



# BEINN GHLAS WIND FARM REPOWERING EIAR VOLUME 4, TECHNICAL APPENDIX 9.1

*Cultural Heritage Baseline  
and Stage 1 Setting Assessment*

*for Beaufort Wind Limited  
(Nadara Ltd)*

*June 2025*

# BEINN GHLAS WIND FARM REPOWERING EIAR VOLUME 4, TECHNICAL APPENDIX 9.1

*Cultural Heritage Baseline  
and Stage 1 Setting Assessment*

*for Beaufort Wind Limited  
(Nadara Ltd)*

*01/06/2025*

*Ver 4.0*

HA Job no.:	P22-035
NGR:	197467 725744 (centred)
Parishes:	Ardchattan and Muckairn
Council:	Argyll and Bute

Project Manager:	Owen Raybould
Author:	Donald Wilson/Owen Raybould
Field Visit:	Donald Wilson
Approved by:	Andy Towle
Version comments:	EIA issue (7 turbine freeze)



## CONTENTS

1.....	INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1.	PLANNING BACKGROUND .....	5
1.2.	SITE DESCRIPTION .....	5
2.....	LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE.....	8
2.1.	STATUTORY PROTECTION.....	8
2.2.	NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK .....	8
2.3.	LOCAL PLANNING POLICY .....	10
2.4.	GUIDANCE.....	12
2.5.	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	13
3.....	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES .....	14
4.....	METHODOLOGY.....	15
4.1.	TERMINOLOGY – ‘SIGNIFICANCE’ AND ‘IMPORTANCE’ .....	15
4.2.	IDENTIFICATION OF HERITAGE ASSETS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED .....	15
4.3.	ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE.....	18
4.4.	POTENTIAL FOR UNKNOWN HERITAGE ASSETS .....	19
4.5.	STAGE 1 SETTING ASSESSMENT.....	19
5.....	RESULTS.....	20
5.1.	OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT.....	20
5.2.	PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS.....	20
5.3.	FIELD VISIT.....	21
5.2.	HISTORIC MAPPING AND AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY REVIEW.....	23
5.5.	GEOLOGY AND GEOMORPHOLOGY.....	24
5.7.	HISTORIC LAND-USE ASSESSMENT (HLA).....	24
5.8.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL NARRATIVE .....	24
6.....	STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPORTANCE.....	27
6.1.	KNOWN AND POTENTIAL HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN THE APPLICATION BOUNDARY.....	27
6.2.	HERITAGE ASSETS IN THE OUTER STUDY AREA.....	29
7.....	CONCLUSIONS .....	37
7.1.	POTENTIAL PHYSICAL EFFECTS.....	37
7.2.	POTENTIAL SETTING EFFECTS.....	37
	REFERENCES.....	38

# CULTURAL HERITAGE BASELINE AND STAGE 1 SETTING ASSESSMENT

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. PLANNING BACKGROUND

- 1.1.1. This report was commissioned by Beaufort Wind Limited (Nadara Ltd) and presents the results of an archaeological baseline and Stage 1 Setting Assessment which will contribute to the cultural heritage elements of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The EIA will be produced in support of a planning application to repower the existing wind farm at Beinn Ghlas with associated infrastructure on a c.436-hectare (ha) Site (including Site Access).
- 1.1.2. This report describes and assesses the heritage significance and importance of known heritage assets and potential archaeological remains within the Application Boundary. This informs a Cultural Heritage EIA Report chapter which identifies the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development on the cultural significance of heritage assets. A 'Stage 1' Setting Assessment in this technical appendix provides an assessment of the contribution to significance made by the setting of heritage assets in order to identify potentially significant planning constraints.
- 1.1.3. 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' (HES 2023, 10). National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) defines the historic environment 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.
- 1.1.4. This report is suitable for submission in support of a planning application and identifies potential heritage constraints for the Proposed Development in accordance with the requirements of national and local planning policies with respect to consideration of the historic environment in the planning process (see Part 2).

### 1.2. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 1.2.1. Beinn Ghlas is located on the undulating uplands around Carn Gaibhre to the east of Beinn Ghlas summit on the Barguilean Estate near Taynuilt in Argyll. The 436 ha Application Boundary (NGR 197467, 725744, centred) is located approximately 6 km south-west of Taynuilt and 12 km east of Oban. The Application Boundary is located in the parishes of Ardchattan and Muckairn, part of the administrative area of Argyll and Bute Council (A&BC).
- 1.2.2. The Site is located across the hills of Beinn Ghlas to the south of the Loch Etive Hills and comprises low, rugged hills, scattered with small outcrops of rocks and scoured with steep sided streams. It is bounded to the north by Glen Lonan and to the east by Glen Nant. The Site lies on the watershed of the Laggan Burn and Garbh Allt, which flow into Sior Loch and Loch Nant to the south and burns feeding the River Lonan to the north. Topography is primarily moderate altitude hills, Beinn Ghlas being the highest point at 512 m AOD with the existing turbines across Carn Gaibhre at 461 m AOD. There is open moorland, predominantly upland heath and mires including bog pools, on the higher ground and a mixture of rough grassland and woodland on the lower slopes. The wind farm site is currently in the most extensive (low intensity over a wide area) agricultural use as hill grazing with pasture across the areas of lower altitude. Within the surrounding area there is a combination of native deciduous woodland and commercial coniferous forestry to the south east of the Site. The area to the west of the Site is a habitat



management area surrounded by a fence to prevent access by grazing animals. To the south there is commercial forestry surrounding Loch Nant and to the west further open moorland.

- 1.2.3. It is proposed that access will be gained via Fearnoch Forest leading from the A85 close to Taynult before following the existing FLS track (minor upgrades required) through the car park and access for Angus' Garden then proceeding along the existing Glen Lonan Road and finally connecting with the existing Site Access junction.



*Illus 1 General view towards Application Boundary looking south from Glen Lonan*



*Illus 2 General view of the Application Boundary, looking north west towards proposed T11 from operational wind farm*





*Illus 3 General view of the Application Boundary, looking east from Beinn Ghlas summit*

## 2. LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

### 2.1. STATUTORY PROTECTION

- 2.1.1. Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings are protected by statute.
- 2.1.2. The relevant heritage legislation in the context of the present site is described in Table 1.

*Table 1. Historic Environment Statutory Legislation*

Legislation	Key Issues
Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014	The Act 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.
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979	It is a criminal offence to carry out any works on or near to a Scheduled Monument without Scheduled Monument Consent. Development must preserve in-situ protected archaeological remains and landscapes of acknowledged significance and protect their settings.
The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997	Provides for statutory protection of listed buildings and conservation areas. No physical works can be carried out in relation to a listed building and its curtilage without listed building consent. It introduces a requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting in considering any Development which may affect these. In conservation areas, the designation introduces general controls to conserve character and appearance within the conservation area.
Protection of Military Remains Act (1986)	Outlines the criteria for designating a military crash site. Certain activities are prohibited at protected sites, without the authority of the Ministry of Defence.
Scots Common Law	The movement or disturbance of human remains without lawful authority is illegal. Any human remains should be reported to the local police or Procurator Fiscal's office. Further disturbance must cease until permission to continue has been granted by the legal authorities.

### 2.2. NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

- 2.2.1. 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. HEPS provides further policy direction to NPF4 and sets out high level policies and core principles for decision-making affecting the historic environment.
- 2.2.2. 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.

- 2.2.3. 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:

*The policy principles:*

- *Policy Intent: To protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places.*
- *Policy Outcomes: The historic environment is valued, protected, and enhanced, supporting the transition to net zero and ensuring assets are resilient to current and future impacts of climate change; Redundant or neglected historic buildings are brought back into sustainable and productive uses; Recognise the social, environmental and economic value of the historic environment, to our economy and cultural identity.*
- *Local Development Plans: LDPs, including through their spatial strategies, should support the sustainable management of the historic environment. They should identify, protect and enhance valued historic assets and places. "*

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

NPF4 – Part 2: Historic Assets and Places Policy 7

*"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."*

## 2.3. LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

2.3.1. Argyll and Bute Council's Local Development Plan (LDP2; February 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.

2.3.2. Table 2 lists the local policy and guidance relating to the historic environment.

Table 2 Local Policy and Guidance

Reference	Policy / Key Principle	Text of relevance to this report
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 15: Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment	<p>Development proposals will not be acceptable where they fail to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect, preserve, conserve or enhance the established character of the historic built environment in terms of its location, scale, form, design or proposed use; or</li> <li>• avoid any cumulative effect upon the integrity or special qualities of designated built environment sites.</li> </ul> <p>When there is significant uncertainty concerning the potential impact of a proposed development on a designated site, consideration will be given to the appropriate application of the precautionary principle.</p>
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 16: Listed Buildings	<p>A. Development:</p> <p>A development proposal which affects a Listed Building, its curtilage or its wider setting will only be supported when it meets ALL of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It respects the original structure in terms of setting, scale, design, materials and proposed use, AND</li> <li>• The proposal is essential to securing an appropriate use of the Listed Building without undermining its architectural or historic character, or its setting, AND</li> <li>• It conforms to national policy and guidance, including but not limited to those set out in the section above 'Related Documents'</li> </ul> <p>The developer is expected to demonstrate to the planning authority's satisfaction, that the effect of a proposed development on a Listed Building, its curtilage and wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the special interest of the asset. The use of appropriate access statements, design statements and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment.</p>
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 17 Conservation Areas	<p>A. Development:</p> <p>There is a presumption against development that does not protect, conserve or enhance the character or appearance of an existing or proposed conservation area or its setting. New development within these areas and on sites affecting their settings must respect the architectural, historic and other special qualities that give rise to their actual or proposed designation and conform to the following national policies and guidance including, but not limited to, section above 'Related Documents' and the area's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (if in place).</p> <p>The developer is expected to satisfactorily demonstrate to the planning authority that the effect of a proposed development on a conservation area and its wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the special interest of the area. The use of appropriate design statements, character appraisals and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment.</p> <p>Applications for planning permission in principle will not normally be considered appropriate for proposed development in conservation areas.</p> <p>The contribution which trees make towards the character or appearance of a conservation area will be taken into account when considering development proposals.</p>

Reference	Policy / Key Principle	Text of relevance to this report
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 18: Enabling Development	<p>"Enabling development proposals which have not already been identified in the Local Development Plan 2, subject to other policies, will be considered in the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the building is Listed and/or on the Building at Risk Register, or in exceptional circumstance unlisted but considered worthy of conservation and reuse by the Council, AND</li> <li>all other possibilities of development funding to secure the conservation and reuse of the building have been exhausted. This includes exploring grant aid and determining if any other group, such as a Building Preservation Trust, is willing to undertake the project; and putting the building on the open market for a period of time (not less than 12 months) and price (reflecting condition and redevelopment costs) which can be considered reasonable to achieve a sale in the context of prevailing market conditions, AND</li> <li>it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum required to meet a verifiable conservation deficit that would achieve conservation and reuse and, if required, this has been confirmed through an independent professional survey by an agency chosen by the council and paid for by the applicant, AND</li> <li>the wider public benefits of securing the conservation and reuse of the building through enabling development significantly outweigh any disadvantages of breaching normal policy presumptions, AND</li> <li>it will not materially harm the heritage value of the listed building or its setting, AND</li> <li>it will secure the long-term future of the asset and avoid detrimental fragmentation of management of the asset.</li> </ul> <p>For proposals associated with listed building restoration and reuse, the physical separation of the restored or reused listed building from the enabling development is normally preferred.</p>
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 19: Scheduled Monuments	<p>There will be a presumption against development that does not retain, protect, conserve or enhance a Scheduled Monument and the integrity of its settings. Developments that have an adverse impact on Scheduled Monuments or their settings will not be permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances. 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 including but not limited to the 'Related Documents'.</p> <p>The developer is expected to satisfactorily demonstrate to the planning authority that the effect of a proposed development on a scheduled monument and its wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the special interest of the asset. The use of appropriate setting analysis, design statements, character appraisals and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment.</p>
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 20: Gardens and Designed landscapes	<p>There will be a presumption in favour of retaining, protecting, conserving and enhancing gardens and designed landscapes, either listed in the inventory of gardens and designed landscapes, or otherwise deemed to be of significant value.</p> <p>Where development would affect a garden and designed landscape the developer will be expected to demonstrate to the planning authority that such an effect has been assessed and that adequate measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the special interest of the asset. Measures of assessment will be expected to follow the principles set out in the 'Related Documents'.</p> <p>In assessing proposals for development in or adjacent to gardens and designed landscapes particular attention will be paid to the impact of the proposal on all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The archaeological, historical or botanical interest of the site, AND</li> <li>The site's original design concept, overall quality and setting, AND</li> <li>Trees and woodlands and the site's contribution to local landscape character within the site including the boundary walls, pathways, garden terraces or water features, AND</li> </ul> <p>Planned or significant views of, or from, the site or buildings within it.</p>

Reference	Policy / Key Principle	Text of relevance to this report
Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2, February 2024	Policy 21: Sites of Archaeological Importance	<p>There is a presumption in favour of retaining, protecting, conserving and enhancing the existing archaeological heritage and any future discoveries found in Argyll and Bute. When a proposed development would affect a site of archaeological significance, ALL of the following will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prospective developer will be advised to consult the planning authority and its advisors the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WOSAS) at the earliest possible stage in the conception of the proposal, AND</li> <li>• An assessment of the importance of the site will be provided by the prospective developer as part of the application for planning permission or (preferably) as part of the pre-application discussions, AND</li> <li>• Relevant policies and guidance including but not limited to the 'Related Documents' must be conformed to.</li> </ul> <p>When development that will affect a site of archaeological significance is to be carried out, both of the following will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers will be expected to make provision for the protection and preservation of archaeological deposits in situ within their developments, OR</li> <li>• Where the planning authority deems that the protection and preservation of archaeological deposits in situ is not warranted for whatever reason, it shall satisfy itself that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation, recording, analysis and publication and, if appropriate preservation of, the remains.</li> </ul> <p>Where archaeological remains are discovered after a development has commenced both of the following will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developer will stop work and notify the WOSAS and the council immediately to enable an assessment of the importance of the remains to be made, AND</li> <li>• Developers should make appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation, recording, analysis and publication of the remains. (Developers may see fit to insure against the unexpected discovery of archaeological remains during work).</li> </ul>

## 2.4. GUIDANCE

- 2.4.1. The methodology for cultural heritage impact assessment in the EIA 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.
- 2.4.2. HES also provides guidance on how to apply NPF4 Policy 7 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).
- 2.4.3. HES published Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (DPSG, 2019) to accompany HEPS. DPSG outlines the policy and selection guidance used by HES when designating sites and places of national importance.
- 2.4.4. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology provides local government officers with 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.
- 2.4.5. PAN 71 Conservation Area Management provides local government and stakeholders with planning advice with regard to conservation areas.



- 2.4.6. 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).
- 2.4.7. 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.

## 2.5. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 2.5.1. Headland Archaeology (UK) is a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), an audited status which confirms that all work is carried out in accordance with the highest standards of the profession.
- 2.5.2. Headland Archaeology (UK), as part of the RSK Group, is recognised by the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) under their 'Historic Environment Service Provider Recognition' scheme. This quality assurance standard acknowledges that RSK works to the conservation standards of the IHBC, the UK's lead body for built and historic environment practitioners and specialists.
- 2.5.3. Headland Archaeology (UK) operates a quality management system to help ensure all projects are managed in a professional and transparent manner, which enables it to qualify for ISO 9001 (Quality Management), ISO 45001 (health and safety management) and ISO 14001 (environmental management).

### 3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 3.1.1. The aim of this desk-based assessment (DBA) is to form the historic environment baseline for an EIA Report chapter in relation to likely significant environmental effects. The assessment aims to identify all known heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development, and the potential for currently unknown heritage assets to be present within the Application Boundary.
- 3.1.2. The purpose is to gain an understanding of the historic environment resource in order to formulate an assessment of the potential for heritage assets to survive within the Application Boundary, their significance, and strategies for further evaluation, mitigation or management as appropriate.
- 3.1.3. The ClfA's *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* (2020) defines a DBA as '*...a programme of study of the historic environment within a specified area or site on land, the inter-tidal zone or underwater that addresses agreed research and/or conservation objectives. It consists of an analysis of existing written, graphic, photographic, and electronic information in order to identify the likely heritage assets, their interests and significance and the character of the Study Area, including appropriate consideration of the settings of heritage assets and, in England, the nature, extent and quality of the known or potential archaeological, historic, architectural and artistic interest. Significance is to be judged in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate.*'
- 3.1.4. NPF4 Policy 7.a requires that "*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.*" This report, therefore, will determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent, and significance of the historic environment within a specified area, and the impact of the Proposed Development on the significance of the historic environment or will identify the need for further evaluation to do so.
- 3.1.5. The specific objectives of this DBA are therefore to:
- Collate all available written, graphic, photographic, and electronic information relevant to the historic environment of the Application Boundary and relevant study area;
  - Describe the nature, extent and significance and importance of the historic environment within the area potentially affected by the development, identifying any uncertainties in existing knowledge;
  - Determine the potential for previously unknown archaeological remains;
  - Identify any requirements for further investigation that may be necessary to understand the effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### 4.1. TERMINOLOGY – ‘SIGNIFICANCE’ AND ‘IMPORTANCE’

- 4.1.1. 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.
- 4.1.2. 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. 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";*
  - *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"; and*
  - *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".*
- 4.1.3. Relative importance of each identified heritage asset potentially affected by the Proposed Development has been determined to provide a framework for comparison between different heritage assets and to inform subsequent stages of archaeological assessment and the development of any appropriate mitigation which may be required (See Table 3 below).

### 4.2. IDENTIFICATION OF HERITAGE ASSETS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED

#### *Study Areas*

- 4.2.1. Nested study areas have been used for this assessment. The Proposed Development Application Boundary, including the Site Access, has been used to identify potential direct and indirect (physical) impacts.
- 4.2.2. All heritage assets within 1 km of proposed turbine locations have been identified and considered to inform the assessment of archaeological potential for the Site.
- 4.2.3. Outer study areas (OSA) are used for the Setting Assessment. Heritage assets in the OSA are considered within the following maximum distances:
- 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: Conservation Areas, non-inventory designed landscapes (NIDLs), and non-designated heritage assets;

- Up to 20 km from proposed turbines: Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Category A Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes;
- Beyond 20 km from proposed turbines, based on the ZTV: any asset which is considered exceptionally important, and where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to be particularly sensitive, in the opinion of the assessor or consultees (see below).

4.2.4. Criteria for the identification of assets of particular sensitivity or importance will be based on the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020) that sets out a range of factors which might form part of the setting of a heritage asset 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 outward 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."*

## Data Sources

4.2.5. The assessment has been based on a study of all readily available documentary sources, following the ClfA Standards and Guidance. 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 data, viewed through the HLA Map website;
- The National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP);
- Geological data available online from the British Geological Survey;
- Historic maps held by the National Library of Scotland;
- 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.



- 4.2.6. All heritage assets within the Application Boundary and OSA are compiled in a Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2). Designated heritage assets are referenced in this report by their Historic Environment Scotland list entry number (prefixed SM for Scheduled Monuments and LB for Listed Buildings). Non-designated assets are referenced by their respective HER Preferred Reference Number or the NRHE reference. Any newly discovered assets have been assigned a number prefixed HA for 'Heritage Asset'. A single asset number can refer to a group of related features, which may be recorded separately in the HER and other data sources.

### *Field Visit*

- 4.2.7. A field visit was undertaken on the 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> May 2023 in clear weather conditions, with good long-distance visibility sufficient for the inspection of known and potential heritage assets within the Application Boundary. 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.
- 4.2.8. Records were made regarding extant archaeological features, such as earthworks or structural remains, local topography and aspect, exposed geology, soils, watercourses, health and safety considerations and any other relevant information.
- 4.2.9. 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. However, this was sufficient for the inspection and assessment of the settings of the selected sites.

### *Historic Map Regression*

- 4.2.10. The historic mapping sequence corresponding with the Application Boundary was consulted to collect information on former land use and development throughout the later historic periods.

### *Limitations of Baseline Data*

- 4.2.11. 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 Application Boundary. This was addressed by field surveys;
  - 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 sites 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 sites 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 sites; and
  - Any archaeological field visit has inherent limitations, primarily because archaeological remains below ground level may have no surface indicators.

### 4.3. ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE

- 4.3.1. The importance of a heritage asset is the overall value assigned to it reflecting its statutory designation or, in the case of non-designated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (Table 3).
- 4.3.2. 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 heritage importance; in general, such features are not considered as heritage assets and are excluded from the EIA.
- 4.3.3. The importance of heritage assets that may be affected by the Proposed Development is identified in the EIA Report Cultural Heritage Chapter's impact assessment.
- 4.3.4. WoSAS maintains a non-statutory register (NSR) of heritage assets considered of National importance, which are possible candidates for scheduling. Regionally significant assets are also identified, that on the levels of information currently available do not appear to meet the criteria for designation as Scheduled Monuments but are still of interest.

Table 3. Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance of the asset	Criteria
Very High (International)	World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal international importance, that contribute to international research objectives
High (National)	Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Category A and B Listed Buildings, Historic Marine Protected Areas, and non-designated heritage assets of equivalent importance that contribute to national research objectives
Medium (Regional)	Conservation Areas, Category C Listed Buildings, undesignated assets of regional importance except where their particular characteristics merit a higher level of importance, heritage assets on local lists and non-designated assets that contribute to Regional research objectives
Low (Local)	Locally listed heritage assets, except where their particular characteristics merit a higher level of importance, undesignated heritage assets of Local importance, including assets that may already be partially damaged
Negligible	Identified historic remains of no importance in planning considerations, or heritage assets and findspots that have already been removed or destroyed (i.e. 'site of')
Unknown / Uncertain	Heritage assets for which a level of importance cannot be defined on current information

## 4.4. POTENTIAL FOR UNKNOWN HERITAGE ASSETS

4.4.1. Archaeological features are often impossible to identify through desk-based assessment. The likelihood that significant undiscovered heritage assets may be present within the Application Boundary is referred to as *archaeological potential*. Overall levels of potential can be assigned to different areas of the Application Boundary, while recognising that the archaeological potential of any zone 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 and other data sources such as HES and NRHE;
- 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 quarrying; 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.

4.4.2. The likelihood that the Application Boundary may contain undiscovered heritage assets, their likely location and potential density, and their likely level of importance is assessed, described, and justified.

## 4.5. STAGE 1 SETTING ASSESSMENT

4.5.1. In the Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2) the results of a screening exercise are presented in full to consider whether further detailed assessment in the EIA Report chapter is 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.

4.5.2. The screening assessment methodology considers each heritage asset in 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 would be harmed by the Proposed Development. Where heritage assets are located outwith the ZTV, third-party viewpoints within the ZTV which may provide a significant view towards the heritage asset and the Proposed Development are considered.

4.5.3. Further, beyond the defined OSAs, the screening assessment methodology considers all heritage assets in the ZTV to identify any assets of particular importance and/or sensitivity to visual change, based on the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020). This is a rapid screening exercise, supplemented through scoping and further consultation with statutory consultees, and only those monuments identified beyond the OSA requiring detailed assessment are added to the Gazetteer.

4.5.4. In the case of this Proposed Development, one Category B Listed Building 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.

## 5. RESULTS

### 5.1. OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

- 5.1.1. The full list of known heritage assets within the Application Boundary and OSA is presented in the Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2). The significance of these assets is discussed by period in the Statement of Significance and Importance section below.

#### *Application Boundary*

- 5.1.2. There are no designated heritage assets located within the Application Boundary.
- 5.1.3. 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 comprise: 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 Application Boundary: a modern memorial (HA01).

#### *Outer Study Area*

- 5.1.4. Within the 2 km OSA, including the Application Boundary, 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.
- 5.1.5. Within the 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.
- 5.1.6. Within the 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.
- 5.1.7. Within the 20 km OSA there is one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape, 125 Scheduled Monuments and 23 Category A Listed Buildings. A total of 57 of the Scheduled Monuments added to the Gazetteer lie within the ZTV for the Proposed Development.
- 5.1.8. In the case of this Proposed Development, one Category B Listed Building 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.
- 5.1.9. No further heritage assets have been identified within the ZTV and beyond the defined OSAs, where its significance and contribution made by setting is such that a significant impact is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development.

### 5.2. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

- 5.2.1. The only intrusive archaeological investigations carried out previously within the Application Boundary relate to the monitoring of groundworks during the construction phase of the existing wind farm (Strachan et al 1999; WoSAS Event ID66). This revealed a section through one of the known dykes in the area. Two archaeological assessments of the area have also been undertaken. A reconnaissance survey in advance of the Barguilean Woodland Grant Scheme (Robins 1996; WoSAS Event ID 48) across part of the area identified three new sites, two single shieling-huts and a group of six shieling huts. A walkover survey was also conducted in conjunction with a desk-based assessment in advance of the existing wind farm at Beinn Ghlas (Alexander 1995; WoSAS Event ID 65). This identified two lengths of dry-stone field dyke of uncertain date.



### 5.3. FIELD VISIT

- 5.1.1. The field visit covered all accessible areas of proposed infrastructure within the Application Boundary, although the proposed Site Access from the A85 through Fearnach Forest was excluded as this route follows an existing constructed forest track and there are no known heritage assets with the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development. All accessible heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development infrastructure recorded on the Argyll and Bute HER or identified on historic mapping as part of this DBA within the Application Boundary were visited.
- 5.1.2. The field visit to the Application Boundary identified no additional potential heritage assets.

#### *PREVIOUSLY RECORDED HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN THE APPLICATION BOUNDARY*

- 5.1.3. HA01 is a modern memorial dedicated to a medieval story of a character known as Deirdre of the Sorrows. The site was found to be present and in good condition. The memorial is located between two existing wind turbines.



Illus 4. HA01 memorial facing north.

- 5.1.4. Shieling huts (21233) were located to the north side of the Application Boundary on the north facing slopes of Carn Gaibhre. These were mapped on the 1<sup>st</sup> edition OS and were seen to still be present. They were in a ruinous condition and covered in scrub grass and bracken.





Illus 5. View to the shieling huts (21233) facing north towards Glen Lonan.

- 5.1.5. Stone dykes 20180 and 20181(x2) do not appear on the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> edition OS mapping and therefore are likely to post-date these maps. Both walls remain extant on the sites forming linear field boundaries probably related to sheep farming in the area.



Illus 6. View of stone dyke 20180 facing south-west.





Illus78. View of stone dyke 20181 facing north-east.

## 5.2. HISTORIC MAPPING AND AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY REVIEW

- 5.2.1. The early maps produced by Pont (1583-96), Cowley (1734) and Conder (1786) show little detail of the Application Boundary, and no settlement is indicated, the latter only depicting the main communication routes through the area.
- 5.2.2. Roy's Military map of the Highlands (1747-52) depicts the Application Boundary as several unforested hills dissected by rivers and burns. No roads or paths are marked across the area. Several settlements and farmsteads are depicted on this map within the glens to the north and east of the Application Boundary. These settlements would imply that the landscape was being farmed to some extent in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. None of the hills in the area are named on this map.
- 5.2.3. The maps of Langlands (1801) and Johnston (1845) are not at a scale useful to identify archaeological potential, only naming nearby settlements and hills. The townships of Dountannachan to north and Clacadow to east and Mid Muir to south are depicted however no features are depicted within the Application Boundary.
- 5.2.4. Study of the First and Second Edition Ordnance Survey (OS) maps (1:2500, surveyed 1870 and revised 1897) and the modern OS identified no additional features within the Application Boundary. These maps depict the Application Boundary as open moorland traversed by streams. The map review demonstrates that the Application Boundary remained unforested with very little change from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to the present day. The Fearnoch Forest, however, is depicted on the First Edition OS, although the access tracks through it are assumed to be modern.
- 5.2.5. Four historical aerial images are available on NCAP covering the Application Boundary (listed in full in the references section of this report). These images date between 1982 and 1988 and show an extensive moorland with very little change of land use up to the present day. None of these images are of suitable quality to identify any hitherto unknown heritage assets.

## 5.5. GEOLOGY AND GEOMORPHOLOGY

- 5.6.1. The Application Boundary of the Proposed Development area 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, often skeletal but sometimes with peat remains mixed in an organic upper horizon (<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>).

## 5.7. HISTORIC LAND-USE ASSESSMENT (HLA)

- 5.7.1. Almost the entire area of the Application Boundary is currently recorded by HLA as hill ground or lower-lying land that shows no evidence of recent agricultural improvement that can be used for rough grazing. Such areas are largely heather moorland or rough grassland. This interpretation is also repeated for the past use of the land across the Application Boundary. Several areas indicating remains of settlements and field systems that pre-date the agricultural improvements of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century survive in marginal areas, with ruinous buildings, small kilns, curvilinear boundaries, and rig cultivation. These are all located across the lower ground of Glen Lonan to the north of the Application Boundary.

## 5.8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

### *Prehistoric Periods*

- 5.8.1. The regional archaeological research framework for Argyll (Scottish Archaeological Research Framework: scarf.scot) has identified a wide range of prehistoric sites across the region. From the Neolithic period (4300 BC to 2450 BC) the cultivation of cereals and the management of domesticated animals formed the basis of the settlement pattern in the area. In conjunction with the settlement pattern new ritual and burial practices are observed with chambered cairns, stone circles and cup-marked and cup and ring-marked stones appearing from this period.
- 5.8.2. By the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age (2450 BC to 800 BC) new pottery styles and the introduction of metal tools are observed. The settlement patterns were similar with an agrarian subsistence economy in place. The archaeological record for this period includes round burial cairns, settlement patterns of multiple roundhouses, platform settlements cut into steeper slopes and the presence of burnt mounts.
- 5.8.3. The introduction of a new metal, in the form of iron, seems to have coincided with a deterioration in the climate around 600 -700 BC. Ritual sites and places of burial are no longer the physical focus of community activity and living sites become the most prominent evidence for the Iron Age (ScARF). These appear in the form of duns (small defensive settlements) and forts, usually situated in defensible positions along with Crannogs constructed on artificial or natural islands in inland lochs.
- 5.8.4. There are no known Prehistoric assets within the Application Boundary. Known Prehistoric remains within the 2 km OSA include the scheduled prehistoric ritual and funerary Cairn SW of Duntanachan (SM3887) and the domestic and defensive Dun 250 m SSW of Barguilean Farm (SM3930). No assets relating to prehistoric activity within the 2 km OSA have been identified within the HER.
- 5.8.5. From a distribution perspective, within the 2 km OSA, heritage assets of likely Prehistoric date are identified in the landscape within the lower ground of Glen Lonan and close to the main water course in the area. The topography of the area comprising mostly of upland moorland probably had an impact on its lack of settlement use during the prehistoric period, and as with most periods much of the area favoured grazing as opposed to settlement or agriculture.
- 5.8.6. This distribution pattern for assets of prehistoric date is replicated within the wider landscape. The nine scheduled monuments within the 5 km OSA and the 39 scheduled monuments within the 10 km OSA



are predominantly located across the lower ground within the glens surrounding the hills, and in many cases in areas that could be considered as natural routes of communication. Within the 5 km OSA these sites include four duns (Duntanachan, dun SM3866, An Dun dun SM3910, Clachadow dun SM4002 and Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun SM4120), four cairns (Clachadow cairns SM3872 and SM3891, Glenamachrie cairns SM4121 and Musdale cairn SM4197) and a cup-marked stone (Clachadubh SM4122). This mix of ritual and settlement continues across the 10 km OSA. The ritual sites include 18 scheduled cairns four standing stones or stone circles and three cup-marked stone sites. Settlement is evidenced by nine scheduled dun sites and four scheduled crannogs.

- 5.8.7. This distribution pattern of site types is also apparent when looking at the non-designated heritage assets. Of the 29 assets identified on the HER within the 5 km OSA and the c.70 assets within the 10 km OSA the vast majority are across the lower ground and close to water sources or routes of communication, particularly on the slopes surrounding the lochs. The majority of these sites seem to be associated with settlement in the form of duns, platform settlements, hut-circles and burnt mounds. However, there are also a relatively large amounts of ritual and funerary monuments such as cairns, cup-marked rocks and stone circles.

## *Roman Period*

- 5.8.8. Roman activity in the area is confined to the recovery of several sherds of Roman pottery found during ground works associated with Portsonachan Hotel. These are more likely related to contact between the local Iron Age tribes and the Roman army rather than direct Roman military activity in the area.

## *Medieval and Post-Medieval Periods*

- 5.8.9. Between AD 400 – 1100, the Kingdom of Dál Riata (Argyll) was a Gaelic speaking region. It is during this period that the Vikings first arrived in Argyll, with evidence for this mostly being focused on the islands. Christianity became increasingly important with some of the best examples of early Christian carved stone monuments in Europe. In archaeological terms very little is known about this period in the area of the site (ScARF).
- 5.8.10. Between AD 1100 – 1600 Argyll transformed from being inhabited by a hybrid culture of both Gaelic and Norse speaking peoples to being predominantly Gaelic speaking, under the influence of the Kingdom of Scotland. Fish was significant to the local economy as too were forms of trade such as cattle droving, textile production and a variety of small-scale industries such as mining (silver and copper), charcoal burning, bloomeries, boat building and general crafts production. The church was a central feature of life during the medieval period and this is when we start to see the first stone-built chapels and the emergence of the classic late medieval West Highland sculpture, which consisted of either grave slabs depicting warrior figures or warrior-type imagery or with scrollwork, mythical beasts, angels, tools and crosses.
- 5.8.11. Medieval activity in the area of the Site is limited to a small number of sites identified within the 10 km OSA and all are across low lying areas and the main communication routes. Sites include Ardchattan Priory which is part of an inventory designed landscape (GDL00019) which includes the Scheduled Monument of Ardchattan Priory (SM13644). Other sites include Dun More motte (SM2527), crosses and carved stones in Taynuilt Old Parish Church (SM3762), carved stones at Nelson's Monument in Taynuilt (SM4077) and a fortified dwelling at Loch Tromlee (SM4037). The pattern of medieval settlement clearly focuses on land close to the main water courses and main communication routes through the surrounding hills. Non-designated farmsteads, buildings and enclosures of potential medieval date also survive along these corridors of communication.
- 5.8.12. The regional research framework (ScARF) identified that early in the post-medieval period Argyll was a predominantly rural population where multiple families in joint tenancy farms practiced subsistence farming. This then changed to single ownership farms and state-owned forests, with the majority of people living in villages and small towns. In the 17th century the clan system was still very strong, and conflicts would have had a huge effect on local communities, the economy and settlement patterns.

- 5.8.13. The general appearance of the Parish of Kilchrenan and Dalavich by the post-medieval period is described in the 1793 Statistical Accounts of Scotland (County of Argyle, Vol. VI) as '*... the surface is much diversified with heights and hollows interspersed by numerous streams descending the hills*', and that '*heath is the prevailing appearance, excepting where the land has been in tillage. Near the shore of the loch, there is good natural pasture, much valuable wood, and some improvable moss*'. It continues by stating that the main mode of cultivation in the area consists of an in and out-field system and that the main cultivars are oats, potatoes and green vegetables and that due to poor climate the land is best suited to grazing of cattle and sheep. The 1845 Statistical Accounts of Scotland (County of Argyle, Vol. VII) indicates that draining had been carried out in some areas in order to improve the amount of arable land available in the parish. This account also states that the practice of illicit distillation prevailed to a very great extent, and even continued after the Board of Excise tried to put a halt to it in 1829. Several sites related to these illicit stills have been recorded in the HER.
- 5.8.14. The OS Name Books for Argyll 1868-1878 reference the following prominent features within or enclosed by the Application Boundary:
- Beinn Ghlas:** *A large prominent hill on the south side of Glen Lonan, situate about 1/4 mile from Duntanachan. Sign [Signification] "Grey Mountain."*
- Carn Gaibhre:** *A small rocky top situate about 1 1/4 miles East of Beinne Ghlas. Sign [Signification] "Goat Cairn."*
- Meal Meadhon:** *A small top immediately north of Beinn Ghlas. Sign [Signification] "Middle Hill."*
- Eas Mor:** *A mountain stream rising near the summit of Beinn Ghlas, flowing in a north and west direction till it joins the River Lonan nearly 1/2 a mile East of Clach dhubh. Sign [Signification] "Great cataract."*
- Glac Gharbh:** *Applicable to a rough part of the above stream 1/2 a mile north of Meall Meadhon. Sign [Signification] "Rough Hollow."*
- 5.8.15. There is evidence for the use of the Application Boundary for pastoral purposes with a sheiling (HER 21233), several dykes (21080 and 20181) and a sheepfold located just outwith the boundary. These have been identified within both the HER data as well as through the analysis of historic mapping and all likely date to post-medieval periods. A wider spread of features identified in the HER dated to the post-medieval period indicates greater use of the marginal land with farmsteads, such as Laggan Burn (44244), Coilleanaish (14782) and Barr Fail (14768) and townships at Duntanachan (14724), Barglass (12147), Achnacraobh (13852), Clachadow (14715), and Achnamady (14745) spread along the glens along with numerous dykes and cultivation rigs. This increased use of the land predominates to the north and south of the Application Boundary where the land is more easily accessible, although the sheepfolds and sheilings are more widespread utilising the available grazing land higher up the hill slopes.

## Modern Period

- 5.8.16. There is relatively little change in the landscape continuing on from the post-medieval period. There is one known modern feature within the Application Boundary, memorial (HA01) and walkers' cairns are evident on historic mapping just outwith the boundary. Assets within the 2 km OSA include a dam on Loch Nant (46020), field boundaries and culverts. Many of the 2 km OSA assets including sheepfolds, enclosures, quarry sites identified as post-medieval in date are still depicted on 20<sup>th</sup> century OS mapping indicating continued exploitation of the land to the present day.

## 6. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPORTANCE

### 6.1. KNOWN AND POTENTIAL HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN THE APPLICATION BOUNDARY

#### *Known Heritage Assets*

- 6.1.1. There are no designated heritage assets within the Application Boundary.
- 6.1.2. There are seven known non-designated heritage assets within the Application Boundary. Six are recorded on the HER, and one was added during research for this assessment (HA01).
- 6.1.3. All seven non-designated heritage assets within the Application Boundary are of intrinsic significance, as they have the potential to hold physical evidence of the societies that built and used them. These are described in detail in the Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2) and summarised in Table 5 below along with an assessment of their importance.
- 6.1.4. Designated heritage assets are of High (National) importance. Non-designated assets with the potential to contribute to Regional Archaeological Research Frameworks are considered of Medium (Regional) importance, including those associated with scheduled monuments. More commonly known non-designated remains that provide direct evidence of settlement or agricultural practices are considered of Low (local) importance. Erroneous interpretations, common features with negligible intrinsic interest, as well as any modern or natural features are considered of Negligible importance.

Table 4. Known/Potential Heritage Assets within the Application Boundary

REF	NAME	DESCRIPTION	E	N	STATUS	PERIOD	IMPORTANCE
<b>Site Access</b>							
43332	Am Barr	(Charcoal burning?) Platforms	197706	728969	non-designated	Historic	Low
<b>The Site</b>							
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	Memorial	<a href="http://www.thedeirdresheiling.co.uk">www.thedeirdresheiling.co.uk</a>	197784	726045	non-designated	Modern	Low

#### *Archaeological Potential of the Site*

- 6.1.5. The Site Access comprises existing forestry tracks and is assumed to have no archaeological potential.
- 6.1.6. 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, shielings and sheepfolds indicating a willingness to utilise these remote areas where possible for summer grazing.

- 6.1.7. The entire area of the Site has remained almost 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.
- 6.1.8. Any hitherto unknown Prehistoric remains that may be preserved beneath the ground surface within the Site can be considered as being of Medium (Regional) importance. Below ground remains that have been damaged by later/modern activities are more likely to be of Low importance.
- 6.1.9. 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, shielings 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 (Regional) 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 (Local) importance for their intrinsic interest.

*Table 5. Archaeological Potential of the Application Boundary*

PERIOD	ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	LIKELY IMPORTANCE
Prehistoric	Negligible potential for Prehistoric occupation.  Negligible to low potential for stone-built remains (e.g. cairns, hut circles etc).	Low-Medium
Medieval – Post Medieval	Negligible potential for hitherto unknown remains relating to seasonal occupation and pastoral exploitation.	Low-Medium

## 6.2. HERITAGE ASSETS IN THE OUTER STUDY AREA

- 6.2.1. Heritage assets in the OSA are considered within the following maximum distances:
- 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: Conservation Areas, non-inventory designed landscapes (NIDLs), and non-designated heritage assets;
  - Up to 20 km from proposed turbines: Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Category A Listed Buildings and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
- 6.2.2. Beyond the OSA's, based on the ZTV, any asset which is considered exceptionally important, and where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to be particularly sensitive, in the opinion of the assessor or consultees are added to the gazetteer. In the case of this Proposed Development, one Category B Listed Building 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.
- 6.2.3. Based on the ZTV, every heritage asset in the OSA has been considered for further detailed assessment in the EIA Report Cultural Heritage Chapter, based on whether it is considered likely that its cultural significance could be harmed through development within its setting.

### *World Heritage Sites*

- 6.2.4. There are no World Heritage Sites (WHS) in the OSA.

### *Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes*

- 6.2.5. There are four Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDL) within the OSA: GDL00018 Ardanaisig House, GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory, and GDL000007 Achnacloich within the 10 km OSA and GDL00223 Inveraray Castle within the 20 km OSA.
- 6.2.6. GDLs derive cultural significance through designed views and vistas, inter-relationships between heritage assets therein, as well as potentially long-range views towards historic or natural features located outwith the defined landscape boundary.
- 6.2.7. In summary, following consultation and Stage 1 Setting Assessment as outlined below (with full details in Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2), one GDL is retained for detailed assessment in the EIA Report supported with photomontage and/or wireline visualisations as appropriate:
- GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory
- 6.2.8. GDL00019, Ardchattan Priory, noted by HES in the scoping opinion, was visited during Stage 1 Setting Assessment and includes the Scheduled Monument of Ardchattan Priory, burial ground and carved stones (SM13644) along with Category B Listed Ardchattan House (LB4715), its formal garden and cultivated pasture and specimen woodland. The priory is situated to the east and rear (north) of the C19th house, an augmented priory building originally with later additions. The GDL provides the setting for the priory and the house. The location of the priory remains is enclosed (by a tall wall to the south and the house to the west and tree cover to the east) with no sense of the remains until the viewer is within them. The archaeological and historical significance of the monastic remains are not contributed to by long distance views. The house is more prominent with a south facing aspect. The list description identifies that there are long views 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. The house's gardens continue to the west where views are screened by specimen tree cover. The remainder of the designed landscape is parkland. No walkways or carriageways or specific designed vista/viewpoints were identified within the

GDL during the visit that would be suitable for a visualisation; as such a representative LVIA view from the GDL supports the EIA.

- 6.2.9. The other two GDLs GDL00018 Ardanaiseig House and GDL000007 Achnacloich were also noted by HES in the scoping opinion. The grounds of Achnacloich were visited during Stage 1 Setting Assessment; the house itself was not accessible. It is a woodland garden developed in the mid-20th century and established within an existing 19th century framework of woodland and parkland. The garden is the setting for the Category B listed Achnacloich House. The garden lies on a headland overlooking Loch Etive. Achnacloich House lies in the centre of the northern section with garden terraces and a large lawn. The house, terraces and lawn together form the central heart of the garden. The woodland garden is laid out on the slopes around the house with the parkland extending along the loch shore to the north and west. It is evident that mature woodland surrounding the house is likely to screen any visibility of the Proposed Development from the house to the south. The garden is set out on a headland on which a raised terrace has been formed. As such, the ZTV indicates theoretical visibility only from these elevated positions - all of which are wooded, with no long distance views to the south. Views north towards Ben Cruachan and west to the hills of Mull are noted in the list description which would remain unchanged. Views towards the wooded landscape from outwith the GDL, and the contribution that this makes to the character of the surrounding area, would remain unaffected by the Proposed Development located 7.7km away.
- 6.2.10. The only part of the designed landscape at Ardanaiseig House that lies within the ZTV is wooded, and no visibility of the Proposed Development is anticipated. No significant viewpoint is identified from this GDL. Furthermore, the wireline from this position of theoretical visibility indicates only blade tips would be visible at a distance of 10.4 km. As a designated designed landscape, the policy woodland will not be removed in the long-term such that this would be reversed.
- 6.2.11. No effect predicted upon the significance of these two GDLs and both are excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.
- 6.2.12. The remaining GDL, located within the 20 km OSA, GDL00223 Inveraray Castle lies outwith the ZTV for the Proposed Development entirely and is also excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

## *Scheduled Monuments*

- 6.2.13. There are 2 Scheduled Monuments (SM) within the 2 km OSA, 10 within the 5 km OSA, 51 within the 10 km OSA, and 125 in the 20 km OSA.
- 6.2.14. Scheduled Monuments typically derive cultural significance from their intrinsic value as they often contain buried archaeological remains that would provide information about the date of construction, form and function of the monument in each case. Settlement sites have evidential value as they provide physical evidence of the former settlement patterns, whilst religious and funerary sites hold intrinsic value of ritual practices.
- 6.2.15. In terms of contextual value, prehistoric funerary monuments and forts are often intentionally placed in the landscape to be prominently visible in their immediate vicinity. Long range views are likely to contribute to the significance of the defensive sites, and possibly to some of the religious, ritual and funerary sites as well as to the settlement sites (in particular intervisibility with contemporary monuments).
- 6.2.16. In summary, following consultation and Stage 1 Setting Assessment as outlined below (with full details in Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2), the following Scheduled Monuments are retained for detailed assessment in the EIA Report supported with photomontage and/or wireline visualisations as appropriate:

### Duns and Forts

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

- SM4120 - Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh

(Although all interpreted as duns in the List Entry titles, the list entry for SM3910 states that the plan, size and construction suggest this is a fort rather than a dun.)

#### Cairns

- SM3891 - Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of
- SM3888 - Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of

(The two cairns were added to the list for detailed assessment in the EIA Report at the request of HES following post-Stage 1 consultation.)

#### *Glen Lonan*

6.2.17. Glen Lonan, the valley of the River Lonan, runs to the north of the Application Boundary. To the east it is orientated ENE-WSW and turns to run roughly north-west – south-east at Clachadow. Therefore the western section of the valley is orientated in the general direction of the Application Boundary. Within the valley are a number of concentrated visible prehistoric remains and was evidently the focus of a prehistoric community.

6.2.18. The following above-ground heritage assets, identified through Stage 1 Assessment and raised by HES through scoping, were visited:

- SM3866 - Duntanachan, dun 515 m W of
- SM3872 - Clachadow, cairn 320 m N of
- SM3886 - Glenamachrie, standing stone 100 m E of
- SM3887 - Duntanachan, cairn SW of
- SM3888 - Glenamachrie, cairns 65 m & 300 m WNW of
- SM3891 - Clachadow, cairn 960 m NW of
- SM3910 - An Dun, dun 500 m ESE of Glenamachrie
- SM3914 - Strontoiller, stone circle 280 m SSW of
- SM3930 - Barguillan Farm, dun 250 m SSW of
- SM4002 - Clachadow, dun 500 m NW of
- SM4121 - Glenamachrie, cairns 850 m ESE of

6.2.19. As summarised above, the Stage 1 Assessment proposes three duns/possible fort and two cairns from this list for detailed assessment in the EIA Report. The remainder of the monuments in Glen Lonan are excluded from detailed assessment in the EIA. Wireline visualisations of the Proposed Development generated for the assessment have identified limited/no visibility in views from/to: SM3866, SM3914, SM3872 and SM3887. For cairn SM4121, as well as dun SM4002 and standing stone SM3886, site visits have concluded that these assets draw significance from functioning in an enclosed valley setting. These monuments are each understood, appreciated and experienced within the fertile valley context, with access to water. It is considered that this understanding, appreciation and experience would be unaffected by the visibility of a small number of proposed turbines over the horizon and at distance in each case. It is considered that in the case of these monuments in Glen Lonan views towards and beyond the head of the valley do not contribute to an understanding of cultural significance. Intervisibility between potentially contemporary monuments would remain unaffected and no effect is predicted upon their significance.

#### *Glen Feochan*

6.2.20. Similar to Glen Lonan, Glen Feochan is, in part, orientated towards the Application Boundary, with a potential for channelled or significant views from heritage assets within it. However, all heritage assets, and views towards them, are located well outwith the ZTV for the Proposed Development. Each of SM3879 Dalnacabaig, cairn 260m W of, SM4009 Kilmore House, cairn 220m E of, SM4094 Kilmore



House, cairns 85m NE & 200m ENE of, SM4231 Kilmore Church, SM4304 Dun Iadain, fort 490m SW of Kilbride and SM5515 Kilmore House, fort 470m E of, are excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

#### *Duns and Forts*

- 6.2.21. A dun is typically understood to be '*...a comparatively small defensive structure with a disproportionately thick drystone wall, usually but not always sub-circular or oval on plan, and enclosing an area not exceeding about 375 sq. m...it would thus normally hold only a single family group.*' *Argyll duns are a very heterogeneous collection of monuments, which even on subjective inspection admit to a variety of ground-plans and topographical locations, and...some significant variation in area enclosed*' (RCHAMS definition (see below for typology discussion), in Harding 1997, 123). The actual shape of the structure and enclosure is likely to have been largely dictated by the local topography and available space, being as they are, often constructed in inaccessible locations, thought to improve their defensive capability. It is thought, given the investment required for their construction, that they 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). Whilst undoubtedly 'domestic' in function (Regan 2009) some are 'fort-like' in that they are oval or pear shaped in plan with single entrances. Others are circular or sub-circular and are roughly the same size as brochs – these could have been roofed dwellings.
- 6.2.22. Their chronology is not fully understood; there is debate in the academic literature as to whether they came before (Harding 1997, 2004a) or after (Neike 1990) hill forts, and the reality is likely to be more nuanced than that with overlaps and anomalies. It is highly likely that these monuments represent more than one type of site and period (Regan & Campbell 2022, 96). But duns are generally understood to have been occupied with modifications for long periods of time throughout the Middle Iron Age. However, Harding has also argued that circular roofable dun-houses were part of the Atlantic roundhouse tradition originating in the 1st millennium BC; Dun Fhinn and Kildonan dun have both yielded convincing evidence of first millennium AD occupation; whereas larger often non-round dun enclosures that contain buildings being later, possibly early Medieval, in date (Ibid, 97).
- 6.2.23. 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): Thomas (1890) differentiated the fortified sites as either a 'dun' or a 'broch tower' and sub-classed the 'duns' according to topographic location. Later, 'galleried duns' and 'semi-brochs' were identified (Beveridge 1903; Young 1962; Feachem 1963). In the late 1960s, Maxwell (1969) devised a scheme to systematically differentiate 'duns' from 'forts'. This scheme was incorporated by the RCAHMS using the arbitrary division between sites capable of serving a '*small community ... or only a single family*' (RCAHMS 1971: 16). Since then the basis of the categorisation of duns used by RCAHMS has been questioned and redefined. Harding refined the dun classification by separating sites that could potentially be roofed, termed a 'dun house' (Harding 1984). Alcock & Alcock also highlighted the inconsistencies in the size classification between fort and duns and recognised a smaller-sized subset of sites that may have had a different function (1987). Armit later simplified the categorisation scheme for drystone structures (including duns, galleried duns, brochs and semi-brochs), devising the Atlantic roundhouse nomenclature, with its complex and simple types, later adapted and modified by Gilmour (Armit 1991, 1992, 2004; Gilmour 1994, 2000). Sites classified by 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).
- 6.2.24. There are over 300 sites classified as duns in Argyll, the majority situated in coastal locations in the west and north of the area. There is a particular concentration of forts and duns around the coast of Kintyre, with fewer in North Argyll and Cowall peninsula. Associatively, 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 (including other duns as well as forts, brochs etc).

6.2.25. Similarly, duns are not fully understood contextually:

*Duns are only one structural element in a wider Iron Age landscape about which we still know little and we need to understand more about these and what is happening around and between them before we can more fully address any questions of the place of duns in their contemporary landscape* (Regan & Campbell 2022, 104 – report's concluding sentence).

6.2.26. The distribution of duns is '*...plainly determined by the prevailing topography, with virtually no sites above the 600ft [c.180 m aOD] contour, and most sites favouring locally-defensible positions within reasonable proximity to lower-lying coastal land*' (Harding 1997, 118). He 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, spurs or took advantage of precipitous stacks (Ibid. 121).

6.2.27. 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 proposed for detailed assessment located in Glen Lonan, other than SM3930 Barguilean Farm, dun 250m SSW of, which is located at 150 m OD) and occupy similar topographic locations, generally on gently sloping ground at southern, south-western and western facing hills (Werner 2007). Harding argues that it seems probable that the smaller duns, or dun-houses, were occupied by single, extended family units of free but not noble status whose livelihood was dependant upon the agricultural resources of the areas in which they were located (1997, 123). Regan and Campbell (2022) 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).

6.2.28. 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. There also appears to be a correlation between duns and the older established tracks or drove routes through the area (Ibid, 99), however, whether both dun and routeway functioned at the same time would be hard to prove.

6.2.29. Whilst duns are not therefore properly understood, 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
- Relationship with navigable routes through the landscape
- Relationship (kinship) or intervisibility (defence and/or display) with other contemporary settlement

6.2.30. Following site visits for Stage 1 Assessments, it is concluded the following duns comply with the above criteria such that it is possible the contribution made to their significance by setting could be affected by the Proposed Development:

- SM3930 - Barguilean Farm, dun 250 m SSW of
- SM4120 - Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh

6.2.31. Prehistoric forts 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. The following fort was visited for Stage 1 Assessment and is retained for detailed assessment in the EIA Report:

- SM3910 - An Dun, dun 500 m ESE of Glenamadrie

6.2.32. The following duns were also considered for Stage 1 Assessments, which concluded that no impact upon cultural significance is likely as a result of the Proposed Development, with full details presented in

Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2) (largely based on a lack of visibility of the Proposed Development):

- SM3866 - Duntanachan, dun 515 m W of
- SM4002 - Clachadow, dun 500 m NW of
- SM4013 - Dun Mhuirageul, dun SE of Taynuilt

#### Scheduled Monuments Excluded from Detailed Assessment in the EIA Report

6.2.33. Many SMs within the OSA are designated primarily for their intrinsic archaeological remains with the potential to provide unique information regarding past societies who built and used them. All monuments have a setting which contributes to their significance, being informative about intentional site selection and how the site functioned in relation to the landscape and other contemporary monuments. Monuments whose landscape context that contributes to significance does not extend beyond their immediate vicinity and does not include views to or from, or a significant historical relationship with the Application Boundary, are excluded from detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

6.2.34. Of the SMs within the ZTV (and for those assets outwith the ZTV where views towards it and within the ZTV have been identified as contributory to significance), for a majority of monuments the general presence of the Proposed Development may constitute a visual change within the setting but this has not been identified as a likely impact on significance.

6.2.35. Scheduled Monuments that are discounted from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report are presented with justification in the Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2).

#### *Cairns and Standing Stones*

6.2.36. Cairns and standing stones may have been placed in the landscape to be intentionally or prominently visible. When newly built and at full height, such monuments would often have been prominent features in the landscape, and possibly skylined when viewed from certain significant positions. In addition to their intrinsic remains, it these elements of such monuments' settings contribute to their significance. An understanding of setting could indicate the likely territory of those that built the monument, or how it may have been intended to function in the landscape.

6.2.37. As outlined and justified above, cairns (other than SM3891 and SM3888) and standing stones within the ZTV in Glen Lonan and outwith the ZTV in Glen Feochan are discounted from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

6.2.38. For all other cairns and standing stones within the OSA, the Stage 1 Assessment concluded that the elements of their setting that contribute to their significance does not include the landscape within, or views of, the Application Boundary such that change from the Proposed Development would result in an impact upon cultural significance.

#### *Mottes and Castles*

6.2.39. Mottes and castles were often intentionally prominently located in order to monitor and exert control over an immediately surrounding hinterland. Castles may also have been strategically sited where views from and towards the monuments, or intervisibility between monuments, may contribute to their cultural significance.

6.2.40. There is one scheduled motte, which is located within the 10 km OSA. No impact is anticipated upon the prominence of SM2527 Dun Mor, motte 380 m WNW of Balure Cottage as a result of the Proposed Development due to intervening distance.

6.2.41. Within the 10 km OSA there is one scheduled castle: SM4037 Loch Tromlee, Eilean Tighe Bhain, fortified dwelling. It is located outwith the ZTV with no significant views within the ZTV looking towards it.

6.2.42. SM2219 Fraoch Eilean, castle, is located on an island within Loch Awe and within the ZTV. Views towards it from the loch shoreline with Proposed Development behind were assessed for the Stage 1 Assessment from the A85 roadside at Lag na Luinge. It was determined that the island is clearly visible, however, it has dense tree cover and no visibility was obtained of the castle from the roadside. It is

considered therefore that these views do not contribute to the castle's heritage significance. There is no public access to the castle. Local prominence of the remains in views from the island itself would remain unaffected. It is considered that the castle was/is intended to be understood, appreciated and experienced in relation to Loch Awe, a relationship which would remain unaffected.

- 6.2.43. SM293 Dunollie Castle and SM90120 Dunstaffnage Castle, within the 20 km OSA, are each located within the ZTV. Views towards the Application Boundary from these castles are not considered to contribute to the castle's cultural significance.
- 6.2.44. Within the 20 km OSA, Inverary Castle GDL is also located outwith the ZTV. SM291 Ardchnonnel Castle & Island of Innis Chonnel, Loch Awe, SM294 Gylen Castle, castle and associated settlement, Kerrera, SM4028 Loch Avich, Caisteal na Nighinn Ruaidhe, castle, SM4050 Raera Castle, and SM90179 Kilchurn Castle, Dalmally are all also located outwith the ZTV with no significant views within the ZTV looking towards them.
- 6.2.45. All mottes and castles within the OSA are therefore excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA.

#### *Settlements*

- 6.2.46. Scheduled monuments representing settlement or agriculture are often set within fertile land, close to a water source, and may include defences. These monuments are commonly experienced within their locality only and those whose setting does not include views to or from, or holds a significant historical relationship with the Application Boundary, are excluded from detailed assessment in the EIA Report. The Proposed Development site is geographically separate and does not contribute to how these monuments are understood or appreciated, intrinsically or contextually. Scheduled settlements are therefore excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

#### *Churches*

- 6.2.47. Churches are often built with a tall spire or tower, intended to be a focal point within a community and/or visible across long distances within or beyond a parish. Church buildings are therefore susceptible to adverse impacts through tall developments located nearby which may challenge their intentional prominence.
- 6.2.48. There are three scheduled churches, all located within the 10 km OSA. SM2687 Baile Mhaodain, church is a ruin associated with Ardchattan Priory. Long distance views do not contribute to its significance. SM3762 Taynuilt, Old Parish Church of Muckairn, tombstones and burial ground is located within an urban situation and has no tower or spire such that it is prominently visible beyond the village of Taynuilt. SM4231 Kilmore Church is a ruin that lies outwith the ZTV. Scheduled churches are therefore excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

### *Listed Buildings / Conservation Areas*

- 6.2.49. Within the 2 km OSA there are no Listed Buildings. Within the 5 km OSA there is one Category B Listed Building. Within the 10 km OSA there are five Category A Listed Buildings. Within the 20 km OSA there are 23 Category A Listed Buildings.
- 6.2.50. Listed Buildings derive significance from their wider landscape setting in a vast array of ways. Most notable is where they have evidently been constructed with an aspect or orientation to enjoy views over designed or manipulated landscapes or aesthetics of the natural landform. Other considerations include the visual prominence of the building in views towards it as a status display or as an aesthetic eyecatcher across the landscape. Often, the context of the surrounding landscape informs the experiential understanding of a building on the journey to, from and around it, regardless of intervisibility.
- 6.2.51. In summary, following Stage 1 Setting Assessment as outlined below (with full details in Gazetteer (Volume 4, Technical Appendix 9.2), one Listed Building is retained for detailed assessment in the EIA Report:

- Category B listed LB4715 Ardchattan House. It is proposed that the listed building is assessed as part of GDL00019 Ardchattan Priory.

- 6.2.52. Listed Buildings that are designated for the architectural value, with no contribution made by their wider landscape setting beyond their local setting, are excluded from detailed assessment in the EIA Report. Listed Buildings that have been identified in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment whose elements of their wider landscape setting does contribute to significance, but these areas do not include the Application Boundary, are also excluded from further consideration.
- 6.2.53. LB52504 1-4 Lochandu Cottages, excluding additions to rear, interiors and detached outbuildings, Bonawe and LB52505 Shore House, excluding late 20th century house at southwest corner, Bonawe, are Category A Listed Buildings, both located in Lorn Furnace Conservation Area, Lochandhu. Raised by HES through scoping, these were visited for Stage 1 Setting Assessment. The buildings form part of the wider complex at Bonawe Ironworks (scheduled monument SM90037) dating from 1753, and are each located c.100 m from the furnace itself. Whilst the mountains form a backdrop for the conservation area, scheduled ironworks, and component buildings in all directions, these do not contribute to an understanding of the cultural significance, history, or industrial character of the group of assets. From the two Category A Listed buildings themselves, existing road-side trees also restrict long-distance views. The component parts of the furnace/conservation area together form group value with the River Awe (connected via a lade, supplying cooling water) and Loch Etive (connected via the pier, for product distribution). An understanding, appreciation and experience of the former industrial complex would remain unaffected by theoretical visibility of wind turbines on distant hilltops to the south-west, and all are therefore excluded from further detailed assessment in the EIA Report.

### *Inventory Battlefields*

- 6.2.54. There are no Inventory Battlefields in the OSA.

### *Non-designated Heritage Assets*

- 6.2.55. There are 28 known non-designated assets (NDA) within the Application Boundary / 2km OSA, 151 NDAs within the 5 km OSA (of which eight are considered certainly or probably of National importance on the WoSAS NSR), and 545 NDAs within the 10 km OSA (of which 24 are considered certainly or probably of National importance on the WoSAS NSR).
- 6.2.56. Following Stage 1 Setting Assessment, presented in full in the gazetteer, no NDAs are retained for detailed assessment in the EIA Report.
- 6.2.57. There are no NDAs within the Application Boundary / 2 km OSA whose wider landscape is considered to contribute to significance. NDAs in the 5 km OSA whose wider landscape contributes to significance includes cairns (1622 (of National importance), 58275 & 59077), none of whose prominence would be affected, and a ROC observation post (45791) assessed as positioned to monitor the loch to the north in views facing away from the Application Boundary. Non-designated heritage assets in the 10 km OSA whose wider landscape contributes to significance includes cairns (1356, 1361, 1618 (of National importance), 1655, 1659, 1662, 1663, & 22545), none of whose prominence would be affected by the Proposed Development. No adverse effects are predicted upon the cultural significance of these NDAs.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

### 7.1. POTENTIAL PHYSICAL EFFECTS

- 7.1.1. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid known heritage assets within the Application Boundary.
- 7.1.2. There are seven known heritage assets located within the Application Boundary. These heritage assets are identified in the gazetteer and Table 5 above. All assets are of Low or higher importance and thus can be considered heritage assets for planning purposes in the EIA Report.

### 7.2. POTENTIAL SETTING EFFECTS

- 7.2.1. The Stage 1 Setting Assessment has found that there may be impacts through changes within their setting on the significance of six Scheduled Monuments, one Garden and Designed Landscape, and one Category B Listed Building (Table 7).
- 7.2.2. The Scheduled Monument and Category B Listed Building at Ardchattan Priory are assessed in the EIA Report as part of the Ardchattan Priory GDL.

*Table 6. Stage 1 Setting Assessment. Assets identified for further assessment.*

REF	NAME	STATUS
<b>2 km OSA</b>		
SM3930	Barguilean Farm, dun	Scheduled Monument
<b>5 km OSA</b>		
SM3891	Clachadow, cairn 960m NW of	Scheduled Monument
SM3910	An Dun, dun 500m ESE of Glenamadrie	Scheduled Monument
SM4120	Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470 m NW of Achnacraobh	Scheduled Monument
<b>10 km OSA</b>		
SM3888	Glenamachrie, cairns 65m & 300m WNW of	Scheduled Monument
GDL00019 / SM13644 / LB4715	Ardchattan Priory / Ardchattan Priory, priory, burial ground and carved stones / Ardchattan House	Garden and Designed Landscape, Scheduled Monument, Category B Listed Building (assessed as a group)

- 7.2.3. The heritage assets identified in Tables 5 & 7 are considered and assessed in detail in the EIA Report Cultural Heritage Chapter 9.

## REFERENCES

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Alexander, D 1995, Proposed Windfarm at Beinn Ghlas, Barguilean 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 Barguilean Woodland Grant Scheme. West of Scotland Archaeology Service
- Strachan, R. Cressey, M. & Suddaby, I 1999 Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, Barguilean 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.



## WEBSITE REFERENCES

British Geological Survey (BGS) <https://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>

Old Statistical Account of Scotland, Parish of Ardchattan, Vol. VI 1793, Statistical Accounts of Scotland (edina.ac.uk) accessed 16/01/2023

Old Statistical Account of Scotland, Parish of Kilchrenan and Dalavich, Vol. VI 1793, Statistical Accounts of Scotland (edina.ac.uk) accessed 16/01/2023

New Statistical Account of Scotland, Parish of Ardchattan, Vol. VII 1845, Statistical Accounts of Scotland (edina.ac.uk) accessed 16/01/2023 Statistical Accounts of Scotland (edina.ac.uk)

Scottish Archaeological Research Framework <https://scarf.scot> accessed 20/02/23

## POLICY AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2019 *Code of Conduct* ([https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2019\\_0.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2019_0.pdf))

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2020 *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* ([https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_4.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_4.pdf))

Argyll and Bute Council (2015). *Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2)*

Historic Environment Scotland (2014). *Our Place in Time: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland*

Historic Environment Scotland (2016, updated 2020). *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*

Historic Environment Scotland (2016, updated 2020). *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Works on Scheduled Monuments*

Historic Environment Scotland (2019a). *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS)*

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b). *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance*

HEMA, IHBC and CIfA (2021). *Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK*

NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland (2018). *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook*

NatureScot (2019). *Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction*

Scottish Government (1979). *The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act*

Scottish Government (1997). *The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act*

Scottish Government (2011). *Planning Advice Note (PAN) 02/2011: Planning and Archaeology*

Scottish Government (2014). *The Historic Environment Scotland Act*

Scottish Government (2023). *National Planning Framework NPF4*

UK Government (2017). *The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations*

## HISTORIC MAPPING

Pont, T 1583-1614 Loch Linnem Loch Eil and Loch Leven

Roy's Military Map of the Highlands 1747-52

Cowley, J 1734 A map of such part of his Grace the Duke of Argyll's heritable dukedom

Conder, T 1786 A new and correct map of the counties of Argyle, Bute and Dumbarton

Langlands G 1801 This map of Argyllshire taken from actual survey.

OS Argyllshire, Sheet C Survey date 1870 publication 1875, six inch to one mile

OS Argyllshire, Sheet XCIX Survey date 1871 publication 1874 six inch to one mile

OS Argyllshire, Sheet CXI Survey date 1871 publication 1875 six inch to one mile

OS Argyll and Bute Sheet XCIX SE Date revised 1897, date published 1900 Six inch to the Mile

OS Argyll and Bute Sheet C SW Date revised 1897, date published 1900 Six inch to the Mile.

## AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

Prints held by National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP)

NAME	SORTIE	DATE	FRAME NUMBERS
Carn Gaibhre; Ardchattan and Muckairn	HLS/UK/82/0064	1982	1342
Carn Gaibhre; Ardchattan and Muckairn	ASS/51088	1988	0016
Ardchattan and Muckairn	ASS/51088	1988	0017
Ardchattan and Muckairn	ASS/51088	1988	0018