Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage

Tables

Figures

Volume 3a

Volume 3b

Technical Appendices

Executive Summary

This chapter considers the potential effects to cultural heritage of the Proposed Varied Development. It considers the potential direct effects on cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Varied Development site from the proposed amendments to the Consented Development and provides a revised assessment of the potential effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets associated with the Proposed Varied Development.

A refreshed Historic Environment Record (HER) dataset from the West of Scotland Archaeology Service ('WoSAS') on behalf of Argyll & Bute Council ('A&BC'), was obtained in January 2026, and further field survey was carried out in February 2026. This identified eight heritage assets within the Site, in addition to those previously identified by AOC Archaeology for the Consented Development 2018 EIA Report (SSE Renewables 2018).

It is assessed that there is potential for the construction of the Proposed Varied Development to directly affect two heritage assets, a sheepfold and the remains of a building, both of low sensitivity.

Mitigation measures have been set out to avoid, reduce or offset these direct effects to no more than negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms). All other heritage assets have been avoided by the design of the Proposed Varied Development layout.

Taking account of the current land-use and historic landscape character of the Inner Study Area, the potential for further archaeological discoveries within the Inner Study Area is assessed as being moderate. As was concluded for the Consented Development, mitigation proposed to address potential direct construction effects on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets within the Site, would result in a residual effect that is **not significant** in EIA terms.

The assessment has also considered the effect of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of heritage assets within the Site and in the wider landscape. Based on analysis of the revised blade-tip height Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Varied Development, there are seventeen heritage assets that lie within 10km of the Proposed Varied Development that would have theoretical visibility from their locations that did not have predicted visibility of the Consented Development.

The assessment for the Consented Development concluded that a **significant** impact was predicted on two designated heritage assets of national importance and high sensitivity (Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27) and Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21)) and remains as such for the Proposed Varied Development. An additional level of effect has been

identified on Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, 2018 EIA Report Site 43), as a result of the Proposed Varied Development; an impact of moderate significance (**significant** in EIA terms). The Proposed Varied Development would be a new element in the wider landscape surroundings of this cairn, and the introduction of modern wind turbines and substation into an otherwise rural, pastoral setting would result in a noticeable alteration to its current landscape setting. However, the key contributors to the cairn's significance (interrelationship with other features and expansive coastal views to the south) would be retained. It is assessed that the understanding, appreciation and experience of the cairn would be adequately retained such that the integrity of the monuments setting and its capacity to inform and convey its cultural significance would not be significantly adversely affected by the Proposed Varied Development (NPF4 Policy 7 (h)ii). The effect of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of the remaining heritage assets are assessed as being of no greater than minor significance, and **not significant** in EIA terms.

Three significant cumulative effects are predicted resulting from the operation of the Proposed Varied Development in-combination with other cumulative developments. A predicted cumulative operational effect of moderate significance (**significant** in EIA terms) has been identified on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) as was concluded for the Consented Development, and an additional moderate significance (**significant** in EIA terms) is predicted on Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27) and Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43) as a result of the Proposed Varied Development in-combination with other proposed developments. For each asset the Proposed Varied Development contributes the greatest level of effect to the cumulative impact. It is assessed, however, that the combined developments would not adversely affect the overall heritage value or cultural significance of these assets, that is; the key isolated and defensive setting of the Fortified Dwelling and the south-facing coastal views from the Cairns.

10.1. Introduction

10.1.1. A cultural heritage assessment was previously undertaken for the Tangy IV Wind Farm (the Consented Development) in 2018 which assessed a layout consisting of 16 turbines with a maximum tip height of 149.9m.

10.1.2. This chapter considers the potential for the Proposed Varied Development as described in **Chapter 2: Design Iteration and Description of Proposed Varied Development** to result in material changes to the effects identified for the Consented Development.

10.1.3. The assessment is supported by **Figures 10.1 - 10.3** in **Volume 3a**, **Figures 10.4.1 - 10.20.3** in **Volume 3b**, and **Technical Appendices 10.1 – 10.4** in **Volume 4** of this EIA Report.

10.2. Scope of Assessment

10.2.1. The scope of this cultural heritage assessment, as set out in the EIA Scoping Report (SSE Renewables 2025), takes into account the comparative changes between the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development. As such it addresses only those cultural heritage assets where there may be a change in the predicted effects from those of the Consented Development. The assessment has been informed by Section 36C ('S.36C') Scoping Opinions and further Pre-Application consultation comments, made by Historic Environment Scotland ('HES') and Argyll and Bute Council ('A&BC').

10.2.2. The specific objectives of this cultural heritage assessment are to:

- Assess the direct (physical) effects of the Proposed Varied Development on cultural heritage assets resulting from construction works;
- Assess the effects (including cumulative effects) of the Proposed Varied Development on cultural heritage assets resulting from impacts to their settings; and
- Proposed measures, where appropriate, to mitigate any predicted significant adverse effects.

10.2.3. For full details of effects scoped in/out, see **Chapter 10, Section 10.3** of the S.36C Scoping Report (**Technical Appendix 3.1: Scoping Report**).

10.3. Consultations

10.3.1. Following submission of the S.36C Scoping Report (ECU Ref: ECU00006203) in July 2025 (**Technical Appendix 3.1: Scoping Report**), consultation responses and further opinions, as detailed in **Table 10.1** below, were received from HES and A&BC.

Table 10.1: Relevant Consultation Responses Received Following Submission of the 2025 S36C Scoping Report

Consultee	Response	How this response has been implemented
A&BC, 18 August 2025	At the time of response, advice from the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) had not been obtained and therefore not possible to provide comment on scope of these assessments. Noted that visualisations utilised previously will be updated to reflect the increased turbine height now proposed.	Noted. See **Volume 4**, **Technical Appendix 10.4** for a full list of updated visualisations.
HES, 4 September 2025	Content with proposed methodology for assessment of significance of effect and with proposals for scoping assets in and out of further assessment. Consider three assets with potential to result in significant adverse impacts arising from scale and proximity of the proposed turbines; • Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180) • Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664); and • Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647). Photomontage should demonstrate impact on setting of the fortified dwelling, produced from the shore of Tangy Loch with monument in foreground. Would prefer another visualisation from monument itself	Noted. No assets beyond 10km have been found with settings sensitivity to change as a result of the Proposed Varied Development. Photomontage visualisations have been commissioned for all three assets with potential significant adverse impacts, including one from the location of both Killocraw cairns together (**CHVP5 - Figure 10.8.1-10.8.4**, **Volume 3b**). Due to health and safety risks, it was not possible to reach the islet on which Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180) is located. As access is not possible, no photomontage visualisation from this monument has been included. Instead, an alternative photomontage, as agreed by HES in their later response (20/01/26) (**CHVP2 - Figure 10.5.1-10.5.4, Volume 3b**)

Consultee	Response	How this response has been implemented
	given the revised proposal scale but did accept a wireline previously. Potential for significant adverse impacts on setting of the monuments should be addressed through photomontage visualisations looking toward the proposal from each of the scheduled cairns, as well as a third looking toward the proposal with the two cairns in the foreground, with cairn positions annotated on this third visualisation.	has been produced from the shoreline opposite the monument looking towards the Proposed Varied Development with the fortified dwelling in the foreground. An additional wireline (**CHVP1 - Figure 10.4.1-10.4.3, Volume 3b**) from the centre of the dwelling will illustrate the variation in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from that location. See HES's Proposed Photomontage Visualisations Response, 20 January 2026 below. Refer to **Volume 4**, **Technical Appendix 10.4** for a full list of visualisations produced for this cultural heritage assessment.
HES, Proposed Photomontage Visualisations Response, 20 January 2026	Reviewed the proposed viewpoint locations for the Proposed Varied Development and accepted that the changed location for the photomontage for Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180) should provide necessary information, and that they were content with the change. Other proposed photomontage locations are as requested.	Noted. This alternative and accepted photomontage for Tangy Loch has been produced for assessment (**Volume 3b**, **CHVP2 - Figure 10.5.1-10.5.4**). An additional wireline (**Volume 3b, CHVP1 - Figure 10.4.1-10.4.3**) from the centre of the dwelling illustrates the variation in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from that location. Full list of visualisations produced for this cultural heritage assessment can be found in **Volume 4**, **Technical Appendix 10.4.**
HES, Gatecheck Report Response, 20 April 2026	Noted that amendments have been made to the layout including the proposed locations of the turbines and the substation compound and advised that they have no record of consultation on the amended layout. Advised that external views towards designated assets (in their remit) to	Noted. There has only been minimal change to the layout provided in the Scoping Report. Towers 1, 2 and 7 have been microsited (45m, 63m and 111m respectively) to avoid areas of deep peat and the proposed substation has been microsited by 52m to the west to

Consultee	Response	How this response has been implemented
	be included in their setting assessments where these views could form an element of the asset's cultural significance.	avoid directly affecting the remains of a building and enclosure (Site 1). These layout changes have not resulted in any change to the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Varied Development provided in the Scoping Report. External views towards designated heritage assets have been considered as part of the setting assessment where these form a key aspect of the asset's setting and cultural significance (see **Volume 4**, **Technical Appendix 10.2**).

10.4. Assessment Methodology

Study Area

10.4.1. Two study areas (5km and 10km study areas referred throughout this chapter as the 'Outer Study Area') were detailed for use in the 2018 EIA Report (**Volume 2: Chapter 13, paragraph 13.2.2**). These study areas were reused to form the assessment of potential effects on the setting of designated heritage assets and NSR sites of potential national importance (as identified in the WoSAS HER), which may be subject to adverse impacts arising from the Proposed Varied Development (including cumulative effects).

10.4.2. A revised Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)[1] model was also produced to aid this assessment (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2 and 10.3**) and identify any other designated heritage assets that may have a setting (views from and towards) especially sensitive to changes from the Proposed Varied Development. No such assets beyond 10km were identified for inclusion.

10.4.3. An additional study area comprising the Site Red Line Boundary, referred throughout this chapter as the 'Inner Study Area', has been used for this

[1] the ZTV models are based on a 'bare-earth' worst-case scenario - that is they have been created using terrain data only and do not consider screening elements such as include any buildings or vegetation which may would be the case with a 'screened' ZTV. It therefore follows that since ZTV's present a worst-case scenario, this may exaggerate the actual impacts of the turbines as they do not take account of vegetation or buildings in the landscape, which may restrict the current nature and extent of views.

assessment to compare the potential direct construction impacts of the Proposed Varied Development with the Consented Development layout.

Desk Study

10.4.4. The following information sources were consulted as part of the assessment:

- HES Spatial Data Warehouse (HES 2026b): for up-to-date data on the locations and extents of designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Listed Buildings);
- A refreshed HER dataset from the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) on behalf of A&BC, was obtained in January 2026, and further field survey was carried out in February 2026. This identified eight additional heritage assets within the Inner Study Area, in addition to those previously identified by AOC Archaeology for the 2018 EIA Report (SSE Renewables 2018);
- Historic Land-Use Assessment data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES 2026a): for information on the historic land use character of the Inner Study Area and the surrounding area;
- Modern aerial photographs available through Google Earth and Bing Maps;
- Tangy IV Wind Farm Section 36 Environmental Impact Assessment Report, and its Appendices (SSE Renewables 2018): for baseline conditions and assessment;
- Tangy III Environmental Statement (SSE Renewables 2014): for baseline conditions and assessment; and
- Relevant bibliographic references and online historic resources were consulted to provide background and historic information.

Field Survey

10.4.5. Additional field survey was undertaken on 25-26 February 2026, covering areas within the Inner Study Area where components of the Proposed Varied Development infrastructure have been relocated from that of the Consented Development. This data was used to inform any potential direct physical effects on both known and unknown heritage assets in these areas.

10.4.6. Further setting visits were made to key designated heritage assets on 26 February 2026 to inform a revised setting impact assessment (**Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**).

10.4.7. Additional heritage assets identified through desk-based assessment and field survey for this chapter have been labelled with the prefix ‘CFA’ to distinguish

between those previously recorded for the Consented Development EIAR (SSE Renewables 2018). For consistency, previously identified assets within the Inner Study Area have been labelled with the site number used in the Consented Development EIAR (ibid), whilst those in the Outer Study Area have been labelled with their WoSAS HER/or HES Designation number. These assets are depicted on **Figures 10.1-10.3**.

Criteria for Assigning Sensitivity to Heritage Assets

10.4.8. Cultural heritage assets are assigned value/importance through the designation process. Designation ensures that sites and places are recognised and protected by law through the planning system and other regulatory processes. The level of protection and how a site or place is managed varies depending on the type of designation and the laws and policies that apply to it (HES 2020a).

10.4.9. The effects of the Proposed Varied Development on heritage assets have been assessed on the basis of their type (direct impacts, setting impacts and cumulative impacts) and nature (adverse or beneficial). Effects can be permanent (lasting for a long time or forever), temporary (not lasting for very long) and/or reversible (can be changed back to what it was before). The assessment has taken into account the value/sensitivity of the heritage asset, and its setting, and the magnitude of the predicted impact.

- Direct (physical) impacts: occur where the physical fabric of the asset is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as a direct result of the proposal. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- Setting impacts: these are generally direct and result from the proposal causing change within the setting of a heritage asset that affects its cultural significance or the way in which it is understood, appreciated, and experienced. Such impacts are generally, but not exclusively, visual, occurring directly as a result of the appearance of the proposal in the surroundings of the asset. However, they may relate to other senses or factors, such as noise, odour or emissions, or historical relationships that do not relate entirely to intervisibility, such as historic patterns of land-use and related historic features. Such impacts may occur at any stage of a proposal's lifespan and may be permanent, reversible, or temporary.
- Cumulative impacts: can relate to impacts on the physical fabric or on the setting of assets. They may arise as a result of impact interactions, either of different impacts of the proposal itself, or additive impacts resulting from incremental changes caused by the proposal together with other projects already in the planning system or allocated in a Local Development Plan.

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

10.4.10. **Table 10.2** summarises the relative sensitivity of heritage assets (including their settings) based on the guidance set out in the SNH (now NatureScot) / HES EIA Handbook (version 5, 2018).

Table 10.2: Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition / Criteria
High	Assets valued at an international or national level, including: • World Heritage Sites; • Scheduled Monuments; • Category A Listed Buildings; • Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes; • Inventory Historic Battlefields; and • Non-designated assets that meet the relevant criteria for designation (including sites recorded in HERs as non-statutory register (NSR) sites of presumed national importance).
Medium	Assets valued at a regional level, including: • Archaeological sites and areas that have regional value (contributing to the aims of regional research frameworks); • Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASA) (where these are identified in Local Authority records); • Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes (NIDL) (where these are identified in Local Authority records); • Category B Listed Buildings; and • Conservation Areas.
Low	Assets valued at a local level, including: • Archaeological sites that have local heritage value; • Category C listed buildings; and • Unlisted historic buildings and townscapes with local (vernacular) characteristics.
Negligible	Assets of little or no intrinsic heritage value, including: • Artefact find-spots (where the artefacts are no longer in situ and where their provenance is uncertain); and • Poorly preserved examples of particular types of features (e.g. quarries and gravel pits, dilapidated sheepfolds, etc).

Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects

10.4.11. The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) will be assessed in the categories: high, medium, low, or negligible as described in **Table 10.3**.

Table 10.3: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria	
	Adverse	Beneficial
High	Changes to the fabric or setting of a heritage asset resulting in the complete or near complete loss of the asset's cultural significance, such that it may no longer be considered a heritage asset.	Preservation of a heritage asset in situ where it would otherwise be completely lost or almost completely lost in the do-nothing scenario.
Medium	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this quality is substantially altered.	Changes to key elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting, resulting in its cultural significance being preserved where this would otherwise be lost, or restored.
Low	Changes to the elements of the fabric or setting of a heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance such that this quality is slightly altered.	Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting that detract from its cultural significance being removed.
Negligible	Changes to fabric or setting of a heritage asset that leave its cultural significance unchanged.	

10.4.12. The sensitivity of the asset (**Table 10.2**) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (**Table 10.3**) will be used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect, summarised using the formula set out in the matrix in **Table 10.4**, below. The matrix employs a graduated scale of significance (from negligible to major effects). Where two outcomes are possible, application of the matrix in-combination with professional judgement supported by reasoned judgement will be used to determine the level of significance. Setting assessment of relevant cultural heritage assets are detailed within **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**.

Table 10.4: Significance of Effects

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

10.4.13. Major and Moderate effects are considered to be '**significant**' in the context of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations). Minor and Negligible effects are considered to be '**not significant**'.

10.4.14. Where a significant effect on the setting of a Scheduled Monument is predicted as a result of change within its surroundings, using the approach outlined above, an assessment is made as to whether that effect would result in a significant adverse effect on the integrity of its setting (NPF 4 Policy 7(h)ii) (Scottish Government 2023). For the purposes of the assessment, the integrity of the setting is considered to be adequately maintained if the setting's contribution to the cultural significance of the monument would not be compromised by the Proposed Varied Development either alone or cumulatively.

Assessment of Effects on Setting

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

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

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

> *"Setting can be important to the way in which historic structures or places are understood, appreciated and experienced. It can often be integral to a historic asset's cultural significance."*
>
> *"Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or 'curtilage' of an individual historic asset into a broader landscape context."*

10.4.17. The guidance also advises that:

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

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

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

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

> *"When considering setting impacts, visual change should not be equated directly with adverse impact. Rather the impact should be assessed with*

reference to the degree that the proposal affects those aspects of setting that contribute to the asset's cultural significance."

10.4.20. Following these recommendations, and for the purposes of this assessment, the updated blade-tip height ZTV (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2 and 10.3**) has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Varied Development and to assess the degree of potential visibility. Consideration has also been given to designated heritage assets where there is no predicted visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from the asset but where views of or across the asset are important factors contributing to its cultural significance. In such cases, consideration was given to whether the Proposed Varied Development could appear in the background of those views.

Cultural Heritage Viewpoints

10.4.21. An additional photomontage visualisation (**Volume 3b, CHVP5 - Figure 10.8.1-10.8.4**) has been produced at the request of HES in their response to the S.36C Scoping Report (**Table 10.1**) to inform the setting assessment of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) and Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43), Scheduled Monuments.

10.4.22. HES requested in the S.36C Scoping Opinion, a visualisation from the Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27) in addition to a wireline, given the revised height of the turbines for the Proposed Varied Development. However, due to health and safety concerns, it was not possible to reach the islet on which the dwelling is located and therefore an alternative photomontage (**Volume 3b, CHVP2 – Figure 10.5.1-10.5.4**) has been produced from the shoreline opposite the monument (approximately 200m from the fortified dwelling). This alternative photomontage looks towards the Proposed Varied Development with the dwelling in the foreground. This change in viewpoint location was accepted by HES (January 2026 response, **Table 10.1**).

10.4.23. The previous wireline co-ordinate location used for the production of the Westport, fort (SM3274, Site 25) visualisation in the 2018 EIAR (**Volume 3b, Figure 13.3.11.1 – 13.3.11.2**) has been sited approximately 970m east of the fort's actual location. A revised wireline co-ordinate location has been used for this report (**Volume 3b, CHVP13 – Figure 10.6.1-10.6.3**), detailed in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.4**.

10.4.24. All other visualisations utilised previously in the 2018 EIAR have been updated to reflect the increase in proposed turbine height. A full list of all visualisations

produced for this Proposed Varied Development assessment can be found in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.4**.

10.4.25. **Volume 3a Figure 10.2b** provides the locations of the cultural heritage viewpoints used for the Proposed Varied Development.

Cumulative Assessment

10.4.26. The assessment of cumulative effects on heritage assets is based upon consideration of the effects of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of assets with statutory designations and non-statutory designations within the Outer Study Area (10km of the Site), in addition to the likely effects of other developments those that are consented but not yet built and those that are currently at the application stage (and for which sufficient detail is available upon which to develop an assessment). Proposed developments at the scoping or pre-application stage have not been included in the assessment, unless part of SSEN's reasonably foreseeable developments directly connected with the Proposed Varied Development, as such proposals are not fully formed and may be subject to changes that cannot be foreseen.

10.4.27. The schemes included in the cumulative impact assessment are those identified to be of sufficient scale and type which could result in cumulative impacts in-combination with the Proposed Varied Development. **Figure 5.10** shows the Proposed Varied Development along with other cumulative developments addressed in **Volume 2, Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual**.

10.4.28. Operational, under construction developments, and existing grid infrastructure elements are considered as part of the baseline and taken to be such for the assessment of effects on the settings of heritage assets for the Proposed Varied Development.

10.4.29. The assessment takes into account the nature and relative scales of the various developments, their distance from the affected assets, and the potential degree of visibility from the assets of the various developments.

Limitations and Assumptions

10.4.30. This assessment has been completed using data derived from HES' Spatial Warehouse, and the WoSAS HER (on behalf of A&BC). It is assumed that, at the time of the acquisition of the refreshed data in January 2026, the information provided was accurate and up-to-date and that there has been no substantive changes to the baseline character, condition and cultural

significance of the heritage assets since their original discovery or their last recorded visit, whichever is the more recent.

10.4.31. The assessment relies in part on the results of field survey carried out across the Site by AOC Archaeology in February 2018 and by previous survey in 2014 for Tangy III EIA Report (SSE Renewables 2014). It is assumed that the data gathered during those surveys is an accurate reflection of the baseline character and condition of those sites at the time of this report.

10.5. Consented Development EIAR Baseline

Inner Study Area

10.5.1. There are no designated assets registered by HES (World Heritage Sites; Scheduled Monuments; Historic Inventory Battlefields; Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes; and Conservation Areas) located within the Site.

10.5.2. Forty-seven non-designated heritage assets were identified within the Consented Development Site. Two heritage assets: Killocraw, cup markings (WoSAS 3097, 2018 EIAR Site 73) and Tangymoil, cup-marked stone (2018 EIAR Site 13) were recorded in the Non-Statutory Register ('NSR') maintained by the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), as 'Code C' sites, deemed to be of 'almost certainly of National Importance'; and further 19 assets (Site 3, Site 7, and 17 huts comprising Sites 10 & 46-60) were recorded as 'Code V' sites which are of 'probable National Importance'. The remaining 26 were defined in the WoSAS HER as being 'standard' non-designated heritage assets.

10.5.3. These non-designated heritage assets range in date from the prehistoric to the modern period. Assets of probable prehistoric date include cup-marked stones, a burnt mound, and a possible cist. Fifteen of the non-designated assets are shielings of likely medieval to post-medieval date. A further five assets were recorded from historic mapping and relate to the sites of structures of likely post-medieval origin which are no longer extant (SSE Renewables 2018).

10.5.4. Desk-based assessment and further reconnaissance field survey work carried out for the Proposed Varied Development has identified an additional eight non-designated heritage assets within the Inner Study Area (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.1**). These are typically the remains of post-medieval agricultural activity in the form of an enclosure, boundary banks, shielings and a dam and sluice. In addition, the site of a former building and garden was recorded from historic maps, alongside the former site of a possible prehistoric cup-marked stone and the potential crash site of a Second World War aircraft

as recorded within the WoSAS HER. Neither the aircraft site, cup-marked stone, building and garden, or dam and sluice, were identified in the field.

10.5.5. The potential for undisturbed buried archaeological remains in the north of the Site within the commercial forest plantation, is low due to previous afforestation ground disturbance. However, in the south of the Site in areas of peat coverage and limited ground disturbance, coupled with the known assets (e.g. shielings) in the wider area, there is assessed medium potential for discovering unknown buried archaeological remains.

Outer Study Area

10.5.6. There are no world Heritage Sites, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and Inventory Historic Battlefields within the 10km of the Consented Development Red Line Boundary (Outer Study Area).

10.5.7. The 2018 EIAR identified 203 designated heritage assets and NSR assets within 10km of the Consented Development Red Line Boundary. These included 78 Scheduled Monuments, 109 assets on the NSR of potential national importance, and one Conservation Area. Eleven Listed Buildings are located within 5km of the Consented Development Red Line Boundary. Of the total assets identified, 97 were judged to be potentially subject to changes in their settings and/or were located within the ZTV.

10.5.8. The closest Scheduled Monument is Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) situated approximately 235m north of the Consented Development Red Line Boundary and 1.2km north-west of proposed turbine T08 of the Consented Development. Concentrations of Scheduled Monuments are located to the north-west of the Site around Killocraw Farm (SM3664, SM3647, SM209, SM3663, and SM3066) and along the coastlines either side of the Kintyre peninsula (e.g. SM3272-4, SM3224, SM3679) and atop higher ground (e.g. SM3062-4, SM3108, SM3221, SM3096). The majority of these monuments have setting attributes linked to the westward sea-facing views along the coastline, others populate remote higher ground affording long-ranging views.

10.5.9. While the cultural heritage baseline of the Outer Study Area has not changed, analysis of the revised bare-earth ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development shows that there is an increase in visibility due to the increase in tip height from 149m to 200m, in comparison with the Consented Development and there are 17 heritage assets (11 Scheduled Monuments, two Listed Buildings, and four NSR sites) that lie within the Outer Study Area that would have theoretical visibility of the increased (51m) height of the turbines that did not

have predicted visibility of the Consented Development (see paragraph 10.6.5, and **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**).

Future Baseline

10.5.10. Future baselines (without the Consented Development) would largely be expected to mirror the Consented Development EIAR baseline. Any alteration to the baseline condition of the heritage assets within the Site would likely relate to very gradual deterioration of upstanding structures as a consequence of natural weathering and, in some cases, stock grazing. Heritage assets located within the afforested parts of the Site would be at risk from potential further disturbance from forestry operations caused either by tree and root growth or by the eventual disturbance that may result as a consequence of planned, rotational future clear felling. As a result, the Consented Development baseline is taken as the basis for the construction effects assessment presented in the 2018 EIAR (SSE Renewables 2018).

10.5.11. The setting of the Site may be altered in the future through the construction and operation of other proposed wind farm developments. The potential cumulative effects of these turbines will be discussed in detail in the Revised Cumulative Effects Section.

10.6. Summary of Effects Predicted & Mitigation Measures proposed for the Consented Development

Construction Effects

10.6.1. No direct significant effects were predicted on known heritage assets within the Site during the construction phase of the Consented Development, and it is anticipated that some of the existing turbine and access track footprints from the Operational Development will be reused. Forest clearance required for construction of turbine T09 of the Consented Development had the potential to directly impact Allt nan Creamh, shieling-hut cluster (Sites 10, 46-60) along the Allt nan Creamh burn. There was also potential to accidentally damage Allt nan Creamh, hut-circle (Site 3) and Tangymoil, cup-marked stone (Site 13) as a result of forestry operations within the areas for proposed re-planting.

10.6.2. Relevant mitigation measures proposed to offset the above include;

- Archaeological recording of physical remains (in the form of survey and photography); and
- Fencing off the assets prior to commencement of construction works and maintained on the hut-circle (Site 3) and the cup-marked stone (Site 13) throughout felling and re-planting stages.

10.6.3. To mitigate the potential for previously unrecorded buried remains to be impacted during the construction phase, an archaeological watching brief was proposed on a representative proportion of ground-breaking works. The purpose of such works will be to identify any unknown assets, asses their value and to mitigate impact through avoidance, or if preservation in situ is not possible, through preservation by record. Areas to be monitored include;

- All areas of peat >1m deep; and
- Proposed borrow pit locations, three of which are located close to known heritage assets (Site 14, Site 15 and Site 16).

10.6.4. Details of further mitigation, including excavation and post-excavation works, will be agreed in consultation with WoSAS and through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

10.6.5. Following the implementation of outlined mitigation measures above, no residual direct effects were predicted on known and unknown heritage assets as a result of the construction of the Consented Development.

Operational Effects

10.6.6. Potential operational effects resulting from impacts to the setting of 97 heritage assets (41 SMs, 3 LBs, 53 NSR sites) were assessed in the 2018 EIAR (SSE Renewables 2018, **Volume 4: Appendix 13.3**). Effects on designated and non-statutory designated NSR sites were considered if the assets lay within the finalised ZTV and were judged to be potentially subject to changes in their settings.

10.6.7. The potential for likely significant operational effects on the setting of three heritage assets was identified and given detailed assessment: Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, 2018 EIAR Site 21), Killocraw cup-marked stone 800m E of (SM209, Site 22), and Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27). As a result of detailed assessment, **moderate** operational effects (**significant** in EIA terms) were identified on two assets: Killocraw, cairn (SM3664, Site 21) and Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27). No additional cumulative effects were predicted, and the residual effects were the same as the predicted operational effect.

10.6.8. Decommissioning impacts were scoped out due to their limited nature, though the eventual removal of the wind farm was considered in assessing long-term

effects. Non-designated asset settings were only assessed if they lay within the ZTV and were requested at scoping.

Residual Effects

10.6.9. No residual construction effects were outlined, as no significant direct effects were identified.

10.6.10. The following operational residual effects were identified (the same as their predicted operational effect) (see 2018 EIAR, **Volume 4: Appendix 13.3**):

- **Moderate** (**significant**) residual effect predicted on two Scheduled Monuments, (SM3664, Site 21 and SM3180, Site 27).
- Minor-moderate (not significant) residual effect predicted on nine Scheduled Monuments and on three WoSAS non-statutory register sites 'almost certainly of national importance' (Code C).
- Minor (not significant) residual effect predicted on 23 Scheduled Monuments, two WoSAS non-statutory register sites 'almost certainly of national importance' (Code C) and on four WoSAS non-statutory register sites 'probably of national importance' (Code V).

10.6.11. Either negligible or neutral/no impact residual operational effects were predicted for the remaining designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, one Conservation Area) and non-statutory register sites (Code C & V) assessed for the Consented Development.

10.7. Revised Assessment of Effects for the Proposed Varied Development

Revised Construction Effects

10.7.1. As a result of changes to the footprint and layout of the Proposed Varied Development compared to the Consented Development, a revised assessment of construction effects has been undertaken within the Inner Study Area.

10.7.2. The construction effects predicted for the Consented Development remain the same for the Proposed Varied Development. Forest clearance required for both the Consented and Proposed Varied Development has the potential to impact the same identified assets. The following additional adverse

construction effects have been identified for the Proposed Varied Development;

- A sheepfold (Site 15), of low sensitivity, lies within the proposed borrow pit working area at proposed turbine T04. Construction works for the proposed borrow pit would remove the sheepfold, resulting in a high magnitude impact. Without mitigation this could result in an effect of minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms); and
- There is potential for construction works for the proposed permanent access track between proposed turbine T08 and the proposed substation to the west, to directly impact the upstanding remains of a former building (Site 1), of low sensitivity. The northern end of the building lies approximately 3.5m south of the proposed access track route and could be damaged by construction works and vehicles traversing the area, resulting in a medium magnitude impact. Without mitigation this impact could result in an effect of minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

Revised Operational Effects

10.7.3. To establish whether the proposed increase in turbine tip height is likely to result in any effects on the setting of heritage assets within 10km of the Proposed Varied Development Red Line Boundary, the following assessment has been undertaken:

- A review of the updated blade-tip height ZTV for the proposed increase in tip height from 149.9m to 200m; with heritage assets overlain to establish which assets will now have predicted turbine visibility due to the tip height increase;
- A review of updated visualisations from specific assets with potential blade-tip and hub-height visibility of proposed turbines overlain to determine any predicted changes to effects on setting;
- An assessment of any heritage assets not previously within the ZTV to determine the likely predicted effects on setting; and
- An appraisal of designated assets located beyond 10km of the Proposed Varied Development Red Line Boundary, but within the ZTV of one or more proposed turbines, to determine whether they need to be included as part of the setting assessment. None were identified as having a setting sensitive to change beyond this distance.

10.7.4. All designated heritage assets and NSR sites with potential national importance (Code C & V) which were predicted to have theoretical visibility of the Consented Development are also predicted to have theoretical visibility of

the Proposed Varied Development. A full list and setting summary of these assets is available in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**.

10.7.5. Seventeen additional heritage assets that did not have predicted theoretical visibility of the Consented Development, have been identified as having predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Varied Development; 11 Scheduled Monuments (SM188, SM208, SM229, SM249, SM3109, SM3272, SM3315, SM3641, SM3642, SM3646, SM3658), two Category B Listed Buildings (LB22962 and LB51689), two NSR sites 'Code C' (WoSAS 3360 and WoSAS 3382) and two NSR sites 'Code V' (WoSAS 3045 and WoSAS 3087) (see **Volume 3a, Figure 10.3**). It is assessed that the impact on these assets is of no more than negligible magnitude (**not significant** in EIA terms) (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**).

10.7.6. Designated heritage assets and non-designated NSR sites recorded within the 10km Outer Study Area with no predicted theoretical visibility of the Consented Development or the Proposed Varied Development, have been listed in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.3**.

Re-assessed Detailed Setting Assessment

10.7.7. Both Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27) and Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) remain with a predicted moderate adverse significant effect (**significant** in EIA terms) and have been included for detailed re-assessment.

Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27)

10.7.8. This monument comprises the remains of a fortified dwelling comprising two turf-covered sub-rectangular stone buildings on a small island situated towards the east end of Tangy Loch. The islet may be partially or wholly artificial, is roughly D-shaped in plan and rises less than 2m above the loch surface. A now submerged causeway connects the island to the south-west loch shore. The site is indicated as a dwelling-place on the Pont-Gordon Map of the second quarter of the 17th century when Tangy was held by the McEachan family. As a Scheduled Monument, the fortified dwelling is of national heritage value, and of high sensitivity.

10.7.9. The immediate setting of the dwelling comprises the loch and loch shore with the wider setting extending to include afforested hill slopes to the north and south, and views west along the Tangy Burn. The dwelling has an overall secluded setting, enclosed by the immediate surrounding rising topography with an isolated and defensive position sited on the water. First sighting of the monument is obtained only on close approach to the loch from the immediate surrounding hill slopes and from along Tangy Burn valley. Views out to the

wider landscape are limited to glimpses west towards the coast along Tangy Burn when approaching the monument from the north-east. The turbines of the Operational Development are visible in views to the west-northwest, almost all to hub-height. The key setting aspects of the monument within a waterbody contributes to the understanding of the asset as a defensive monument constructed in an isolated location with excellent surveillance opportunities, thereby contributing to its cultural significance.

10.7.10. The removal of the operational Tangy I and II turbines and their replacement with those of the Proposed Varied Development would increase the horizontal and vertical extent in which turbines would be seen to the north-west of the dwelling. Analysis of the revised blade-tip ZTV (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2**) confirms that all 16 proposed turbines would be visible from the dwelling, as per the ZTV of the Consented Development. Revised wireline and photomontage visualisations (**Volume 3b, CHVP1 & CHVP2 - Figures 10.4.1-10.4.3 and 10.5.1-10.5.4**) have been produced to illustrate the visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from the Scheduled Monument. These demonstrate that all 16 of the turbines will be visible to hub-height. The most prominently visible turbine would be T05 located 935m to the north-west and a prominent feature in views towards, and from, the island itself. The associated forestry felling behind T05 will also change the overall wider setting of the dwelling. The proposed turbines would be visible in the same direction as the Operational Development, yet at a closer distance.

10.7.11. The Proposed Varied Development would be visible on the hillslopes to the north-west of the monument and widen the extent of turbines seen in this direction. Despite the proposed turbines being a visible feature, these would appear beyond immediate elements which contribute to an understanding of the dwelling's setting i.e. the loch itself. Views in all other directions and external views towards the monument from the top of surrounding terrain, which contribute to its secluded setting, would be retained.

10.7.12. Overall, the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling remains the same as that assessed for the Consented Development (of medium magnitude). However, in the context of the NPF4 Policy 7h ii) test it is considered that the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the siting of this Scheduled Monument and the key aspects of the setting of relevance to the isolated and defensive loch dwelling, would be adequately retained such that the integrity of its setting would not be significantly adversely affected. Therefore, the effect on the setting of Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling is assessed as being of **moderate** adverse

significance (**significant** in EIA terms) and the same as that for the Consented Development.

Killocraw, Cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21)

10.7.13. This monument comprises a prehistoric burial cairn, which survives as a low grassy mound up to 1m high with a slightly hollowed centre. It has been considerably damaged by stone robbing and is completely overgrown by grass. The cairn is situated in rough grazing on a small knoll overlooking a burn to the north. The cairn is part of a group of prehistoric monuments in the same area, including Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43) and Killocraw, cup-marked stone 800m E of (SM209, Site 22). As a Scheduled Monument, the cairn is of national heritage value, and of high sensitivity.

10.7.14. The cairn has extensive views directed westward out to sea, on a clear day as far as Islay and Northern Ireland, and along the Kintyre coastline. This is likely a key aspect of the cairns overall setting. The monument is a typical early prehistoric burial cairn and is legible as a monument deliberately sited to have visibility over a wide area and to be visible across the landscape (although the cairn can now only be appreciated at relatively close quarters). The cairn is part of a small group of prehistoric monuments around Killocraw, including another scheduled cairn (SM3647, Site 43) 220m to the north-east, and cup-marked boulder (SM209, Site 22) 415m to the north-east which both have clear intervisibility. These closely grouped monuments overlook a burn, and this landscape relationship is also considered to be an aspect of the cairn's setting. The ground rises to the east and south-east of the cairn, towards current commercial forestry plantation, with the terrain limiting distant views in these directions and with no current visibility of the Operational Development to the south-east.

10.7.15. The Proposed Varied Development would be visible to the south-east of the monument and appear in the backdrop in views to the cairn on approach from the north and west. Analysis of the revised blade-tip ZTV (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2**) confirms that all 16 proposed turbines would be visible from the cairn, as per the Consented Development. A revised photomontage visualisation (**Volume 3b, CHVP4 - Figure 10.7.1-10.7.4**) and an additional photomontage looking toward the Proposed Varied Development with the two Killocraw cairns in the foreground (**Volume 3b, CHVP5 - Figure 10.8.1-10.8.4**), have been produced to illustrate the visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from the Scheduled Monument. These demonstrate that all 16 of the turbines would be visible to hub-height: an increase in level of visibility from the previous 13 turbines visible to hub-height from the Consented Development wireline (2018 EIAR, **Volume 3b, Figure 13.3.3.2a**). The most prominently visible and nearest proposed turbine (T08) would be located approximately 1.2km to the south-east, in the same location as the Consented Development. The

proposed substation would be located to the east of T08 on the same north-west sloping hill, and now 0.8km from the cairn.

10.7.16. The proposed turbines and associated elements would be temporarily accentuated by the removal of current forestry plantation surrounding the Proposed Varied Development and during the regrowth stage of forest replantation. The proposed substation at 11.5m in height would be visible in this same direction as the turbines, to the south-east (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.7.4b**). However, the substation would not extend beyond the skyline in height and constitutes a smaller element of the development when compared to the proposed turbines. All three turbines of the operational Auchadaduie Wind Farm would be theoretically visible beyond commercial forestry north of the cairn (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.7.3d**) at a distance of approximately 6-7km and limited to one visible to hub-height. Four turbines of the operational Gigha and Gigha Extension Wind Farm are visible to hub-height long-distance over 17km to the north.

10.7.17. The Proposed Varied Development would be visible on the broad hill ridges to the south-east. However, the physical and topographic separation of the cairn from the Proposed Varied Development sited on the other side of the Allt nan Creamh burn, allows for its setting within the landscape to still be understood. The key aspects of the cairns setting that contribute to its cultural significance; the expansive coastal views and the relationship with the possibly contemporary Killocraw, cairn (SM3647, Site 43) and Killocraw, cup-marked stone (SM209, Site 22) to the north-east, as well as the nearby burn, would still be retained.

10.7.18. Overall, the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of Killocraw, cairn, remains the same as that assessed for the Consented Development (both of medium magnitude). However, in the context of the NPF4 Policy 7h ii) test it is considered that the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the siting of this Scheduled Monument and the key aspects of the setting of relevance to the cairn (the interrelationship with contemporary monuments and coastal views) would be adequately retained such that the integrity of its setting would not be significantly adversely affected. Therefore, the effect on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of, is assessed as being that of **moderate** adverse significance (**significant** in EIA terms) and the same as that for the Consented Development.

Additional Detailed Setting Assessment

10.7.19. Nineteen heritage assets were assessed as having an increased level of operational effect on their settings as a result of the increased turbine height of the Proposed Varied Development. This includes one designated asset now predicted to have a **moderate** and therefore **significant** setting effect (in EIA

terms), identified through analysis of the revised blade-tip ZTV (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2-10.3**) and assessed below.

10.7.20. The remaining 18 heritage assets were re-assessed as now having either a **minor** or **negligible** level effect, raised from previously assessed effects from the Consented Development, however, their level of effect outcome remains **not significant** in EIA terms. For all other heritage assets, the change in the appearance and layout of the Proposed Varied Development would not be so apparent as to result in an appreciable change to the assessment of the effects on their settings represented and described in the original 2018 EIAR. All assessed heritage assets are listed in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**.

Killocraw, Cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43)

10.7.21. This monument comprises a prehistoric burial cairn, which survives as a low grassy mound up to 1.5m high. The cairn is situated in wet rough grazing on the north side of a small burn, on a west-facing slope. The cairn is part of a group of prehistoric monuments, including Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) and Killocraw, cup-marked stone 800m E of (SM209, Site 22). As a Scheduled Monument, the cairn is of national heritage value, and of high sensitivity.

10.7.22. The cairn has extensive views directed westward out to sea, on a clear day as far as Islay and Ireland, and along the Kintyre coastline. This is likely a key aspect of the cairns overall setting. The monument is a typical early prehistoric burial cairn and appears to be deliberately sited to have visibility over a wide area and also to be visible across the landscape. The cairn is part of a small group of prehistoric monuments around Killocraw, including another scheduled cairn (SM3664, Site 22) 220m to the south-west, and a cup-marked boulder (SM209, Site 22) 415m to the north-east which both have clear intervisibility. These closely grouped monuments overlook a burn, and this landscape relationship is also considered to be an aspect of the cairns setting. The ground rises to the east and south-east of the cairn, towards current commercial forest plantation, with the terrain limiting distant views in these directions and with no current visibility of the Operational Development to the south-east.

10.7.23. The Proposed Varied Development would be visible to the south-east of the monument and appear in the backdrop in views to the cairn on approach from the north and west. Analysis of the revised blade-tip ZTV (**Volume 3a, Figure 10.2**) confirms that all 16 proposed turbines would be visible from the cairn, as per the ZTV of the Consented Development. The closest elements of the Proposed Varied Development include the proposed substation and proposed turbine T08, approximately 0.8 to 1.1km to the south-east respectively. A revised photomontage visualisation from the cairn (**Volume 3b, CHVP3 -**

Figure 10.6.1-10.6.4) and an additional photomontage looking toward the Proposed Varied Development with the two Killocraw cairns in the foreground (**Volume 3b, CHVP5 - Figure 10.8.1-10.8.4**), have been produced to illustrate the visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from the Scheduled Monument. These demonstrate that all 16 of the turbines would be visible to hub-height.

10.7.24. The proposed turbines and associated elements would be temporarily accentuated by the removal of existing forest plantation surrounding the Proposed Varied Development and during the regrowth stage of forest replanting. The proposed substation at 11.5m in height would be visible in the same direction as the turbines, to the south-east, (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.6.4b**). However, the substation would not extend beyond the skyline in height and constitutes a smaller element of the development when compared to the proposed turbines. The operational Auchadaduie Hill Wind Farm is currently visible (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.6.3c**) beyond commercial forestry north of the cairn, at a distance of approximately 5.9-6.6km, and limited to one blade-tip turbine visibility.

10.7.25. The Proposed Varied Development would be visible on the broad hill ridges to the south-east. However, the physical and topographic separation of the cairn from the Proposed Varied Development, sited on the other side of Allt nan Creamh burn, allows for its setting within the landscape to still be understood. The key aspects of the cairns setting that contribute to its cultural significance; the expansive coastal views and the relationship with the possibly contemporary Killocraw, cairn (SM3664, Site 21) and Killocraw, cup-marked stone (SM209, Site 22), as well as the nearby burn, would be retained.

10.7.26. Overall, the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of Killocraw, cairn is assessed as being of medium magnitude. However, in the context of the NPF4 Policy 7h ii) test it is considered that the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the siting of this Scheduled Monument and the key aspects of the setting of relevance to the cairn (the interrelationship with contemporary monuments and coastal views) would be adequately retained such that the integrity of its setting would not be significantly adversely affected. Therefore, the effect on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 640m E of, is increased from minor-moderate (not significant) assessed from the Consented Development to that of **moderate** adverse significance (**significant** in EIA terms).

Revised Cumulative Effects

10.7.27. 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, and in the tabulated setting assessment in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.2**. **Volume 3a, Figure 5.10** provides details of the

developments which have been identified for consideration in the cumulative impact assessment.

10.7.28. The assessment of cumulative effects remains the same as the Consented Development. At the time of writing, there have been changes to the relevant cumulative schemes eligible for inclusion of assessment of cumulative effects in-combination with the Proposed Varied Development;

- Auchadaduie Wind Farm and Blary Hill Wind Farm have since been constructed and are now fully operational. Therefore, they are no longer eligible for cumulative assessment as they are now considered part of the baseline;
- Killean Estate Wind Farm original application (ECU00005266 – 17 turbines. 149.9m max tip height) refused by Scottish Ministers in December 2019. A revised layout and reduction in the number of proposed turbines has been considered as a new Killean Wind Farm application (ECU00004927, 9 turbines, 180m max height) and since been referred to DPEA for a decision; and
- Clachaig Glen Wind Farm (14 turbines, 126.5m) has since been subject to a revised S36C application for an increase in turbine height (ECU00002103, 12 turbines, max blade-tip height 200m), which now supersedes an earlier consent. The cumulative assessment focuses on the revised application only as a 'worst case' scenario.

10.7.29. Therefore, based on professional judgement, five cumulative developments have been identified as most likely to have a cumulative effect on heritage assets in-combination with the Proposed Varied Development;

- Killean Wind Farm (ECU00004927, 9 turbines, 180m max height);
- Clachaig Glen Wind Farm (ECU00002103, 12 turbines, 200m max blade-tip height), consented;
- Allt Domhain Wind Farm (formerly known as Arnicle Wind Farm) (ECU00003231, 9 turbines, four at 200m and five up to 230m max height);
- Breackerie Wind Farm (WIN-130-9, 13 turbines up to 200m height), S36 application awaiting decision of minister's post-inquiry; and
- Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub (ECU00004767, 29 turbines, 180m up to 200m turbine blade-tip height), S36 EIA Report.

10.7.30. The Scottish and Southern Energy Networks Section 37 application (SSEN S.37) cumulative development has been included for assessment in-combination with the Proposed Varied Development:

- Tangy IV Wind Farm and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm 132 kV OHL Shared Use Connection, at Scoping stage (ECU00006122, double circuit 132 kV OHL connection approximately 13km in length, supported with steel lattice towers).
- Associated works also considered in terms of cumulative development include: the construction of an underground cable connection (UGC) between Tangy IV Wind Farm and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm substations, approximately 5.6km in length.

Construction

10.7.31. The proposed section of UGC between Tangy IV Wind Farm and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm for the Shared Use Connection would cross the northern end of the Inner Study Area and tie into the proposed substation. A number of heritage assets (including a cluster of five shielings (WoSAS 3092/58784, Sites 139-141) and one sheepfold (WoSAS 59606, Site 11)) are recorded within this area of the Inner Study Area. None of these heritage assets are predicted to be directly affected by construction of the Proposed Varied Development.

10.7.32. Accordingly, there is no likely significant cumulative direct (construction) effects predicted from the Proposed Varied Development and the proposed Shared Use Connection UGC.

Operation

10.7.33. The following heritage assets have been brought forward for a cumulative assessment from the Proposed Varied Development in-combination with other developments:

Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27)

10.7.34. In addition to the Proposed Varied Development, **Volume 3b, Figure 10.4.3a-b** shows 14 turbines of the S36 application Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub (nine at hub-height) would be visible to the north-northwest of the monument, at a distance of approximately 2.6km. Some of these turbines would be visible behind the Proposed Varied Development effectively forming a group in this same direction. The enclosed topographic bowl in which the monument is set restricts views out to the wider landscape and no further cumulative developments would be visible from the monument. The secluded and defensive setting of the Fortified Dwelling on the loch, which contributes to its

cultural significance, would still be retained. Therefore, the combined effect of the Proposed Varied Development with the Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub would be no greater than that assessed for the Proposed Development alone (**moderate** significance; **significant** in EIA terms), with the Proposed Varied Development exerting the greater effect on the setting of the monument. This is an increase from the cumulative predicted effect for the Consented Development.

Killocraw, Cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21)

10.7.35. **Volume 3b, Figure 10.7.3a-d** show at least 28 turbines of the S36 application Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub (26 at hub-height) would be visible upslope from the cairn to the north-east, with the closest proposed turbine at a distance of 2.2km. This development would be visible alongside the Proposed Varied Development situated to the south-east. Allt Domhain Wind Farm would not be visible in same views to the north-east, screened by intervening topography. In addition to operational wind farms to the north, there would also be theoretical visibility beyond commercial forestry north of the cairn, to Killean and Clachaig Glen Wind Farm at a distance of 10-13km. There would be visibility of all nine turbines of the application Killean Wind Farm (three at hub-height), and visibility of nine turbines of consented Clachaig Glen Wind Farm (six at hub-height) (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.7.3d**). All of these turbines would be seen north of the cairn and not in the same view as the Proposed Varied Development. Similarly, from the available Scoping information, the Tangy IV and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm 132 kV OHL Shared Connection sited 5.2km to the north-east, would not be visible as a result of raised topography interrupting views in this direction. The closer UGC portion of the 132 kV Shared Connection would not result in any potential setting impacts due to the lack of any prominent above-ground features.

10.7.36. Up to six proposed turbines of the S36 application Breackerie Wind Farm would be visible in distant views 13km to the south (two at hub-height) (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.7.3b**). The Proposed Varied Development would thus increase the arc of view in which wind farm infrastructure would be visible from the cairn and would also, owing to its greater proximity, appear larger and more prominent in comparison to other cumulative developments. The interrelationship between Killocraw cairn (SM3647, Site 43) and other contemporary prehistoric monuments within the landscape to the immediate north-east would not be affected by the wider increase in surrounding wind farm developments and key coastal views to the south would remain unaffected. The magnitude of cumulative impact would be no greater than that assessed for the Proposed Varied Development alone (**moderate** significance; **significant** in EIA terms) with the Proposed Varied Development exerting the greater effect on the setting of the monument. This is the same as was predicted for the Consented Development.

Additional Cumulative Assessment

10.7.37. An additional cumulative assessment has been undertaken for Killocraw, Cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43) due to the identified increase in operational effect from the Proposed Varied Development.

10.7.38. All other cumulative effects on heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Varied development in-combination with other proposed developments in the area, remains the same as the cumulative effects predicted from the Consented Development in-combination with other proposed developments.

Killocraw, Cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43)

10.7.39. **Volume 3b, Figure 10.6.3c** shows that there is current visibility of one turbine of the operational Auchadaduie Wind Farm, sited approximately 6km to the north of the cairn. Twenty-eight proposed turbines of the S36 application Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub development would be visible from the cairn (**Volume 3b, Figure 10.6.3a-c**) in views to the east and north-east, all but three at hub-height. Allt Domhain Wind Farm would likely not be visible in views further to the north-east, screened by intervening topography, and there is no visibility of operational Killean and Clachaig Glen Wind Farm over 10km further north, beyond commercial forestry. Similarly, from the available Scoping information, the Tangy IV and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm 132 kV OHL Shared Connection sited 5km to the north-east, would not be visible as a result of raised topography interrupting views in this direction. The closer UGC portion of the 132 kV Shared Connection would not result in any potential setting impacts due to the lack of any prominent above-ground features.

10.7.40. **Volume 3b, Figure 10.6.3b** shows that two proposed turbines of the S36 application Breackerie Wind Farm would be theoretically visible in distant views 13km to the south (both at tip-height only). All of these developments would be visible north, east and south of the cairn and not in the same view as the Proposed Varied Development. The Proposed Varied Development would thus increase the arc of view in which wind farm development would be visible from the cairn and would also, owing to its greater proximity, appear much larger and more prominent in scale in comparison to other cumulative developments. The interrelationship between Killocraw cairn (SM3664, Site 21) to the south-west and other contemporary prehistoric monuments within the landscape directly north-east would not be affected by the wider increase in surrounding wind farm infrastructure and key coastal views to the south would remain unaffected. The cumulative effect has increased from that assessed from the Consented Development, with the magnitude of cumulative impact no greater than that assessed for the Proposed Varied Development alone (**moderate** significance; **significant** in EIA terms), with the Proposed Varied Development exerting the greatest effect on the setting of the monument. This is an increased cumulative level of effect from the Consented

Development, previously assessed as a minor-moderate effect (**not significant**).

10.8. Revised Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Varied Development

10.8.1. NPF4 (Scottish Government 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.

10.8.2. Mitigation measures for the Proposed Varied Development, on heritage assets not previously identified for potential impact from the Consented Development, are proposed as follows.

Construction

10.8.3. Prior to commencement of construction works, sheepfold (Site 15) an asset of low sensitivity, will require a suitable programme of archaeological recording (written records, photography, surveying), to a standard acceptable to WoSAS and outlined in a suitable Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

10.8.4. To avoid any potential accidental damage from construction work along the route of the proposed access track to the proposed substation, the building remains (Site 1), of low sensitivity, will be demarcated using high visibility markers placed from the outer edge of the building, facing the area of work, and visible to construction workers. These markers will be used during the construction phase and removed on completion of the access track construction.

10.8.5. If the building remains (Site 1) cannot be preserved in situ then mitigation in the form of excavation and archaeological recording to a standard acceptable and agreed to in consultation with WoSAS, will be conducted to preserve the asset by record. The provision may include the production of written reports, post-excavation analysis and publication of works where necessary. The nature of such works will be outlined within a suitable WSI.

10.8.6. It has been assessed that there is low to moderate potential for undiscovered archaeological remains to be present within the Site and without mitigation there could be a direct construction impact of up to moderate significance. Therefore, if required under the terms of a condition of consent, the scope of any required archaeological watching brief(s) will be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and will be set out in the WSI, as per the Consented Development. If any new archaeological discoveries are made during the course of development works,

they shall be reported to WoSAS to enable written agreement on appropriate mitigation measures.

Operational

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

Residual Effects

Construction

10.8.8. Taking into account the mitigation measures proposed, the following residual construction effects have been identified;

- Residual effect of negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) is predicted on the remains of a sheepfold (Site 15), the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the sheepfold being offset by archaeological recording, implemented before ground-breaking activities take place, and recorded to a standard acceptable to WoSAS; and
- Residual effect of no more than minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) on any buried archaeological remains revealed through archaeological investigations and ground-breaking activities and recorded to a standard acceptable to WoSAS.

10.8.9. Building (Site 1) would be marked off and avoided for the duration of the access track construction works and no residual effect is predicted on this asset. Post-construction monitoring would be carried out to check that marking

out has been effective and that the asset has not been disturbed, and that all markers have been removed following completion of construction works.

Operational

10.8.10. During its operational lifetime, the residual effects of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of heritage assets in the wider study area will be the same as the predicted effects.

Cumulative Construction

10.8.11. No cumulative construction effects are predicted hence there would be no residual cumulative construction effects.

Cumulative Operation

10.8.12. During its operational lifetime, the residual cumulative effects of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of heritage assets in the Outer Study Area, would be the same as the predicted cumulative effects. Any changes to the cumulative operational effects during the operational lifetime of the development would come as a result of changes to the surrounding cumulative developments.

10.8.13. **Table 10.5** summarises and compares the potential **significant** effects of the Proposed Varied Development and Consented Development, the proposed mitigation measures, and the conclusion of likely effects in EIA terms, in respect to cultural heritage.

Table 10.5: Summary of Potential Significant Effects of the Proposed Varied Development

Comparison of Development	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome / Residual Effect
Proposed Varied Development	**Construction**			
	Moderate adverse direct construction impact on unknown buried archaeological remains in undisturbed areas from construction works.	Archaeological Watching Brief(s).	To be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and would be set out in the WSI.	Not Significant

Comparison of Development	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome / Residual Effect
Consented Development	Moderate adverse direct construction impact on unknown buried archaeological remains in undisturbed areas from construction works.	Archaeological Watching Brief(s).	To be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and would be set out in the WSI.	Not Significant
Proposed Varied Development	**Operational**			
	Moderate adverse impact on the setting of Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
	Moderate adverse impact on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
	Moderate adverse impact on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
Consented Development	Moderate adverse impact on the setting of Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
	Moderate adverse impact on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
Proposed Varied Development	**Cumulative Operational**			
	Moderate adverse setting impact on the setting of Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant

Comparison of Development	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Proposed	Means of Implementation	Outcome / Residual Effect
	Moderate adverse setting impact on Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
	Moderate adverse setting impact on Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant
Consented Development	Moderate adverse setting impact on Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21).	None proposed.	N/A	Significant

10.9. Conclusion

10.9.1. This chapter has considered the potential construction effects on heritage assets within the Site (Inner Study Area) of (the Proposed Varied Development and operational effects on the setting of heritage assets within a 10km Outer Study Area from the Site's Red Line Boundary. A revised desk-based assessment and further field survey and setting visits have been carried out to establish the cultural heritage baseline within the Red Line Boundary and in the wider Outer Study Area. The assessment has been informed by the 2018 EIAR Opinions and further responses made by HES and A&BC to the S36C Scoping Report.

10.9.2. The layout and design of the Proposed Varied Development has been designed as far as possible to avoid direct effects on the identified heritage assets within the Site. An additional adverse construction impact has been identified on two heritage assets; one direct impact on sheepfold (Site 15), and one potential accidental direct impact on building and enclosure (Site 1), both of low sensitivity, and would be partially or wholly removed as a result of construction works for the Proposed Varied Development. This would result in an impact of minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms). Following mitigation to offset this effect, the residual effect would be of negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) on the sheepfold, and none on the building.

10.9.3. An assessment of the identified cultural heritage assets within the Site, and consideration of the current and past land-use, indicates that there is medium

potential for unidentified archaeological remains of prehistoric or medieval/post-medieval date being present within the Site. It is possible that, without mitigation, there could be an impact of up to **moderate** significance on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets. As was concluded for the Consented Development, following mitigation, agreed with WoSAS, the residual effect on previously unrecorded archaeological remains would be of no more than minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms).

10.9.4. Within 10km of the Red Line Boundary, 52 Scheduled Monuments, six Category B Listed Buildings, one Category C Listed Building, one Conservation Area and 34 NSR sites (22 Code C & 12 Code V), were taken forward for setting assessment as a result of predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Varied Development, identified from the revised ZTV. Seventeen of these assets with predicted theoretical visibility of the Proposed Varied Development had no former predicted visibility of the Consented Development.

10.9.5. Assessment of the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of these assets has resulted in the identification of an effect of **moderate** significance (**significant** in EIA terms) on the setting of three Scheduled Monuments; Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27), Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21) and Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43). Two of these have an effect that remains the same as assessed from the Consented Development, whilst the change in appearance of the Proposed Varied Development on one monument (SM3647), has increased the significance of effect on its setting from a previously concluded **not significant** effect. The assessments concluded that, although the Proposed Varied Development would introduce a notable change to each monument's setting in views to the north-west and south-east respectively, key views and intervisibility with contemporary monuments would not be impacted and it would remain possible to experience, appreciate and understand the cultural significance of the Fortified Dwelling and the Cairns', with their setting's adequately retained such that their integrity would not be significantly compromised. All other effects on the settings of designated assets and NSR sites within the Outer Study Area, as assessed in the 2018 EIAR, are of no greater than minor significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) as a result of the Proposed Varied Development.

10.9.6. In the wider landscape a significant cumulative effect is predicted arising from the Proposed Varied Development in-combination with six proposed cumulative developments. A predicted effect of **moderate** significance (**significant** in EIA terms) would remain on the setting of Killocraw, cairn 450m ESE of (SM3664, Site 21), as was concluded for the Consented Development, and an additional **moderate** significance cumulative effect predicted on Tangy Loch, Fortified Dwelling (SM3180, Site 27) and Killocraw, cairn 640m E of (SM3647, Site 43) as a result of the Proposed Varied Development in-combination with other proposed developments. The combined developments

would not however adversely affect the overall heritage value or cultural significance of these assets.

10.10. References

Planning Legislation and Guidance

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (2019, updated 2020) Designation Policy and Selection Guidance, Edinburgh, available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b.

Historic Environment Scotland (2016, updated 2020) Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting, Edinburgh (https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549).

Scottish Government (2023) National Planning Framework for Scotland 4, Edinburgh. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/. [Accessed 20 January 2026].

Scottish Government (2017) Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017, Edinburgh. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/pdfs/ssi_20170101_en.pdf.

Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (SNH & HES) (2018) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=6ed33b65-9df1-4a2f-acbb-a8e800a592c0

Online Resources

Historic Environment Scotland (2026a) Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap). [Online] Available at: http://hlamap.org.uk [Accessed 28/07/2025]

Historic Environment Scotland (2026b) Spatial Data Warehouse: GIS downloader [Online] Available at

https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/apex/f?p=PORTAL:downloads:::::DATASET:ALL [Accessed 09/01/2026].

Bibliographic References

SSEN (2025) Tangy IV Wind Farm and Cnoc Buidhe Wind Farm 132 KV OHL Shared Use Connection, Environmental Impact Assessment: Scoping Report.

SSE Renewables (2025) Tangy IV Wind Farm Varied Development S36C, Scoping Report.

SSE Renewables (2018) Tangy IV Wind Farm Section 36 Environmental Impact Assessment Report.

SSE Renewables (2014) Tangy III Wind Farm Environmental Statement.

Stevenson, J.B. (1997) The Prehistoric Rock Carvings of Argyll, in Ritchie, G (ed) The Archaeology of Argyll Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.