the 17th, 19th and 20th centuries, based on the 13th century monastic garden, provides the designed garden setting for the house.

9.7.23 As a scheduled monument the priory is of high importance. As a Category B Listed Building, Ardchattan House is of medium importance. The Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape is of high importance.

9.7.24 Ardchattan Priory is situated 5 miles (8 km) east of the Connel Bridge on the north shore of Loch Etive, about 10 miles (16 km) north-east of Oban. Na Maoilean rises to 350 m AOD to the north of the Priory.

9.7.25 SM13644: The Valliscaulian priory of Ardchattan, dedicated to St Mary and St John the Baptist (D E Easson 1957), was founded in 1230 or 1231, and a church with associated conventional buildings was erected soon after. The church comprised a small choir and crossing, north and south transepts with double transeptal chapels, and a nave having a narrow north aisle. The conventual buildings were disposed round a cloister on the south side of the church, but the west range was represented only by a cloister walk and an outer retaining wall. Of the buildings of this period, there remains today the south transept with its two chapels and some fragments of the nave and crossing. A major scheme of reconstruction was begun and partially completed during the 15th and early 16th centuries when a new and much larger choir with an adjacent north sacristy was erected, and parts of the crossing, north transept and nave were rebuilt. The south range of the conventual buildings was also re-modelled, a new refectory being constructed on the site of the original one. All these buildings survive today either in whole or in part. The priory was secularised towards the end of the 16th century and passed into the ownership of the Campbells who converted the south range of the conventual buildings into a private dwelling house, and the choir and transepts of the church were used for parochial worship. Burnt out by MacCell Kitson in 1644, the monastic church fell into disuse, except for the purpose of burial, following the erection of a new parish church in 1731-2. Colin Campbell of Glenure was interred in the burial ground in 1752.

9.7.26 The monastic refectory survives as the nucleus of Ardchattan House (LB4715), whose offices and outbuildings now extend over the site of the priory's former nave and cloister. Although no longer appreciable as a monastic garden, records show that the priory would have been associated with a productive garden for feeding the inhabitants or for sale.

9.7.27 The List Description Statement of National Importance reads as follows: '*The monument is of national importance as a well-preserved example of a Valliscaulian Priory dating from 1230/1. It has an inherent potential to make a significant addition to our understanding of the past, in particular the establishment, patronage and development of religious houses in Argyll and the West Highlands and the impact they had on contemporary life. The monument is also important for our understanding of how lordship was projected within a Gaelic context. The survival of standing fabric and buried remains of the priory and associated burial ground adds to its potential to contribute to the wider study of medieval ecclesiastical architecture within Scotland. The presence of a significant carved stone collection is important as it enhances our understanding of West Highland sculpture, funerary art and architecture, and memorial practices, as well as of medieval society and politics more generally. The loss of the monument would diminish our ability to understand the development and role of medieval monasticism in Scotland.*'

9.7.28 Beyond the boundary of Ardchattan GDL lies the non-designated remains of Ardchattan Old Kirk (23219) and burial ground which may or may not be related to Ardchattan Priory and is therefore not included in the designation.

9.7.29 The scheduled monument's intrinsic remains and associated documentary evidence hold the majority of its cultural significance as identified in the Statement of National Importance, which are/would be revealed through excavation, as well as through academic study and research. Associatively, significance is added through comparison with contemporary monastic institutions in Scotland and more locally and recently through association with the Campbell family.

9.7.30 The location of the priory on the bank of Loch Etive may have been practical, relating to land-ownership or accessibility; economic, relating to the climate or agricultural quality of the alkali soils around Ardchattan Burn; or perhaps spiritual, relating to the sense of tranquillity provided by the proximity to the loch. Ultimately the reasoning is speculative.

9.7.31 A field visit for the assessment identified that the preserved walls of the priory prevents any views outwith the scheduled remains to the surrounding gardens which provide the designed setting for Ardchattan House. A place of sanctuary, contemplation and study, the wider landscape setting of the scheduled medieval remains therefore contributes little to its cultural significance. The monastic garden provides a historical context contributing to the cultural significance of the priory, and is considered to have been functional, contributing to the operation of the priory, with no formal design elements, views or sightlines conceived at this time.

9.7.32 There is no view of the Proposed Development from the scheduled remains due to the presence of high walls of the monument itself. **Photomontage CHVP01 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.3)** is positioned on the north bank of Loch Etive which shows that from outwith the scheduled area, the hubs and blades of nine proposed turbines and the blade tips of one turbine would be visible over the horizon. The photomontage indicates that turbines of the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm are currently visible over the horizon. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 8.3 km to the south. These views do not contribute to the cultural significance of the scheduled priory remains.

9.7.33 The significance of the monument lies within the physical remains. An understanding and appreciation of the relationship with a former monastic garden for economic purposes, and an experience of the proximity to Loch Etive, potentially for spiritual purposes, would remain unaffected. Academic comparisons with contemporary related monastic sites would remain unaffected. The ability to understand the historical relationship with the Campbell family would remain unaffected. No significant or intentional sightlines from, to, or within the priory remains have been identified such that these may be affected by the Proposed Development. Visibility of the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm on the horizon from outwith the scheduled area does not preclude an understanding, appreciation or experience of this cultural significance as described.

9.7.34 As per the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, it is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM13644 Ardchattan Priory, priory, burial ground and carved stones, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h), the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

9.7.35 LB4715: The monastic refectory building was initially altered by Alexander Campbell, last (commendatory) prior (1580-1602) who received a charter of the lands of the priory in 1602 and converted the conventual buildings into his seat. However, it was enlarged and re-modelled to become a house in its current form in the middle of the 19th century, with further alterations carried out since. A Victorian Wing was added in 1852 by the Glasgow architect Charles Wilson when the offices and outbuildings were also built, extending over the site of the former priory nave and cloister.

9.7.36 The listed building's significance derives largely from its fabric of, and association with the physical remains of the medieval priory. The monastic refectory survives as the

nucleus of the present mansion, now operating as a dining room where 15th century open timbers are visible in the ceiling and wall, and an original pulpit is also preserved.

9.7.37 The house is two and a half storeys, built of random rubble, with a gabled slated roof with dormers. It is approached along a driveway from the C-road to the west, arriving at the house's western entrance façade. The main axis of the house is oriented east-west, with the long garden façade facing south. Given its architecture and designed garden elements to the south, this is considered the 'principal façade'. A field visit identified no large windows indicative of entertaining rooms on the south façade to suggest that the house was laid out to function in relation to the southerly views, although a glass conservatory on this elevation implies that views are enjoyed of the garden in this direction (albeit this position is common for conservatories to maximise the warmth of winter sunshine).

9.7.38 The position and orientation of the house relates to the former presence of the priory and the desire of the last (commendatory) prior to convert the conventual buildings into his seat. The presence of the priory was unrelated to the presence of Beinn Ghlas. Views towards Beinn Ghlas to the south are considered to be incidental from the house's position on the bank of the loch as opposed to the result of an intentional design ethic.

9.7.39 **Photomontage CHVP01 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.3)** illustrates the view from the rear driveway upon exiting the GDL grounds of Ardchattan House, and is indicative of the view from the southern façade conservatory. The photomontage indicates that turbines of the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm are currently visible over the horizon and that the hubs and blades of seven proposed turbines would be visible over the horizon. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 8.3 km to the south.

9.7.40 It is considered that these views do not contribute to the cultural significance of the listed building, although the aesthetic from the house would change. Visibility of a wind farm being subjective, it is not possible to ascribe adverse or beneficial magnitude of impact upon this aesthetic.

9.7.41 The significance of the listed building lies within its medieval fabric as part of Ardchattan Priory, and its architectural value as a 19th century mansion, neither of which would be affected by the Proposed Development. An understanding, appreciation and experience of the aesthetic of the loch and mountains in views from the house's conservatory, constructed on the site of the former priory, would remain unaffected. Visibility of the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm on the horizon does not preclude an understanding, appreciation or experience of this cultural significance as described. No significant or intentional (designed) sightlines from or to the listed building have been identified such that these may be affected by the Proposed Development.

9.7.42 Ardchattan House would remain a focal point in views of the GDL from publicly accessible areas outwith the GDL boundary. The contribution that the house and garden makes to the scenery of the local area would not change as a result of the Proposed Development located over 8 km away.

9.7.43 As per the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, it is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of LB4715 Ardchattan House, an asset of medium importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(c), the Proposed Development would preserve the character, special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

9.7.44 GDL00019: Based on the location of the former priory monastic garden that could date back to the 13th century, the designed landscape has been improved in the 17th, 19th and 20th centuries. The present policies are pastures and shelterbelts dating from the mid-19th-century with formal and woodland gardens associated with the house and approaches. The gardens lie to the south and west side of the house and are divided into two areas: 'the Woodland Garden' which runs along the drive to the west, and 'the Garden' in front of the southern 'principal façade' of the house. The remaining parts of the designated area comprise pasture. Strips of woodland divide the policies from the surrounding moorland on the three other sides, such that views out from the GDL are restricted to those to the south of the house. The List Description notes that while sheltered by the hills to the north, the site is exposed to severe winds along the loch, and the belts of trees within the GDL may have been planted to minimise these effects.

9.7.45 The GDL derives its cultural significance from its relationship with Ardchattan Priory and Ardchattan House and provides the setting in which these buildings stand. The GDL area has changed over time. The relationship of the garden with the priory is not a visual one, but a historical one, as the GDL overlays the monastic garden but cannot be appreciated from within the scheduled area due to the presence of high walls of the priory itself. The garden does however contribute visually to the significance of Ardchattan House, being laid out to compliment views from and towards the mansion.

9.7.46 From the parkland to the south of the house there are long views to the south across Loch Etive to the Fearnoch Forest as well as views along the loch to Ben Cruachan in the east and to the hills of Mull in the west, albeit these views are obscured from some locations within the garden by the parkland trees. The Woodland Garden is enclosed with no long-distance views. Aesthetically, the GDL List Description describes how the canopy of the woodland and the open parkland makes an important contribution to the scenery of the surrounding area, adding to the variety in the surrounding upland scenery. The significance of the designed landscape in part derives from the contribution it makes to the locality in views towards it from outside its policies.

9.7.47 **Photomontage CHVP01 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.3)** is indicative of the view from the Garden to the south of the house. The photomontage indicates that turbines of the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm are currently visible over the horizon and that the hubs and blades of seven proposed turbines would be visible over the horizon. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 8.3 km to the south.

9.7.48 The significance of the garden is considered to derive from its intention as a polite garden setting to the mansion, which would remain unchanged. There is no evidence that the garden was laid out to enjoy sightlines in the direction of Beinn Ghlas specifically or generally. Some views in this direction are limited by parkland planting, which may be an effort to ameliorate the effects of winds across the exposed loch which may have adversely affected the growing conditions within the GDL. Views towards Beinn Ghlas to the south are considered to be incidental from the house's position on the bank of the loch as opposed to the result of an intentional design ethic.

9.7.49 An understanding, appreciation and experience of the incidental aesthetic of the loch and mountains in views from the GDL, constructed on the site of the former monastic garden, would remain unaffected. No significant or intentional (designed) sightlines from the GDL have been identified such that these may be affected by the Proposed Development.

9.7.50 Ardchattan House would remain a focal point in views within the GDL. The presence of the Proposed Development would not detract from an understanding, appreciation and experience of the design intention of the woodland and parkland planting within the GDL boundaries to compliment immediate views from and towards Ardchattan House. The contribution that the house and garden makes to the scenery of the local area would not change as a result of the Proposed Development located over 8 km away. Visibility of the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm on the horizon does not change the factors of setting that contribute to the cultural significance of GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory as described above, and therefore does not affect the integrity of its setting.

9.7.51 As per the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, it is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(i), the Proposed Development would preserve the cultural significance, character and integrity of GDL00019 and would not significantly impact on important views to, from and/or within the GDL, or its setting.

Scheduled Duns

9.7.52 SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250 m SSW of and SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh are classified as duns whereas SM3910 An Dun, dun 500 m ESE of Glenamadrie, whilst recorded as a dun, is classified as a possible fort.

9.7.53 A dun site is defined typically by its size relative to other Iron Age settlements such as forts, brochs and roundhouses, as summarised in Regan & Campbell (2022). Sites classified by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) as forts may occupy higher ground than those classified as duns; 30% of forts are at a greater height than the highest of duns (Harding 1997, 119). This typological distinction based arbitrarily on size and elevation does not preclude that duns and forts may have been contemporaneous and carried out similar practical and societal functions.

9.7.54 For a more extensive discussion regarding the typology and significance of duns and forts see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.1**, Cultural Heritage Baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, which is summarised here.

9.7.55 A dun is typically understood to be a comparatively small defensive structure built to hold only a single family group. Whilst undoubtedly 'domestic' in function (Regan 2009) some duns are 'fort-like' in that they are oval or pear shaped in plan with single entrances. They are generally understood to have been occupied for long periods throughout the Middle Iron Age. Larger, often non-round, dun enclosures that contain buildings are later, possibly early Medieval, in date (Regan & Campbell 2022, 97).

9.7.56 A study of the distribution and location of dun sites in Argyll shows that the majority of sites are located between sea-level and 120 m OD (this is the case for the duns located in Glen Lonan, other than SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of, which is located at 150 m OD. However, SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh, located north of Kilchrenan, is a particular anomaly, lying at a very (relatively) elevated 220 m OD). Duns are observed to occupy similar topographic locations, generally on gently sloping ground at southern, south-western and western facing hills (Werner 2007). Harding (1997, 118) suggests that locations of duns are determined partly by climactic factors, with warmer, wet lowlands preferable to cooler wet uplands. If absolute height was not a major factor in the siting of the majority of forts and

duns, natural defensibility within the local terrain evidently was. Both were frequently located on rocky summits, knolls or spurs, or took advantage of precipitous stacks (Ibid. 121).

9.7.57 Prehistoric forts and duns are understood to have been situated in the landscape strategically, where views from and towards the monuments, or intervisibility between monuments and/or natural landscape features, may contribute to their cultural significance. However, there is accumulating evidence that some duns may have been focal points within an agricultural landscape (Harding 1997, 118). The proximity of some duns to each other which have been demonstrated to be operating contemporaneously does raise questions as to whether the occupants of each site actually knew one another or were indeed part of a wider kin grouping. If this were the case, there are further questions as to why they felt the need to construct in such defensive positions. Nevertheless, the significance of dun sites derives in part through their relationships and potential intervisibility with other contemporary settlements.

9.7.58 Societally, it is thought, given the investment required for their construction, that duns would have been occupied by a 'noble class', 'above subsistence level', relative to other contemporary dwellings which may not remain as visible in the archaeological record (Regan & Campbell 2022, 104). The prominence both of the position chosen for the dun or fort, as well as the prominence of the earthwork and stone-built defences may therefore relate to a display of wealth and prestige, as opposed to being for actual defence purposes. (The reality is likely to be more nuanced than that with variation, overlaps and anomalies).

9.7.59 Contextually, Regan and Cambell (2022) also identify potential in terms of agriculture (Ibid,118): *'The proximity to and perhaps the control of local resources, whether marine resources, animal pasture or arable land, was undoubtedly a prime consideration in the selection of a suitable site to construct a dun structure'* (2022, 102). Harding argues that it seems probable that the livelihood of an extended family unit occupying a dun would have been dependent upon the agricultural resources of the areas in which they were located (1997, 123). There is therefore a strong correlation of dun sites and potential cultivable land which suggests duns were built by those controlling the immediately surrounding landscape. Interestingly, along Glen Lonan, SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie is located 1.6 km from SM4002 Clachadow, dun 500m NW of. This, in turn, is located 1.8 km from SM3866 Duntanachan, dun 515m W of, which is also 1.8 km from SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun. This regular spacing may indicate the cultivable hinterland required to sustain a single family group.

9.7.60 There also appears to be a correlation between duns and the older established tracks or drove routes through the area (Regan and Cambell 2022, 99). Whether both dun and routeway functioned at the same time would be hard to prove, but Glen Lonan does offer a natural routeway through the landscape between Glen Nant and the coast.

9.7.61 Whilst duns are not therefore properly understood, and may not all have undertaken the same function, a precautionary approach to assessment would identify the following aspects as likely contributors to cultural significance, beyond their physical remains (the excavation of which would perhaps help to answer questions regarding typology and chronology):

- Relationship with and control of adjacent resources - water and fertile agricultural land

- Potentially to control navigable routes through the landscape
- Relationship (kinship) or intervisibility (defence and/or display) with other contemporary settlement.

SM3910 An Dun, Dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie

9.7.62 The Atlas of Hillforts of Britain and Ireland describes the monument: The remains of a small fortification, oval on plan, it measures 29 m from ENE to WSW by 21 m transversely within a wall largely reduced to a band of rubble from which a few outer facing-stones protrude on the ENE and WSW. Excavation has shown that the wall varies between 2.5 m in thickness to either side of the entrance on the south-east, to as much as 4.6 m on the west; fragments of two rotary quernstones were recovered from the wall. The only feature visible within the interior is a small rectangular building on the north-west (NRHE Report, Canmore ID 23201). It was the RCAHMS, following a site visit in 1968, who stated: '*The plan, size and construction suggest this is a fort rather than a dun*.' Measuring 29 m x 21 m the enclosed area is significantly larger, for instance, than SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun which measures 12.8 by 10.0 m internally.

9.7.63 As a scheduled monument the fort is of high importance.

9.7.64 Associatively, a field visit has determined intervisibility with the group of prehistoric monuments at Glenmachrie (cairns SM3888 and SM4121 and standing stone SM3886) and SM4002 Clachadow, dun 500m NW of (albeit this view is currently obscured by modern plantation. The plantation could be felled or windblown within the operational phase of the Proposed Development and as such the assessment ignores this existing screening). Whilst the cairns and standing stone are likely to have preceded the fort (likely being late Neolithic or Bronze Age in date), as today, they would have been prominent features in the glen during the Iron Age; it is possible that the inhabitants of the fort were attracted to the glen for habitation in addition to its obvious resources due to the presence of these earlier features, and may have based some ties or ownership over the surrounding agricultural land through association with these visible features.

9.7.65 Contextually, the fort is positioned on a steep-sided knoll in the bottom of Glen Lonan, less than 50 m from the river. Prominently visible on approach, the fort was likely positioned in order to monitor and control the surrounding agricultural land, water resources of the River Lonan, and the navigable route along Glen Lonan which runs between Glen Nant and the coast. Although defined as a 'fort', the monument is not a hillfort, being located in the glen. The fort was evidently not positioned to be visible over long distances, but to be prominent within the settled fertile glen. The intentional siting of the fort to control movement through the glen, on land or by water, required it to be prominently positioned, guiding views both from and towards it. Given the narrow topography of the glen this would have restricted views and therefore views from and towards it in an easterly and westerly direction are considered important.

9.7.66 Glen Lonan contains a large number of prominently visible prehistoric earthworks and, being well-preserved, this creates a legible prehistoric landscape. With very little modern intrusion, the glen's sense of place is one that can readily be experienced as a place attractive to prehistoric settlement. This sense of place is reduced in the vicinity of modern farms established at Glenamachrie, Clachadow and Barguillean Farm. The overhead electricity line of paired wood poles, however, largely blends in with this largely unaltered cultural landscape and is not overly intrusive.

9.7.67 **Photomontage CHVP02 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.4)** illustrating the approach from the west along Glen Lonan towards SM3910 shows that the hub and blades of one proposed turbine would be visible, with blade tips only of a further two turbines also theoretically visible over the horizon. The bases of none of the turbine towers would be visible. No turbines would appear above the prominent position of the fort from this approach position.

9.7.68 **Photomontage CHVP03 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.5)** from the monument itself shows that the hub and blades of one proposed turbine would be visible from the fort, with blade tips only of a further two turbines also theoretically visible over the horizon. The bases of none of the turbine towers would be visible. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 5.1 km to the south-east.

9.7.69 The high ground on which the Proposed Development is located forms a distinct topographical landscape zone to the fort and its glen hinterland. The occupants of the fort, and associated forts and duns in Glen Lonan, would have targeted habitation in the warmer, fertile lowlands which could sustain them agriculturally. The cooler, wetter uplands of the Site meanwhile would not have been attractive for settlement and views in this direction therefore contributes nothing to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the cultural significance of these forts and duns. Immediate and important views along and within Glen Lonan to the east and west from the fort, and intervisibility with contemporary settlements and earlier cairns and standing stones which may have tied the communities to the glen, would remain unaffected. Reciprocal views towards the fort which allow an understanding, appreciation and experience of its intentionally prominent landscape position alongside the navigable land corridor/river would remain unchanged and its earthworks would remain prominently visible from its local environs.

9.7.70 Whilst a view towards the Proposed Development from this position is considered largely peripheral and incidental, easterly views towards the Proposed Development would be guided on approach to the fort, and the Proposed Development would be visible to a limited extent in these views, offset backdropping the prominent monument. The Proposed Development would not, however, be visible on the westerly approach. The Proposed Development would introduce an element of modern distraction into a part of the glen that is otherwise a relatively unaltered and legible prehistoric cultural landscape.

9.7.71 It is therefore considered that the Proposed Development would have a small magnitude impact on the cultural significance of SM3910 An Dun, dun 500 m ESE of Glenamadrie, an asset of high importance, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h) the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

SM3930 Barguillean Farm, Dun

9.7.72 RCAHMS described the monument after a site visit in 1975: the last vestiges of a dun which has been enclosed on three sides by an outer wall or bank. On the north side, the slope of the knoll is so steep that it was evidently considered unnecessary to construct additional defences. The dun is oval on plan and has measured about 12.8 by 10.0 m internally, but all that remains of the wall is a thin band of rubble core, interrupted by an entrance at the east end. The outer work, now reduced to a mere scarp lies 1.5 m below the dun. Its entrance is on the east side (NRHE Report, Canmore ID 23176).

9.7.73 As a scheduled monument the dun is of high importance.

9.7.74 Associatively, theoretical intervisibility with SM3866 Duntanachan, dun 515 m W of may have been possible in the Iron Age when the monuments were fully constructed, however, given their eroded condition and at a distance of 1.8 km apart, this relationship is difficult to experience in the modern landscape.

9.7.75 Contextually, the dun is positioned on an isolated knoll, prominently visible on approach along Glen Lonan, and near to the source of the Allt Nathais which drains into Loch Etive. The dun was likely positioned in order to monitor and control the surrounding agricultural land, water resources of the River Lonan, and the navigable route along Glen Lonan which runs between Glen Nant and the coast. Located strategically at the eastern end of the glen, perhaps monitoring and controlling entry, it may have been more important than the other duns within the glen itself. The intentional siting of the dun to control movement through the glen, on land or by water, required it to be prominently positioned, guiding views both from and towards it. Given the topography of the approaches (largely indicated by the route of the modern road) this would have restricted views and therefore views from and towards it in an easterly and westerly direction are considered important. The 360 photomontage **Photomontage CHVP04 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.6)** illustrates striking views from the monument itself towards Loch Etive (north) and Ben Cruachan Hills (north east). Views in the direction of the Proposed Development are less attractive and form more of a backdrop. There is no reason that views in the direction of the Site can be considered to contribute to the cultural significance of the dun.

9.7.76 The setting in the vicinity of the dun is currently affected by buildings associated with Barguillean Farm which increase the modern character of the surroundings. In addition there is currently one turbine of the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm visible from the monument. These modern elements do not preclude an understanding of cultural significance or the contribution made by the monument's setting.

9.7.77 **Photomontage CHVP04 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.6)** shows that the hubs and blades of two proposed turbines would be visible from the dun, with blade tips only of a further two turbines also theoretically visible over the horizon. The bases of none of the turbine towers would be visible. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 2.0 km to the south.

9.7.78 An existing access track for the operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, proposed for access for the Proposed Development, is located at its closest point 140 m to the east of the monument. This track requires upgrading and straightening for the Proposed Development as shown on **Photomontage CHVP04 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.6)**. It is considered that any setting changes required for the existing track for the Proposed Development would fall generally within the parameters of the current baseline of the existing track and no impact is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development.

9.7.79 The high ground on which the Proposed Development would be located forms a distinct topographical landscape zone to the dun and its glen hinterland. The occupants of the dun, and associated duns in Glen Lonan, would have targeted habitation in the warmer, fertile lowlands which could sustain them agriculturally. The cooler, wetter uplands of the Site meanwhile would not have been attractive for settlement and views in this direction therefore contribute nothing to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the cultural significance of these duns. A view towards the Proposed Development from the dun is peripheral and incidental. The important vantage views along Glen Lonan to the

west, and theoretical intervisibility with contemporary settlements, would remain unaffected. Reciprocal views towards the dun which allow an understanding, appreciation and experience of its intentionally prominent landscape position would similarly remain largely unchanged and its earthworks would remain visible (albeit degraded). However, it is considered that in views of the dun from the north-east and the north, at the eastern entrance to the glen and its navigable land/river corridor, the dun was intended to be prominently visible and the Proposed Development would appear in backdropping views from these positions. This would challenge the intended dominance of the dun in a key view.

9.7.80 All elements of the monument's cultural significance being considered, the Proposed Development would have a small magnitude impact on the cultural significance of SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun, an asset of high importance, resulting in an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h) the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh

9.7.81 The Scheduling List Description describes 'one of the best-preserved duns in Lorn'. Almost circular in plan, the walls still stand to a maximum height of over 2.0 m and are up to 5.0 m thick, enclosing an area of 11.9 m by 13.1 m. The NRHE Report describes how the monument is protected by steep slopes on all sides except the west where there is a gentle approach along the crest of the ridge. The outer face, which consists of large stones survives to a maximum height of over 2.0 m on the west whilst the inner face still stands to an average height of 2.0 m in about nine courses, but the base of the wall on both sides is now largely obscured by fallen debris. It is recorded that, before being used as a quarry for field walls, it stood 6 m high. The entrance is on the north-east side, the outer corners being formed of large blocks. The passage may have included a door at a point 1.7 m from the outside from where it widens to 2.1 m. The inner portion of the passage is 2.4 m long and has slightly curved sides. During excavation in 1890 several hearths were discovered as well as bones of horse and deer.

9.7.82 As a scheduled monument the dun is of high importance.

9.7.83 There are no known contemporary settlement sites with likely intentional intervisibility identified or postulated. Associatively, the coursed rubble footings of a rectangular hut are set against a rock outcrop immediately to the north of the dun, and is likely to have been constructed from its building materials.

9.7.84 Contextually, the dun occupies a commanding position at 220 m OD, on the highest part of the eastern end of a rock ridge. This elevation, nearly double that considered typical for duns in Argyll (i.e., most are below the 120 m OD contour) illustrates the arbitrariness of the typology, and overlap between monuments that are classed as 'duns' and those classed as 'forts'. The dun overlooks the valley to the east that runs between Taynuilt and Kilchrenan and 'commanding views' are also described in the NRHE Report looking to the south and east from the dun. Perhaps importantly, the entrance passage, on the ENE, looks directly across to Ben Cruachan. The dun is also located in a strategic position to overlook three lochs and their resources: Loch an Droighinn and Loch an Leoid to the north-west and Loch Tromlee to the north-east.

9.7.85 Visibility of the current operational Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm and/or Carraig Gheal Wind Farm from the vantage point of the scheduled area does not preclude an understanding, appreciation or experience of this cultural significance as described.

9.7.86 **Photomontage CHVP05 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.7)** shows that the hubs and blades of all seven of the proposed turbines would be visible from the dun. The nearest proposed turbine would be T1, located 4.6 km to the north-west.

9.7.87 The high ground on which the Proposed Development is located forms a distinct topographical landscape zone to the dun and its valley hinterland. The occupants of the dun would have targeted habitation in the warmer, fertile lowlands which could sustain them agriculturally along with the resources offered by the numerous lochs. The cooler, wetter uplands of the Site meanwhile would not have been attractive for settlement and views in this direction therefore contributes nothing to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the cultural significance of the dun. A view towards the Proposed Development from this position is therefore peripheral and incidental. Commanding views to the east and south, and reciprocal views towards the dun which allow an understanding, appreciation and experience of its intentionally prominent landscape position would remain unchanged and its stone and earthworks would remain prominently visible.

9.7.88 It is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM4120 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h) the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

Scheduled Cairns

9.7.89 Prehistoric cairns derive cultural significance from their intrinsic remains and also their positioning in the landscape. Cairns were usually sited to relate to the communities which built them, often positioned in prominent locations overlooking areas of settlement, particularly if the cairns were funerary in nature as this may have forged links between the living and the dead and relate to inferred possession of discrete parts of the local landscape.

<u>SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960 m NW of</u>

9.7.90 Cairn SM3891 measures 18.3 m in diameter and 1.9 m in height. There is a shallow depression in the centre which contains a flat slab. This slab was lifted in the 1870s when it was confirmed as being the capstone of a cist filled with earth in which a few small fragments of human bone were found, but there were no grave goods of any kind.

9.7.91 Associatively, a field visit has determined no intervisibility with other monuments although it is assumed that the settlement of the community who raised the cairn would have been within sight of it, within the glen. Intervisibility with SM4121 Glenamachrie, cairns 850m ESE of, located 775 m to the north-west of SM3891, may have been possible prior to establishment of the plantation immediately to the north of the cairns (the assessment does not therefore account for this existing screening) and they are likely to have been contemporary and carried out the same societal function.

9.7.92 Contextually, as with SM4121, these cairns are located on the river floodplain, at the base of the slopes of hills to north side of glen. The cairn is understood, appreciated and experienced overlooking this fertile agricultural context, a settled area with access to water, evidently densely occupied in the prehistoric period.

9.7.93 Other than adjacent plantation, the setting of the cairn is without modern intrusion and the glen's sense of place is one that can readily be experienced as a place attractive to prehistoric settlement. However, there is little evidence of any settlement and the cairn stands in isolation in an intimate setting enclosed by the valley sides. The overhead electricity line of paired wood poles largely blend in with this largely unaltered cultural landscape and is not overly intrusive.

9.7.94 **Photomontage CHVP06 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.8)** shows that blade tips only of two turbines only would theoretically visible over the horizon. The bases of none of the turbine towers would be visible. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 3.9 km to the south-east. In reality, parts of the Proposed Development would be obscured from view by existing plantation, however it is acknowledged that this plantation is likely to be felled in the near future which would open up the view; as such a 'worst case' scenario has been assessed which ignores the screening effect of the plantation.

9.7.95 The high ground on which the Proposed Development is located forms a distinct topographical landscape zone to the cairn and its valley hinterland. The community who raised the cairn would have targeted habitation in the warmer, fertile lowlands which could sustain them agriculturally. The cooler, wetter uplands of the Site meanwhile would not have been attractive for settlement and views in this direction therefore contribute nothing to an understanding, appreciation or experience of the cultural significance of the cairn. A view towards the Proposed Development from the cairn is therefore peripheral and incidental. From positions alongside the cairn within the glen, its prominence would remain unaffected by the visibility of the Proposed Development 3.6 km away. Theoretical intervisibility with SM4121 would remain unaffected. Given the limited number of turbines visible from this position, it is considered that any visibility of the Proposed Development would be negligible in relation to the glen's sense of place.

9.7.96 It is therefore considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM3891 Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of, an asset of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h) the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

SM3888 Glenamachrie, cairns 65 m & 300 m WNW of

9.7.97 The scheduling covers two prehistoric cairns separated by a distance of 360 m within Glen Lonan. Despite the erroneous scheduling title, one of the cairns is located within the farmyard and 65 m to the east of the farm of Glenamachrie (referred to in this assessment as the 'eastern cairn'), whilst the other is described correctly, located alongside the road 300 m to its WNW ('the western cairn').

9.7.98 The eastern cairn is an oval stony mound measuring 19.1 m by 17.2 m and up to 2.6 m in height. The western cairn is also an oval, stony mound measuring 18.6 m by 17.4 m and standing to a height of 1.9 m.

9.7.99 The cairns are associated with each other as well as SM3886 standing stone and SM4115 cup marked stone, both in the nearby vicinity and based on typology which may be contemporary. It is assumed that the settlement of the community who raised the cairns, standing stone, and cup marked stone would have been within sight of these monuments within the glen.

9.7.100 Contextually, the cairns are located on the river floodplain. The western cairn is located directly alongside the River Lonan (within 10 m) whilst the eastern cairn is located within the farmyard of Glenamachrie (20 m from the river). The cairns are understood, appreciated and experienced overlooking this fertile agricultural context, a settled area with access to water, evidently densely occupied in the prehistoric period.

9.7.101 **Photomontage CHVP07 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.9)** shows that the hub and blades of one proposed turbine would be visible from the eastern cairn, with blade tips only of a further two turbines also theoretically visible over the horizon. The bases of none of the turbine towers would be visible. The nearest proposed turbine would be T7, located 5.5 km to the south-east. The same proposed turbines would be visible from the western cairn.

9.7.102 The high ground on which the Proposed Development is located forms a distinct topographical landscape zone to the cairns and their valley hinterland. The community who raised the cairns would have targeted habitation in the warmer, fertile lowlands which could sustain them agriculturally. The cooler, wetter uplands of the Site meanwhile would not have been attractive for settlement and views in this direction contribute nothing to an understanding, appreciation or experience of their cultural significance. A view towards the Proposed Development from the cairns is therefore peripheral and incidental. From positions alongside the cairns within the glen, from where they were intended to be experienced, their prominence would remain unaffected by the visibility of the Proposed Development between 5.1-5.5 km away. Theoretical intervisibility between the cairns as well as SM3886 standing stone and SM4115 cup marked stone would remain unaffected. Given the presence of the Glenamachrie farmstead, visibility of the Proposed Development would absorb within the baseline and be of no impact upon sense of place.

9.7.103 It is considered that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the cultural significance of SM3888 Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of, assets of high importance, resulting in an effect of **no significance**, which is **not significant**. In the context of NPF4 Policy 7(h) the understanding, appreciation and experience of the scheduled monument would be adequately retained such that the integrity of setting would not be significantly adversely affected.

Potential Decommissioning Effects

Construction

9.7.104 The extent of ground disturbance associated with decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not extend beyond the construction footprint, within which impacts upon any archaeological remains would have been fully mitigated during construction. Direct physical decommissioning effects on heritage assets within the Site would not therefore occur.

Operation

9.7.105 Any residual operational phase setting effects will be reversed and there is no potential for significant operational phase decommissioning effects.

9.8 Mitigation

Mitigation During Construction

9.8.1 The preferred mitigation option in respect of direct physical impacts is always to avoid or reduce impacts through design (embedded mitigation), or through precautionary measures such as fencing off of heritage assets during construction works. Impacts which cannot be eliminated in these ways will lead to residual effects.

9.8.2 Where construction impacts are unavoidable, these will be offset by excavation and recording of the remains in accordance with NPF4 Policy 7(o) and PAN2/2011, sections 25-27, and A&BC LDP2 Policy 21.

9.8.3 If consented, a programme of archaeological monitoring, fieldwork, recording, and reporting is likely to be required in accordance with the standard archaeological condition No. 30 in Onshore Wind Standard Conditions, Section 36 Consent and Deemed Planning Permission (Scottish Government, February 2025).

Direct and Indirect Physical Impacts within the Application Boundary

Known Heritage Assets

9.8.4 No direct or indirect physical impacts upon known heritage assets are anticipated and therefore no asset-specific mitigation is proposed.

Accidental Impacts and Micro-siting

9.8.5 Accidental direct physical impact during construction is possible upon HA01 the Deirdre Shieling Memorial, a modern sculpture. Mitigation by fencing for its protection throughout construction is proposed. The sculpture's location should also be included on construction plans and its presence highlighted in project inductions to minimise the potential for accidental impacts.

9.8.6 Located on the Site Access, possible charcoal burning platforms 43332 Am Barr is located beyond a field boundary, and an accidental physical impact is therefore considered very unlikely. Further, as the Site Access follows the route of an existing track which is to be straightened, micro-siting is considered very unlikely. No mitigation is therefore proposed.

9.8.7 Within the Site, any accidental direct physical impact upon stone dykes 20180 & 20181 would be of **negligible significance** and no mitigation is therefore proposed.

Archaeological Potential

9.8.8 The Site Access is assumed to have no archaeological potential. No archaeological mitigation is proposed during construction phase works within this part of the Application Boundary.

Although archaeological potential of the Site is considered to be negligible for important archaeological remains, impacts on unexpected archaeological remains may occur during the construction phase. It is anticipated that preservation by record through archaeological monitoring (watching brief) is likely to be required over construction groundworks for the Proposed Development. The scope and nature of additional mitigation will be outlined in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and agreed with A&BC in advance of construction and it is assumed this will be proportionately tailored to the negligible archaeological potential of the Site.

9.8.9 Further guidance on appropriate mitigation can be found at Part 6 (Historic Environment/Archaeology) of NatureScot's Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction (NatureScot, 2019).

Construction Phase Setting Effects

9.8.10 Adverse construction phase setting effects of **minor significance** are predicted upon:

- SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.8.11 These effects are **not significant**, temporary and short-term. Following construction, the residual effect would be **no impact** and no additional mitigation is proposed.

Mitigation During Operation

9.8.12 Adverse operational effects of **minor significance** are predicted upon:

- SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie
- SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.8.13 These effects are **not significant** and no additional mitigation beyond the applied mitigation embedded in the design of the Proposed Development to minimise effects upon the historic environment is proposed.

9.9 Residual Effects

Residual Construction Effects

9.9.1 Following the proposed mitigation by protection with fencing of HA01 Deirdre Shieling Memorial and implementation of additional mitigation for construction impacts upon any areas of archaeological potential in the Site there would be **no residual physical construction phase effects** which is **not significant**.

9.9.2 Construction phase setting effects on SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of are temporary and short-term. Following construction, the residual effect would be **no impact** which is **not significant**.

Residual Operational Effects

9.9.3 In respect of the setting of heritage assets, no additional mitigation is proposed and therefore residual adverse operational effects which are **minor** and **not significant** are predicted upon:

- SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie
- SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.10 Cumulative Effects

Cumulative Construction Effects

9.10.1 There is no potential for cumulative construction effects on any known or unknown and previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets. Any effects would be contained within the Site boundary, and none will be further directly impacted by any other developments outside this area.

Cumulative Operational Effects

9.10.2 Cumulative operational effects can occur when the contribution made to the cultural significance of a heritage asset by its setting is directly altered by the Proposed Development in combination with other developments. The assessment of effects uses the same methodology applied in considering the likely effects of Proposed Development alone. All analysis of asset significance and the contribution made by setting remains unchanged. All that is altered is the nature of change predicted for the one or more scenarios under consideration.

9.10.3 Cumulative operational effects are considered in cases where an effect of **minor or greater significance** has been predicted on the setting of a heritage asset as a result of the Proposed Development. In terms of operational impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets in the study area through development within their setting, an adverse effect of **minor significance** is anticipated upon:

- SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie
- SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.10.4 For the cumulative assessment, other developments (consented but not yet built and those that are currently at scoping or application stage (for which sufficient detail is known)) are considered where they also feature within views from or towards these assets as demonstrated by the suite of visualisations as agreed with HES.

9.10.5 Overall there are no identified cumulative impacts of increased magnitude, and **no significant cumulative effects** are identified.

SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie

9.10.6 **Photomontages CHVP02 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.4)** and **CHVP03 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.5)** illustrate that in views from and towards SM3910 An Dun, dun, the proposed Corr Chnoc Wind Farm, which is currently in planning, would be visible in combination with the Proposed Development. The nearest proposed turbine of Corr Chnoc Wind Farm (T6) is located 1.3 km to the south of SM3910 An Dun, dun, and six turbines of this proposed development would be visible to an extent in views to the south across the Glen. The EIAR cultural heritage chapter for Corr Chnoc Wind Farm identifies an adverse effect of **minor significance**, which is **not significant**. It is considered, following the same methodology as for the Proposed Development in isolation, that the adverse effects of **minor significance** from the Proposed Development in combination with the adverse effects of **minor significance** from the proposed Corr Chnoc Wind Farm would be unlikely to cross a threshold of significance, and the effect would remain an adverse cumulative effect of **minor significance** which is **not significant**.

SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of

9.10.7 **Photomontage CHVP04 (Volume 3a, Figure 9.6)** illustrates that in views from SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun, the proposed Corr Chnoc Wind Farm, which is currently in planning, would be visible in combination with the Proposed Development. The nearest proposed turbine of Corr Chnoc Wind Farm (T4) is located 4.9 km to the south-west of SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun, and 12 turbines of this proposed development would be visible to an extent in views. The EIAR cultural heritage chapter for Corr Chnoc Wind Farm identifies an adverse effect of **negligible significance**, which is **not significant**. It is considered, following the same methodology as for the Proposed Development in isolation, that the adverse effects of **minor significance** from the Proposed Development in combination with the adverse effects of **negligible significance** from the proposed Corr Chnoc Wind Farm would be unlikely to cross a threshold of significance, and the effect would remain an adverse cumulative effect of **minor significance** which is **not significant**.

9.11 Summary of Effects

9.11.1 Table 9.6 provides a summary of the conclusions of the impact assessment with respect to cultural heritage taking into consideration embedded and any additional mitigation measures.

Table 9.6: Summary of effects

Potential impact	Pre-mitigation		Mitigation	Residual	
	Effect	Significance		Effect	Significance
Construction Phase					
Potential accidental direct (physical) impact upon HA01 Deirdre Shieling Memorial within the Site	Adverse	Minor	Fencing for its protection throughout construction. The monument's location should also be included on construction plans and its presence highlighted in project inductions	None	None
Potential accidental/micro-siting direct (physical) impact upon 20180 & 20181 stone walls (dykes) within the Site	Adverse	Negligible	None proposed	Adverse	Negligible
Direct (physical) impact upon unexpected archaeological remains within the Site	Adverse	(up to) Moderate	Implementation of a proportionate programme of archaeological fieldwork agreed through a written scheme of investigation with A&BC	None	None
Operational Phase					

Potential impact	Pre-mitigation		Mitigation	Residual	
	Effect	Significance		Effect	Significance
Effect upon cultural significance through development within setting of: • SM3910 An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie • SM3930 Barguillean Farm, dun 250m SSW of	Adverse	Minor	None proposed	Adverse	Minor
Decommissioning Phase					
None					
Cumulative effects					
None					

9.12 References

Alexander, D 1995, Proposed Windfarm at Beinn Ghlas, Barguillean Estate, Taynuilt, Oban, Argyll & Bute: Archaeological Assessment (Commissioned by Bioscan Environmental Consultancy on behalf of National Wind Power Limited). Unpublished client report by Centre for Field Archaeology.

Alcock, L & Alcock, E A 1987 'Reconnaissance excavations on early historic fortifications and other royal sites in Scotland, 1974–84: 2, Excavations at Dunollie Castle, Oban, Argyll, 1978', Proc Soc Antiq Scot 117: 119–47.

Armit, I 1991 'The Atlantic Scottish Iron Age: five levels of chronology', Proc Soc Antiq Scot 121: 181–214.

Armit, I 1992 The Later Prehistory of the Western Isles of Scotland. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, British Series, 221.

Armit, I 2004 'The Iron Age', in Omand, D (ed) The Argyll Book, 46–59. Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Beveridge, E 1903 Coll and Tiree: Their Prehistoric Forts and Ecclesiastical Antiquities, with Notices of Ancient Remains in the Treshnish Isles. Edinburgh: T & A Constable.

Feachem, R W 1963 A Guide to Prehistoric Scotland. London: Batsford.

Gilmour, S 1994 'Iron Age Drystone Structures in Argyll', unpublished MA dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Gilmour, S M D 2000 'Later Prehistoric and Early Historic Settlement Archaeology of the Western Seaways: A Study of the Western Settlement Record from Shetland to Brittany in the First Millennia BC and AD', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Harding, D W 1984 'The function and classification of Brochs and Duns', in Miket, R & Burgess, C (eds) Between and Beyond the Walls, Essays on the Prehistory and History of North Britain in Honour of George Jobey, 206–20. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Harding, D.W 1997 Forts, Duns, Brochs and Crannogs: Iron Age Settlement in Argyll, in Ritchie, G (ed) The Archaeology of Argyll Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Maxwell, G 1969 'Duns and forts: a note on some Iron Age monuments of the Atlantic province', Scottish Archaeological Forum 1: 41–6.

Nieke, M 1990 'Fortifications in Argyll: retrospect and future prospect', in Armit, I (ed) Beyond the Brochs: Changing Perspectives on the Atlantic Scottish Iron Age, 131–42. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

RCAHMS 1971 The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. Argyll: An Inventory of the Monuments, vol 1: Kintyre. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Regan, R & Campbell, E 2022 Two Iron Age duns in western Scotland: excavations at Barnluasgan and Balure, North Knapdale, Argyll, Scottish Archaeological Internet Reports 99. https://doi.org/10.9750/issn.2056-7421.2022.99

Regan, R 2009, Balure Dun, Dalriada Project, Excavation Data Structure Report II, Kilmartin House Museum, Argyll

Robins, P 1996 Reconnaissance survey in advance of the Barguillean Woodland Grant Scheme. West of Scotland Archaeology Service

Strachan, R. Cressey, M. & Suddaby, I 1999 Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, Barguillean Estate, Taynuilt: Archaeological Watching Brief. Unpublished client report by Centre for Field Archaeology (CFA Archaeology)

Thomas, F W L 1890 'On the duns of the Outer Hebrides', Archaeologia Scotica 5: 365–415.

Werner, S D 2007 'An Assessment for the Case of Shared Traditions in the North Channel Region: Site Morphology and Settlement Distribution during the 1st Millennium BC to 1st Millennium AD', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Young, A 1962 'Brochs and duns', Proc Soc Antiq Scot 95: 171–98