10. Cultural Heritage

Executive Summary

The Cultural Heritage chapter considers the likely effects on cultural heritage interests arising from the Proposed Development. The assessment has been undertaken by CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA).

A desk-based assessment and field survey, informed by information provided by Historic Environment Scotland (HES), Stirling Council Archaeology Service (SCAS) and Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT), have been carried out to establish the cultural heritage baseline, within the Proposed Development Site (Inner Study Area, **Figure 10.1, EIAR Volume 2**) and the wider landscape (Outer Study Area).

The baseline assessment has established that there are 84 assets within the Inner Study Area Zones and that there would be direct construction impacts on up to 12 of these assets. In addition, 17 other heritage assets lie within the micrositing allowance and could be affected by any micrositing of the proposed layout. In the absence of mitigation, eleven of these construction impacts are assessed as **significant** in EIA terms.

Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid, reduce, or offset the predicted effects. No residual effects of more than 'minor significance' (**not significant** in EIA terms) have been identified.

An assessment of the identified heritage assets, and consideration of the current and past land use, within the Inner Study Area, suggests that there is a low likelihood of hitherto unidentified archaeological remains of prehistoric or medieval/post-medieval date being present across the majority of the Inner Study Area. Given the limited land take required by the separate elements of the Proposed Development within areas of increased potential, such as at the mouth of the Beich Burn, it is considered that the potential for further archaeological discoveries is low. Mitigation measures are proposed to address the possibility of direct effects on buried archaeological remains.

Within 10 km from the outermost turbines there are 20 Scheduled Monuments, five Category A Listed Buildings, 28 Category B Listed Buildings, two Conservation Areas, and two Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes. Following consultation with HES, two additional Scheduled Monuments which lie within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and beyond 10 km from the outermost turbines have been included in the assessment. Within 5 km from the outermost turbines there are seven Category C Listed Buildings.

It is assessed that the settings of designated assets would not be significantly adversely affected by the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

The potential effect of the Proposed Development, both individually and cumulatively, in combination with other wind farm developments within 10 km of the outermost turbines has been considered. **No significant residual cumulative effects** on the setting of any heritage assets would arise from addition of the Proposed Development to a baseline including consented and proposed developments.

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 This chapter considers the likely significant effects on cultural heritage (historic environment sites and features, archaeology and built heritage) associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The specific objectives of the chapter are to:

- describe the cultural heritage baseline within and in the vicinity of the Proposed Development red line boundary (the Site);
- assess the Site in terms of its archaeological potential;
- describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the impact assessment;
- describe the potential effects, including direct, indirect, and cumulative effects;
- describe the mitigation measures proposed to address likely significant effects; and
- assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation.

10.1.2 The assessment has been carried out by Oliver Rusk MA (Cantab) MLitt ACIfA of CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA) based in Musselburgh, East Lothian, a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). Mr Rusk is a Consultant with CFA with eight years post-graduate experience as an archaeologist and is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ACIfA).

10.1.3 This Chapter is supported by the Figures (**EIAR Volume 2**), Visualisations (**EIAR Volume 3**), and Technical Appendices (TAs) (**EIAR Volume 4**) listed in **Table 10.1,** which are referenced throughout the Chapter.

Table 10-1: Supporting Figures and Technical Appendices

Document Location	Document Description
Figure 10.1: Cultural Heritage: Inner Study Area	Constraints figure showing cultural heritage assets within the Site boundary.
Figure 10.2: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area	Figure showing the locations of designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, along with the ZTV model and cumulative developments.
Figures 10.3 – 10.6: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints	Visualisations from sensitive receptors within the Outer Study Area, showing the Proposed Development in addition to cumulative developments.
Technical Appendix 10.1: Assessment Methodology	Appendix detailing the methodology of the cultural heritage assessment.
Technical Appendix 10.2: Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area	Gazetteer of heritage assets within the Site, including tabulated assessment of potential impacts and significance of effects.
Technical Appendix 10.3: Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area	Gazetteer of designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, including tabulated assessment of potential effects on their settings.

10.2 Assessment Methodology and Significance criteria

Scope of Assessment

10.2.1 The assessment of cultural heritage impacts of the Proposed Development has been undertaken in accordance with the 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK' (IEMA 2021), the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 'Code of Conduct' (CIfA 2014, updated 2022) and 'Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment' (CIfA 2017), and with reference to the relevant statutory and planning framework for cultural heritage. It considers the following main potential

impacts upon cultural heritage receptors associated with construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development:

- Direct and indirect effects on non-designated cultural heritage sites or features within the Site.
- Impacts on the settings of cultural heritage assets with statutory and non-statutory designations within 10 kilometres (km) of the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. Scheduled Monuments, Category A and B Listed Buildings, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes and Conservation Areas, where present within the blade tip height ZTV and within 10 km of the outermost turbines, are included in the assessment. Category C Listed buildings are considered where present within 5 km of the outermost turbines.
- Cumulative operational effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with other wind farms that are either operational, consented, under construction or at the application stage.

10.2.2 For effects scoped out, see Paragraph 10.2.9.

10.2.3 The assessment is based on the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 2: Development Description (EIAR Volume 2)**.

10.2.4 The scope of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses summarised in **Table 10-2** and the following key legislation, planning policy and guidance:

Legislation

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011);
- Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013; and
- Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

Planning Policies

- National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4) (2023);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (2019a);
- Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Local Development Plan (2017);
- Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2 (Perth and Kinross Council 2019); and
- Stirling Local Development Plan (Stirling Council 2018).

Guidance

- Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and HES, 2018, version 5);
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, 2014, updated 2020);
- Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment (CIfA, 2014, updated 2020);
- Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (CIFA, 2014, revised October 2022)
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (IEMA, IHBC & CIfA 2021);
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019b);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2016); and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2/2011).

10.2.5 Relevant policies for cultural heritage interests in the Local Development Plans applicable in the case of the Proposed Development are:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Local Development Plan:

- Historic Environment Policy 1: Listed Buildings;
- Historic Environment Policy 2: Conservation Areas;
- Historic Environment Policy 5: Scheduled Monuments; and
- Planning Guidance: Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2:

- Policy 26: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology;
- Policy 27: Listed Buildings;
- Policy 28: Conservation Areas;
- Policy 29: Gardens and Designed Landscapes; and
- Policy 31: Other Historic Environment Assets.

Stirling Local Development Plan:

- Policy 7.1: Archaeology and Historic Building Recording (designated and undesignated buildings sites);
- Policy 7.2: Development within and outwith Conservation Areas;
- Policy 7.3: Development affecting Listed Buildings; and
- Policy 7.8: Development affecting Battlefields, Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

10.2.6 Additional guidance relevant to cultural heritage is provided in Supplementary Guidance: Wind Energy Developments (Stirling Council 2019).

Consultation

10.2.7 In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the scoping responses and other consultation as undertaken with HES, Stirling Council Archaeology Service (SCAS) and Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT). **Table 10-2** summarises the consultation undertaken throughout the EIAR process, including Scoping and further pre-application consultation, relevant to cultural heritage.

Table 10-2: Consultation Responses

Organisation and Type of Consultation	Response	How Response has been Considered
PKHT (22/02/2023) Scoping Response	Agreed that the proposed Study Areas are appropriate and that the proposed assessment methodology is acceptable.	Noted. The methodology for the assessment, including field survey, is detailed in **TA 10.1: Assessment Methodology (EIAR Volume 4)**.
	Content that the key potential setting impacts have been identified.	Noted. Assessment of the potential impact on the settings of designated heritage assets is included in **Section 10.6**.
SCAS (13/01/2023) Scoping Response	Content with the methodology of the assessment. Recommended a more detailed scope of walkover field survey, paying particular attention to bedrock and boulders for potential rock art.	Noted. The methodology for the assessment, including field survey, is detailed in **Section 10.2** and **TA 10.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

Table 10-2: Consultation Responses

Organisation and Type of Consultation	Response	How Response has been Considered
HES (30/01/2023) Scoping Response	Recommended a large-scale map be produced as part of EIA assessment, indicating designated heritage assets that lie within the ZTV.	Noted. **Figure 10.2 (EIAR Volume 2)** shows designated assets along with the ZTV for the Proposed Development
	Consideration should be made to potential impacts where turbines might be visible in views towards heritage assets.	Noted. The assessment methodology is detailed in **TA 10.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**.
	Agreed that those assets most sensitive to potential setting impacts are Dundurn Fort (SM 2885) and St Blane's Chapel (SM 5434). Recommended wireline and photomontage visualisations for these assets.	Noted. Further consultation on visualisations to accompany the assessment is detailed below.
	Advised that three Scheduled Monuments lie within the ZTV beyond 10 km from the Proposed Development and should be included in the assessment: SM 1501, SM 1589 and SM 4435.	Noted. Detailed assessments of the potential impact on Balmuick stone circle (SM 1501) and Edinchip chambered cairn (SM 4435) are included in **Section 10.5: Operational Impacts**. Wester Tullybannocher, stone circle (SM 1589) lies within 10 km of the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development and is included in the tabulated assessment in **TA 10.3 (EIAR Volume 4)**. There is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Development from the location of the asset or the vicinity, based on the finalised ZTV.
HES (30/04/2024) Viewpoint and Visualisations Consultation	Content that wirelines are sufficient to demonstrate likely setting impacts on designated heritage assets.	Noted. Visualisations agreed to illustrate the detailed assessments are included in **Figures 10.3-10.6 (EIAR Volume 2)** and listed in **TA 10.3 (EIAR Volume 4)**.
	Content that no visualisations will be provided for A-listed buildings, GDLs or CAs. Satisfied with the conclusion that intervening topography affords sufficient "distance and separation" as to not detract from the setting of these assets.	Noted. A tabulated summary of the predicted setting impacts on designated assets in the Outer Study Area is provided in **TA 10.3 (EIAR Volume 4)**.

10.2.8 Full details of all consultation undertaken is provided in **TA 1.2: Consultation Register (EIAR Volume 4**).

Potential Effects Scoped Out

10.2.9 On the basis of the desk based and field survey work undertaken, the professional judgement of the EIA team, experience from other relevant projects and policy guidance or standards, and feedback received from consultees, the following effects areas have been 'scoped out' of detailed assessment, as proposed in the EIA Scoping Report:

- Listed Buildings (LB) within built settings in St Fillans and Killin are scoped-out of assessment as these all have localised settings defined by their surrounding townscapes and their place within the built environment of their respective Conservation Areas. Most lie outside the Proposed Development ZTV.

- Impacts on setting of cultural heritage assets during construction, as these would be temporary for the duration of construction phase.
- Direct impacts on cultural heritage assets during operation; none are likely to occur given that the as-built layout and access would be used for activities during operation.

Method of Baseline Characterisation

Extent of the Study Area

10.2.10 Two Study Areas were used for the assessment:

- The Inner Study Area (**Figure 10.1, EIAR Volume 2**): the Proposed Development red line boundary (the Site) forms the Study Area for the identification of heritage assets that could receive direct impacts arising from the construction of the Proposed Development. The current land-use of this area is as rough upland pasture and moorland. **Figure 10.1** shows the Site boundary, the Proposed Development layout and the locations of heritage assets identified and described in the gazetteer (**TA 10.2, EIAR Volume 4**).
- The Outer Study Area (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**): a 10 km Study Area, extending from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development, was used for the identification of cultural heritage assets whose settings may be affected by the Proposed Development (including cumulative effects). **Figure 10.2** shows the Proposed Development, together with the blade tip height Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and the location of heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. Lists of these heritage assets are provided in **TA 10.3 (EIAR Volume 4**), which also provide tabulated summary assessments of the predicted effect on their settings on a case-by-case.

10.2.11 Assessment of cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets has also been undertaken, employing the 10 km Study Area. **Figure 10.2** shows the Proposed Development in its wider landscape context, together with the blade tip height ZTV, the locations of the heritage assets within 10 km of the outermost turbines which have theoretical visibility of one or more turbines of the Proposed Development and that are included in the assessment, and the locations of other wind energy development within 10 km. The cumulative schemes included in the assessment are illustrated in **Figure 5.15 (EIAR Volume 2**).

Desk Study

10.2.12 The following information sources were consulted as part of the desk-based assessment work:

- Perth and Kinross and Stirling Council Historic Environment Records (HER): for a digital database extract for all assets within the Inner Study Area.
- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) (HES 2024a): for any information additional to that contained in the HER.
- HES Spatial Data Warehouse (HES 2024b): for up-to-date data on the locations and extents of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes and Inventory Historic Battlefields.
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES 2024c): for information on the historic land use character of the Site and the surrounding area.
- National Library of Scotland Map Library: for Ordnance Survey maps (principally 1st and 2nd editions) and other historical map resources.
- Modern aerial photographs available through Google Earth and Bing Maps.

- Scottish Remote Sensing Portal (Scottish Government 2024): for 1 m DTM[1] Lidar data (where available) covering the Inner Study Area.
- Relevant bibliographic references and on-line historic resources were consulted to provide background and historic information.

Outer Study Area

10.2.13 Up-to-date information was obtained from HES on statutory and non-statutory designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area.

10.2.14 The blade tip and hub height ZTVs generated for the Proposed Development were utilised to identify those designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area that would have theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

Field Survey

10.2.15 A field survey was carried out for the Inner Study Area concentrating on known heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment and those areas that lie within the micrositing allowance for the Proposed Development (i.e. in proximity to proposed access tracks, turbine locations, borrow pits and laydown/compound areas, etc).

10.2.16 The field survey was undertaken between 24 June and 5 July 2024, with the following aims:

- Assess the baseline condition of the known heritage assets identified through the desk-based assessment.
- Identify any further features of cultural heritage interest not detected through the desk-based assessment that could be affected by the Proposed Development.
- Identify areas with the potential to contain currently unrecorded buried archaeological remains.

10.2.17 No intrusive archaeological interventions have been carried out as part of this assessment. It was not possible to conduct a systematic investigation of exposed bedrock and boulders for possible prehistoric rock art, due to frequent moss cover and turf overgrowth. Exposed rock was visually inspected within the micrositing allowance as far as ground conditions allowed.

10.2.18 All data were captured electronically using a Trimble TDC600 Handheld GNSS with sub-metre accuracy. The baseline condition of identified assets were recorded on pro-forma monument recording sheets and by digital photography.

10.2.19 Site visits were also undertaken to assess the character and sensitivity of the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area. These focused on those heritage assets most likely to receive significant effects on their setting, based on the blade tip height ZTV, and those identified through consultation with HES as requiring detailed assessment.

Method of Assessment

10.2.20 The full assessment methodology, including criteria for assessing sensitivity of receptors, magnitude of change and cumulative effects, as well as overall significance criteria and approach to mitigation, is detailed in **TA 10.1: Assessment Methodology (EIAR Volume 4).**

[1] Digital Terrain Model

Limitations and Assumptions

10.2.21 The desk-based assessment draws on the records in the HER, provided in a digital geographic information system (GIS) dataset acquired in February 2024. It is assumed that those records were up to date at the time of acquisition.

10.2.22 Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**) have been identified from the HES database downloaded from the HES website in May 2024. That data is assumed to have been current and up to date at the time of acquisition.

10.3 Baseline Conditions

Current Baseline

Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area (Figure 10.1; TA 10.2)

10.3.1 Numbers in brackets in the following text refer to heritage asset numbers depicted on **Figure 10.1** (**EIAR Volume 2**) and listed in **TA 10.2 (EIAR Volume 4**).

Prehistoric

10.3.2 The locations of four cup marked rocks (**3, 10, 23** and **24**) are recorded in the HER to the north and east of Ardveich. The monuments consist of several cup marks present on rocky outcrops or boulders, situated at the southern end of Glen Beich. Field survey recorded the cup marked stones as described in the HER; one cup mark (**3**) survives in good condition while the remainder (**10**, **23** and **24**) are faint and shallow. As surviving elements of the prehistoric landscape, of probable Neolithic date, they are assessed as being of value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity.

10.3.3 Field survey identified a rock-cut hollow (**7**) atop a bedrock knoll to the east of Ardveich, surrounded by scattered stones that may indicate a robbed burial cairn. The hollow has since been used to secure a stone as a scratching post. As a possible prehistoric feature for which limited trace remains, it is assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

Medieval/Post-medieval: Farmsteads

10.3.4 The remains of a deserted settlement (**2**) are recorded in the HER at Ardveich and are situated to the east of the modern occupied farm. The head-dyke (**21**), a sheepfold (**1**) and a building (**4**), situated at the northern edge of the settlement, are given separate records in the HER. The township of Ardveich is named on Pont's 1614 map, along with Dalveich to the west. It is evidently of at least 17th century date, during which time ownership of the surrounding lands passed from the Clan Laurin to the Stewarts of Ardvorlich (Stewarts of Balquhidder 2024). The 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1867) depicts three roofed buildings, four unroofed structures, two enclosures, and a sheepfold abutting a head-dyke at Ardveich, situated to the north of an enclosed field and passed by a track (**12**) to the north, orientated southeast-northwest. By the time of the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map (1901), the seven structures are all shown as unroofed, and the enclosures and sheepfold have been removed.

10.3.5 Field survey recorded the drystone remains of fourteen buildings in moderately good condition, with a later phase indicated by construction of substantial buildings (**2l** and **2m**) atop an earlier dyke (**2j**), which had enclosed the eastern edge of the settlement in the mid-19th century. The depopulated settlement at Ardveich survives as a former farmstead that has undergone modification throughout its development

from at least the 17th century. It is considered to have heritage value at the regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

10.3.6 The remains of a settlement (**76**) situated on the south bank of the Allt Coire an Daimh, to the east of the Beich Burn, were recorded during field survey in moderate condition. They comprise eleven rectangular structures (**76a-h**, **76j-k** and **76m**) of drystone or turf and stone construction, featuring varied dimensions, indicative of phased or sustained use. They are likely to retain archaeological evidence for the development of more complex domestic and pastoral sites and are assessed as having heritage value at a regional level and to be of medium sensitivity.

Medieval/Post-medieval: Structures

10.3.7 The remains of a number of shieling sites survive within rough pasture to the east of the Beich Burn, distributed along the length of Glen Beich. Where these have been recorded as isolated features (**49**, **50**, **59**, **72**, **74** and **78a-b**) during field survey, they comprise turf and stone footings or scooped features in moderate to poor condition, atop low rises and knolls. Field survey recorded several groups of shielings (**51-57**, **61a**-**q**, **63-68**, **69a-h** and **70a-k**) situated on better-drained terraces adjacent to tributaries of the Beich Burn. An additional group (**84a-f**) is situated in the east of Glen Tarken. These groups include rectilinear structures with more substantial drystone footings, with variations in plan and construction indicative of prolonged occupation or changing use of the sites.

10.3.8 Two of the groups (**61** and **69**) comprise better preserved clustered structures that are likely to retain archaeological evidence for the development of more complex pastoral sites and are assessed as having heritage value at a regional level and to be of medium sensitivity. The remaining shieling sites, where structural remains are in poor to moderate condition, retain some archaeological potential and are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

10.3.9 The remains of a rectangular drystone building (**62**) recorded in the HER to the east of the Beich Burn, were identified in moderate condition during field survey, to the south of a group of shielings (**63-68**). As an upstanding feature of the past farming landscape contributing to the historic landscape character, they are assessed as having heritage value at a local level and to be of low sensitivity.

10.3.10 The remnants of a possible stone platform (**47**), heavily disturbed by tree planting, were noted during field survey on the west-facing slope of Glen Beich and may have functioned as a foundation for a temporary shieling hut. As a poorly preserved site of uncertain, though probable post-medieval date, it retains little heritage value and is of negligible sensitivity.

Medieval/Post-Medieval: Field Boundaries and Enclosures

10.3.11 The remains of several turf and stone dykes (**13-15**, **18-21**) are recorded in the HER and survive to the northeast of Ardveich (**2**) as low banks or intermittent lines of boulders. Field survey recorded these vestigial field boundaries in generally fair to poor condition, across the southwest-facing slope. A substantial head-dyke (**21**) forming the northern boundary of the deserted settlement (**2**), consists of a drystone wall that follows the same course with little alteration, measuring 0.7 m wide and 0.8 m high. No clear trace of an earlier bank was observed underlying the wall. Field survey recorded an additional head-dyke (**58**), comprising a line of boulders with a slight external ditch, to the east of a group of structures (**54-57**) above the Beich Burn. As the vestigial remains of historic land management associated

with the adjacent settlements, the boundaries are assessed as having heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.

10.3.12 Additional poorly preserved boundaries (**39**, **48** and **60**) were recorded during field survey, orientated roughly east-west down the slope of Glen Beich within gullies or burns. The northern boundary (**60**) comprised intermittent stone walling retaining the south bank of a burn and incorporated a ruined enclosure along its extent. As limited traces of historic land boundaries, surviving in poor condition, they retain little residual heritage value and are of negligible sensitivity.

10.3.13 Several drystone field walls (**11**, **12**, **26** and **27**) are recorded in the HER and extend along the eastern slopes of Glen Beich, from the field system at Ardveich farm. Field survey recorded the walls in good condition, though frequently bisected by modern estate tracks, measuring 1 m wide and up to 1 m high. As extensive elements of the historic farming landscape, retained by modern land-use, they are assessed to have heritage value at the local level and to be of low sensitivity.

10.3.14 Three sheepfolds (**8**, **46** and **71**) were recorded during field survey along Glen Beich. A drystone sheepfold (**46**) is depicted on the 1st and 2nd edition Ordnance Survey maps and survives in good condition, connected to the 19th century field wall (**27**) to the west. A compartmented enclosure (**8**) immediately to the north of Ardveich, is shown on the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map (1901). Field survey observed only modern fencing at the sheepfold (**8**), which appears in recent use, in common with a modern enclosure (**70**) toward the head of Glen Beich. As a well-preserved stock enclosure associated with the historic pastoral economy, the drystone sheepfold (**46**) has heritage value at a local level and low sensitivity. The other enclosures are of no residual heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

Miscellaneous

10.3.15 Several areas of field clearance (**9**, **17**, **29-38**, **40-45**) are recorded in the HER, comprising circular cairns of boulders to the north and northeast of Ardveich. They were recorded during field survey, in addition to a number of recent stone dumps (**6**) with improved pasture, and a small clearance cairn (**77**) in Glentarken. As minor features associated with post-medieval improvement of land for agriculture, they are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and of low sensitivity.

10.3.16 Four marker cairns (**73**, **75**, **81** and **83**) were recorded during field survey within Glen Tarken, comprising small mounds of loose stones probably used as shepherd's cairns. As minor elements of the historic pastoral landscape, they are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and of low sensitivity.

10.3.17 Several shooting butts (**79a-c**, **80a-b** and **82a-h**) were recorded during field survey, grouped along linear alignments within Glen Tarken. They commonly consist of U-shaped or linear walls of turf and stone, though many have been remodelled or repaired with modern wooden blinds or posts. As features collectively representative of post-medieval and modern sporting activity across the moorland, they are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and of low sensitivity.

10.3.18 An embankment (**16**) for the former Lochearnhead, St Fillans and Comrie Railway runs parallel and to the north of the A85 public road at Dalveich, now in use as a footpath. The earthwork and any surviving remains associated with the construction of the railway are assessed as being of heritage value at a local level and of low sensitivity.

10.3.19 Four additional features were observed during field survey in poor condition, related to post-medieval land-use at Dalveich. They retain little heritage value and are assessed to be of negligible sensitivity:

- Two relict tracks (**5** and **25**) surviving as intermittent hollow-ways, frequently eroded.
- One area of possible rig and furrow cultivation (**22**) recorded in the HER, identified as drainage cuts during field survey.
- One probable quarried outcrop of bedrock (**28**).

Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area (Figure 10.2; Appendix 10.3)

10.3.20 There are 64 designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, as shown on **Figure 10.2** (**EIAR Volume 2**) and detailed in **TA 10.3** (**EIAR Volume 4**).

10.3.21 Within 10 km of the outermost turbines there are:

- 20 Scheduled Monuments, of high sensitivity (14 with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Five Category A Listed Buildings, of high sensitivity (one with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- 28 Category B Listed Buildings, of medium sensitivity (six with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development);
- Two Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, of high sensitivity (one with some predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development); and
- Two Conservation Areas, of medium sensitivity (two with some predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development).

10.3.22 In addition, there are seven Category C Listed Buildings of low sensitivity, within 5 km of the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. None of these have predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development.

Historic Landscape Character

10.3.23 The Site comprises an access corridor which extends northward from the shore of Loch Earn at Ardveich for 5.5 km along the eastern slopes of Glen Beich, reaching a turbine area that encompasses the north and northeastern slopes of Glen Tarken at the head of the Glentarken Burn. With the exception of improved and semi-improved pasture fields at Ardveich, the Site comprises rugged upland moor and rough grazing with frequent rocky outcrops across the north of Glen Tarken. Managed woodland flanks the Beich Burn and recent tree planting extends up the eastern slope of Glen Beich.

10.3.24 HLAMap (HES 2024c) records that much of the Site comprises rough grazing, interspersed with isolated clusters of medieval and post-medieval shieling huts. The medieval or later settlement at Ardveich occupies the gently sloping terraces at the northern loch shore, now characterised by rectilinear fields. That assessment was borne out by the field survey which found that most of Site consists of unimproved and remote moorland.

10.3.25 Roy's 'Military Survey of Scotland' map (1747-55) shows the Site as mainly consisting of uncultivated moorland, apart from the shore of Loch Earn where the settlement of Dalveich is depicted along a road linking other townships on the north shore. Dalveich and Ardveich, to the east, are shown on Pont's 1614 map spanning the Beich Burn, indicating established agricultural settlement surrounding Loch Earn since

at least the 17th century. By the time of the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (1867), extensive enclosure and improvement is depicted throughout the lower slopes of Glen Beich, centred on farmsteads at Dalveich, Glenbeich and Wester Ardveich. Several buildings at Ardveich (**2**) are shown unroofed by that time, appearing to have largely been abandoned. Except for a narrow track running a short distance across the east of Glenbeich, no routes to the upland of Glen Tarken are shown. The 2nd edition Ordnance Survey map (1901) shows Ardveich in ruins, with its named transferred to the later steading to the west. A group of unroofed shielings is depicted near the head of the Beich Burn, by the Allt Coire an Daimh.

10.3.26 The lands surrounding Ardveich and Dalveich were the property of the Clan Laurin during the 13th century, evidenced by the fealty of 'Loarn of Ardebechey' in the Ragman Roll of 1296 (PoMS 2024[2]). These lands later passed into the ownership of the Stewarts of Ardvorlich, who settled at Dalveich from the 17th century (Stewart 1990[3]). It is evident that the pattern of land use across the Site has remained largely unchanged since the medieval period, supported by the numerous complexes of shielings identified throughout Glen Beich during field survey. Much of the Site can be characterised as remote land on the periphery of the agricultural settlement at Ardveich, utilised seasonally as pasturage for livestock with limited later use for sporting activities.

Archaeological Potential

10.3.27 No prehistoric settlement remains have been identified within the Inner Study Area, although there are four cup-marked rocks (**3, 10, 23** and **24**) recorded on the east side of the Beich Burn, within and to the north of Ardveich. Four additional cup-marked rocks are recorded in the HER to the west of the Glenbeich, indicative of activity during the Neolithic period that is concentrated where major watercourses feed Loch Earn. The natural routeway afforded by the loch shore would have made the immediate area both favourable and strategic for settlement throughout prehistory. This is exemplified by the Iron Age fort at Dundurn (SM 2885), 1 km to the southeast of St Fillans, which occupies a commanding viewpoint along the River Earn valley to the east and overlooks the western end of Loch Earn. Evidence of prehistoric activity on higher ground, away from the loch and watercourses is scarce, however.

10.3.28 The pattern and scope of land-use within the Inner Study Area in the medieval period is characterised by the deserted settlement at Ardveich (**2**) and an enclosed infield (**56** and **58**) recorded during field survey, 2.1 km to the north. The remote upland moor that comprises the rest of the Inner Study Area was isolated and unsuitable for lasting settlement, more suited to be used predominantly for grazing livestock as evidenced by established groups of shieling huts. These shieling sites are generally situated in sheltered locations within more well-draining pasture, with ready access to watercourses.

10.3.29 Little effort has been made to enclose or improve land for cultivation further to the north of Glen Beich or Glen Tarken, as indicated on historic maps and corroborated by field survey. Land use throughout the post-medieval period appears to have consisted of grazing and sporting activities, with the construction of numerous shooting butts to the north of the Glentarken Burn.

10.3.30 Based on evidence indicative of a landscape conducive to prehistoric activity of Neolithic and later date, it is assessed that there is a moderate potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological features of prehistoric date to survive close to the mouth of the Beich Burn. This potential is considered to be low to negligible across the majority of the Site, encompassing the northern half of Glen Beich and throughout

[2] People of Medieval Scotland (2024) Loan of 'Ardebechey', *PoMS, no 19011*, available online at: https://poms.ac.uk/record/person/19011/ [Accessed August 2024].

[3] Stewart, J. (1990) 'Settlements of western Perthshire: land and society north of the Highland Line, 1480 – 1851.' Edinburgh: Pentland Press.

Glen Tarken. The potential for previously unrecorded archaeology associated with the medieval and post-medieval farming landscape is considered to be moderate in the vicinity of known sites. Elsewhere, within the unimproved moorland and within areas of managed woodland, there is considered to be no more than low potential for undiscovered features of medieval or later date.

Future Baseline

10.3.31 If the Proposed Development was not to proceed, there would likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets and features that presently survive within the Site. The current land-use as improved pasture, managed woodland and rough grazing would be likely to continue and those heritage assets that survive would be subject only to natural decay and erosion processes.

Sensitive Receptors

10.3.32 A summary of identified sensitive / important cultural heritage receptors is provided within **Table 10-3.**

Table 10-3: Summary of Identified Sensitive/ Important Cultural Heritage Receptors

Receptor	Sensitivity
Scheduled Monuments up to 10 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development, in addition to two Scheduled Monuments beyond 10 km identified through consultation with HES. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.3.	High
Category A and B Listed Buildings up to 10 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.3 along with their relative sensitivities.	Medium to High
Category C Listed Buildings up to 5 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.3.	Low
Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes up to 10 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.3.	High
Conservation Areas up to 10 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.3.	Medium
Other non-designated historic environment assets within the Site. A list of these is provided in Technical Appendix 10.2 along with their relative sensitivities.	Negligible to Medium

10.4 Assessment of Likely Effects

Embedded Mitigation

10.4.1 The results of the desk-based study and field survey were digitised as GIS data showing the locations (and, where relevant, the extents) of identified heritage assets. The layout of the Proposed Development, including the positioning of the turbines and the siting of other infrastructure, was subsequently designed to avoid or minimise direct effects and minimise the effects on setting on cultural heritage assets as far as possible. The layout shown on **Figure 10.1** (**EIAR Volume 2**) therefore embeds design-based mitigation into the siting of the turbines and ancillary infrastructure.

Potential Construction Effects

10.4.2 Any ground-breaking activities associated with the construction of the Proposed Development (such as those required for turbine bases and crane hardstandings, substation, access tracks, cable routes, compounds, borrow pits, etc.) have the potential to disturb or destroy features of cultural heritage

interest within the Site. Other construction activities, such as vehicle movements, materials storage, soil and overburden storage, and landscaping, also have the potential to cause permanent and irreversible effects.

10.4.3 The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid impacts on heritage assets as far as possible (**Figure 10.1, EIAR Volume 2**), however 12 non- designated heritage assets could be directly affected by construction works associated with the Proposed Development. These are:

- The northern limit of a deserted settlement (**2**), of medium sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access route at Ardveich. Construction works for the access track could disturb the remains of one structure (**2e**) in close proximity, in addition to any surviving buried remains within the settlement. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of medium sensitivity, could be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of major significance that would be **significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- The remains of a building or enclosure (**4**), of low sensitivity, lie in close proximity to the proposed access route at Ardveich. Construction works for the access track could disturb the structural remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, could be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of moderate significance that would be **significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- A drystone field wall (**11**), of low sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access route to the north of Ardveich. Construction works for the access track would disturb a small section of the wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- A drystone field wall (**12**), of low sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access route to the north of Ardveich. Construction works for the access track would disturb a small section of the wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- An embankment for the former railway (**16**), of low sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access track to the north of the A85. Construction works for the access track would disturb a small section of the earthwork. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. No mitigation measures are recommended with regard to the predicted effect.
- The remains of a head-dyke and drystone walling (**21**), of low sensitivity, form the northern boundary of a deserted settlement at Ardveich (**2**) and are crossed by the proposed access route. Construction works for the access track would disturb a section of the boundary. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of moderate significance that would be **significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- A relict trackway (**25**), of negligible sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access route and a borrow pit area to the north of Ardveich. Construction works for the access track would disturb less well-preserved sections of the track. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of negligible sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of negligible

significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. No mitigation measures are recommended regarding the predicted effect.

- A drystone field wall (**26**), of low sensitivity, is crossed by the proposed access route to the north of Ardveich. Construction works for the access track would disturb a small section of the wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- A drystone field wall (**27**), of low sensitivity, lies immediately adjacent to the proposed access route to the north of Ardveich. Construction works for the access track would remove a section of the wall though the greater extent of the boundary would be retained. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of medium magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures to offset the predicted effect are set out **Section 10.5**.
- The remains of a low turf and stone dyke (**48**), of negligible sensitivity, are crossed by the proposed access route within open moorland. Construction works for the access track would disturb a section of the poorly preserved bank. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of negligible sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. No mitigation measures are recommended with regard to the predicted effect.
- The remains of a field wall (**60**), of negligible sensitivity, are crossed by the proposed access route within the gully of a burn. Construction works for the access track would disturb a section of the poorly preserved wall. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of negligible sensitivity, would be of low magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of negligible significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. No mitigation measures are recommended with regard to the predicted effect.
- The remains of a possible structure or marker cairn (**75**), of low sensitivity, lie within the proposed substation area. Construction works for the substation would disturb the poorly preserved remains. It is assessed that, without mitigation, the predicted impact, on an asset of low sensitivity, would be of high magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of minor significance that would be **not significant** in EIA terms. Mitigation measures are recommended with regard to the predicted effect where possible, set out in **Section 10.5**.

10.4.4 There are a further 17 sites (non-designated) within the micrositing allowance (100 m around turbine locations and 50 m around proposed infrastructure) that could be affected by any deviation from the proposed layout:

- Sheepfold (**1**) – c. 4 m from the proposed access track at Ardveich, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).
- Additional elements of Ardveich township (**2c-r**) – at least 7 m from the proposed access track at Ardveich, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of medium sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (major significance).
- Possible robbed cairn (**7**) – c. 3 m from the proposed access track at Ardveich, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).

- Cup-marked rock (**23**) – c. 38 m from the proposed access track at Ardveich, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of medium sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (major significance).
- Quarried bedrock (**28**) – c. 40 m from the proposed access track at Ardveich, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of negligible sensitivity, resulting in an effect assessed as **not significant** in EIA terms (negligible significance).
- Field clearance cairns (**29-30**, **33**, **41**, **44-45**) – at least 5 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in an effect assessed as **not significant** in EIA terms (minor significance).
- Sheepfold (**46**) – c. 7 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of medium magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in an effect assessed as **not significant** in EIA terms (minor significance).
- Shieling (**47**) – c. 15 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).
- Shieling (**50**) – c. 7 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).
- Shielings (**61p-q**) – c. 5 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of high magnitude on an element individually of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).
- Shielings (**70a** and **70f**) – c. 10 m from the proposed access track, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms (moderate significance).
- Shooting butt (**79a**) – c. 24 m from the proposed turbine base for T6, potential impact of high magnitude on an element individually of negligible sensitivity, resulting in an effect assessed as **not significant** in EIA terms (negligible significance).
- Marker cairn (**83**) – c. 47 m from the proposed turbine base for T8, potential impact of high magnitude on an asset of low sensitivity, resulting in an effect assessed as **not significant** in EIA terms (minor significance).

10.4.5 In each case, it is unlikely that micrositing would be required to the extent that the Proposed Development would impinge on these recorded remains. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are set out in **Section 10.6** to ensure that, where practical, the recorded heritage assets are avoided, and where direct impacts are unavoidable measures are in place to either minimise the direct effects or to record any assets lost as a result of construction works, where appropriate.

10.4.6 As outlined in paragraph 10.3.30 there is a moderate potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological features of prehistoric date to survive close to the mouth of the Beich Burn and for remains of medieval or later date to survive in the vicinity of known sites. Elsewhere within the Site, across the remote unimproved moorland and within areas of managed woodland, there is considered to be low to negligible potential for previously unrecorded archaeology to be encountered. Without mitigation, the predicted direct impact on assets of up to medium sensitivity, could be of high magnitude, potentially resulting in a **significant** effect in EIA terms.

10.4.7 A mitigation strategy is proposed in **Section 10.5** that would be sufficient to offset any predicted construction impacts.

Potential Operational Effects

10.4.8 The Proposed Development could result in adverse effects on the settings of cultural heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the Site. At distances greater than 10 km, it is considered that, in most instances, the Proposed Development would not appreciably alter characteristics of the settings of heritage assets that contribute to their cultural significance. Neither would it appreciably alter how a heritage asset is understood, appreciated, and experienced.

10.4.9 **TA 10.3: Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area** (**EIAR Volume 4**) contains tabulated assessments of the predicted effects on the settings of designated heritage assets with cogitation of the degree of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development, based on analysis of the bare-earth hub and blade tip height ZTVs.

10.4.10 Two designated heritage assets (listed in **TA 10.3**) beyond 10 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development, were identified in the HES scoping response as requiring consideration of potential impacts on their settings. No further assets beyond 10 km have been identified through appraisal of the blade tip height ZTV that require consideration of potential impacts on their settings.

10.4.11 The assessment of operational effects on the settings of heritage assets has been carried out with reference to the layout of the Proposed Development and the locations of the heritage assets shown on **Figure 10.2** (**EIAR Volume 2**). The methodology detailed in **TA 10.1** (**EIAR Volume 4**) has been used to assess the nature and magnitude of the effects which are set out in tabulated summary form in **TA 10.3** (**EIAR Volume 4**).

10.4.12 The tabulated assessment (**TA 10.3**) has resulted in the identification of **no significant effects** (in EIA terms) on the settings of designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area.

- **Minor** significance effects have been predicted for two Scheduled Monuments and one Category B Listed Building.
- **Negligible** significance effects have been predicted for 14 Scheduled Monuments, two Category A Listed Buildings, one Category B Listed Building, and two Conservation Areas.

10.4.13 The assessments below and in **TA 10.3** are supported with cultural heritage wireline visualisations (**Figures 10.3-10.7, EIAR Volume 3**) as agreed through post-scoping consultation with HES.

*Dundurn Fort, Fort St Fillan's Hill (SM 2885) (**Figure 10.3: CHVP1, EIAR Volume 3**)*

10.4.14 The remains of an early medieval hillfort are situated on a prominent and isolated knoll, rising from the floodplain of western Strathearn. The fort occupies a strategic position on a major routeway, dominating the former border between Scottish Dalriada and southern Pictland and separating the narrow valley of Loch Earn to the west from vast cultivable lands to the east. The key aspect of its defensive setting is communicated in the commanding views of lower ground along the River Earn attainable from the fort to the northwest and north, in addition to distant views to the east into the heart of Strathearn. Views to the north and south are constrained by the topography of the valley slopes, which also obstruct visibility of Loch Earn to the west. The fort is a prominent feature in views throughout the local landscape, when moving along the A85 and in reciprocal views from the site of an early medieval burial ground at St Fillan's chapel (LB 5298), which holds an ecclesiastical association with Dundurn, also named St Fillan's Hill. The fort is a Scheduled Monument, an asset of heritage value at a national level and of high sensitivity.

10.4.15 The bare-earth ZTV (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**) indicates that there would be visibility of five turbines of the Proposed Development in the view to the northwest from the fort, at distances greater than 5.1 km. The wireline visualisation (**Figure 10.3, EIAR Volume 3**) demonstrates that five tips and one hub would be visible in this view, seen above the skyline and largely screened by intervening topography. The Proposed Development would be visible beyond the immediate landscape of the Earn valley and would not obstruct visibility of the surrounding low-lying ground or interrupt reciprocal views of St Fillan's chapel. The proposed turbines would not appear in the backdrop of any key views towards Dundurn, such as are attainable from the east or from the northwest. Visibility of the Proposed Development would be generally limited to views from the hill itself, with no visibility predicted from the floodplain to the north or along the A85 public road.

10.4.16 The Proposed Development would add an industrial element to the otherwise agricultural and natural landscape in the view to the northwest from atop Dundurn. However, visibility of the proposed turbines from the monument would not significantly detract from the commanding views of the surrounding valley floor or obscure the association with St Fillan's chapel. Intervening topography would provide a sense of separation of the proposed turbines from the Earn valley, such that the Proposed Development would not appreciably diminish the integrity of the fort's defensive setting. Views from the monument in other directions and views towards the fort would be unaltered, and it would remain possible for visitors to understand, appreciate and experience the fort in its strategic position within Strathearn.

10.4.17 Overall, it is assessed that the change to the baseline setting would have an impact of low magnitude on the setting of the fort, an asset of high sensitivity, and give rise to an effect assessed as being of minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

*St Blane's Chapel (SM 5434) (**Figure 10.4: CHVP2, EIAR Volume 3**)*

10.4.18 The stone footings of a medieval chapel, potentially occupying an earlier prehistoric site, are situated on the southern shore at the west end of Loch Earn. The ruins have a low-lying position which, in the absence of woodland overgrowth, affords open views along the loch to the east and through Glen Ogle to the northwest. Views in other directions are significantly constrained by the upper slopes of the Earn valley and rising topography in the foreground to the south. St Blane's Chapel is not a prominent feature in the landscape due to its low elevation and its location is most readily visible from the opposing shoreline, at Lochearnhead to the northwest and north. The remains are a Scheduled Monument, an asset of heritage value at a national level and of high sensitivity.

10.4.19 The bare-earth ZTV (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**) indicates that there would be visibility of one turbine of the Proposed Development in the view to the northeast from the monument, at a distance of 8.5 km. The wireline visualisation (**Figure 10.4, EIAR Volume 3**) demonstrates that one turbine tip would be marginally visible in this view, seen above the skyline and almost entirely largely screened by the intervening topography of Glen Beich. Views in other directions from the monument would be unaltered and there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development in key views from settlement and historic landmarks along the shore of Loch Earn, from the northwest or from Edinample Castle (LB 4198) to the southeast. Visibility of the Proposed Development would be further minimised by the screening effect of surrounding woodland and the enclosing valley slopes, which direct views along Loch Earn.

10.4.20 The Proposed Development would constitute a minimal alteration to the view to the northeast from the monument, positioned beyond the topography of the immediate valley. Distant views beyond the valley

are not a key aspect of the setting of St Blane's Chapel, which is positioned to take in views of the west end of Loch Earn and along the valley to the east. The Proposed Development would not noticeably alter the character of key views to and from the monument or detract from the principal focus of its lochside setting. It would remain possible for visitors to understand, appreciate and experience the monument in open vistas along and across Loch Earn, such that the integrity of the valley setting would not be diminished.

10.4.21 Overall, it is assessed that the change to the baseline setting would have an impact of negligible magnitude on the setting of St Blane's Chapel, an asset of high sensitivity, and give rise to an effect assessed as being of negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

*Edinchip, chambered cairn (SM 4435) (**Figure 10.5: CHVP3, EIAR Volume 3**)*

10.4.22 The remains of a Clyde-type long chambered cairn, of Neolithic date, are situated on a southeast-facing slope to the south of Glen Kendrum, orientated east-northeast to west-southwest. The principal views from the monument are directed by the topography of the valley towards Strathyre, to the southwest and towards Loch Earn, to the northeast. In the absence of enclosing woodland, the monument overlooks the routeway from Strathyre to Strathearn from a slightly elevated position to the northwest of the modern A84. The placement of the monument in relation to open views along this route, guided by the position of interlocking spurs on the skyline, may form a key aspect of its setting. The chambered cairn is not a prominent feature when viewed from the surrounding landscape, backdropped against the wooded slope and obscured by a modern railway embankment which lies immediately to the east. The cairn is a Scheduled Monument, an asset of heritage value at a national level and of high sensitivity.

10.4.23 The bare-earth ZTV (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**) indicates that there would be visibility of four turbines of the Proposed Development in the view to the northeast from the monument. The wireline visualisation (**Figure 10.5, EIAR Volume 3**) demonstrates that four tips and no hubs would be visible above the skyline and beyond the valley of Glen Beich, at distances greater than 11 km from the monument. Where visible, the proposed turbines would be almost entirely screened by the intervening topography. The turbines would appear substantially lower than the immediately adjacent topography, reducing their prominence on the skyline. Visibility of the Proposed Development in this view would be further reduced by the screening effect of woodland and a railway embankment in the foreground. Views towards the monument and throughout the adjacent valleys would be uninterrupted.

10.4.24 The Proposed Development would constitute a minor alteration to the skyline in the view to the northeast from the monument, seen beyond the topography of the Earn valley landscape. The proposed turbines would not be prominent in this view, screened by the valley slopes and situated low on the skyline beneath the dominant hills. As such, they would not detract from visibility of key landforms towards and across Loch Earn. The Proposed Development would not alter views in other directions and views of and across the monument, throughout the adjacent valleys to the northeast and southwest, would be uninterrupted. The integrity of the open valley setting of the cairn would be retained and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the monument and its position in the landscape would not be diminished.

10.4.25 Overall, it is assessed that the change to the baseline setting would have an impact of negligible magnitude on the setting of the cairn, an asset of high sensitivity, and give rise to an effect assessed as being of negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

*Balmuick, stone circle 1600 m ENE of (SM 1501) (**Figure 10.6: CHVP4, EIAR Volume 3**)*

10.4.26 The remains of a stone circle of Neolithic or Bronze Age date, comprising a standing stone and several fallen slabs, are situated atop a small hill to the east of Glen Lednock. The hilltop position provides panoramic views taking in the floodplain of the River Earn to the south, the upper valley slopes to the north, and views along Glen Lednock to the west. The predominant vista to the southeast affords distant views across the heart of Strathearn to the Ochil Hills beyond, forming a key aspect of the monument's setting. The stone circle does not occupy a prominent position in the landscape and is frequently backdropped by topography in views towards the monument, though it forms part of the skyline in the view from the west, from the mouth of Glen Lednock. Intervening topography precludes intervisibility with prehistoric monuments on the River Earn valley floor, at Kindrochet (SM 1555) and Wester Tullybannocher (SM 1589). The stone circle is a Scheduled Monument, an asset of heritage value at a national level and of high sensitivity.

10.4.27 The bare-earth ZTV (**Figure 10.2, EIAR Volume 2**) indicates that there would be visibility of eight turbines of the Proposed Development in the view to the west-northwest from the monument. The wireline visualisation (**Figure 10.6, EIAR Volume 3**) demonstrates that eight tips and three hubs would be visible beyond the skyline, at distances greater than 10.7 km. At least two turbines would be seen above the immediately adjacent topography, with the remainder sited low along the skyline beyond Glen Lednock. Intervening topography would screen the majority of the proposed turbines from view. The Proposed Development would not obstruct or interrupt visibility of the valley landscape and would not alter views in other directions. The proposed turbines would not be visible in the backdrop of views towards the monument, including those most readily attainable from within Glen Lednock.

10.4.28 The Proposed Development would introduce wind development in a narrow arc of the view to the west-northwest, beyond the topography of Glen Lednock. This would constitute an alteration of the skyline in the distant exterior view from the monument. However, visibility of the proposed turbines would not interrupt or detract from open views along and across the neighbouring valleys. The proposed turbines would not appreciably adversely affect the panoramic views attainable from the hilltop and key views from the monument to the southeast across Strathearn, would be unaffected. The prominence of the hilltop as a landmark seen from Glen Lednock would be undiminished and it would remain possible for visitors to understand, appreciate and experience the stone circle in its elevated position, such that the integrity of its open setting would be retained.

10.4.29 Overall, it is assessed that the change to the baseline setting would have an impact of low magnitude on the setting of the stone circle, an asset of high sensitivity, and give rise to an effect assessed as being of minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

Potential Decommissioning Effects

10.4.30 Any ground-breaking activities, or other activities, such as vehicle movements, soil and overburden storage and landscaping, associated with the decommissioning of the Proposed Development have the potential to cause direct, permanent, and irreversible impacts on the cultural heritage. The likelihood of direct impacts is similar to that expected during construction but likely to be less significant presuming that the built infrastructure is used to facilitate decommissioning and removal of the components from the Site.

10.4.31 A total of ten previously recorded and identified assets (**1**, **2d-e**, **2j**, **4**, **7**, **41**, **44**, **45**, **46**, **50** and **70f**) lie within 15 m of the proposed infrastructure and access tracks and could potentially receive significant direct effects arising from decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

10.4.32 There are no other assets likely to receive a significant direct effect arising from decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

10.4.33 Decommissioning of the Proposed Development would remove the operational effects (impact on their setting) on heritage assets.

Potential Cumulative Construction Effects

10.4.34 Cumulative construction effects arise from the Proposed Development in combination with developments that have the potential to impact the same heritage assets. There are no cumulative developments that have footprints within the area for potential direct effects from construction of the Proposed Development. As such, construction of the Proposed Development would not give rise to any cumulative adverse effects on cultural heritage assets.

Potential Cumulative Operational Effects

10.4.35 **Figure 10.2** (**EIAR Volume 2**) shows the Proposed Development, along with the locations of other operational/under construction wind farms and those that are consented, in-scoping or at the application (in planning) stage, together with those cultural heritage assets that are within the Outer Study Area.

10.4.36 Developments that are operational or under construction are considered to form part of the baseline setting and are considered in the context of the assessment above.

10.4.37 Based on professional judgement, one cumulative scheme: the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm, is most likely, in combination with the Proposed Development, to have a cumulative effect on heritage assets within the Outer Study Area. Other cumulative developments lie at distances greater than 15 km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. No designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area have been identified as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development, in combination with any cumulative developments more than 10 km from the Site.

10.4.38 Where visible from the designated heritage assets described above (paragraphs 10.4.14-10.4.29), the cumulative developments are shown on the wirelines provided to support the assessment (**Figures 10.3-10.6, EIAR Volume 3**).

Dundurn Fort, Fort St Fillan's Hill (SM 2885) (Figure 10.3: CHVP1)

10.4.39 **Figure 10.3** (**EIAR Volume 3**) shows that from Dundurn fort, the Proposed Development would be seen together with the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm in the view to the northwest; the two developments would be seen as one combined group of turbines, visible beyond the skyline in an arc from northwest to north.

10.4.40 The cumulative impact on the setting of Dundurn fort from adding the Proposed Development to a baseline including the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm is assessed as being of low magnitude and minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.4.41 Although a wider spread of turbines would be visible from the monument, the combined effect of the Proposed Development with Glen Lednock Wind Farm would be no greater than that assessed for the

Proposed Development alone, occupying a limited portion of the view to the northwest and topographically separated from the immediate landscape surrounding the monument. Views in other directions would be kept clear, including the predominant strategic views along Strathearn and overlooking the floodplain of the River Earn. There would be little to no visibility of the combined group of turbines in views towards the monument, from the valley floor or adjacent slopes.

St Blane's Chapel (SM 5434) (Figure 10.4: CHVP2)

10.4.42 **Figure 10.4** (**EIAR Volume 3**) shows that from St Blane's Chapel, there would be no more than marginal tip visibility of the Proposed Development and no visibility of the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm in the view to the northeast. Intervening topography would entirely screen the Glen Lednock turbines from this view, situated beyond the Proposed Development.

10.4.43 The cumulative impact on the setting of St Blane's Chapel from adding the Proposed Development to a baseline including the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm is assessed as being of negligible magnitude and negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.4.44 The combined effect of the Proposed Development with Glen Lednock Wind Farm would be no greater than that assessed for the Proposed Development alone, resulting from the introduction of one marginally visible turbine tip in the view to the northeast, topographically separated from the immediate landscape surrounding the monument. Views of and across the valley landscape would be generally unaltered. There would be no visibility of the combined group of turbines in views towards the monument, attainable when moving along the shores of Loch Earn.

Edinchip, chambered cairn (SM 4435) (Figure 10.5: CHVP3)

10.4.45 **Figure 10.5** (**EIAR Volume 3**) shows that from Edinchip chambered cairn, there would be no more than marginal tip visibility of the Proposed Development together with the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm in the view to the northeast. Intervening topography would almost entirely screen the Glen Lednock turbines from this view, situated beyond the Proposed Development. Two additional turbines of the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm; one tip and one hub, would be visible in the distant view to the east-northeast and offset from the combined group.

10.4.46 The cumulative impact on the setting of Edinchip chambered cairn from adding the Proposed Development to a baseline including the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm is assessed as being of negligible magnitude and negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.4.47 The combined effect of the Proposed Development with Glen Lednock Wind Farm would be no greater than that assessed for the Proposed Development alone, resulting from the introduction of marginally visible turbine tips and one hub in the view to the east-northeast, topographically separated from the immediate landscape surrounding the monument. Views of and across the valley landscape would be generally unaltered.

Balmuick, stone circle 1600 m ENE of (SM 1501) (Figure 10.6: CHVP4)

10.4.48 **Figure 10.6** (**EIAR Volume 3**) shows that from Balmuick stone circle, the Proposed Development would be seen together with the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm in the view to the west-northwest. The Proposed Development would be seen beyond the turbines of the Glen Lednock Wind Farm, which would be visible above and below the skyline in this view.

10.4.49 The cumulative impact on the setting of Balmuick stone circle from adding the Proposed Development to a baseline including the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm is assessed as being of low magnitude and minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.4.50 Although a greater number of turbines would be visible in the view to the west-northwest, the combined effect would interrupt a narrow portion of the skyline and would not appreciably detract from the open view along Glen Lednock from the monument. Views in other directions would be unaltered, including open vistas taking in the River Earn floodplain and the distant hills to the southeast. The introduction of the Glen Lednock turbines would not detract from views of the monument on the skyline when seen from within Glen Lednock. As such, the vantage of the monument and the integrity of its hilltop setting would be retained. The closer proximity of the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm in the view to the west-northwest would exercise the greater part of any cumulative impact, than would the Proposed Development.

10.5 Additional Mitigation

Mitigation During Construction

10.5.1 NPF4 (2023) provides a mitigation hierarchy: avoid, minimise, restore and offset. Avoidance and minimisation measures can be achieved through design, whilst compensatory measures offset effects that have not been avoided or minimised.

10.5.2 Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) requires the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment and the emphasis in Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN2) is for the preservation of important remains in situ where practicable and by record where preservation is not possible. The mitigation measures presented below take this policy advice and planning guidance into account and provides various options for protection or recording ensuring ensure that, where practical, surviving assets are preserved intact to retain the present historic elements of the landscape.

10.5.3 All mitigation works presented in the following paragraphs would take place prior to, or where appropriate, during, the construction of the Proposed Development. The scope of works would be detailed in one or more Written Scheme(s) of Investigation (WSI) developed in consultation with SCAS and PKHT, as archaeological advisors to Perth and Kinross Council.

10.5.4 A professionally qualified Archaeological Contractor would be appointed to act as an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) for the duration of the construction phase. The role of the ACoW would be to provide advice to the appointed Construction Contractor regarding micrositing of development components, where there is a possibility of intersecting with identified heritage assets, and to undertake archaeological monitoring of topsoil stripping in areas designated and approved by the Council's Archaeological Advisors (SCAS and PKHT). The activities of the ACoW would be carried out according to the scope of work and terms specified under the WSI and approved by SCAS and PKHT.

Preservation in Situ

10.5.5 Disturbance to field banks and walls, such as drystone field walls (**11**, **12**, **26** and **27**), would be kept to a minimum necessary to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact. Where practicable, access tracks would be routed through any existing gates or through broken or less well-preserved sections of the banks or walls.

10.5.6 Surviving heritage assets that are within 20 m of any proposed access track that utilises existing estate tracks would be marked out for avoidance. This limit along existing tracks reflects the fact that these only require possible modification/upgrading and so would be subject to only widening or limited deviation of their existing alignments. Any greater deviation would have to be agreed through consultation with the ACoW, who would advise on any necessary avoidance measures and marking off where appropriate.

10.5.7 Where surviving heritage assets are within 100 m of proposed turbine locations and within 50 m of infrastructure or proposed access tracks, and could be affected by micrositing, they would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. No micrositing that takes proposed development closer to known heritage assets would be undertaken without the prior approval of the ACoW, who would advise on any mitigation measures to be adopted.

10.5.8 Marking out would be achieved using high visibility marker posts set 5 m or 10 m from the edge of the identified heritage assets (dependent on the sensitivity of the individual asset) and these markers would be retained for the duration of the enabling works and construction phases. Assets for marking out would be identified on the ground by a qualified professional archaeologist using the baseline information provided in **Appendix 10.2**. Marking out of the assets would be undertaken by the appointed main contractor.

10.5.9 Heritage assets identified as requiring marking out are:

- Sheepfolds (**1** and **46**);
- Structural remains (**2c-r**, **4**, **47**, **50**, **61p-q**, **70a**, **70f**, **75**)
- Possible robbed cairn (**7**);
- Cup-marked stone (**23**);
- Field clearance (**29-30**, **33**, **41**, **44-45**); and
- Marker cairn (**83**).

10.5.10 There are no further requirements for any measures to ensure preservation in situ of any of the other identified heritage assets within the Site.

Watching Briefs / Excavations

10.5.11 If required under the terms of a planning condition, the scope of any requirement for archaeological watching brief(s) during the construction works would be agreed through consultation with SCAS or PKHT, on behalf of Perth and Kinross Council, in advance of development works commencing and would be set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

10.5.12 It is recommended that an archaeological watching brief be carried out at Ardveich township (**2**), where the proposed access track passes along the northern limit of the settlement and crosses the head-dyke (**21**), near a sheepfold (**1**) and building remains (**2c-r** and **4**). A watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works across the head-dyke, to record the structure of the boundary and recover any archaeological information regarding its construction and/or date, and to identify and record any potential surviving remains that may be encountered associated with the settlement.

10.5.13 It is recommended that this archaeological watching brief be extended along the proposed new access track to the north of Ardveich (**2**), as far as the northern limit of post-medieval field clearance (**30**) enclosed within a drystone wall (**11**). A watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking

works within the historic infield, an area potentially defining the limits of good quality ground at the mouth of the Beich Burn, to identify and record any surviving remains of prehistoric or later date.

10.5.14 An archaeological watching brief is recommended to be carried out where the proposed access track passes two groups of shielings (**61** and **70**) that lie within the micrositing allowance. A watching brief would be carried out during construction works for the access track, to identify and record any hitherto unrecorded surviving remains that may be encountered associated with the shielings.

10.5.15 On the basis of the established baseline, it is assessed that there are no additional sensitive areas where watching briefs would be expected to encounter any archaeological remains.

Post Excavation

10.5.16 If significant discoveries are made during any archaeological monitoring works which may be required to be carried out, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered site or features in situ, provision would be made for the excavation where necessary, of any archaeological remains encountered. The provision would 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

10.5.17 Written guidelines would be issued for use by all construction contractors, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines would set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional support in the event that buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc.) should be discovered in areas not subject to archaeological monitoring.

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

Mitigation During Operation

10.5.19 As the as-built infrastructure would be used to facilitate maintenance, repair and replacement activities, no mitigation is required within the Site in relation to cultural heritage during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development.

Mitigation During Decommissioning

10.5.20 As the as-built infrastructure would be used to facilitate decommissioning, minimal mitigation is required in relation to cultural heritage.

10.5.21 Known areas of constraint (**1**, **2d-e**, **2j**, **4**, **7**, **41**, **44**, **45**, **46**, **50** and **70f**) that lie close to as-built components of the Proposed Development would be marked out for avoidance during the decommissioning works.

10.6 Assessment of Residual Effects

Residual Construction Effects

10.6.1 For heritage assets within the Inner Study Area, completion of the programme of archaeological mitigation works set out in Additional Mitigation (above) would avoid, minimise, or offset the loss of any archaeological remains that may occur from construction of the Proposed Development.

10.6.2 Taking account of the mitigation proposals set out above, the following residual construction effects are predicted:

- A **minor** residual effect on field walls (**11**, **12**, **26** and **27**), as a consequence of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development.
- A **minor** effect on a section of the railway embankment (**16**), as a consequence of disturbance during access track construction.
- A **minor** residual effect on the head-dyke (**21**) at Ardveich, as a consequence of disturbance offset by archaeological recording of the remains.
- A **negligible** residual effect on field boundaries (**48** and **60**), as a consequence of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development.
- A **negligible** effect on the relict track (**25**) at Ardveich, as a consequence of minimal disturbance during construction of the Proposed Development.

10.6.3 Where upstanding heritage assets lie close to the Proposed Development, either as currently designed or as built (including micrositing), and where they would be marked off and avoided for the duration of the construction phase, no residual effects are predicted. The assets would be retained in-situ and unaffected by the Proposed Development.

10.6.4 Taking the proposed mitigation into account, any residual effect arising from construction of the Proposed Development in relation to direct effects on hitherto unrecorded buried remains surviving within the Site would be of no more than minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

Residual Operational Effects

10.6.5 During its operational lifetime, the residual impacts of the Proposed Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be the same as the predicted effects. See **Appendix 10.3** for a tabulated assessment of the predicted operational effects.

10.6.6 All predicted impacts affecting the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would give rise to residual effects from minor to negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

Residual Decommissioning Effects

10.6.7 There would be no residual direct effects arising from decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

10.6.8 Decommissioning the Proposed Development would remove the operational effects (impacts on their setting) on heritage assets, resulting in no residual effects.

Residual Cumulative Construction Effects

10.6.9 Construction of the Proposed Development would not give rise to any cumulative adverse effects on cultural heritage assets. As such, there would be no residual cumulative construction effects.

Residual Cumulative Operational Effects

10.6.10 The residual impacts of the Proposed Development, in combination with cumulative schemes, on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would be the same as the predicted effects.

10.6.11 All predicted cumulative impacts affecting the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area would give rise to residual effects from minor to negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.7 Monitoring

Construction Phase Monitoring

10.7.1 Post construction site visits would be carried out by the ACoW to verify the effectiveness of the marking-out/avoidance mitigation, to ensure that all markers have been removed and that no damage has occurred to demarcated heritage assets.

10.7.2 No further monitoring is required during the operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.

10.8 Summary

10.8.1 A desk-based assessment and field survey, informed by information provided by HES, SCAS and PKHT, have been carried out to establish the cultural heritage baseline, within the Proposed Development Site (Inner Study Area) and the wider landscape (Outer Study Area).

10.8.2 Eighty-four assets were identified within the Inner Study Area: eight (**2**, **3**, **10**, **23**, **24**, **61**, **69** and **76**) are assessed as being of value at the regional level and of medium sensitivity; 67 others are of value at the local level and low sensitivity. Nine assets are assessed to be of little or no heritage value and of negligible sensitivity.

10.8.3 An assessment of the identified heritage assets, and consideration of the current and past land use, within the Inner Study Area, suggests that there is a low likelihood of hitherto unidentified archaeological remains of prehistoric or medieval/post-medieval date being present across the majority of the Site. Given the limited land take required by the separate elements of the Proposed Development within areas of increased potential, such as at the mouth of the Beich Burn, it is considered that the potential for further archaeological discoveries is low.

10.8.4 Twelve potential direct impacts on heritage assets have been identified, arising from the construction of the Proposed Development. In addition, 17 other heritage assets lie within the micrositing allowance and could be affected by any micrositing of the proposed layout. In the absence of mitigation, eleven of these construction impacts are assessed as **significant** in EIA terms: three (**2**, **3**, **23**) are assessed as being potentially of major significance, eight (**1**, **4**, **7**, **21**, **47**, **50**, **61p-q**, **70a**, **70f**) are assessed to be of moderate significance. The remaining impacts are assessed as **not significant**: nine (**27**, **29**, **30**, **33**, **41**, **44**, **45**, **46**, **83**) are assessed as being of minor significance, and seven (**11**, **12**, **16**, **25**, **26**, **28**, **79a**) are assessed as being of negligible significance.

10.8.5 Mitigation measures have been set out that would avoid, reduce, or offset the predicted effects and residual effects of no more than minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) have been identified.

10.8.6 Within 10 km from the outermost turbines there are 20 Scheduled Monuments, five Category A Listed Buildings, 28 Category B Listed Buildings, two Conservation Areas, and two Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes. Following consultation with HES, two additional Scheduled Monuments which lie within the ZTV and beyond 10 km from the outermost turbines have been included in the assessment.

10.8.7 Within 5 km from the outermost turbines there are seven Category C Listed Buildings.

10.8.8 There are **no predicted significant effects** on heritage assets within the Outer Study Area.

10.8.9 Taking account of the mitigation measures set out, there are **no predicted residual effects** on heritage assets, arising from decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

10.8.10 The potential effect of the Proposed Development, both individually and cumulatively, in combination with the in-scoping Glen Lednock Wind Farm has been considered. No designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area have been identified as having settings sensitive to adverse effects from the Proposed Development, in combination with other cumulative developments, which lie more than 10 km from the Site. No significant residual cumulative effects on the setting of any heritage assets would arise from addition of the Proposed Development to a baseline including consented, in-scoping and proposed developments.

Table 10-4: Summary of Potential Significant Effects

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/ Residual Effect
Construction			
Direct adverse effect on head-dyke (**21**), which is crossed by the proposed access track.	Archaeological watching brief to be carried out during any ground-breaking works.	Archaeological condition attached to planning consent.	Not significant
Potential direct adverse effect on sheepfold (**1**), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off and avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect on Ardveich township (**2**), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off structural elements (**2c-r**) and avoid during construction. Archaeological watching brief to be carried out during any ground-breaking works in the vicinity.	Archaeological condition attached to planning consent.	Not significant
Potential direct effect on building (**4**), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect on possible robbed cairn (**7**), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect on cup-marked rock (**23**), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect shieling (47), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect shieling (50), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential direct effect shieling (61p-q), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant

Table 10-4: Summary of Potential Significant Effects

Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome/ Residual Effect
Potential direct effect shieling (70a and 70f), which lies within the micrositing allowance.	Mark off avoid during construction.	Carried out by main contractor as directed by ACoW.	Not significant
Potential adverse effects on buried archaeology.	Archaeological watching brief to be carried out during any ground-breaking works in designated areas.	Archaeological condition attached to planning consent.	Not significant
Operation			
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a