

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	11-1
Consultation	11-2
APPROACH AND METHODS.....	11-4
Study Areas	11-4
Effects Assessed in Full	11-4
Effects Scoped Out	11-5
Data Sources	11-5
Field Survey.....	11-6
Approach to Assessment of Effects	11-6
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Analysis.....	11-10
Mitigation	11-10
Cumulative Effects	11-11
Residual Effects.....	11-12
Statement of Significance	11-12
Limitations to Assessment	11-12
BASELINE CONDITIONS	11-12
Introduction.....	11-12
Nationally Designated Cultural Heritage Assets.....	11-12
Known Cultural Heritage Assets within the Site.....	11-13
Historic Mapping and Historic Land-Use Assessment.....	11-15
Aerial Photography	11-16
Discussion of Archaeological Potential	11-16
ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS.....	11-16
Potential Construction Effects	11-16
Operational Effects of the Proposed Development.....	11-18
Cumulative Effects	11-29
SUMMARY AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	11-30
REFERENCES	11-31

INTRODUCTION

- 11.1 The cultural heritage of an area comprises archaeological sites, historic buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventoried Battlefields and other historic environment features (collectively known as ‘cultural heritage assets’). It also includes features or places which have the capacity to provide information about past human activity, or which have cultural significance due to associations with literary or artistic work, folklore or historic events. The setting of an asset within the wider landscape may contribute to the understanding and appreciation of the asset, and thereby the experience of it and its cultural heritage significance.
- 11.2 This chapter assesses the potential effects of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets within the site and surrounding area. A full description of the Proposed Development is given in **Chapter 3: Proposed Development**. The assessment has included consideration of all known designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets within the site, all nationally significant cultural heritage assets within 10km of the proposed turbines that fall within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility model (ZTV), and further nationally significant cultural heritage assets beyond 10km of the proposed turbines identified in consultation with Statutory Consultees or by the assessment as having a setting sensitive to changes within the distant landscape (**Figures 11.1 and 11.2**).
- 11.3 This assessment has been based on a range of data, including cultural heritage assets recorded by regional and national bodies, readily available secondary sources and the results of a walkover survey of the site.
- 11.4 The historic development of the site and study area are discussed in the context of the wider region, in order to predict any direct impacts on any known or potential archaeological remains within the site, and any indirect impacts on assets within the site and study area as appropriate.
- 11.5 Measures necessary to safeguard or record any assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development are suggested.
- 11.6 For the purposes of this assessment the historic environment and cultural heritage are considered to consist of a variety of cultural heritage assets, including the following types of designated assets:
- World Heritage Sites (WHS);
 - Scheduled Monuments (SM);
 - Listed Buildings (LB);
 - Inventoried Battlefields;
 - Conservation Areas; and
 - Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs).
- 11.7 The above designated assets are of national importance, with the exception of Conservation Areas, which are designated by local authorities and may be of lesser (regional) importance. Only Category A Listed Buildings are considered to be of national importance. Category B Listed Buildings are considered of regional importance, and Category C Listed Buildings of local importance (NatureScot

Handbook, 2018).

11.8 Planning policies of relevance to this assessment are provided in **Technical Appendix 4.1: Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance**.

11.9 This Chapter is supported by:

- **Technical Appendix 11.1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets;**
- **Technical Appendix 11.2: Appraisal of Designated Heritage Assets;** and
- **Technical Appendix 11.3: Heritage Walkover Survey Reports.**

11.10 **Figures 11.1 to 11.12** are referenced in the text where relevant:

- **Figure 11.1:** Gazetteer Assets;
- **Figure 11.2:** Heritage Designations;
- **Figure 11.3:** Heritage Viewpoints; and
- **Figures 11.4 to 11.21:** Visualisations including wirelines and a photomontage for heritage viewpoints VP021 to VP029.

11.11 The assessment has been conducted by Beth Gray ACIfA, and Erin Ashby PCIfA of SLR Consulting Ltd.

Consultation

11.12 Scoping responses addressing cultural heritage matters were received from the Highland Council Historic Environment Team (HCHET) and Historic Environment Scotland (HES). Further consultation by email was undertaken with consultees to facilitate data acquisition. A summary of the consultation undertaken is provided in **Table 11-1**.

Table 11-1: Summary of Scoping and Consultation Responses

Consultee	Response	Comment/Action Taken
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (17 October 2022)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HES disagreed with the proposal for a 5km Study Area and recommended a 10km Study Area from the proposed turbine locations. ○ Third viewpoints¹ should be considered, including approaches from the sea for assets with maritime focusses. This includes Dun Neill (SM3885) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SLR responded on 14 December 2022. ○ Suggested that a study area of 5km for assets to which long distant views are integral. ○ Agreed with HES’s position that Dun Neill (SM3885) had a strategic maritime focus. However, suggested that views towards this asset from a maritime

¹ Third viewpoints are a terminology used by HES to describe points of appreciation outside of the designated area.

Consultee	Response	Comment/Action Taken
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HES disagreed with the categorisation of direct and indirect impacts as outlined in scoping with reference to SPP 2014². HES stated that the preservation of both setting and direct impact carry equal weight as both are integral parts of cultural significance. ○ Noted that the term ‘cultural heritage significance’ should be used. ○ The 2020 update of ‘Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting’ should be used. ○ A table of proposed viewpoints for the locations of potential wireframes should be provided to HES. ○ Notes a list of cultural heritage assets which should be included for assessment within the EIA Chapter including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SM893 ○ SM13664 ○ SM3494 ○ SM13662 ○ LB498 ○ LB501 ○ LB00164 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ position are not publicly accessible and as such, these inward views would not result in a significant adverse effect or warrant a photomontage/wireline. SLR requested a definitive location for a viewpoint if HES still required an assessment. ○ SLR noted that SPP 2014¹ was wrongly quoted with regard to the categorisation of impacts. SLR agrees that these impacts carry equal weighting but uses labelling consistent with the UK industry standard. ○ SLR agrees that the term ‘cultural heritage significance’ will be used. ○ SLR provided a table of assets and proposed viewpoints for confirmation with HES.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (20 December 2022)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reiterates the request for a 10km Study Area. ○ Reiterates that third viewpoints should be considered even if a cultural heritage asset falls outwith the ZTV. ○ Wireframes should be produced where there is a possible impact on the setting of an asset. The wireframe may be used to scope out further assets. ○ A wireframe should be produced for Dun Neill (SM3885), taking into account its maritime setting as a point from which to view the asset. ○ Confirmed that HES consider the impacts of on the setting of a monument are direct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SLR has used a 10km Study Area. ○ Third viewpoints have been considered even if a cultural heritage asset falls outwith the ZTV, evidence is available in Technical Appendix 11.2. ○ Wireframes have been produced for all assessed assets. ○ A wireframe has been produced for Dun Neill (SM3885)(Figure 11.4), taking into account its maritime setting as a viewpoint.

² It is noted that SPP 2014 is now revoked but was relevant at the time of consultation.

Consultee	Response	Comment/Action Taken
	rather than indirect effects, referring to Appendix 1 of the EIA Handbook.	
The Highland Council Comhairle na Gàidhealtachd – Historic Environment Team (Archaeology) (09 March 2023)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Consultee is satisfied with the proposed methodology to adequately address the impacts on assets within the 1km study area. ○ States that justification should be provided if using a study area of less than 10km when assessing designated cultural heritage assets. ○ LiDAR data should be looked at for the site, if available. ○ Upstanding remains should be identified by the walkover survey and the potential for any buried features or deposits to be present should be stated in the report. ○ Where impacts are unavoidable, methods to mitigate any impacts should be discussed in detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A study area of 10km is being used for the assessment of impacts on designated cultural heritage assets. ○ LiDAR data was not available for the Proposed Development. ○ Any upstanding remains, potential for buried features, and potential mitigation has been discussed within this Chapter.

APPROACH AND METHODS

Study Areas

11.13 There is no guidance from HES defining a required study area for the archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of wind farms. Two study areas are therefore proposed:

- a 1km radius study area, as measured from the site boundary, to inform the predictive modelling of archaeological potential; and
- a 10km radius study area, as measured from the site boundary, comprising land beyond the site within which the proposed turbines might theoretically be visible from, or within views of, nationally important designated assets. The 10km radius has been selected at the request of HES, as per the scoping response of 17 October 2022.

Effects Assessed in Full

11.14 The following effects have been assessed in full:

- direct effects on all cultural heritage assets within the site;
- significant effects on the cultural significance of designated cultural heritage assets of national importance within the study areas, as a result of change to setting; and

- effects upon specific assets agreed with HES, as set out in consultation within **Table 11-1**.

Effects Scoped Out

11.15 The following effects have been scoped out:

- cultural heritage assets more than 10km from the Proposed Development unless identified as being particularly sensitive to distant landscape change;
- cultural heritage assets for which there is clear justification for their being scoped out, as outlined in **Technical Appendix 11.2**; and
- cultural heritage assets within the study area shown by the ZTV not to be intervisible with the Proposed Development, and where there is no identified viewpoint of the cultural heritage assets which contributes to our understanding, appreciation and experience of the same within the ZTV.

Data Sources

11.16 **Table 11-2** sets out the main data sources used in this study.

Table 11-2: Historic Environment Data Sources

Subject	Source	Location
Designated cultural heritage assets (except conservation areas)	The database of Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	HES digital data download
Conservation areas	The Highland Council (THC)	HES digital data download
Non-Designated cultural heritage assets	Data held by The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Record (HER)	Digital data supplied as download
Historic maps	National Library of Scotland	Online
Aerial photography	HES	HES database Canmore and National Collection of Aerial Photograph (NCAP) (online)
Historic Land-Use Assessment	HES	On-line
Historic environment	Unpublished reports	Various
	Published works of synthesis	Various
Current OS maps	Ordnance Survey	Licence acquired for project
Condition of recorded cultural heritage assets within Proposed Development	Field inspection	Inspected by SLR Consulting on 04 August 2021 and the 04 and 05 October 2022.
Setting of cultural heritage assets	Field inspection within study areas and other specified assets from areas of	Inspected by SLR Consulting on the 04 and 05 October 2022.

Subject	Source	Location
	public access.	

- 11.17 Non-designated cultural heritage assets within the 1km Study Area are numbered in the following text as set out in the gazetteer in **Technical Appendix 11.1**. As this gazetteer is composed of records from a number of sources these have been combined into a single sequence with each assigned an SLR Number. References to other coding systems, e.g., THC HER and Canmore, are also included in the Technical Appendix.
- 11.18 Designated assets are listed separately within this Chapter, identified by their official designation number as assigned on the relevant statutory register or index.
- 11.19 Those non-designated and designated cultural heritage assets that have been assessed are mapped on **Figure 11.1a-b** and **Figure 11.2**.

Field Survey

- 11.20 Two targeted walkover surveys were conducted at the site. The first was in August 2021, using the Pre-Application Layout B, and the second was in October 2022, using Scoping Layout D (Figure 2.3). The proposed turbine locations at the time of each site survey were visited to confirm the presence/absence of any known/potential archaeological remains; and known cultural heritage assets within the site were inspected to confirm their presence/absence. Both surveys covered the area in which the final infrastructure layout is proposed.
- 11.21 Those assets recorded within the site in the HER were inspected, and these are listed within **Technical Appendix 11.1**. All of these assets were located and confirmed to be as described in the HER.

Approach to Assessment of Effects

- 11.22 Impacts have the potential to be caused by the Proposed Development where it changes the baseline condition of either the asset itself or its setting.
- 11.23 In accordance with the EIA Regulations, this assessment will identify impacts/effects as either direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial, and short-term, long-term or permanent. Direct impacts are those which change the cultural heritage significance of an asset through physical alteration; for purposes of this assessment, indirect impacts are those which affect the cultural heritage significance of an asset by causing change within its setting. Both direct and indirect impacts have equal potential for cultural heritage significance to be adversely affected.
- 11.24 Assessment of direct effects on the cultural heritage significance of an asset will take into account the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, the probability of further assets being located within the affected areas and their likely significance, and the magnitude of impact on those assets that would result from the implementation of the Proposed Development.
- 11.25 Indirect effects on the cultural heritage significance of cultural heritage assets will be identified and assessed with reference to Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2020) and the guidance set out in SNH (NatureScot) (2017) and HES (2018). Assessment will be conducted in the following stages:

- initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the cultural heritage significance of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the contribution of the setting of those cultural heritage assets to their significance;
- assessment of the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development on the contribution of setting to the cultural significance of assets (as a result of change to setting); and
- prediction of the significance of the effect.

11.26 Assessment will be undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects. The magnitude of both beneficial and adverse impacts will be assessed according to a scale of impact ranging from 'high' to 'neutral/none'.

Cultural Heritage Significance

11.27 The cultural significance of undesignated cultural heritage assets will be assessed by a consideration of their intrinsic, contextual, and associative characteristics as defined in Annex 1 of HES (2019b). In relation to such assets, this assessment will focus upon an assessment of the assets' inherent potential to contribute to our understanding of the past:

- the character of their structural, decorative and field characteristics as determined from the HER and Canmore records and / or site visits;
- the contribution of an asset to its class of monument, or the diminution of that class should an asset be lost; and
- how a site relates to people, practices, events, and/or historical or social movements.

11.28 Assessments of significance recorded within the HER will be taken into account where available.

11.29 **Table 11-3** shows the potential levels of cultural heritage significance of an asset related to designation, status and grading, and where non-designated, to a scale of highest to lowest importance. This table will act as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provides a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions reached.

Table 11-3: Cultural Heritage Significance of Cultural Heritage Assets

Cultural Heritage Significance	Explanation
Highest	Designated assets of international importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>World Heritage Sites</i>.

Cultural Heritage Significance	Explanation
High	Designated assets of national importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Scheduled Monuments</i>; ○ <i>Category A Listed Buildings</i>; and ○ <i>Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory</i>; ○ <i>Designated Battlefields on the national inventory</i>.
Medium	Designated assets of regional importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Category B Listed Buildings</i>; ○ <i>Some Conservation Areas</i>; and ○ <i>Non-designated assets of equivalent significance</i>.
Low	Assets of local importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Category C Listed Buildings</i>; ○ <i>Some Conservation Areas</i>; and ○ <i>Non-designated assets of equivalent significance</i>.
None	Features that do not retain any cultural heritage significance.
Unknown	Assets of indeterminable significance.

Magnitude of Impact

- 11.30 Determining the magnitude of any likely impacts requires consideration of the nature of the activities proposed during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
- 11.31 The impacts could potentially include direct change (e.g., ground disturbance), and indirect change (e.g., visible environmental change, noise, vibration, traffic movements affecting the setting of the asset). Impacts may be beneficial or adverse, and may be short term, long term or permanent. Magnitude of impact will be assessed with reference to the criteria set out in **Table 11-4**.

Table 11-4: Magnitude of Impacts on Cultural Heritage Assets

Magnitude of Impact	Explanation
High Beneficial	The Proposed Development would considerably enhance the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Medium Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a clearly discernible extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a minor extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a very minor extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.

Magnitude of Impact	Explanation
Neutral/None	The Proposed Development would not affect or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude on the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would diminish to a very minor extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would diminish to a minor extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Medium Adverse	The Proposed Development would diminish to a clearly discernible extent the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
High Adverse	The Proposed Development would considerably diminish the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.

Significance of Effect

11.32 The significance criteria are presented in **Table 11-5**. **Table 11-6** provides a matrix that relates the cultural heritage significance of the asset to the magnitude of impact on its significance (incorporating contribution from setting where relevant), to establish the likely overall significance of effect. Professional judgement has also been used in the determination of the overall significance of effect. This assessment will be undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects, the latter being principally concerned with effects through development within the setting of cultural heritage assets. Moderate or substantial effects are considered to be significant for the purposes of the EIA Regulations.

Table 11-5: Significance Criteria

Magnitude of Impact	Explanation
Substantial	Severe harm or enhancement such as total loss of significance or integrity of the setting, or exceptional enhancement by the Proposed Development of the cultural heritage significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset in its setting.
Moderate	Harm or enhancement such as the introduction or removal to the baseline of an element that would affect to a clearly discernible extent the cultural heritage significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Slight	To a minor extent the Proposed Development would introduce change to the baseline that would harm or enhance the cultural heritage significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Very Slight	To a barely discernible extent the Proposed Development would introduce change from the baseline that would harm or enhance the cultural heritage significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Negligible	The Proposed Development would not affect or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude, on the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset and the

Magnitude of Impact	Explanation
	ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Neutral/Nil	The Proposed Development have would no effect on the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.

Table 11-6: Significance of Effects on Cultural Heritage Assets

Magnitude of Impact	Cultural Heritage Significance			
	Highest	High	Medium	Low
High beneficial	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight
Medium beneficial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight
Low beneficial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	Very slight
Very low beneficial	Slight	Very slight	Negligible	Negligible
Neutral/None	Neutral/nil	Neutral/nil	Neutral/nil	Neutral/nil
Very low adverse	Slight	Very slight	Negligible	Negligible
Low adverse	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	Very slight
Medium adverse	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight
High adverse	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Analysis

- 11.33 Assessment of visual impact has been assisted by a ZTV calculation, as presented on **Figure 11.2**. The methodology used to determine the ZTV is set out in detail in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual**. In summary the ZTV shows the predicted degree of visibility of the Proposed Development from all points within a study area around the site, as would be seen from an average observer’s eye level two metres above the ground. The ZTV model presented on **Figure 11.2** is based on the maximum height of the blade tips of the Proposed Development (149.9m). The ZTV model is used to inform the potential impacts on the setting of designated assets within the study area.
- 11.34 The ZTV is theoretical because it is based on landform only (it is a ‘bare earth’ model) and does not take into account the screening or filtering effects of vegetation, buildings or other surface features. In that respect it is likely to provide an over-estimate of the actual visibility of the proposed turbines.
- 11.35 Assets that fall outwith the ZTV are excluded from any further assessment, with the exception of where a view is identified which includes the heritage asset and the proposed turbines, and that view may enable appreciation of the assets’ cultural heritage significance.

Mitigation

- 11.36 Where adverse effects on cultural heritage are identified, measures to prevent, reduce, and / or where possible offset these effects, have been proposed. Measures can be broken down into two

categories relative to whether the impact is direct or indirect.

11.37 Direct impact mitigation may include:

- the micrositing of Proposed Development infrastructure away from sensitive locations;
- the fencing off or marking out of cultural heritage assets or features in proximity to construction activity in order avoid disturbance where possible;
- a programme of archaeological work where required, such as an archaeological watching brief during construction activities in or in proximity to areas of particular concern, or excavation and recording where damage is unavoidable; or
- a working protocol to be implemented should unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.

11.38 Indirect impact mitigation may include:

- alteration of a wind turbine location;
- reduction of wind turbine height; or
- changes in wind turbine colour.

Cumulative Effects

11.39 A cumulative effect is considered to occur when there is a combination of:

- a moderate or above significance of effect on an asset or group of assets as a result of the Proposed Development; and
- an effect on the same asset or group of assets as a result of another development or developments.

11.40 Effects from existing wind farms are included in the baseline. Consideration of cumulative effects with other wind developments are limited to:

- other wind farm planning and section 36 applications that have been submitted and validated; and
- wind farm planning and section 36 applications which have been granted permission but not yet constructed.

11.41 Cumulative effects would be addressed in two stages:

- assessment of the combined effect of the developments including the Proposed Development; and
- assessment of the degree to which the Proposed Development contributes to the combined effects.

11.42 The cumulative assessment is presented in **paragraphs 11.161 – 11.170**.

Residual Effects

11.43 Residual effects are those effects that would persist even following mitigation. A summary of residual effects is presented in the concluding remarks.

Statement of Significance

11.44 The predicted significance of the effects arising from the Proposed Development are stated. Effects that are considered significant in EIA terms are those that are assessed to be moderate or substantial, in accordance with the guidance contained in the HES and SNH (NatureScot) (2018) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, Section C, Page 75. Professional judgment will be used in relation to any findings of a moderate significance of effect, however, to ensure that such effects are genuinely significant and are not being overestimated due to an overly narrow application of the Handbook guidance.

Limitations to Assessment

11.45 The assessment is based on the sources outlined in the References section and, therefore, shares the same range of limitations in terms of the comprehensiveness and completeness of those sources.

11.46 Due to high water levels on October 2022 site visit, Dun Arkaig could not be visited due to inaccessibility across the River Ose. Previous baseline data collected for Dun Arkaig for the Ben Sca Wind Farm were used.

BASELINE CONDITIONS

Introduction

11.47 A full description of the site and its environs is given in **Chapter 2: Site Description and Design Evolution**. All cultural heritage assets within the 1km Study Area are shown on **Figure 11.1a**. Nationally designated assets within the study areas are shown in relation to the ZTV on **Figure 11.2**.

11.48 All recorded non-designated cultural heritage assets within the 1km Study Area are listed in the gazetteer that is contained within **Technical Appendix 11.1**. Where designated assets are tabulated in this Chapter, they are identified by the index number (i.e. Scheduled Monuments) or reference number (i.e. Listed Buildings) under which they are registered by HES.

11.49 Results of the site walkover are presented in **Technical Appendix 11.1**.

Nationally Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

11.50 There are no nationally or regionally important designated cultural heritage assets within the site or within 1km of the site boundary.

11.51 There are 34 heritage assets of national importance within 10km: 30 scheduled monuments, one Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape, and three Category A Listed Buildings. As per

correspondence with HES (**Table 11-1**), and as agreed through scoping consultation, the nine assets to be considered in this assessment are presented in **Table 11-7**.

Table 11-7: Designated Cultural Heritage Assets to be assessed in agreement with HES

Designation Reference	Name
SM3494	Dun Feorlig, broch 230m NNE of Feorlig Farm
SM13662	Dun Arkaig, Broch
SM13664	Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich, broch and standing stone 145m SE of An Cairidh
SM911	Dun Flashader, broch, Skye
SM3492	Dun Osdale, broch 850m N of Osdale
SM3885	Dun Neill, dun 420m SW of Ardmore
SM893	Barpannan, two chambered cairns, Vatten Duirinish
SM903	Ullinish Lodge, chambered cairn, Bracadale
SM930	Ullinish, fort, Bracadale

11.52 All the other assets within 10km were considered for assessment through an appraisal process. This appraisal is located in **Technical Appendix 11.2** Where neither the asset nor a third point of appreciation was found to share any material level of intervisibility with the Proposed Development, and where the aspects of the setting of the asset that contributes to its cultural heritage significance were predicted not to be impacted, the asset has been scoped out of assessment.

Known Cultural Heritage Assets within the Site

Prehistoric and Romano-British

11.53 There are no prehistoric cultural heritage assets within the site.

11.54 There are three prehistoric cultural heritage assets within 1km of the site. There is a peat-covered hut circle (**SLR47**) located c.0.5km to the north of the Ben Aketil Wind Farm access track and c.4.8km north west of proposed Turbine 1. There is a hut circle (**SLR11**) located c.0.9km west of the site boundary and c.3.9km north west of proposed Turbine 1. There is an ovular stone setting (**SLR43**) located c.0.45km west of the Ben Aketil Wind Farm access track and c.4.1km north west of proposed Turbine 1. The stone setting is 7m in length and 5m in width and comprises large irregular boulders. Its precise function has not been noted.

11.55 There are no Romano-British cultural heritage assets within the site or 1km of the site.

Early Medieval and Medieval

11.56 There are no cultural heritage assets attributed to the early medieval or medieval periods within the site or 1km of the site.

Post-medieval

- 11.57 There is one post-medieval heritage asset within the site boundary, the ruin of a single twin-celled styled shieling (**SLR19**). The asset is within the northwestern extent of the site and is c.3.3km north west of proposed Turbine 1.
- 11.58 There are a further 22 post-medieval cultural heritage assets within 1km of the site. These post-medieval assets comprise a cottage (**SLR13**), a farmstead (**SLR45**), two longhouses (**SLR36**, **SLR38**), a mound that is potentially the remains of a hut (**SLR44**), 16 shielings³, and the remains of a boulder-built structure (**SLR31**).

Undated Features or Structures

- 11.59 There are nine undated cultural heritage assets within the site. Six assets were newly identified during the two walkover surveys undertaken in August 2021 and October 2022. Three assets (**SLR91**, **SLR92**, **SLR93**) were identified as part of a walkover undertaken for Ben Sca Wind Farm by SLR Consulting in 2019.
- 11.60 The August 2021 walkover survey identified six undated potential cultural heritage assets within the site. A raised mound (**SLR49**), 5m in length, 3m in width, and 0.5m in height, was identified on the southern slope of Ben Aketil hill. The mound is c.0.6km to the west of proposed Turbine 8. An additional mound (**SLR53**) was identified c.0.3km south east of proposed Turbine 8, comprising a circular raised area, 3m in diameter.
- 11.61 During the 2021 walkover, four possible cairns were identified within the site (**SLR52**, **SLR54**, **SLR55**, **SLR56**). Three of the potential cairns are thought to be clearance cairns due to their placement within the landscape, with **SLR52** being located c.0.5km south west of proposed Turbine 9, **SLR54** being located c.0.18km north of proposed Turbine 4 and **SLR55** being located c.0.43km west of proposed Turbine 3. **SLR56** is located on the summit of Ben Sca, c.0.66km north west of proposed Turbine 3, and is noted on the 1965 1:10,000 Ordnance Survey Map.
- 11.62 A further three cairns were identified during the Ben Sca Wind Farm walkover survey. SLR93 is located c.0.76km west of proposed Turbine 1, with SLR91 and SLR92 located c.0.77km north west of proposed Turbine 1.
- 11.63 These cairns were all avoided during the design evolution process, ensuring that the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure was not routed through them.
- 11.64 There are 14 undated cultural heritage assets within 1km of the site. These assets comprise farmsteads, headlands, and structures and buildings, providing an insight into the domestic and agricultural land use of the area surrounding the site. Two headlands or field boundaries (**SLR50**, **SLR51**) were identified during the 2021 walkover survey, in the south of the site, located c.1.5km southwest of proposed Turbine 8. These assets comprised large raised sub-ovoid-shaped mounds, both covered in vegetation but well-defined within the surrounding landscape. The undated HER records from outwith the site boundary are presented in **Technical Appendix 11.1**.
- 11.65 An additional six undated cultural heritage assets were identified within the southern portion of

³ SLR8, SLR10, SLR12, SLR14, SLR15, SLR16, SLR20, SLR22, SLR24, SLR25, SLR28, SLR29, SLR30, SLR33, SLR37, SLR42

the scoping site boundary during the October 2022 walkover survey. The site boundary has since been refined to exclude this area. These results have been included here for completeness.

- 11.66 A potential area of quarrying (**SLR401**) was identified c.2.6km south west of proposed Turbine 8, the quarrying comprised a turf-covered hollow, 3m in width by 4m in length. A linear feature (**SLR402**), comprising a turf-covered mound approximately 1m in width, 0.5m in height and 400m in length was identified. The asset is likely a field or land boundary, running north east to south west, and is visible on the OS 1:50k mapping. The asset is approximately 2km south west of proposed Turbine 8. A further linear feature (**SLR403**) was identified c.70m north east of **SLR402**. The asset comprises a ditch, approximately 0.5m in depth and 0.4m in width, running north to south. The asset is visible for approximately 10m and turns to the west at the northern end before terminating abruptly. The feature is perpendicular to **SLR402**, but it is unknown if it connects. A linear feature was identified c.0.4km south of **SLR403** (**SLR404**), comprising a mound running north to south, 0.4m in height and visible for approximately 15m. The asset is likely a field or land boundary.
- 11.67 A C-shaped enclosure (**SLR405**) was identified on satellite imaging and OS 1:50k mapping, located c.2.4km south west of proposed Turbine 9. The asset was visited during the walkover and was confirmed to enclose an area of approximately 0.8ha, using a c.130m long mound and the western bank of Abhainn Bhaile Mheadonaich. The asset is likely an agricultural enclosure, either using the water of the burn to fertilise the soil or enclose livestock.
- 11.68 Potential evidence of peat cutting was identified within the site (**SLR406**). **SLR406** comprises a circular depression within the topography, approximately 10m in diameter, with a distinct cut of 0.25m in depth.

Historic Mapping and Historic Land-Use Assessment

- 11.69 A review of the online historic mapping available from the National Library of Scotland was undertaken. The earliest map that shows the site as an identifiable area is the Skye Island sheet of John Thomson's Atlas of Scotland, published in 1832. Thomson's map shows 15einS ca (Ben Sca) and Ben Ackadale (Ben Aketil) hills, along with many unnamed watercourses. The map does not show any additional unknown cultural heritage assets.
- 11.70 The earliest map of sufficient scale and detail to cover the development is the Inverness-shire (Isle of Skye) 1/6 OS Map (1880, sheet XXII), which does not identify any assets within the site. No features are identified as well on the 2nd edition of the Inverness-shire (Isle of Skye) 1/6 OS Map (1903, sheet XXII). A review of the 1965 National Grid map (NG34NW – A), shows two previously unidentified possible assets. It lists a cairn atop Ben Sca and shows three unroofed buildings to the immediate west of the site boundary along the Aketil Burn. These features were investigated as part of the field survey walkover; the full results of which are provided in **Technical Appendix 11.3**.
- 11.71 The Historic Land-Use Assessment data provided by HES identified areas of medieval and post-medieval settlement and agriculture within the south of the site. This comprises areas of field systems and associated structures that predate the agricultural improvements of the 18th and 19th Centuries. Modern-era land use within the site comprises a mixture of rough grazing to the south of the site and modern plantation to the north.

Aerial Photography

- 11.72 The online aerial imagery of NCAP was examined for evidence of archaeological sites. No oblique aerial imagery in the HES archives on Canmore was found. No further archaeological sites were identified.

Discussion of Archaeological Potential

- 11.73 Analysis of the historic environment suggests that the landscape within the site has been utilised from the prehistoric to post-medieval periods. Though most assets recorded within the site are of an unknown date, their form is primarily agricultural, including clearance cairns and field boundaries.
- 11.74 There are no prehistoric cultural heritage assets within the site, and five within 1km of the site. This suggests that there is a low potential for any unknown cultural heritage assets of these dates within the site. There is a small concentration of prehistoric cultural heritage assets to the north and north west of the site, so there may be a higher potential for assets within this area.
- 11.75 There is very low potential for unknown Romano-British cultural heritage assets within the site, as there are no recorded assets within the site or 1km. In addition, there are no known roman sites on Skye, with only evidence of roman trade through pottery.
- 11.76 Additionally, there is a low potential for unknown early-medieval or medieval cultural heritage assets within the site as no specific features of these dates have been identified. Several undated field or land boundaries and other undated cultural heritage assets were identified within the southern part of the scoping site boundary during the October 2022 walkover survey, which may indicate the presence of agricultural cultural heritage assets from these periods.
- 11.77 There is a moderate potential for unknown post-medieval cultural heritage assets within the site. Whilst there is only one known post-medieval heritage asset within the site, there are a further 22 assets of this period within 1km. These assets are both agricultural and domestic in nature, comprising cottages, farmsteads, shielings, and longhouses. The locations of such structures, including historic farmsteads, are well recorded on historic mapping and as such, it is unlikely that there are any unrecorded domestic structures of this period within the site. Any unrecorded post-medieval cultural heritage assets within the site are likely agricultural in nature, potentially comprising field boundaries or other types of cultivation features.

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

Potential Construction Effects

Layout Considerations

- 11.78 The assessment of effects is based on the Proposed Development description outlined in **Chapter 3: Description of the Development**. The Proposed Development has undergone multiple design iterations in response to all environmental and technical constraints identified as part of the baseline research and field studies including cultural heritage. The final proposed layout as shown on **Figure 11.1a-b**, therefore includes embedded mitigation measures to avoid disturbance of known cultural heritage assets.

Predicted Construction Effects

- 11.79 Assessment of potential direct impacts on cultural heritage assets is based on the maximum likely impact that could be caused by the Proposed Development.
- 11.80 Direct impacts would derive from any groundworks or other ground disturbance undertaken as part of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Specific activities which have the potential to cause impacts in this way include:
- excavation of turbine bases, substation foundations, crane hardstandings, borrow pits and cable trenches; and
 - construction and upgrading of access tracks, working compounds and laydown areas.
- 11.81 Where significant ground disturbance takes place, these activities would remove or change any cultural heritage assets located within the area of ground disturbance. This damage would be irreversible and permanent.
- 11.82 With reference to **Figure 11.1a-b**, the Proposed Development has the potential for a direct impact upon the following assets identified during the August 2021 walkover due to their proximity to the proposed infrastructure:
- **SLR54** – Possible mound (located 37m from proposed infrastructure);
 - **SLR55** – Possible clearance cairn (located 125m from proposed infrastructure);
 - **SLR56** – Possible marker cairn (located 52m from proposed infrastructure);
 - **SLR91** – Possible marker cairn (located 10m from proposed infrastructure); and
 - **SLR93** – Possible marker cairn (located 32m from proposed infrastructure).
- 11.83 These assets are of low cultural heritage significance. Due to their location within the site boundary and their proximity to the proposed infrastructure, without mitigation (refer to **paragraph 11.84**), an adverse impact is predicted of up to high magnitude during construction if accidental damage did occur. The overall significance of effect would however be slight. This is not a significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation

- 11.84 Mitigation of direct impacts on cultural heritage assets has taken the form of avoidance through careful design and positioning of the proposed infrastructure away from all known heritage features. Appropriate mitigation to be undertaken during construction would be in the form of:
- fencing off and avoidance of five known assets (**SLR91, SLR93, SLR54, SLR55** and **SLR56**) that could otherwise be accidentally damaged during construction works; and
 - a targeted watching brief during groundworks adjacent to the four known closest assets (**SLR91, SLR93, SLR54, and SLR56**) that may have the potential to have a direct impact on unrecorded buried archaeology.
- 11.85 The precise scope of the watching brief would be negotiated with THC Historic Environment Team

on behalf of the Applicant and the agreed mitigation programme would be documented in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation.

Residual Effects

- 11.86 The completion of the archaeological mitigation programme outlined in **paragraphs 11.84 and 11.85** would minimise the potential loss of the archaeological resource that could occur as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development. In the instance where ground-breaking works are taking place, with the targeted watching brief in attendance and buried remains are discovered, any harm caused to those buried remains would be off-set by the gain in knowledge resulting from investigation and reporting. No significant residual direct effects are anticipated from the construction of the Proposed Development.

Operational Effects of the Proposed Development

Brochs

- 11.87 Brochs are round, tower-like domestic homes and defensive structures, characteristic of late-prehistoric Scotland, often with structures added to the side and earthworks such as ditches and ramparts for defence around them (Armit I, 2003). Nearby activities such as cultivated land, field boundaries and ditches, hut circles and funerary cairns are often found in association with brochs.
- 11.88 Brochs are often situated on elevated platforms or mounds within the landscape, which would have given them wide views across the surrounding landscape. They are often situated close to a river, the coastline, or another major watercourse, in areas that provided them with a visual and defensive advantage. Some, as discussed below, were likely intervisible and associated. The following brochs are primarily scheduled on the basis of their archaeological interest, i.e., their potential to further our knowledge and understanding of the past through future investigation. Their in-situ locations and spatial patterning within the landscape are also important, showing larger-scale spatial planning of both defensive structures and boundaries, but also economic, domestic and agricultural activity in the late prehistoric period.

Dun Feorlig, Broch 230m NNE of Feorlig Farm (SM3494) (VP023)

- 11.89 Dun Feorlig (**Figure 11.2**) is a potential broch, measuring approximately 16.5m in diameter. The broch wall is approximately 1.2 to 1.5m in height, but only visible to the north and south of the asset. The wall appears to be between 3.2 to 4.3m in diameter to the north, with an ill-defined entrance to the west. The asset is located on an elevated outcrop on the west bank of Loch Caroy. There is a hollow between the projection and the land, measuring approximately 1m by 3.6m, which appears to have been excavated.
- 11.90 Whilst the Broch is not well preserved above ground, the asset has the potential for significant below-ground remains. As such, Dun Feorlig's significance is of national importance as the remains of a fortified dwelling with the potential to make a material contribution to our understanding of defensive prehistoric structures and domestic life.
- 11.91 The asset is located on the west bank of Loch Caroy, on an elevated knoll above the loch. This position allows the asset to have wide-ranging views to the north east and south west along the loch. The original occupiers of the asset would have taken advantage of this position along the loch bank to utilise, monitor and administer access to and egress from the loch, as well as approaches to the Caroy River to the north. The positioning of the asset within the landscape preserves this

sense of strategic topography and makes it intelligible, thus contributing to the asset's significance.

- 11.92 The asset has intervisibility with Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich (**SM13663**), a broch located 1km north east on the eastern bank of Loch Caroy. Whilst there is not a visual relationship with the nearby Dun Arkaig broch (**SM13662**), located 5km to the east, there may have been an intrinsic connection as part of a wider prehistoric landscape. The connection between these brochs contributes to the significance of the singular asset, as their connection furthers our understanding of their interrelationship, as well as Iron Age society, economy and social hierarchy.
- 11.93 The setting of Dun Feorlig has changed since its initial construction. The asset is located along a single-track road, on a peninsula comprising mostly rough grazing land. A modern farmstead is located c.150m south east of the asset. These modern assets do not impede the strategic views along the loch.
- 11.94 Currently, the east bank of Loch Caroy is sparsely populated with domestic structures, situated along a single-track road. This means that **SM13664** is partially obscured by the houses, acting as visual barriers. Edinbane Wind Farm, currently operational, is visible c.5.6km to the north east of the asset, causing a minor distraction to the intervisibility of the assets.
- 11.95 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 8, would be located c.5km to the north east of Dun Feorlig. The ZTV and wireline (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.6**) predict that all ten blade tips and five hubs would be visible from the monument, all orientated to the north east of the asset. The proposed turbines are anticipated to be a minor distraction to the intervisibility between the associated assets, which are orientated more to the east. In addition, none of the other aforementioned aspects of setting which contribute to the significance of the asset, including the association with the loch and the assets defensive topography, would be impacted.
- 11.96 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich, Broch and Standing Stone (SM13664) (VP024)

- 11.97 Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich (**Figure 11.2**) is an Iron Age broch, located to the east of Loch Caroy. The broch currently comprises a roughly circular grass-covered mound, with associated terracing to the south east. The broch walls have an external diameter of 17.5m, with the walls measuring 1.8m high and an average of 4m in width at their base. The broch has evidence of internal features, with an entrance passage to the north east and a potentially associated large stone slab. There are two terraces to the southwest, with the upper terrace having the remains of a sub-rectangular structure.
- 11.98 Due to the lack of preservation of the asset, the function of this structure is unknown. The asset has the potential for significant below-ground remains, having not been previously excavated. Through further investigation, Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich broch has the potential to further contribute to our understanding of the design of prehistoric defensive structures and their place within society.
- 11.99 In addition, a standing stone is located 45m west-south west of the broch, dating to the late Neolithic or Bronze Age. The stone measures 1m high and 0.8m wide and is angled to the east, away from the direction of Loch Caroy. The standing stone predates the broch. However, the relationship between the assets contributes to their significance as the position of the pre-existing standing

stone, which likely marked an important boundary, place or view, may well have been a further influence on the siting of the broch.

- 11.100 The assets are located c.0.25km from the eastern bank of Loch Caroy, on a west-facing slope elevating the asset above the surrounding landscape. The elevated position of the broch provides a vantage point above Loch Caroy, with views along its entire length. Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich, a small river, runs c.0.25km to the north and enters Loch Caroy, and the Caroy River is located c.1.4km north at the head of the loch. The positioning and orientation of the broch mean that it has visibility over the mouth of both rivers, controlling passages inland. The broch's prominence within the landscape and wide-ranging views would have allowed occupants to monitor and command the approach along the loch from the south, defending the entrance to the rivers. The positioning of the asset within the landscape preserves this sense of strategic topography and makes it intelligible, thus contributing to the asset's significance.
- 11.101 Standing stones were often positioned as markers along watercourses and coastlines. The standing stone was likely a marker for those approaching Loch Caroy from the south, potentially for trade reasons. As such, the standing stone's positioning on the eastern side of the loch contributes to its significance, with both visibility from the asset to the loch and from the loch to the asset being of importance.
- 11.102 The broch is located 1km east of Dun Feorlig (**SM3494**), with which it shares intervisibility. Positioned across the loch from each other, the assets would likely have administered access to the loch in tandem. In addition, Dun Arkaig (**SM13662**) is located 4km to the east of the asset, and whilst not visible from the asset, forms part of a wider prehistoric defensive landscape. The connection of Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich to other contemporary brochs contributes to the significance of the asset, having the potential to further our understanding of their interrelationship, as well as Iron Age society, economy and social hierarchy.
- 11.103 The settlement of Caroy is located immediately to the west and north of the asset, stretching along the A863 which runs north to south. The settlement includes multiple domestic buildings, the closest of which is located c.25m north of the asset. The settlement lines the east bank of the loch, and along with the associated infrastructure that aligns with a settlement (e.g., utility poles c.3m in height), causes a minor distraction to the intervisibility between the asset and Dun Feorlig (**SM3494**) on the western bank of the Loch. The modern development on the bank of the loch partially obscures the views and approaches to and from the standing stone. Edinbane Wind Farm is located approximately 4.5km north east of the asset, though it is peripheral to key views towards **SM13664**, with only three turbines being visible (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.7**).
- 11.104 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 8, would be located c.4.1km to the north east of the asset. The ZTV and wireline predict that all ten blade tips and five hubs would be visible from the monument, all orientated to the north east of the asset (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.7**). The proposed turbines are anticipated to be a minor distraction to the intervisibility between the associated assets, which are orientated to the east. The Proposed Development has the potential to be visible in views between the standing stone and the broch. However, due to the distance of the Proposed Development from the two assets, the proposed turbines would not diminish the ability to appreciate and understand their connection. In addition, the Proposed Development is not anticipated to be visible in views from the asset towards Loch Caroy. The Proposed Development has the potential to be present within views when approaching the assets along the bank of Loch Caroy, though it is the presence of the modern settlement that is likely to form the greater distraction to understanding the connection between the assets and their setting. In that context,

the addition of the Proposed Development to the north east would be a comparatively minor distraction.

- 11.105 Due to the modern changes within the environment surrounding the broch with a minimal addition of turbines to the north east and a minor distraction from the intervisibility between the monument and the contemporary assets (**SM13664**, **SM13662**) the impacts upon the contributing factors to the assets significance are likely to be minimal. As such, the asset as a Scheduled Monument is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Dun Arkaig, Broch (SM13662) (VP022)

- 11.106 Dun Arkaig (**Figure 11.2**) is a broch, totalling 16.5m in diameter, with 1.5m high walls that are up to 4m thick. There is a 1m wide entrance passage in the north east wall, containing a door-check and a possible guard cell. There is evidence of a passage running between the walls on the east and south sides. There is a casing wall against the outer west face of the broch, with an outer wall running north-south along the outcrop approximately 10.5m to the east of the entrance. There is evidence of multiple phases of development, with a square structure within the centre of the broch potentially being a later addition.
- 11.107 Whilst the Broch is not of significant preservation above ground, the asset has the potential for significant below-ground remains. As such, Dun Arkaig's significance is of national importance as any in-situ remains have the potential to further contribute to our understanding of prehistoric defensive structures and society.
- 11.108 The asset is located approximately 0.5km south east of the River Ose, which enters the sea approximately 4km south west of the asset. The asset is situated at the top of a rocky outcrop of the north west slope of Glen Colbost, at approximately 90m AOD. Due to its elevated height, the asset is visible and prominent through the valley and acts as a focal point. The positioning of the asset along and above the river allowed the broch's inhabitants to monitor and command the valley. The broch's location was chosen for these views, and therefore the surrounding landscape contributes largely to the broch's significance.
- 11.109 The broch sits within a wider prehistoric landscape, with nearby contemporary brochs, Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonnaich (**SM13664**) and Dun Feorlig (**SM3494**), located to the west. Whilst the natural topography means that there is no intervisibility between the assets, the connection between these brochs contributes to the significance of the singular asset, as their spatial relationship has the potential to further our understanding of Iron Age society, economy and social hierarchy.
- 11.110 The asset's setting has been modernised since its initial construction. Whilst the asset's immediate setting consists of grazing land, Edinbane Wind Farm is located 2km to the north of the asset, occupying part of the northern slope of the River Ose valley. Edinbane Wind Farm is present in views to the north, with nine turbines visible (**Figure 11.3**, **Figure 11.5**) presenting a minor distraction to views of the river, however, not being present in views along the valley to the east and west.
- 11.111 Ben Aketil Wind Farm is located c.5km to the north west of the asset, although due to its linear nature, views are limited.
- 11.112 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 10, would be located c. 4km to the north of

Dun Arkaig. The ZTV, wireline, and photomontage predict that all ten blade tips and ten hubs would be visible (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.5**), all orientated to the north of the asset. The Proposed Development would sit between Ben Aketil and Edinbane Wind Farms, so it would not be a dramatic change to the landscape to the north of the asset. In addition, whilst the proposed turbines would be visible to the north, they would be peripheral to the views along the Ose River and approaches to the asset along the river valley. The Proposed Development would therefore not impact the parts of the setting of the asset that contributes to its significance, such as its spatial connection with nearby contemporary assets or its association with the River Ose.

- 11.113 The Proposed Development is a minor distraction to the elements of setting which contribute to the significance of the asset. As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Dun Flashader, broch, Skye (SM911) (VP026)

- 11.114 Dun Flashader (**Figure 11.2**) is a broch, dating to the Iron Age, located on the summit of a rocky outcrop measuring c.7.6m in height. The broch is in poor condition, with walls of a maximum of 1.5m in height and covering the entire outcrop which measures 0.25ha. There is a possible outer wall encircling the outcrop, with an entrance to the east. Whilst the broch is in poor condition above ground, it has not been excavated, meaning that there is potential to further our understanding of the construction and use of the defensive structure. Thus, the potential of the asset to further our understanding of prehistoric society contributes to its significance.
- 11.115 The broch is located approximately 0.4km east of the eastern bank of Lochs Greshornish, sitting on top of a rocky outcrop which sits at a narrow point of the loch. The asset's positioning monitors the length of the loch, utilising its natural position at a narrow point to control approaches from the sea to the north into the mainland of Skye. As such, the setting of the asset contributes to its significance.
- 11.116 Unlike other nearby brochs, Dun Flashader is the only recorded broch along the banks of Loch Greshornish. The nearest broch is Dun Suladale (**SM921**), located 2.5km to the south east, which sits inland and commands the routeway along Allt Clachamish and Allt an Loin Ruaidh to the east. These brochs have the potential to be intervisible, however, whilst they exist within the same general landscape they do not seem to focus on the same features. Nevertheless, an investigation into their spatial positioning may further inform our understanding of Iron Age society and economy.
- 11.117 The setting of the asset has changed since its initial construction. The asset sits to the west of the A850 and a small unnamed offshoot. The asset currently sits within the settlement of Arnisort, south of Kildonan and north of Flashader. There are multiple domestic buildings to the east of the asset, currently comprising the Ascrib and Shiant Cottage Apartments. However, these structures do not obstruct the view along the coast to the west. The wider landscape is sparsely populated with modern domestic buildings, stretching to the north and south. However, the height of the rocky outcrop on which the asset is located means that it is still prominent within the landscape. The current setting of the asset has a minimal impact on the ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
- 11.118 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 1, would be located c.6km to the south of Dun Flashader. The ZTV and wireline predict that all ten blade tips and six hubs would be visible

from the monument (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.9**), all orientated to the south and south west of the asset.

- 11.119 The Proposed Development is not anticipated to be present in views along the length of the loch. The proposed turbines may be present in some views to the very south, however, these views are peripheral to the key approaches along the loch and would not be a distraction to the ability to appreciate, understand or experience the asset. The Proposed Development is not anticipated to impact the intervisibility between Dun Flashader and Dun Suladale (**SM921**). The aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance are not anticipated to be impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 11.120 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Dun Osdale, broch 850m N of Osdale (SM3493) (VP025)

- 11.121 Dun Osdale (**Figure 11.2**) is an Iron Age broch, located 8.5km west of the Proposed Development. The broch is located on a knoll at the end of a ridge which stretches to the east. The broch is not well preserved, with the majority of the outer walls being only a few courses in height. A section of wall in the south west is approximately 2.14m in height. The broch has an entrance to the east, which faces the approach along the ridge. There are several internal cells/features, most accessed from the central court. There is evidence of lintel stones from multiple doorways and potential evidence of an upper gallery. The broch is unexcavated, but a quern stone was discovered inside the walls of the structure, which is believed to predate the broch. The broch has the potential to further inform our understanding of broch construction, and how the space was used, as well as our understanding of wider Iron Age society.
- 11.122 The asset is located along a ridge at the bottom of the northern slope of Healabhal Mhor (McLeod's Table North). The broch overlooks Loch Dunvegan to the north east, with the mouth of the Osdale River visible 0.7km to the south east. The asset's location monitors and commands the entrance to the Loch and the mouth of the river, with its position on a ridge providing a natural defensive position. Loch Dunvegan was likely a route of trade and movement, particularly for those approaching from the west (e.g., the Outer Hebridean islands). Loch Dunvegan has multiple rivers that feed into it, which may have been utilised as further routes of movement through the landscape and allowed access further inland. By monitoring the loch and the mouth of the Osdale River, the asset had control over movement through the landscape. This use of landscape contributes to the significance of the asset.
- 11.123 The asset is located 4km south of Dun Fiadhart (**SM905**), another Iron Age broch, which is located on a spit of land at the convergence of Loch Dunvegan and the sea. The proximity of these brochs, as well as their shared focus on the Loch, insinuates that they had a relationship. The intervisibility and relationship, between Dun Osdale and **SM905**, has the potential to further our understanding of Iron Age society, economy and defensive structures. As such, the potential connection between the two assets contributes to Dun Osdale's significance.
- 11.124 The asset currently sits to the south west of the B884, with Uignish Road running to the north. A wire fence runs directly to the south of the asset, with the general immediate landscape being unpopulated. Views towards the Loch are unrestricted by modern development, however, the modern settlement of Dunvegan is visible, located 1.7km to the north east. Whilst there are modern

distractions within the landscape, the command of the Loch from the broch is still clear, which means that the current setting of the asset does not diminish the ability to appreciate, understand, or experience the asset.

- 11.125 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 8, would be located c.9.2km to the east of Dun Osdale. The ZTV and wireline predict that all ten blade tips and seven hubs would be visible from the monument, all orientated to the east of the asset (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.8**).
- 11.126 The Proposed Development is not anticipated to impact the asset's intervisibility with **SM905**, due to its orientation to the north. The Proposed Development may be present in views towards the southern tip of the loch, located to the east of the asset. However, due to their distance, these views would be a minor distraction to the ability to appreciate and understand the connection of the broch to the loch. Whilst approaches towards the broch from the loch may have long-distance views of the Proposed Development, these points of appreciation would not be impacted by the Proposed Development due to these views being peripheral. The aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance are not anticipated to be impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 11.127 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Dun Neill, dun 420m SW of Ardmore (SM3885) (VP021)

- 11.128 Dun Neill (**Figure 11.2**) is a dun, a type of fort, located c. 7.3km south west of the nearest proposed turbine. The asset comprises a dun, encircled by a potentially earlier fortification. The asset is located on a coastal promontory, with the dun located at the north eastern end. The dun measures 24m by 12m, with a wall up to 2.8m thick preserved at the eastern end. The potential earlier fortification encircles an area of approximately 0.04ha, comprising a robbed-out wall most visible to the west of the asset along the cliff edge. There appears to be an entrance on the northern edge, entering through the north of the stack, with a potential single step visible. There is a circular depression within the outer walls at the eastern end, potentially the remains of a structure.
- 11.129 The asset is unexcavated, and as evidenced above, its full form and function are unclear. The asset derives part of its significance from its potential to further inform our knowledge about later prehistoric defensive structures, including trade economy and society.
- 11.130 The asset is situated on a west-facing promontory stack, on the west side of the Harlosh Peninsular, which juts into Loch Bracadale to the south and west and borders Loch Vatten to the north. The position of the asset provides wide-ranging views to the west of the lochs, across to Beinn Bhacglas and Beinn na Boineid on the western bank of the loch. Views to the south and south east are likely restricted by Harlosh Island, which sits at the end of the Harlosh Peninsular. The asset's positioning would have allowed the dun to monitor Loch Bracadale and Loch Vatten, especially from approaches from the west. This would include monitoring coastal trade routes from neighbouring Outer Hebridean Islands, such as Uist and Benbecula.
- 11.131 The asset sits within a wider later prehistoric/Iron Age landscape, with a series of defensive structures surrounding Loch Bracadale and Harport's eastern side, with the closest assets being Dun Feorlig (**SM3494**) and Abhainn Bhaile Mheadhonaich (**SM13664**), located c.2.4km and c.3.4km north east of the asset, respectively. An Iron Age promontory fort (**SM930**) is located c.4.8km to

the south east of the asset. These assets potentially shared intervisibility, and as a group likely controlled the entrance into the heart of Skye through Loch Bracadale and Harport.

- 11.132 The significance of the asset partially derives from its setting, with its positioning along the coast being able to further our understanding of Iron Age defensive structures, trade routes, economy and society. In addition, the asset derives its significance from its placement within a group of Iron Age assets, with analysis of their spatial placement likely further informing our understanding of society, trade and economy.
- 11.133 The setting of the asset has changed since the dun was first constructed. The settlement of Harlosh is situated to the north of the asset, encompassing much of the peninsula and mainly comprising dispersed modern domestic properties. The asset sits within grazing land, with a modern fence c.0.2km to the north east. The remains of a medieval chapel and cemetery (**SM3884**) c.0.15km to the north east. The remains of modern farming enclosures also populate the field. Views towards the Loch to the west are unrestricted by modern developments and as such, these changes to the landscape are a minor distraction at most to the ability to understand and appreciate the connection of the asset to its maritime setting.
- 11.134 The Proposed Development would be located to the north east of the asset, with the closest proposed turbine, Turbine 8, being located c.7.3km to the north east. The ZTV indicates that between 0-1 turbine tips would be visible from the asset itself, with zero hubs visible (**Figure 11.2**). From the asset itself, the Proposed Development is unlikely to have an impact on the ability to appreciate, understand or experience the asset.
- 11.135 However, as previously stated, the asset's maritime connection is strong. As such, the asset could be appreciated from a third viewpoint (VP021), approaching from across the loch to the south west (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.4**). This viewpoint considers the route that approaching traders from neighbouring Islands, or visitors from nearby contemporary settlements, would have used, hugging the coastline where possible. The ZTV indicates that all ten turbine tips and eight hubs would be visible from this viewpoint. Whilst the turbines are anticipated to be visible, they would not fall within the maritime setting of the asset, being located on the hills within the wider landscape. They would not distract from the coastal prominence of the asset and would not impact the aspects of the setting of the asset which contribute to its significance.
- 11.136 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Barpannan, two chambered cairns, Vatten Duirinish (SM893) (VP028)

- 11.137 The asset comprises two Hebridean-type chambered cairns, both neolithic in date (**Figure 11.2**).
- 11.138 The northernmost cairn is approximately 6.1m in height and 27.5m in diameter, comprised of small, rounded boulders that are partially turf-covered. There appears to have been a kerb of stones surrounding the cairn, with stones still mostly visible on the north east segment and visible in small areas around the rest of the cairn. The cairn has a bell-like shape. It is in relatively good condition with some evidence of superficial robbing or disturbance on the south western side.
- 11.139 The southernmost cairn is approximately 3.4m in height and approximately 35m in diameter, comprising mostly bare stones with turf coverage around the edges. Unlike the northern cairn, the interior of the cairn has been robbed extensively, leaving a depression c.15m in diameter and

evidence of disturbance throughout the rest of the cairn. The cairn has a kerb of stones, similar to its northern counterpart. The cairn shows evidence of a chamber, entered from the south east. There is evidence of a lintel stone and a singular orthostat within the cairn.

- 11.140 The northern cairn has the highest archaeological potential, appearing to be mostly intact. However, the full extent of the damage to the southern cairn is unknown, meaning that there is the potential for further archaeology within the remains. The archaeological potential of the assets contributes to their significance, as both have the potential to further inform our understanding of neolithic funerary practices and neolithic society. In addition, the intervisibility between the two assets contributes to their significance, as their connection also has the potential to further inform our understanding of neolithic funerary practices and society.
- 11.141 The assets are located c.0.4km to the north west of the mouth of the Caroy River, where it enters Loch Caroy. The assets are situated on a west-facing slope, which overlooks the river valley and the head of the loch. As well as being funerary structures, cairns are thought to have been used as markers along routeways or land boundaries, often placed along waterways or on highpoints within the landscape. Due to the prominence of the assets within the landscape, they would be visible along approaches through the valley or the loch, potentially acting as markers within the landscape. Thus, the setting of the asset contributes in part to its significance.
- 11.142 The asset is located within an agricultural landscape, with the surrounding land to the north, east, and south mainly consisting of fields. The asset is located on the west side of the A863, which runs north west to south east. The settlement of Caroy is mainly focussed on the east side of the assets, with some domestic properties to the south. The properties to the east of the assets comprise a mixture of domestic, commercial, and agricultural properties, with the closest being c.0.15km to the west. The modern buildings do form a minor obstruction when viewing the assets from along the river or the loch, or when viewing these features from the assets. However, due to their spacing, they do not form a complete obstruction.
- 11.143 Edinbane Wind Farm and Ben Aketil Wind Farm are located to the north east of the asset, visible when viewing the river. As the main focus of the asset's setting is the connection to the river and loch, the wind farms form part of the wider landscape which does not contribute to the significance of the assets. They form a minor distraction to key views across the river. As such, the modern developments within the landscape form a minor distraction to the ability to appreciate, understand, and experience the asset.
- 11.144 The Proposed Development's closest turbine, Turbine 8, would be located c.4km to the north east of the two cairns. The ZTV and wireline predict that eight blade tips and six hubs would be visible from the monument, all orientated to the north east of the asset (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.11**).
- 11.145 The Proposed Development is not anticipated to impact the intervisibility between the two cairns, as they are orientated north/south. The Proposed Development would appear in views to the east of the asset and would be present in views of the river. However, the main focus of the asset is the river valley and the convergence with the loch, with the Proposed Development site forming part of the wider landscape. As such, whilst the proposed turbines are anticipated to be visible from the asset, they would not impact the connection of the asset and the river/loch, with any views of the Proposed Development being peripheral.
- 11.146 The presence of modern development already impacts the ability to understand and appreciate the connection between the asset and its setting, meaning that the addition of the proposed

turbines in the distance would be a minor distraction.

- 11.147 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such, the significance of effect is very slight.

Ullinish Lodge, chambered cairn, Bracadale (SM903) (VP027)

- 11.148 The asset is a Hebridean-type chambered cairn (**Figure 11.2**), approximately 1.8m in height and 24m in diameter. The whole asset is turf-covered but does have a distinctive edge. There appears to be a pear-shaped central chamber, measuring 5.2m by 3m and entered from the south east. There is a single block to the south east of the chamber, potentially representing the location of an antechamber or passage. Whilst the cairn appears to have been robbed or damaged extensively, the asset does have minor potential to further our understanding of prehistoric funerary practices and society.
- 11.149 The cairn is located on the Ullinish peninsular, which juts into Loch Bracadale on its western bank. The asset is located at approximately 40m AOD, which slopes to sea level to the west. This affords views over the coastal loch. The visibility of the asset from the water was likely significant, with cairns often doubling as way markers or land markers as well as burial sites. This enhanced presence within the landscape was likely an expression of genealogical associations and the potential legitimisation of authority/tenure. Loch Bracadale was likely a key trade/movement route into the western part of Skye, especially for any trade from the outer Hebridean islands to the west. The cairn may have been a way marker for any approaching in that direction as the elevated positioning would have allowed for views from a distance. Thus, the placement of the asset within the landscape contributes to its significance.
- 11.150 The asset sits within a wider prehistoric landscape, with assets ranging from neolithic to the Iron Age in date within relatively close proximity. The asset nearest in date is the Struanmore chambered cairn (**SM7929**), which is located c.1.3km to the south east, along the southern side of the Ullinish peninsula. There is a potential for a relationship between the two assets, with their potential intervisibility and spatial connection contributing to the significance of the asset. Further investigation into the spatial relationship of nearby funerary monuments has the potential to further our understanding of prehistoric funerary practices.
- 11.151 Since the initial construction of the cairn, the setting of the asset has changed. The asset is located on the western side of the Ullinish road, an offshoot from the A836. The road runs through the Ullinish settlement, which is located directly to the south east of the asset. The settlement does not obstruct views along the coast to the west but does infringe on any views to the south. This means that intervisibility with **SM7929** is likely impacted. Edinbane Wind Farm is located 7.3km north east of the asset, with potential visibility when approaching the asset from the south. Due to the distance of the wind farm from the asset, it is not located within the immediate setting, and as such is peripheral to any key views.
- 11.152 The Proposed Development would lie to the north of the asset, with the closest proposed turbine being Turbine 8, c.8km to the north. The ZTV and wireline indicates that ten tips and ten hubs would be visible from the centre of the asset (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.10**). As previously stated, the main landscape focus of the asset is along the coast to the west and the south. The Proposed Development is not anticipated to be present in views from the asset towards these directions. The Proposed Development may be present in approaches towards the asset along the coast, however, due to the distance and orientation of the Proposed Development, any views are likely to be

peripheral and would be a minor distraction. Due to the modernised landscape in which the Cairn is located, the addition of ten visible blade tips to the north of the Cairn would not distract from the views and experience of the monument, as it would not provide any further distraction from the surrounding prehistoric assets or the view over the loch to the west. As such, the aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance are not anticipated to be impacted by the Proposed Development.

- 11.153 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. Due to the lack of further disruption to the appreciation and understanding of the monument, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such the significance of effect is very slight.

Ullinish, fort, Bracadale (SM930) (VP029)

- 11.154 Ullinish Fort (**Figure 11.2**) is a prehistoric fort, located 8.5km south of the nearest proposed turbine location. The remains of the fort comprise a curved wall which divides a coastal promontory from the rest of the land. The wall does not encircle the promontory, which leaves some areas of easy access along the northern and southern edges. The wall is approximately 2m thick, with an entrance approximately 10m from the southern terminus. The interior of the fort is featureless. The fort is the only promontory fort recorded on Skye and as such, the unique asset offers the opportunity to further our understanding of coastal defences and Iron Age society, economy and conflict.
- 11.155 The asset is located on a promontory which protrudes into Loch Bracadale on its eastern shore. The promontory, with a cliff to the north, south and west, provides natural defences to the asset. The fort's promontory position provides views across the coastal Loch, especially to the island of Wiay and Tarnar Island to the west, and along the coast to the north and south. Loch Bracadale was likely an important trade/movement route for the western side of Skye, with connected watercourses such as Loch Harport and the Amar River providing access further inland. As such, the fort likely monitored movement across the loch, controlling access to the land. These views are unobstructed, with no modern development intervening. The placement of the asset within the landscape contributes to its significance, providing a defensive position and controlling access to the peninsula.
- 11.156 The asset does sit within a wider prehistoric landscape, with the Ullinish Lodge chambered cairn (**SM903**) located c.0.7km to the north east. However, the cairn is neolithic in date and there is no indication of a connection between the assets. A potential contemporary fort (**SM918**) is located c.2.7km north east of the asset, situated inland and thus having less of a maritime focus. Intervisibility between these assets was likely important, potentially creating a defensive network across the peninsula. The asset's proximity to other contemporary assets contributes in part to its significance, having the potential to further our understanding of Iron Age defensive structures, economy and society.
- 11.157 Since the initial construction of the fort, there has been development on the peninsula, altering the original setting of the asset. The fort is located approximately 0.5km south west of the settlement of Ullinish, which comprises a small number of domestic properties. The asset is situated at approximately 4m AOD, with the landscape sloping gently upwards to the east. As previously stated, the presence of modern development does not infringe on views along the coast from the asset, however, it likely forms a minor distraction when approaching the asset from the water. In addition, modern development likely impacts intervisibility with the contemporary fort (**SM918**), potentially forming a minor distraction to the ability to understand and appreciate their spatial connection.

- 11.158 The Proposed Development would be located 8.7km to the north of the asset, with the closest proposed turbine being Turbine 10. The ZTV and wireline indicates that there would be ten turbine tips and six hubs visible from the asset (**Figure 11.3, Figure 11.12**). The Proposed Development would not be visible when looking at key views along the coast from the asset and is anticipated to be peripheral to any key views when approaching the asset from the coast. The Proposed Development would not form part of the coastal setting of the asset, orientated instead to the north and forming part of the wider landscape. As such, whilst the Proposed Development may be visible from the asset it would be a minor distraction to the ability to appreciate, understand and experience the asset and its connection to its setting.
- 11.159 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. Due to the lack of further disruption to the appreciation and understanding of the monument, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be very low adverse, and as such the significance of effect is very slight.

Residual Effects

- 11.160 There are no predicted significant operational effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets from the proposed turbines, and as such, there are no significant residual effects.

Cumulative Effects

- 11.161 Cumulative effects have been considered with regard to any wind farm developments 50m to blade tip or greater that are:
- consented or the subject of valid but currently undetermined planning or s36 applications; and
 - within 15km of assets of any nationally important assets anticipated to be subject to a moderate adverse effect (or above) as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 11.162 There are no cultural heritage assets anticipated to be subject to a moderate adverse effect (or above) as a result of the Proposed Development. However, despite the threshold not being met, Dun Arkaig (**SM13662**) is being taken forward for further assessment for potential cumulative effects due to the addition of numerous applications in close proximity to the asset both in height and scale.

Dun Arkaig, broch (SM13662)

- 11.163 Dun Arkaig and its current setting are described in **paragraphs 11.106 – 11.113**, with a wireline and photomontage available in **Figure 11.5**.
- 11.164 Dun Arkaig is located c.3.1km south-south east of proposed Turbine 10. The current cumulative baseline (operational wind farms) consists of Edinbane Wind Farm, with the closest turbine being c.2.1km to the north, and Ben Aketil Wind Farm, located c.5km north west of the asset.
- 11.165 The consented Ben Sca Wind Farm and Extension is proposed 5.8km north west of the asset, comprising nine turbines. Due to the linear nature of this scheme, visibility of the turbines from the asset would be limited, with only the southern turbines of the scheme being visible.
- 11.166 The asset is located within the site boundary of the consented Glen Ullinish Wind Farm; an 11

turbine scheme located 0.3km to the north of Dun Arkaig. It is noted that Glen Ullinish II (at scoping as of 31 January 2023) would replace the consented scheme if progressed to application and consented.

- 11.167 As stated in **paragraph 11.106**, the setting of the asset comprises the valley of the River Ose, with long-ranging views in all directions over the landscape, including along the valley towards the coast to the west. The asset is highly visible within the landscape, especially when approaching along the valley. The asset setting demonstrates the ability of the asset to monitor and control the valley.
- 11.168 Cumulatively, the existing and proposed wind farms, would enclose the asset within its landscape. The consented Glen Ullinish Wind Farm would greatly disrupt key views along the valley to the west. The addition of the 10 turbines of the Proposed Development to the north of the asset would blend in with the other consented and operational developments to the north of the asset; Edinbane, Ben Sca and Extension and Ben Aketil Wind Farms.
- 11.169 The asset would no longer be highly visible within the landscape and would be obscured by the consented turbines of Glen Ullinish within approaches along the valley towards the asset. The Proposed Development would be indistinguishable and would be a minor addition to this feeling of enclosure and would not form part of the group of turbines obscuring the asset within the landscape.
- 11.170 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is of high cultural heritage significance and the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development is anticipated to be low adverse, the anticipated cumulative significance of effect is slight.

SUMMARY AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 11.171 This assessment has considered data from a diverse range of sources to identify any cultural heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development. The potential effects on the identified assets, mitigation measures for protecting known assets during construction, recording of currently unknown features which might be affected, and the residual and cumulative effects of the Proposed Development have been considered.
- 11.172 With due regard to potential insignificant impacts identified to the buried archaeological resource during construction, mitigation measures for protecting or recording non-designated assets during construction have been set out.
- 11.173 With regard to operational effects on designated assets, a very low adverse effect has been identified with respect to nine Scheduled Monuments. A low adverse cumulative impact was identified with respect to Dun Arkaig (**SM13662**).
- 11.174 No significant impacts to designated assets have been identified at the construction or operational stages of the Proposed Development. This conclusion extends to cumulative and residual impacts. With reference to NPF4, it is considered that the changes in setting affecting the monument would not have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the setting of any Scheduled Monuments, which in all instances would be preserved.
- 11.175 All effects are consistent with the lowest level of effect identified within the SNH (NatureScot) and HES EIA Handbook 2018. There are no predicted significant effects on cultural heritage assets resulting from the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.

REFERENCES

Legislation

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979. Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act, 1997. Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents>

The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act, 2011. Available at:

[legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents/enacted](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents/enacted)

Planning Policy

Highland Council (2012) *Highland-wide Local Development Plan*.

Historic Environment Scotland (2016) *Historic Environment Circular 1*. Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.

Historic Environment Scotland (2019a) *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland*. Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.

Scottish Government (2011) *Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology*. Edinburgh: Local Government and Communities Directorate.

Scottish Government (2014) *Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)*. Edinburgh: Local Government and Communities Directorate.

Scottish Government (2017) *Scottish Statutory Instrument No. 101 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations*.

Scottish Government (2023) *National Planning Framework 4*. Edinburgh: Local Government and Housing Directorate.

Guidance

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa) (2017) *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment*. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa) (2022) *Code of Conduct*. Available at:

<https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Historic Environment Scotland (2020) *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*. Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b) *Our Place in Time. A Guide to Climate Change Impacts: On Scotland's Historic Environment*. Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.

Nature Scot (Previously Scottish Natural Heritage, SNH) (2018) *A handbook on environmental impact assessment: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland*. Available at:

<https://www.nature.scot/doc/handbook-environmental-impact-assessment-guidance-competent-authorities-consultees-and-others>

Cartographic Sources

Ordnance Survey (1880), 1:10,560. Inverness-shire (Isle of Skye), Sheet XXII (includes: Bracadale; Duirinish)

Ordnance Survey (1903), 1:10,560. Isle of Skye Sheet XXII (includes: Bracadale; Duirinish)

Ordnance Survey (1904), 1:10,560. Inverness-shire - Isle of Skye Sheet XVI (includes: Duirinish; Snizort)

Ordnance Survey (1941a), 1:25,000. GSGS 3906 Sheet 17/86 S.E.

Ordnance Survey (1941b), 1:25,000. GSGS 3906 Sheet 17/86 N.E.

Sources

Armit, I. (1997) *Celtic Scotland*. Edinburgh: Historic Scotland.

Armit, I. (2003) *Towers in the North: the Brochs of Scotland*. Cheltenham: The History Press Ltd.