

Chapter 15: Cultural Heritage - Contents

15.1	Executive Summary	1
15.2	Introduction	1
15.3	Scope of the Assessment	2
15.4	Consultation Response	2
15.5	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	5
15.6	Methodology	6
15.7	Baseline Description	11
15.8	Mitigations by Design / Embedded Mitigation	15
15.9	Potential Effects	16
15.10	Mitigation	21
15.11	Residual Effects	23
15.12	Conclusion	23

List of Figures (Volume 2)

Figure 15.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area

Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV

List of Appendices (Volume 4)

There are no appendices associated with this Chapter.

15. Cultural Heritage

15.1 Executive Summary

- 15.1.1 This Chapter provides the results of an assessment of the predicted impact of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets and archaeological features. A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey has been carried out to assess the effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment has been informed by comments and information supplied by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and The Highland Council (THC) as part of the Scoping Opinion.
- 15.1.2 Three non-designated assets were identified within a 100 m buffer of the Proposed Development, one of local and two of regional value. Direct Impacts from inundation are predicted for the site of local value during operation, and potential direct impacts are predicted through widening or construction of access roads on minor features associated with one site of regional value during construction. The potential for unidentified archaeological remains is considered to be low to insignificant at the site. Mitigation to protect the archaeological record is recommended for one non-designated asset during the construction phase, as well as the implementation of general good practice measures. There are no predicted impacts on the second site of local value. With the implementation of mitigation measures, no significant effects are predicted on any site directly impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 15.1.3 Within a 3 km outer study area a total of thirteen designated assets were identified, consisting of one scheduled monument and twelve listed buildings. A brief appraisal of a further thirty-nine designated sites, consisting of four scheduled monuments and thirty-five listed buildings at a distance of up to 10 km from the Proposed Development was also undertaken. Of the designated assets within the 3 km study area, the scheduled monument (Dell Farm, Burial Mound) and one Category B listed building (Dell Lodge and Rear Service Cottages) are considered vulnerable to an adverse alterations to their setting, however their predicted impacts are considered not significant when existing screening and the implementation of proposed landscape earthworks and planting at Dam 3 is considered.
- 15.1.4 All of the designated assets within the 10 km study area have been eliminated from further consideration as for the majority of these assets there is no visibility of any elements of the Proposed Development. Minor, distant visibility affects only a very few of these assets, at a distance of 10 km, and to such a small degree that there would be no significant impact on these assets or their settings. One Scheduled Monument and three listed buildings at Fort Augustus are considered to have the potential for there to be visibility of some elements of the Proposed Development, however these are located approximately 10 km away. At this distance, potential impacts would be to such a small degree that there would be no significant effects on these assets or their settings.

15.2 Introduction

- 15.2.1 This Chapter addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development during construction and operation on the cultural heritage of the immediate area, which is taken to include:
- Designated assets: Scheduled Monuments (SMs), listed buildings, inventory gardens, designed landscapes and inventory battlefields; and
 - Non-designated assets: recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites and areas of archaeological, historical or cultural significance within the study area, previously unevaluated policies and designed landscapes; and other elements of Cultural Heritage.
- 15.2.2 The assessment considers the potential for both direct impacts, meaning those that have potential to physically disturb, damage or inundate heritage features within the study area, and indirect impacts, meaning those which can adversely affect the historic setting of heritage features via the Proposed Development's visibility from each feature or its curtilage. Where likely significant effects are predicted during construction and operation, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed, and the significance of predicted residual effects are assessed. As described in **Chapter 3: Description of Development**, with proper maintenance the Proposed Development should remain functional indefinitely. If the project were to be decommissioned, it is anticipated that the potential effects on Cultural Heritage would be equal to and/or lesser than the construction impacts. As such, a separate assessment of potential decommissioning effects on Cultural Heritage is not included in this Chapter.
- 15.2.3 The assessment has been undertaken by field archaeologist and cultural heritage consultant Catherine Dagg who is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. A table presenting relevant qualifications and experience of key staff involved in the preparation of this Chapter is included in **Volume 4, Appendix 4.1: EIA Team**, of this EIA Report.

15.3 Scope of the Assessment

15.3.1 The assessment considers cultural heritage features within a study area appropriate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development. The study areas, referred to below, are defined as the extent to which the Proposed Development has the potential to give rise to significant effects.

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

Inner Study Area

15.3.3 The inner study area to locate and define archaeological, historical and otherwise cultural features with the potential for direct impacts was formed by a 500 m buffer around the Development Area of the Proposed Development, as shown in **Volume 2, Figure 15.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**.

Outer Study Area

15.3.4 All sites identified with statutory protection in the broad development area of the Proposed Development were considered for potential indirect impacts on their setting during the construction and operational phases. The outer study area for indirect impacts was 3 km from the overground elements of the Proposed Development, with an additional brief appraisal of sites at a greater distance within an outer study area of up to 10 km.

Cumulative Effects

15.3.5 The chapter assesses cumulative effects as arising from the addition of the Proposed Development with other developments, which are the subject of a valid planning application, consented, or are reasonably foreseeable. Operational and under construction developments are considered as part of the baseline.

15.4 Consultation Response

15.4.1 To inform the scope of the assessment for the Proposed Development, consultation was undertaken with statutory and non-statutory bodies. **Table 15.1: Consultation Responses** sets out the comments received from consultees in relation to cultural heritage and provides information on where and / or how points raised have been addressed in this assessment.

Table 15.1 Consultation Responses

Consultee	Consultation Type	Date	Issue Raised	Response / Action Taken
HES	Scoping	7th February 2022	The scope of assessment proposed the report will identify any likely significant effects on our interests. HES have not identified any specific assets where we would like to	Noted. This assessment includes an assessment of likely significant direct and settings effects on designated heritage features.

			offer further advice at this stage.	
			HES note that the proposed methodology refers to 'heritage importance and sensitivity'. HES would recommend the approach taken in the EIA Handbook, which focuses on cultural significance. HES expect the assessment to refer to the handbook and the advice it contains.	This assessment includes reference to the EIA handbook and 'cultural significance'.
			It appears likely that any impacts on HES's interests will be on the setting of heritage assets. HES therefore recommend that the assessment follows the advice given in our Managing Change guidance note on Setting.	An assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on all types of designated cultural heritage sites, including setting effects, is included in Section 15.8 of this Chapter of the EIA Report. This assessment considers HES's advice given in their Managing Change guidance note on Setting.
THC	Scoping	11th March 2022	The EIA Report needs to identify all designated sites which may be affected by the development either directly or indirectly. THC would expect any assessment to contain a full appreciation of the setting of these historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings.	An assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on all types of designated cultural heritage sites, including setting effects, is included in Section 15.8 of this Chapter of the EIA Report. Interrelationships between the features are highlighted where relevant.
			Where the assessment finds that significant impacts are likely, appropriate visualisations such as photomontage and wireframe views of the development in relation to the sites and their settings could be provided. Visualisations illustrating views both from the asset towards the proposed development and views towards the asset	An assessment of the potential setting impacts of the Proposed Development on designated cultural heritage features is included in Section 15.8 of this EIA Report. No significant setting impacts on designated cultural heritage features are anticipated so no visualisations have been proposed. Volume 3a,

			with the development in the background would be helpful.	Figures 3a-3g and Volume 3b, Figures 3a-3n illustrate the view of Dam 3 from Core Path IN25.01 – Dell Lodge – Foyers during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. These visualisations provide a representative view of the Proposed Development from the Dell Burial Mound Scheduled Monument (SM), which is located close to this Core Path.
			HES will set out the potential impacts on the setting of assets require consideration.	Noted.
			THC’s Historic Environment Team are generally satisfied with the information presented in the scoping request but note that the assessment must consider potential impacts to upstanding features as well as potential for buried features and deposits. It requests that where impacts are unavoidable mitigation will be required to be set out in detail.	Where unavoidable impacts on cultural heritage features will be experienced, mitigation measures have been detailed Section 15.10 of this Chapter of the EIA Report, as well as Volume 4, Appendix 3.2: Schedule of Mitigation .
			There are a large number of heritage assets in the vicinity of the development, these need to be assessed. HES and HET may provide detailed advice on potential setting impacts.	An assessment of the potential impacts, including setting impacts, of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage features is included in Section 15.8 of this EIA Report.
HES	Gate Check Response	19 th September 2023	HES noted that the height of the four new saddle dams proposed have increased in height from 15-30 m to 16-34 m and advised that they did not receive a consultation for this design revision.	The revised height of the saddle dams is included in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) shown in Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area , which has informed the Cultural Heritage Assessment described in this Chapter.
			HES noted that a Cultural Heritage Assessment will be	Noted.

			included as part of the EIA Report and welcome the assessment will include reference to the EIA Handbook and consider the advice in our Managing Change guidance note on Setting.	
--	--	--	---	--

Issues Scoped Out of Assessment

15.4.2 Assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of World Heritage Sites, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, and Marine Resources has been scoped out. There are no assets with these designations within 10 km of the Site.

15.4.3 Assessment of the settings of designated heritage assets in the outer study area that fall outside of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Development has been scoped out. Where there is not predicted to be visibility of the Proposed Development from these assets their settings would not be adversely affected. This includes the majority of the designated assets located in the wider study area up to 10 km from the site, as illustrated in **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV** and the following Listed Buildings (LB) within the 3 km Outer Study Area:

- Invermoriston St Columbas Church, Gatepiers (LB15023);
- Invermoriston St Columbas Church, Well and Graveyard (LB15023); and
- Invermoriston House, Gazebo (LB15020).

15.5 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislative Context

15.5.1 The following legislation has been considered in the assessment:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011)); and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).

Policy Context

15.5.2 The following policy has been considered in the assessment:

- National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4) (Scottish Government, 2023);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES, 2019a, finalised amended 2020);
- Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013) (Scottish Government, 2013, revised 2017);
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN 2/2011) (Scottish Government, 2011);

- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ClfA, 2017);
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (ClfA, 2014; revised 2021);
- Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (Highland Council (THC), 2012):
- Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage;
- Policy 69: Electricity Transmission Infrastructure;
- Appendix 3: Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features;
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019);
- Scotland's Woodlands and the Historic Environment (Forestry Commission, 2008); and
- UK Forestry Standard: The Governments Approach to Sustainable Forestry (Forestry Commission, 2017).

Technical Guidance

15.5.3 The following technical guidance has been considered in the assessment:

- UK Forestry Standard Guidelines: Forests and the Historic Environment (Forestry Commission, 2011);
- Forests and Historic Environment: Information and Advice (Forestry Commission, 2016);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2016; updated 2021);
- Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work (THC, 2012);
- Highland Historic Environment Strategy: Supplementary Planning Guidance (THC, 2013);
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Assessment (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and ClfA, 2021); and
- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES), 2018).

15.6 Methodology

Desk Study

15.6.1 A detailed desk-based evaluation was undertaken to identify the locations and extents of heritage assets within the study areas. Sources included:

- The Highland Council Historic Environment Record (HER)¹;
- CANMORE database of Historic Environment Scotland²;
- British Newspaper Archive;

¹ Highland Historic Event Record (2023) available online at: <https://her.highland.gov.uk/map> (last accessed 31/08/2023)

² Historic Environment Scotland: Past Map available online at: <http://pastmap.org.uk> (last accessed 31/08/2023)

- Historical Ordnance Survey maps and pre-Ordnance Survey maps held in the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland, in particular Lovat Estate mapping by courtesy of the North of Scotland Archaeological Society (NoSAS); and
- Satellite images available online (Google and Bing).

Field Study

15.6.2 The inner study area was subject to a walk-over survey in July 2021. This survey targeted known or potential areas of interest based on the findings of the desk study.

Assessment Methodology

Assessment of Effects

15.6.3 The effects of the Proposed Development on heritage assets have been assessed on the basis of their type (direct effects, effects on setting, and cumulative effects) and nature (adverse or beneficial):

- Adverse effects are those that detract from or reduce cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets; and
- Beneficial effects are those that preserve, enhance, or better reveal the cultural significance or special interest of heritage assets.

15.6.4 The assessment of significance of effects has been undertaken using two key criteria: the value / sensitivity of the cultural heritage asset and the magnitude of the predicted impact, which measures the degree of change to the baseline condition of an asset resulting from the Proposed Development.

Sensitivity / Importance of Receptors

15.6.5 Cultural heritage assets are attributed importance through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised and protected by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the laws and policies applicable to it (HES, 2019³).

15.6.6 **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets** summarises the relative sensitivity of those heritage assets (and their settings) relevant to the Proposed Development, excluding in this instance World Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Marine Resources.

Table 15.1: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition/Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monuments • Category A Listed Buildings

³ Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (2019) 'Designation Policy and Selection Guidance', Edinburgh.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory Historic Battlefields
Medium	<p>Assets valued at a regional level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks) Category B Listed Buildings Conservation Areas
Low	<p>Assets valued at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological sites that have local heritage value Category C listed buildings Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics
Negligible	<p>Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Artefact find-spots (where the artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain) Poorly preserved examples of particular types of features (e.g. quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc)

Magnitude of Effect

15.6.7 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) are presented in **Table 15.3: Description of Spatial Impact Magnitudes**.

Table 15.3: Description of Spatial Impact Magnitudes

Sensitivity of Asset	Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
High	<p>Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of the asset's cultural significance.</p> <p>Changes that substantially detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>	<p>Preservation of a heritage asset in situ where it would otherwise be completely or almost completely lost.</p> <p>Changes that appreciably enhance the cultural significance of a heritage asset and how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>
Medium	<p>Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is appreciably altered.</p> <p>Changes that appreciably detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>	<p>Changes to important elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting, resulting in its cultural significance being preserved (where this would otherwise be lost) or restored.</p> <p>Changes that improve the way in which the heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.</p>

Low	Changes to those elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is slightly altered. Changes that slightly detract from how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting detracting from its cultural significance being removed. Changes that result in a slight improvement in the way a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.
Negligible	Changes to fabric or setting of a heritage asset that leave its cultural significance unchanged and do not affect how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced.	

Assessing Effects on Setting

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

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

15.6.9 Historic Environment Scotland's guidance document, 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES, 2016), notes that:

"Setting can be important to the way in which historic structures or places are understood, appreciated and experienced. It can often be integral to a historic asset's cultural significance."

"Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or 'curtilage' of an individual historic asset into a broader landscape context".

15.6.10 The guidance also advises that:

"If proposed development is likely to affect the setting of a key historic asset, an objective written assessment should be prepared by the applicant to inform the decision-making process. The conclusions should take into account the significance of the asset and its setting and attempt to quantify the extent of any impact. The methodology and level of information should be tailored to the circumstances of each case".

15.6.11 The guidance recommends that there are three stages in assessing the impact of a development on the setting of a historic asset or place:

- Stage 1: identify the historic assets that might be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated, and experienced; and
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any adverse impacts can be mitigated.

15.6.12 The SNH/HES EIA Handbook (2018) Appendix 1, paragraph 43 advises that:

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

15.6.13 Following these recommendations, the ZTV for the Proposed Development has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration has also been given to designated heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from the asset but where views of or across the asset are important factors contributing to its cultural significance. In such cases, consideration was given to whether the Proposed Development could appear in the background of those views.

Cumulative Effects

15.6.14 The assessment of cumulative effects on heritage assets is based upon consideration of the effects of the Proposed Development on the settings of assets with statutory and non-statutory designations within the Outer Study Area (which includes the Inner Study Area), in addition to the likely effects of cumulative developments.

15.6.15 The assessment takes into account the nature and relative scales of the various developments, their distance from the affected assets, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets within the Outer Study Area.

Significance of Effect

15.6.16 The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 15.1: Sensitivity of Heritage Asset**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 15.3: Description of Spatial Impact Magnitudes**) are used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect (direct effect or effect on setting), summarised using the approach set out in the matrix in **Table 15.2 Significance of Effect**. The matrix employs a graduated scale of significance (from negligible to major effects) and where two outcomes are possible through application of the matrix, professional judgement, supported by reasoned justification, has been used to determine the assessed level of significance.

Table 15.2: Significance of Effect

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

- 15.6.17 **Major** and **moderate** effects are considered to be significant for the purposes of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)⁴. **Minor** and **Negligible** effects are considered to be not significant.

15.7 Baseline Description

Statutory Designated Sites

- 15.7.1 There are no statutory designated sites within the Site of the Proposed Development.

Outer Study Area

- 15.7.2 There is one Scheduled Monument within 3 km of the Proposed Development (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**) as follows:

Dell Farm, burial mounds 350 m NE of (SM4536) centred on NH 493 171

- 15.7.3 This monument, a barrow cemetery of probable Late Iron Age date is located north and east of Dell Farm, on slightly raised open ground forming a tongue between the River Fechlin to the west and the Allt an Loin to the east. The confluence of these two watercourses is only 400 m to the north. The siting of the monument was probably of significance, placing it possibly at a significant territorial boundary or meeting place, with the adjacent section of General Wade's Military Road reflecting the long use of this overland route. There are potentially contemporary settlements located to the east and southeast, but none survive in the direction of the Proposed Development, i.e. southwest.

- 15.7.4 The monument is assumed to have been a prominent landscape feature before the robbing of materials for later settlements and agricultural improvements. Therefore, its setting in the landscape is assumed to be more concerned with its own visibility as a cultural and religious focus than visibility of contemporary features from the monument. It is now impossible to reconstruct these potentially significant vistas as the monument is not visible on the ground and its general vicinity is obscured by modern tree plantings from contemporary prehistoric settlements to the east, southeast and south.

- 15.7.5 The following six Listed Buildings are located within 3 km of the Proposed Development, on the east side of Loch Ness (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**), as follows:

Dell Lodge and rear service cottages (LB1860) at NH 48584 16274

- 15.7.6 This house, the home of Andrew Fraser of Dell in the late 18th century, is east facing, its frontage facing the avenue approaching from the east and giving significance to the vistas to the eastern hills. The location of the outbuildings to the rear, west, indicates that the vistas to the west, i.e., towards the Proposed Development, were not considered significant in the setting of the house. Shown on the 1874 Ordnance Survey map with policies to the east only, flanking the avenue, the house and outbuildings are now backed to the west by mature plantings, further blocking the views westwards.

⁴ Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/contents/made> [Last Accessed 11/09/2023]

- 15.7.7 The original setting of the house and policies would have been a changing landscape of agricultural improvement, with scattered dwellings, plantations and enclosed fields, some decades before aesthetic appreciation of wilderness became associated with the development of sporting activities. The cultural significance of the building is its survival as relatively unaltered small laird's house associated with the local family the Frasers of Dell and their standing in the community.
- 15.7.8 Dell Lodge and rear service cottages are also included in the inner study area (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**).
- Whitebridge, New Bridge (LB1875)*
- Whitebridge, Old Bridge Over River Foyers (LB1874)*
- 15.7.9 These two bridges, although Listed for their architectural and historical interest, were not sited with any aesthetic or practical consideration of the wider landscape, but only with regard to the practical consideration of crossing points on the river. The older and more historically significant bridge is the original Wade bridge dating to 1732 and is located immediately south of the present road bridge, from which it can be viewed.
- 15.7.10 The cultural significance of the two bridges is in their contribution to the history of transport and communications in the Highlands. Both now stand within a landscape of woodland and modern chalet development, where visual appreciation of both assets is only practically possible from each other.
- 15.7.11 These bridges are also included in the inner study area (see **Volume 2, Figure 15.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area**).
- Boleskine Parish Church (LB1846)*
- 15.7.12 The church, dating to 1777, is prominently located on high ground with broad vistas from south to northeast. To a lesser extent the church has a vista towards the Proposed Development to the southwest, broken by modern housing. The approach to the church and therefore appreciation of it by the visitor, is from the public road to the west, seeing the building in an open landscape of improved fields with distant hills. The cultural significance of the church was in its role as spiritual focus of the parish, although its siting may have been more to do with the practicalities of land acquisition combined with centrality to a scattered rural congregation. The spiritual significance would have been inward looking, with little concern for the aesthetics of the building or its setting.
- Boleskine Old Manse (LB1848)*
- 15.7.13 This building, dating to 1773-1775, is located in a landscape of open fields but surrounded by mature woodland within its grounds. Its location was probably dictated by proximity to the church and availability of land and its main vista is to the southeast across the public road to views of distant hills. This setting will have changed little since the 18th century, with the introduction of plantations, enclosed fields and adjacent farm steading gradually creating a more formal near landscape but not altering the more distant vistas. The cultural significance of this building lies in its architectural merit and appreciation of the exterior is from the southeast, looking at the front elevation of the building set against the skyline.

Knockie Lodge Hotel (LB1876)

15.7.14 Constructed in the mid to late 18th century, but with many later additions, the main elevation of this small laird's house faces to the southeast, with views across Loch Knockie. The approach to the building from the southeast presents the building in a setting of open ground surrounded by low hills and scattered woodland, emphasising its present role as a sporting estate.

15.7.15 Given the potential for views of elements of the Proposed Development located on the loch shore from the far side of Loch Ness, the following three Listed Buildings are also noted:

Allt Saigh Cottage (LB15016) at NH 45676 19096, approximately 2 km from Proposed Development

15.7.16 This domestic dwelling dating to the early 19th century is most likely to have been a small farmhouse associated with arable ground at the outflow of the Allt Saigh. The building faces southeast, an alignment dictated by topography rather than aesthetic considerations of setting and is at present screened from views across the loch towards the Proposed Development by dense tree growth. The cultural significance of this building lies primarily in its architectural qualities and historical associations. Its present setting is thickly wooded and appreciation of the exterior of the building is from the public road to the south, looking at the main, south facing aspect of the house set against a backdrop of mature coniferous planting.

Invermoriston, Home Farm and Former Barn to Rear. (LB15021) at NH 43111 16515, just over 2 km from the Proposed Development

15.7.17 Originally constructed as one of three linen factories in the Highlands and dating to c. 1755, converted to the Home Farm after the failure of the linen factory in 1771, the building was sited adjacent to the loch shore to facilitate the transportation of materials by water and there is a small derelict pier to the east of the buildings. Choice of setting for the factory was thus made on pragmatic terms. While there are now attractive gardens to the east of the main building, falling away to the shore to allow views of the loch and beyond, these are modern considerations. The visual element of the original setting of the buildings and associated features is confined to the visual relationship between the main and the ancillary buildings and other contemporary built features. The cultural significance of the building lies in its original function as a linen factory and its architectural qualities. Appreciation of the building is as best seen from the loch, where its setting against a backdrop of mature conifers is much altered from the original 18th century landscape.

Invermoriston Barracks and servants' tunnel (LB 15017) at N 42621 16437, approximately 3 km from the Proposed Development

15.7.18 Constructed in c.1810 to service the now demolished Mansion House, this purely functional building is now screened from all views across Loch Ness by the present Invermoriston Lodge, itself constructed in 1956. The cultural significance of the building is in its architectural qualities and historical associations. Its setting can be considered as being its relationship to the main lodge and other adjacent service buildings.

15.7.19 Consideration was also given to two further listed buildings, both located within Invermoriston and within the 3km study area for potential impacts on setting: St Columba's Church. Graveyard and Gatepiers (LB15023) and Invermoriston, gazebo (LB15020) but these have no visibility towards Loch Ness and potential built elements of the Proposed Development. These assets have therefore been scoped out of further assessment, as described in **paragraph 15.4.3**.

Wider Study Area

15.7.20 Within the wider 10 km Study Area, for which a ZTV has been prepared, there are five Scheduled Monuments and thirty-five Listed Buildings. However, for the majority of these assets there is no visibility of any elements of the Proposed Development. Minor, distant visibility affects only a very few of these assets, at a distance of approximately 10 km and to such a small degree that there is no significant impact on these assets or their settings and these are not examined further in this assessment, with the exception of the following:

- Caledonian Canal, Kyltra Lock to Fort Augustus (SM3615);
- Fort Augustus, Old Bridge over River Oich (LB1865);
- Fort Augustus Abbey, Monastery and School (LB1861); and
- 'Crusader', remains of speedboat in Loch Ness, near Achnahannet (SM11070).

Non-Statutory Cultural Heritage Assets

15.7.21 Desk and field studies have identified the area of the Proposed Development to have a small number of sites of cultural heritage interest as shown on **Volume 2, Figure 15.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area** and described below.

15.7.22 The Highland Historic Environment Record (HER) and CANMORE both record two non-designated features of early modern date or later within or adjacent to the Proposed Development. One further site was also recorded during baseline field survey.

Loch a' Choin Uire, buildings, MHG23342 at NH 4599 1610

15.7.23 Recorded on the HER as a possible township but this is not supported by available documentary or cartographic evidence. The group of buildings do not feature on Lovat Estate mapping which offers detailed information about all buildings, roads, areas of cultivation etc. of economic value to the Estate from the early 18th century onwards. By the time of the first Ordnance Survey, 1871, all of the buildings are abandoned and unroofed, although visible to surveyors. Evidence suggests that this group is more likely to be a shepherd's cottage and outbuildings dating to the early 19th century. The lands of Easter Drummond, southwest of Loch Kemp, were used as a 'hog fence', that is, grounds where hoggets were kept through the winter months.

15.7.24 The main building in the group, interpreted as the shepherds' dwelling, is visible on slightly raised ground as clear stone footings of a rectangular structure aligned northeast-southwest at NH 45945 16174. Of the other, smaller buildings, interpreted as outbuildings, two were not located during recent field survey, while the third, the most easterly of the group, survives but at the time of survey was obscured by bracken. Comparison of mapping and satellite images suggest that one of the unlocated buildings lies directly under the present access road and was destroyed during its construction. Satellite images also suggest a further building north of the previously recorded group and east of the access road.

15.7.25 This building group is considered to be of Regional Importance.

Easter Drummond township, MHG2643, centred on NH 4749 1460

15.7.26 The surviving features of this Early Modern township are listed as twenty-five buildings, fourteen enclosures, two corn drying kilns and the remains of field banks, all located within open ground northeast of the present Easter Drummond farm buildings and east of Whitebridge Plantation,

separated from this by a dyke probably dating to the establishment of the plantation. Within the more recent plantings to the north are a small rectangular building attached to a large square enclosure. This building is indicated as roofed on the 1874 first edition Ordnance Survey mapping, suggesting that it is not contemporary with the Early Modern township to the south.

15.7.27 Although documentary evidence has not been located, the archaeological evidence would suggest that the Early Modern township was cleared and abandoned in the early 19th century to be replaced by the sheep farm now known as Easter Drummond, including the building and enclosure to the north of the township and probably contemporary with the Loch a'Choin Uire buildings.

15.7.28 This site is considered to be of Regional Importance.

Allt Leachd Gowrie, Enclosure at NH 46847 15847

15.7.29 This archaeological feature was recorded during a site visit carried out on behalf of The Applicant in August 2021:

15.7.30 The well-preserved drystone remains of a small approximately square enclosure straddling the watercourse. It has no obvious opening but is probably associated with early sheep farming. This structure is recorded on the 1874 Ordnance Survey Mapping but has not been added to the HER.

15.7.31 This site is considered to be of local Importance.

Summary of Historical Background

15.7.32 The archaeological record would suggest that the area of development was not settled in the prehistoric period. Evidence from available documentary material and early maps would also indicate that the area was not settled in the Early Modern period and only gained economic use when commercial sheep farming was introduced.

15.7.33 The detailed Lovat Estate map of 1840 'Stratherrick Plan no.1' leaves the area of development as blank, indicating no buildings or enclosures, which might indicate that the structures at Loch a' Choin Uire had fallen out of use by this date. Subsequent use of the area appears to have been restricted to sport fishing and coniferous plantings, completed for the most part by 1875.

15.8 Mitigations by Design / Embedded Mitigation

15.8.1 Embedded mitigation measures developed during the design of the scheme (see **Chapter 2: Design Evolution and Alternatives**) form part of the Proposed Development, in order to improve the visual appearance of and assimilation of the Proposed Development into the landscape setting.

15.8.2 As described in **Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**, habitat and landform reinstatement would be undertaken to restore areas disturbed during construction and would assist in ensuring that the Proposed Development would be successfully accommodated into the existing landscape. Mitigation earthworks would re-use materials excavated during the construction period, and new landform would be modelled around new structures to ensure that these tie in smoothly into their surroundings where possible. This would be supplemented where appropriate with native planting and seeding and the use of rocks and boulders to reflect the pre-construction landscape character (refer to **Volume 4, Appendix 3.1: Design and Sustainability Statement**). Dam 3 would receive additional mitigation earthworks on the dry side of the dam face,

in order to soften the steep slopes of the structural dam. The mitigation earthworks would be soiled and planted with native woodland to help soften the appearance of the dam structure and help assimilate it into the landscape (refer to **Volume 3a and 3b, Figures V3a-3a to V3a-3g and Figure V3b-3a to V3b-3n VL3: Core Path IN25.01 near Whitebridge**).

- 15.8.3 Where access is required in close proximity to the Loch a' Choin Uire, buildings and the Allt Leachd Gowrie, Enclosure, existing tracks would be upgraded rather than new tracks being constructed, in order to reduce potential direct impacts on these cultural heritage assets during construction.

15.9 Potential Effects

Potential Direct Effects

Construction

- 15.9.1 Potential direct effects of the Proposed Development are predicted for two non-statutory Cultural Heritage assets during construction.

Lochan a'Choin Uire, group of buildings identified as a shepherds' cottage and outbuildings.

- 15.9.2 There is low potential for further unrecorded features but, with lower vegetation levels, structures which were not located during field survey may be revealed. There is therefore potential for accidental damage during the construction of the Proposed Development, particularly the widening of the present access road and the construction of the new road access to the proposed cable shaft site to the northwest. Potential for further below ground archaeological features such as pits, foundations, trenches and drains, given the interpretation of the building group as a shepherds cottage and outbuildings, is considered to be low but not negligible. These potential features would be most vulnerable to direct impacts during the construction phase.

- 15.9.3 This site is of regional value and the magnitude of the direct impact would be medium. Therefore, according to criteria given in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect**, the significance of direct effect on the known structures which are visible in the landscape, prior to mitigation would be **Moderate** and therefore *significant*. Significance of minor associated features, not visible in the landscape would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*. Mitigation measures to reduce or offset the predicted effect are set out in **Section 15.10**.

Allt Leachd Gowrie, enclosure.

- 15.9.4 There would be no direct impact to this asset during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

- 15.9.5 This site is of local value and the magnitude of the direct impact during construction would be negligible. Therefore, according to criteria given in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect**, the significance of this impact would be **Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Easter Drummond Township

- 15.9.6 This asset is not considered to include any surviving individual features that lie within the Development Area of the Proposed Development and therefore no direct impacts on this asset are anticipated during construction. This site is of regional value and the magnitude of the direct impact would be negligible. Therefore, according to criteria given in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** and

professional judgement, the significance of this effect would be **Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Operation

Allt Leachd Gowrie, enclosure.

- 15.9.7 This structure lies within the area of maximum inundation. While inundation alone would not remove the structure, repeated fluctuations in water levels may have the effect of undermining the walling and causing collapse. The structure would not be exposed and visible during the timeframe of the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
- 15.9.8 This site is of local significance and the magnitude of the direct impact would be medium. Therefore, according to criteria given in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect**, the significance of this impact would be **Moderate / Minor**. However, professional judgement has been used to determine the level of significance on this asset would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*.
- 15.9.9 No other potential direct effects are predicted on any Cultural Heritage assets during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

Potential Indirect Impacts

Construction

- 15.9.10 Any potential indirect impacts of the Proposed Development on Designated Assets would be short-term (i.e. limited to the construction period, anticipated to be up to 5 years) and temporary and are therefore not considered further in this EIA Report.

Operation

- 15.9.11 Potential indirect impacts of the Proposed Development on Designated Assets are predicted as follows:

Dell Farm, burial mounds

- 15.9.12 There may be a degree of visibility of this designated site from Dam 3 as highlighted in **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**, but this should be for the most part screened by extant tree plantings and interrupted by the large modern steadings of Dell Farm. There would also be the implementation of the mitigation earthworks and planting proposed for Dam 3 (refer to **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Section 8.8: Mitigation**), as well as reinstatement of vegetation around the dam and tracks, which would soften the artificial skyline of the dam in the longer term to be assimilated into the wider landscape. The burial mounds are considered to be sensitive only to impacts which break the relationship between them and contemporary settlement or intrude on vistas along the river but neither of these elements are in the direction of the Proposed Development. Dam 3 would alter the western skyline as seen from this monument, but there is no evidence that skyline features were significant in its setting. Appreciation of the monument would be barely impacted by any visible element of the Proposed Development once reinstatement of vegetation and tree planting to break the artificial skyline is established.
- 15.9.13 The sensitivity of this site to alternations to its setting is, according to criteria given above, High and the Magnitude of impact as given above would be Low. The Significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would therefore be **Moderate/Minor**.

However, an evaluation of the potential significance of an alteration to its setting based on professional judgement concludes that the overall significance on the setting of this designated asset would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*. This judgement is based on the monuments being low grass covered mounds, which are not prominent in the landscape. The site itself is difficult to interpret and therefore the assessment of significance of potential impacts on setting is for the most part based on conjecture. This evaluation has been partly informed by the visualisation contained in **Volume 3a, Figures 3a-3g** and **Volume 3b, Figures 3a-3n** of the EIA Report, which illustrate the view of the Dam 3 from the Core Path Core Path IN25.01 – Dell Lodge – Foyers and show the proposed mitigation earthworks and planting at Dam 3. These visualisations provide a representative view of what the Proposed Development would look like from the burial mound, which is located close to the viewpoint location on this Core Path.

Dell Lodge and rear service cottages

- 15.9.14 As illustrated in **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**, there would be a minor degree of mounds and not prominent in the landscape. The site itself is difficult to interpret and therefore the assessment of significance of potential impacts on setting is for the most part based on conjecture. This evaluation has been partly informed by the visualisation contained in **Volume 3a, Figures 3a-3g** and **Volume 3b, Figures 3a-3n** of the EIA Report, which illustrate the view of the Dam 3 from the Core Path Core Path IN25.01 – Dell Lodge – Foyers and show the proposed mitigation earthworks and planting at Dam 3. These visualisations provide a representative view of the Proposed Development from the burial mound, which is located close to the viewpoint location on this Core Path. Visibility would be of Dam 3 and some access tracks but with the implementation of the mitigation earthworks and planting proposed for Dam 3 (refer to **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Section 8.8: Mitigation**), as well as reinstatement of vegetation around the dam and tracks, the artificial skyline of the dam would be softened and the tracks would, in the longer term be assimilated into the wider landscape and for the most part, would be screened by existing tree plantings around the buildings. The house itself is considered to be sensitive only to setting impacts which intrude on the main vista to the east, both as the vista eastwards from the main elevation of the house and as a vista towards the house along the avenue approach. As far as the latter is concerned, there is virtually no point along the avenue where both the house frontage and Dam 3 would be in view together.
- 15.9.15 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above, High and the Magnitude of impact as given above would be Low. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would therefore be **Moderate/Minor**. However, an evaluation of the potential significance of an alteration to setting based on professional judgement concludes the overall significance on the setting of this designated asset would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*.

Whitebridge, New Bridge and Whitebridge, Old Bridge Over River Foyers

- 15.9.16 There should be no impacts on the setting of either of these monuments by any element of the Proposed Development, which both lie outside of the ZTV of the Proposed Development, as illustrated on **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**.
- 15.9.17 The sensitivity of these sites to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, is high and the magnitude of impact would be Negligible. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Boleskine Parish Church

- 15.9.18 There would be a very minor visibility of Dam 3 as illustrated in **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**, partially blocked by modern housing. The setting and appreciation of the building, in an open landscape with broad vistas, would be altered imperceptibly.
- 15.9.19 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets** is high but on more practical terms it would be medium and the magnitude of impact as given above would be Negligible. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Minor/Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Boleskine Old Manse

- 15.9.20 There would be a very minor visibility of Dam 3 as illustrated in **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**, mostly blocked by a screen of mature trees in the grounds of the manse. The setting and appreciation of the building, in an open landscape with the main vista of the house seen from the west, would be altered imperceptibly.
- 15.9.21 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, is high but on more practical terms it would be medium and the magnitude of impact would be Negligible. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Minor/Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Allt Saigh Cottage

- 15.9.22 As a domestic dwelling whose siting was dictated by practicalities of topography and proximity to arable ground, this building would have in effect low sensitivity to impacts on its setting by elements of the Proposed Development along the shore of Loch Ness, from which it is almost entirely screened by mature trees.
- 15.9.23 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, high but on more practical terms it would be medium and the magnitude of impact as given above would be negligible. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Minor/Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Invermoriston, Home Farm and Former Barn to Rear

- 15.9.24 Originally built as an industrial site whose setting was dictated by proximity to population and transport and now as a working farm, the setting of the building has in effect a low degree of sensitivity to the elements of the Proposed Development on the opposite shore of Loch Ness which would be partially visible at a distance of over 2 km.
- 15.9.25 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, high but on more practical terms it would be medium and the magnitude of impact as given above would be low. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Moderate/Minor**. However, professional judgement has been used to determine the level of significance on this asset would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*.

Wider Study Area*Invermoriston Barracks and servants' tunnel*

- 15.9.26 These buildings are screened from any setting impacts by the modern Invermoriston Lodge.
- 15.9.27 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, high and the magnitude of impact as given above is Negligible. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Minor/Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Caledonian Canal, Kyltra Lock To Fort Augustus, Fort Augustus, Old Bridge over River Oich, Fort Augustus Abbey, Monastery and School

- 15.9.28 Although all of these sites are within or adjacent to Loch Ness, their distance from the Proposed Development is approximately 10 km and visibility of any built elements of the Proposed Development along the shore of Loch Ness and rising to the higher ground are likely to be indistinct.
- 15.9.29 The sensitivity of these sites to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, high but is on more practical terms medium and the magnitude of impact as given above is low. The significance of this effect, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Moderate/Minor** However, professional judgement has been used to determine, given the distance of these assets from the Proposed Development, that the level of significance on these assets would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant* (see **Volume 3b, Figures 7a-c: Visualisation Location 7: Fort Augustus Shore** for a representative view of the location of the Proposed Development from Fort Augustus).

Crusader', Remains of Speedboat in Loch Ness, Near Achnahannet

- 15.9.30 This Scheduled Monument is a speedboat wreck located at the bottom of Loch Ness, approximately 10 km northeast of the Proposed Development. Although this site is within the ZTV on **Volume 2, Figure 15.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area with ZTV**, given it is underwater, no visibility of any built elements of the Proposed Development would be visible from this site.
- 15.9.31 The sensitivity of this site to setting impacts is, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets**, high but in more practical terms, given that the site is underwater, would be low and the magnitude of impact would be Negligible. The significance of this impact, according to criteria given above in **Table 15.4: Significance of Effect** would be **Negligible** and therefore *not significant*.

Potential Cumulative EffectsDell Lodge and Rear Service Cottages

- 15.9.32 Potential cumulative settings effects from the construction of the proposed on-site 275 kV switching station, and associated track and cable would have a negligible impact on the setting of Dell Lodge, as these developments would be screened by existing tree plantings around the buildings. The house itself is considered to be sensitive only to impacts which intrude into its setting, either into the vista eastwards from the main elevation of the house or into the vista west towards the house along the avenue approach. As far as the latter is concerned, there is virtually no point along the avenue where both the house frontage, Dam 3 and the proposed switching station would be in view together. The

setting of the house in an open landscape of farmland with adjacent farm buildings and distant hills, would barely be altered.

Dell Farm Burial Mounds

- 15.9.33 Potential cumulative settings effects from the construction of the proposed on-site 275 kV switching station, and associated track and cable would have a negligible impact on the setting of Dell burial mounds as they would not intrude on the significant vistas to or from the monument and would have a minimal impact on its setting.

Other Statutory designations

- 15.9.34 Potential cumulative effects from the construction of the proposed on-site 275 kV switching station or any other proposed or consented development in the surrounding area (as shown on **Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Site Context**) are not predicted for the other statutory designations considered in this evaluation, as setting impacts would be negligible.

15.10 Mitigation

Mitigation During Construction

- 15.10.1 Mitigation is recommended for one non-statutory Cultural Heritage asset during construction:

Loch a'Choin Uire group of buildings

- 15.10.2 There is the possibility of direct impact through track improvement and the construction of a new section of access road to the site of a cable shaft. Recommended mitigation would be identification of individual features to ensure the proposed new access road can avoid them and the creation of archaeological exclusion zones during groundbreaking work. Depending on the proximity of the new access road to the structure and on the location of any road widening within the broad area of the features, an archaeological watching brief may be advisable in order to identify and record any associated minor features.

General Mitigation

Micrositing and Preservation in Situ

- 15.10.3 Any identified heritage asset or feature that falls within or close to a revised working area or access route would be marked out and avoided. Should micro-siting of any elements of the Proposed Development be required, associated infrastructure, including forestry felling works, would be located away from heritage assets where possible.
- 15.10.4 Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, ground-breaking works at dam positions, and construction access tracks, as far as reasonably practicable. This would be achieved through marking out the locations of assets to be avoided using high visibility markers placed a minimum of 2 m from the outermost edge of the identified features but noting that some assets may require a larger protection buffer. It may also be appropriate to employ tracking mats over earthworks and to define access corridors so as to minimise disturbance to linear features such as field boundary banks and tracks.
- 15.10.5 Known heritage assets and archaeologically sensitive areas, would not be used for storage of material or as parking areas for vehicles or machinery.

15.10.6 Where linear assets survive as upstanding features, existing access tracks would be used where possible to provide access through these structures. If this is not possible, disturbance to these features would be kept to the minimum necessary to facilitate the Proposed Development, to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact. In the case of upstanding drystone walls breached to facilitate access, these would be made good upon completion of the works using traditional drystone walling techniques. Construction contractors would be made aware of the need to avoid these assets during construction works and any markers would be removed upon completion of the Proposed Development.

Watching Briefs

15.10.7 The Applicant would seek to agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with THC in advance of development works (e.g., forestry felling activity and construction phase). The scope of the agreed works would be confirmed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be signed-off prior to commencement of work on-site, including any required enabling works.

15.10.8 Where buried features are encountered during archaeological monitoring of groundworks, further mitigation may be required to the approval of THC. The preferred mitigation will be preservation in situ.

15.10.9 Where topsoil removal is required for the purposes of constructing access tracks or establishing working areas, preservation of any exposed archaeological deposits could be achieved by recording the locations and extents of any features identified and retaining them unexcavated beneath a geotextile membrane placed on the subsoil surface and beneath the track or compound make up layer.

15.10.10 Where disturbance of the features is unavoidable, allowance will be made for the full or partial excavation of any features encountered to a scheme to be agreed with THC under the terms of the WSI. Costs of excavation and potential post-excavation work will be clearly set out and agreed with THC in advance and would be paid for by the Applicant.

Post-Excavation Assessment and Reporting

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

Construction Guidelines

15.10.12 Written guidelines will be set out in the WSI, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines will set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional support if buried archaeological features of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc.) should be discovered during any construction activities.

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

Mitigation during Operation

- 15.10.14 No specific mitigation measures are proposed during the operation phase of the Proposed Development. However the mitigation earthworks and planting proposed for Dam 3 (refer to **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Section 8.8 Mitigation**), as well as reinstatement of vegetation around the dam and tracks would become established within the first 10 years of operation and would soften the artificial skyline of the dam and the tracks would, in the longer term, be assimilated into the wider landscape, leading to reduced settings effects the Dell Lodge and rear service cottages and the Dell Farm Burial Mound. For the latter, this can be illustrated by the visualisations presented in **Volume 3a, Figures 3a-3g** and **Volume 3b, Figures 3a-3n** of the EIA Report.

15.11 Residual Effects

- 15.11.1 This section describes the predicted residual effects and associated effect significance of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development, following the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in **Section 15.10**.

Residual Construction Effects

- 15.11.2 Direct impacts were predicted for one non-designated cultural heritage asset; the Loch a'Choin Uire building group. In the absence of mitigation, the predicted effects from construction of the Proposed Development on this asset would be anticipated to be **Moderate** and therefore *significant*. These impacts would be limited to accidental damage during the construction phase on indistinct or associated buried features.
- 15.11.3 No significant indirect impacts were predicted on any designated cultural heritage asset within the Outer Study Area.
- 15.11.4 Using a combination of guideline criteria and professional judgement, it is anticipated that following the implementation of the mitigation measures set out in **Section 15.10** of this Chapter at construction stage, it is anticipated that all effects from the Proposed Development on the nearby Lochan a'Choin Uire building group, would be **Minor** and therefore *not significant*.
- 15.11.5 Although no other significant adverse effects are anticipated on other cultural heritage assets, using a combination of guideline criteria and professional judgement, it is anticipated that following the implementation of the general mitigation measures set out in **Section 15.10** of this Chapter, it is anticipated that all effects from the Proposed Development on nearby heritage features would be further reduced.

15.12 Conclusion

- 15.12.1 This Chapter provides the results of an assessment of the predicted impact of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets and archaeological features. A desk-based assessment and walkover field survey has been carried out to assess the effects on archaeology and cultural heritage interests associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
- 15.12.2 Three non-designated assets were identified within a 100 m buffer of the Proposed Development; one of local and two of regional value. Direct impacts through inundation are predicted for the site of local significance during operation and potential direct impacts through widening or construction

- of access roads are predicted on minor features associated with one site of regional value. However, the potential for unidentified archaeological remains is considered to be low to negligible. Mitigation to protect the archaeological record is recommended for one site during the construction phase as well as general mitigation. Following the implementation of these mitigation measures, no significant direct effects on cultural heritage assets are predicted.
- 15.12.3 Within a 3 km outer study area a total of thirteen designated assets were identified, consisting of one scheduled monument and twelve listed buildings. A further thirty-nine designated sites, consisting of four scheduled monuments and thirty-five listed buildings at a distance of 10 km were also considered. Of the designated assets within the 3 km study area, the scheduled monument (Dell Farm, Burial Mound) and one Category B listed building (Dell Lodge and Rear Service Cottages) are considered vulnerable to an adverse alteration to their setting, however the potential impacts would be considered not significant when existing screening and the implementation of proposed landscape earthworks and planting at Dam 3 is considered.
- 15.12.4 All of the designated assets within the 10 km study area have been eliminated from further consideration as for the majority of these assets there is no visibility of any elements of the Proposed Development. Minor, distant visibility affects only a very few of these assets, at a distance of 10 km and to such a small degree that there would be no significant impact on these assets or their settings. One Scheduled Monument and three listed buildings at Fort Augustus are considered to have the potential for there to be visibility of some elements of the Proposed Development, however these are located approximately 10 km away. At this distance, potential impacts would be to such a small degree that there would be no significant impact on these assets or their settings.
- 15.12.5 The conclusion of this evaluation of potential impacts on designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets is that the potential for direct impacts would be low and could be mitigated by the recommended actions during the construction phase. Potential impacts and alterations to the settings of designated assets would be considered to be minor to insignificant.