

Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

| | |
|--|----|
| 7.1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 2 |
| 7.2. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT | 3 |
| 7.3. CONSULTATIONS..... | 4 |
| 7.4. BASELINE DATA GAP ANALYSIS RESULTS | 9 |
| 7.5. SUMMARY OF EFFECTS PREDICTED & MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED FOR THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT..... | 11 |
| 7.6. REVISED ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS FOR THE PROPOSED VARIED DEVELOPMENT | 12 |
| 7.7. REVISED MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED VARIED DEVELOPMENT | 21 |
| 7.8. CONCLUSION | 22 |
| 7.9. REFERENCES..... | 22 |

Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 7.1: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES RELEVANT TO CULTURAL HERITAGE ... | 4 |
| TABLE 7.2: 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR CONCLUDED CULTURAL HERITAGE EFFECTS OF THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT..... | 11 |
| TABLE 7.3: VISIBILITY OF CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT COMPARED WITH PROPOSED VARIED DEVELOPMENT FOR AGREED HERITAGE ASSETS..... | 14 |

Figures

- Figure 7.1: Designated and Undesignated Heritage Assets within Study Area with ZTV and Cultural Heritage Viewpoint Locations
- Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Comparative Wireline from SM4567 'Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of' (EIAR Site 2)
- Figure 7.3 a-c: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Cumulative Wireline from SM4567 'Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of'(EIAR Site 2)
- Figure 7.4a-b: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Comparative Wireline from Loch Ness towards SM90309/PiC323 Urquhart Castle (EIAR Site 25)
- Figure 7.5 - Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Cumulative Wireline from Loch Ness towards SM90309/PiC323 Urquhart Castle (EIAR Site 25)
- Figure 7.6a -b - 2021 EIA LVIA Viewpoint 4, Comparative wireline from Achtuie Road near Creag Nay

Appendices

- Technical Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer and Stage 1 Setting Assessment

7.1. Executive Summary

- 7.1.1. This cultural heritage assessment considers potential operational impacts that could affect cultural significance through development within the setting of an agreed list of heritage assets for the Proposed Varied Development in comparison with the Consented Development.
- 7.1.2. With the agreement of consultees, assessment of direct and indirect physical impacts related to construction of the Proposed Varied Development on the fabric of heritage assets within the Site Red Line boundary was scoped out of the 2021 Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and 2022 Additional Information Report (AIR), and remains scoped out in this chapter. No cultural heritage mitigation was required for direct physical impacts of the construction phase and no planning conditions were imposed on the Consented Development. This is supported by The Highland Council (THC) Historic Environment Team (HET).
- 7.1.3. With regard to operational stage effects, a data gap analysis and 'Stage 1' setting assessment has been carried out to identify whether it is likely that the setting of any additional heritage assets to those considered in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR for the Consented Development may be affected during the operational phase as a result of the taller turbines and altered layout of the Proposed Varied Development (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 7.1: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer and Stage 1 Setting Assessment**). No additional heritage assets were identified as requiring detailed assessment. Therefore, as agreed through submission of the Scoping Report and its subsequent methodology approval by consultees, three Scheduled Monuments (one of which is a Property in Care), two Category A Listed Buildings, six Category B Listed Buildings, and two Category C Listed Buildings are assessed for operational effects, including cumulative effects, in this chapter.
- 7.1.4. The location of visualisations agreed with consultees and illustrative of views towards, across, or from heritage assets considered for setting effects are presented in **Volume 2, Figures 7.2 to 7.6**, and their locations are shown on **Figure 7.1: Designated and Undesignated Heritage Assets within Study Area with ZTV and Cultural Heritage Viewpoint Locations**.
- 7.1.5. Whilst adverse impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets surrounding the site are assessed as likely to remain of up to **Minor** effects significance, the impact is of no increased magnitude in comparison with the Consented Development. On this basis no additional mitigation or enhancement measures, beyond those embedded in the design, are warranted. Residual operational effects for the Proposed Varied Development are therefore the same as for the Consented Development. No impact of night time aviation lighting is anticipated upon cultural heritage assets. Conclusions

in relation to operational setting effects, including cumulative effects, are the same for the Proposed Varied Development as for the Consented Development.

- 7.1.6. No significant residual effects of the Proposed Varied Development upon cultural heritage have been identified through EIA as presented in this chapter.

7.2. Scope of Assessment

- 7.2.1. The scope of this chapter has been established through Scoping of the Proposed Varied Development. As a requirement of Scoping Responses, a data gap analysis and 'Stage 1' setting assessment has been carried out to identify whether it is likely that any additional heritage assets to those considered in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR for the Consented Development may be affected during the operational phase as a result of the taller turbines and altered layout of the Proposed Varied Development (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 7.1**).

Receptors/Matters Scoped Into Assessment

- 7.2.2. The following matters are scoped into the assessment in this chapter:
 - Change within the setting of heritage assets where this has the potential to impact upon understanding, appreciation or experience of cultural significance. Operational phase effects are scoped into the assessment for the setting of three Scheduled Monuments (one of which is a Property in Care), two Category A Listed Buildings, six Category B Listed Buildings, and two Category C Listed Buildings. These are comparatively assessed in relation to the Consented Development:
 - Cumulative change within the setting of heritage assets has the potential for increased impact upon understanding, appreciation or experience of their cultural significance as compared with the Proposed Varied Development in isolation. Cumulative setting effects are therefore scoped into the assessment for heritage assets identified as experiencing **Minor** or higher setting effects as a result of the Proposed Varied Development.

Receptors/Matters Scoped Out of Assessment

- 7.2.3. The following matters are scoped out of this chapter:
 - With the agreement of consultees, construction phase direct and indirect physical effects are scoped out of the assessment.

- The assessment of construction phase setting effects is scoped out of the assessment, as they would be temporary and are not considered to be significant due to their very short duration.
- Decommissioning effects are scoped out of the assessment. Any residual operational phase setting effects would be reversed and the current baseline would be restored with no potential for significant effects.

7.3. Consultations

7.3.1. **Table 7.1** provides details of consultations undertaken with relevant regulatory bodies, together with action undertaken by the Applicant in response to consultation comments.

Table 7.1: Summary of Consultation Responses Relevant to Cultural Heritage

| Consultee | Consultation | Where and How Addressed |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Historic Environment Scotland (HES) | <p><u>Consented Development Consultations</u></p> <p>HES provided pre-application advice on 11th June 2019 when they recommended that the potential impacts on Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM4567) and Urquhart Castle (SM90309) should be assessed as part of the EIA process and that visualisations should be provided to support the assessment conclusions.</p> <p>HES were consulted directly regarding proposed viewpoints for assessment of impacts upon cultural heritage receptors. On 21st September 2020, HES confirmed they would welcome a wireline from Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM4567, EIAR Site 2). Following further direct consultation HES confirmed, on 17th February 2021, that LVIA Viewpoint 4, would satisfy their request for a viewpoint taken from the north side of the loch and incorporating Urquhart Castle. On 3rd March 2021 HES agreed that a wireline from Loch Ness, on the approximate route of the 'Jacobite Warrior' ferry, would be sufficient to assess the potential impacts upon the setting of Urquhart Castle, along with the LVIA viewpoints noted above.</p> | <p>An updated assessment based on potential visibility of the Proposed Varied Development in comparison with the Consented Development, as indicated by wirelines and in terms of the likely impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets, is carried out in this chapter for the heritage assets cited in HES's consultation responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM4567) • Urquhart Castle (SM90309) <p>The comparative impact assessment for likely cultural heritage operational effects follows the same methodology as implemented in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR.</p> <p>Assessments for these heritage assets are supported with wireline visualisations as agreed with consultees, along with consultation of one supporting LVIA photomontage. Visualisations are presented in Volume 2, Figures 7.2 to 7.6.</p> |

Proposed Varied Development Scoping Response

To ensure that all relevant assets can be identified and assessed, HES recommend that Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping is used to identify assets that could experience setting impacts from the amended wind farm design.

HES confirm they are content to use wireframe visualisations to understand impacts on the settings of Urquhart Castle (SM90309) and Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of (SM4567). These should be produced from the positions assessed in the original EIAR (namely CH VP1 for Levishie Cottage and CH VP2 for Urquhart Castle). They also request that a comparative wireline should be produced for each asset showing the consented scheme and the proposed scheme.

Achratagan hut circle and cairnfield 790m NNE of (SM11456) was not assessed in the original EIAR; the increase in turbine height means that it is now intervisible with the array. HES have considered this monument and note that it has a localised setting and is located around 12km from the proposed development. As such, they do not believe that a significant impact upon this monument is likely to occur, and we are content for it to be scoped out of further assessment.

In addition, comparative assessment is undertaken for all heritage assets agreed through previous consultations for the Consented Development totalling 13 designated assets (comprising three Scheduled Monuments, two Category A Listed Buildings, six Category B Listed Buildings, and three Category C Listed Buildings). (Of these, intervisibility with one of the Scheduled Monuments and one of the Category A Listed Buildings was removed when the previously proposed Turbines T13, T14 & T18 were removed from the scheme layout and reassessed in the submitted Additional Information Report).

A data gap analysis and 'Stage 1' setting assessment is presented in this chapter to identify whether it is likely that any additional heritage assets to those considered in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR for the Consented Development may be affected during the operational phase as a result of the taller turbines and altered layout of the Proposed Varied Development (see **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 7.1**).

The Highland Council
Historic Environment Team (THC HET)

Consented Development Consultations

Direct consultation was undertaken with THC's Historic Environment Team (HET) regarding the need to consider the potential for direct effects upon heritage assets as part of the EIAR and the need to carry out a walkover survey on the Site. HET responded on 8th April 2020, confirming that direct effects could be scoped out of the EIAR and that a walkover survey was not required to inform the assessment.

Direct (physical) effects of the Proposed Varied Development are again scoped out of the assessments presented in this chapter, as it was for the Consented Development application, in consultation with THC HET.

Proposed Varied Development Scoping
Response

THC's HET(Archaeology) are satisfied with the methodology provided in the Scoping Report, including the proposed figures and viewpoint locations. They are satisfied that the matters Scoped Out, including direct impacts to undesignated assets, remain appropriate for this redesigned application.

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) are anticipated to provide comment on the assessment methodology for heritage assets within their remit including the scope of the assessment and their requirements for supporting information (including visualisations) and the potential impacts on heritage assets in their consultation response.

It is noted that THC has deferred comment regarding the scope of the likely operational impacts of the Proposed Varied Development within the setting of heritage assets to HES.

Assessment Methodology Baseline

Data Sources

7.3.2. The baseline data sources for the Consented Development application have largely been relied upon in this assessment for the Proposed Varied Development, although up-to-date data searches have been undertaken for designation data from the HES website.

7.3.3. The following sources of information were referred to:

- Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension EIA Report (2021);
- Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension AI Report (2022);
- Designation data downloaded from the Historic Environment Scotland website in August 2025;
- The National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), including the Canmore database and associated photographs, prints/drawings and manuscripts held by HES;
- A zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV); and
- Photomontage and wireline visualisations.

Field Surveys

7.3.4. Consideration of direct (physical) impacts within the Red Line Boundary has been scoped out of this chapter and therefore baseline data gathering for the Site is not necessary and field surveys have not been undertaken.

Data Gap Analysis

7.3.5. A data gap analysis and 'Stage 1' setting assessment has been carried out to identify whether it is likely that any additional heritage assets to those considered in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR for the Consented Development may be affected during the operational phase as a result of the taller turbines and altered layout of the Proposed Varied Development (see **the Gazetteer, Technical Appendix 7.1**).

7.3.6. A comparison between the ZTVs for the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development has been carried out to identify where any additional heritage assets may be affected where previously no impact was predicted. This includes consideration of:

- Heritage assets that may have been considered unlikely to be affected by the Consented Development as they formerly lay outwith the ZTV but which may now lie within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development.
- Heritage assets within the ZTV for both the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development, for which no impact was predicted in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR but which may be considered likely to be increasingly affected due to the taller scale of the turbines for the Proposed Varied Development.
- The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR used a 10km study area, plus consideration of Urquhart Castle (SM90309) situated within a 15km study area. Due to the taller turbines of the Proposed Varied Development and the according potential for adverse impacts upon cultural heritage over a wider area, designated heritage assets within a 10-20km study area from proposed turbine locations are considered in this chapter.

Study Area

7.3.7. Heritage assets have been included in the assessment for nested Study Areas based on their level of importance (see the Gazetteer **Technical Appendix 7.1** and the study area **Figure 7.1**) to ensure that likely significant effects are identified. The Study Area reflects the fact that the more important the asset, the more likely significant effects could be generated over greater distances.

Therefore, the following study area boundaries have been applied based initially on the methodology in the 2021 EIAR for baseline data gathering:

- Up to 2km from Proposed Varied Development turbine locations: non-designated heritage assets;
- Up to 5km from Proposed Varied Development turbine locations: all designated heritage assets, including Category B and C Listed Buildings, and Conservation Areas;
- Up to 20km from Proposed Varied Development turbine locations: nationally important designated heritage assets including World Heritage Properties, Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Inventoried Battlefields.

7.3.8. In addition, beyond the Study Area as defined above, any other designated assets which are within the ZTV have been considered for assessment, where a significant impact is considered possible as a result of the Proposed Varied Development (i.e., where an asset is considered exceptionally important and/or sensitive to visual change within its setting, and/or where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to contribute to cultural significance in the opinion of the assessor or consultees; as was the case for Urquhart Castle (SM90309) during the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR). This screening exercise is based on the approach set out in *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020). In the case of the Proposed Varied Development, no assets have been identified beyond the defined Study Area and in the ZTV requiring consideration in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment.

7.3.9. Cultural Heritage Viewpoints (CHVPs) within the Study are shown on **Figure 7.1** along with the Proposed Varied Development Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Designated heritage assets are discussed in this chapter with the designation reference number assigned by HES.

Impact Assessment

7.3.10. The impact assessment for likely cultural heritage operational effects follows the same methodology as implemented in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR. The approach to assessment is in accordance with relevant guidance on cultural heritage impact assessment provided by: 'Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook' (NatureScot and Historic Environment Scotland, 2018), 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020), and the 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK' (IEMA, IHBC and CfA, 2021).

- 7.3.11. This assessment is concerned with impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets. It identifies assets that may be affected by the Proposed Varied Development by considering their cultural significance, including the contribution made by their settings. If an asset's setting is found to make a substantive contribution to its cultural significance, and this contribution is likely to be affected as a result of the Proposed Varied Development, the asset is considered to be 'sensitive'. Assets that are found to be sensitive to the predicted changes in their setting may experience a higher magnitude of impact than an asset that is less sensitive to changes in its setting.
- 7.3.12. The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of an asset is diminished or enhanced by a proposed development. The EIA significance of this effect is determined by comparing the predicted magnitude of impact with the level of importance assigned to the specific asset (reflecting the greater protection in policy afforded to assets of higher importance).
- 7.3.13. Comparison **Table 7.3** is presented to outline the difference in anticipated visibility between the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development through analysis of wireline visualisations.
- 7.3.14. Impact assessment conclusions are presented in comparison with the conclusions of the **2021 EIAR** and **2022 AIR Volume 1, Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage** for the agreed list of heritage assets under consideration, also accounting for the data-gap analysis, the results of which are presented in this chapter.
- 7.3.15. In this assessment **Major** and **Moderate** effects are considered 'Significant' in EIA terms, while **Minor** and **Negligible** effects are regarded as 'Not Significant'.

7.4. Baseline Data Gap Analysis Results

- 7.4.1. Within 2km of the proposed turbine locations there is one Scheduled Monument and two non-designated assets, all of which lie within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development, which is the same as for the Consented Development.
- 7.4.2. Within 2-5km of the proposed turbine locations there is one Category A Listed Building, eight Category B Listed Buildings, and three Category C Listed Buildings. All assets other than one Category A Listed Building lie within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development, which is the same as for the Consented Development.
- 7.4.3. Within 5-10km of the proposed turbine locations there are five Scheduled Monuments and three Category A Listed Buildings, none of which lie within the

ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development, which is the same as for the Consented Development.

- 7.4.4. Within 10-20km of the proposed turbine locations there are 39 Scheduled Monuments (one of which is a Property in Care), and six Category A Listed Buildings. Fifteen of the Scheduled Monuments lie within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development (as compared with 12 for the Consented Development, discussed below). One of the Category A Listed Buildings lies within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development, which is the same as the Consented Development.
- 7.4.5. No further heritage assets have been identified within the ZTV and beyond the defined Study Area, where their significance and contribution made by setting is such that a significant impact is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Varied Development.

New Designations

- 7.4.6. No heritage assets requiring assessment have been designated within 20km of the Proposed Varied Development turbines since the previous data gathering for assessments in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR.

Updated/Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility

- 7.4.7. Three Scheduled Monuments are located within the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development where previously they were not in the ZTV for the Consented Development:
 - SM11453 Upper Drumbuie, burnt mound, located 15.17km north-east of the nearest proposed turbine. This monument does not gain significance from long-distance views.
 - SM11456 Achratagan, hut circle and cairnfield, located 11.55km north-east of the nearest proposed turbine. HES has confirmed in their scoping opinion for the Proposed Varied Development (Case ID: 300037514) that a significant impact upon this monument is unlikely to occur and are content for it to be scoped out of further assessment.
 - SM11494 Tir nan Og, cairn, located 13.0km south-west of the nearest proposed turbine. The cairn is located in the base of the valley of the River Moriston and is not a prominent hilltop cairn intended to be visible over long distances. Its prominence within this localised setting would remain unaffected.

7.4.8. Significant effects are therefore not anticipated, and these Scheduled Monuments are not considered further in this chapter.

7.5. **Summary of Effects Predicted & Mitigation Measures suggested for the Consented Development**

Summary of Effects of the Consented Development

7.5.1. **Table 7.2** presents a summary of the effects of the Consented Development.

Table 7.2: 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR Concluded Cultural Heritage Effects of the Consented Development

| Ref | Name | Status | Operational Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|---|-------------------|
| SM4567 (EIAR Site 2) | Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of | Scheduled Monument | Minor | Minor |
| SM4536 (EIAR Site 3) | Dell Farm, burial mounds 350m NE of | Scheduled Monument | Neutral (in AIR, following removal of three turbines) | N/A |
| LB1874 (EIAR Site 9) | Old Bridge, Whitebridge | Cat A Listed Building | Neutral (in AIR, following removal of three turbines) | N/A |
| LB14996 (EIAR Site 12) | Torgyle Bridge | Cat A Listed Building | Neutral | N/A |
| LB15017 (EIAR Site 15) | 'Barracks' And Servant's Tunnel, Invermoriston House | Cat B Listed Building | Negligible | N/A |
| LB15019 (EIAR Site 16) | Smithy House & Smithy Studio, Invermoriston | Cat C Listed Buildings | Negligible | N/A |
| LB15020 (EIAR Site 17) | Gazebo, Invermoriston House | Cat B Listed Building | Minor | N/A |
| LB15022 (EIAR Site 19) | Church Of Scotland, Invermoriston | Cat B Listed Building | Neutral | N/A |
| LB15023 (EIAR Site 20) | Burial Ground, St Columba's Church, Invermoriston | Cat B Listed Building | Negligible | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|------------|-------|
| LB15024 (EIAR Site 21) | Invermoriston Old Bridge | Cat B Listed Building | Negligible | N/A |
| LB15025 (EIAR Site 22) | Invermoriston New Bridge | Cat B Listed Building | Neutral | N/A |
| LB19486 (EIAR Site 23) | Shooting Box And Bothy, Loch Ashlaich | Cat C Listed Building | Negligible | N/A |
| SM90309/ PiC323 (EIAR Site 25) | Urquhart Castle | Scheduled Monument / Property in Care | Minor | Minor |

Summary of Mitigation for the Consented Development

7.5.2. Direct construction effects were scoped out of the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR. No specific mitigation was required for direct physical impacts upon archaeological remains during the construction phase and no planning conditions were imposed on the Consented Development with regards to cultural heritage. This was supported by THC HET consultation response on the Consented Development.

7.5.3. No significant operational setting effects were identified, with setting effects concluded as ranging from **Neutral** to **Minor**. On this basis no additional mitigation or enhancement measures, beyond those embedded in the design, were deemed necessary.

7.6. Revised Assessment of Effects for the Proposed Varied Development

7.6.1. Other than the assets assessed in detail in the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR for the Consented Development, no further heritage assets have been identified for which it is considered likely that the increased scale of the turbines of the Proposed Varied Development would result in an increased magnitude of impact to that previously assessed.

7.6.2. As agreed through Scoping, the heritage assets listed in Table 7.7 of the 2021 EIAR for the Consented Development (see **Tables 7.2 and 7.3** of this chapter) only are therefore considered for comparative setting effects as a result of the Proposed Varied Development in this chapter (see, **Figure 7.1**).

7.6.3. Comparative assessments for these heritage assets are supported with comparative and cumulative wireline visualisations as agreed with consultees,

along with consultation of one supporting LVIA photomontage. Visualisations are presented in **Volume 2, Figures 7.2 to 7.6** and **Volume 3a, Figure 2.5**.

- Volume 2, Figure 7.2a-b: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Comparative Wireline from SM4567 'Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of' (EIAR Site 2)
- Volume 2, Figure 7.3 a-c: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 - Cumulative Wireline from SM4567 'Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of' (EIAR Site 2)
- Volume 2, Figure 7.4a-b: Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Comparative Wireline from Loch Ness towards SM90309/PiC323 Urquhart Castle (EIAR Site 25)
- Volume 2, Figure 7.5 - Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 - Cumulative Wireline from Loch Ness towards SM90309/PiC323 Urquhart Castle (EIAR Site 25)
- Volume 2, Figure 7.6a-b: 2021 EIA LVIA Viewpoint 4, Comparative wireline from Achtuie Road near Creag Nay, to satisfy HES's request for a viewpoint taken from the north side of the loch and incorporating SM90309/PiC323 Urquhart Castle
- Volume 3a, Figure 2.5: Viewpoint 2 Old Bridge, Invermoriston - Nighttime Photomontage, including a night time visualisation, illustrative of the potential impact of aviation lighting upon heritage assets

Comparative Operational Effects of the Consented and Proposed Varied Development

7.6.4. Refer to **2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR Volume 1, Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage** for detailed consideration of the baseline, cultural significance, and the potential for direct visual impacts during the operational phase of the Consented Development upon the below heritage assets. All previous analysis in terms of the contribution made by setting to cultural significance remains valid, with the only change being the extent to which turbines of the Proposed Varied Development would potentially be visible in views from or towards these receptors.

7.6.5. **Table 7.3** therefore presents a summary of the difference in visibility between the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development informed by wireline visualisations.

Table 7.3: Visibility of Consented Development Compared with Proposed Varied Development for Agreed Heritage Assets

| Ref | Name | Status | Wireline Visibility of Consented Development | Wireline Visibility of Proposed Varied Development |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|--|--|
| SM4567 (EIAR Site 2) | Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of | Scheduled Monument | Blade tips of three turbines visible from monument. Blade tips of three turbines visible from River Moriston valley base looking up towards monument. | Blade tips of three turbines visible from monument. Blade tips of three turbines visible from River Moriston valley base looking up towards monument. |
| SM4536 (EIAR Site 3) | Dell Farm, burial mounds 350m NE of | Scheduled Monument | N/A Outwith ZTV | N/A Outwith ZTV |
| LB1874 (EIAR Site 9) | Old Bridge, Whitebridge | Cat A Listed Building | N/A Outwith ZTV | N/A Outwith ZTV |
| LB14996 (EIAR Site 12) | Torgyle Bridge | Cat A Listed Building | Blade tips of five turbines visible from bridge. | Hub of one turbine and blade tips of eight turbines visible from bridge. |
| LB15017 (EIAR Site 15) | 'Barracks' And Servant's Tunnel, Invermoriston House | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of two turbines visible from building. | Hub of one turbines and blade tips of one turbine visible from building. |
| LB15019 (EIAR Site 16) | Smithy House & Smithy Studio, Invermoriston | Cat C Listed Buildings | Blade tips of three turbines visible from house and studio. | Hubs of three turbines and blade tips of three turbines visible from house and studio. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| LB15020 (EIAR Site 17) | Gazebo, Invermoriston House | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of three turbines visible from building. | Hubs of three turbines and blade tips of three turbines visible from building. |
| LB15022 (EIAR Site 19) | Church Of Scotland, Invermoriston | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of two turbines visible from church. | Hubs of two turbines visible from church. |
| LB15023 (EIAR Site 20) | Burial Ground, St Columba's Church, Invermoriston | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of two turbines visible from church, burial ground and gate piers. | Hubs of two turbines visible from church, burial ground and gate piers. |
| LB15024 (EIAR Site 21) | Invermoriston Old Bridge | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of three turbines visible from bridge. | Hubs of three turbines and blade tips of three turbines visible from bridge. |
| LB15025 (EIAR Site 22) | Invermoriston New Bridge | Cat B Listed Building | Blade tips of three turbines visible from bridge. | Hubs of three turbines and blade tips of three turbines visible from bridge. |
| LB19486 (EIAR Site 23) | Shooting Box and Bothy, Loch Ashlaich | Cat C Listed Building | Blade tips of one turbine visible from building. | Hub of one turbine and blade tips of three turbines visible from building. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|
| SM90309/ PiC323 (EIAR Site 25) | Urquhart Castle | Scheduled Monument / Property in Care | Blade tips of one turbine visible from ferry Jacobite Warrior, c.5km to the west of Urquhart Castle. | Blade tips of three turbines visible from ferry Jacobite Warrior, c.5km to the west of Urquhart Castle. |
| | | | Blade tips of six turbines visible from LVIA Viewpoint 4. | Hubs of three turbines and blade tips of seven turbines visible from LVIA Viewpoint 4. |

7.6.6. The following paragraphs present a comparative assessment of the perceived operational effects of the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development on each agreed heritage asset.

SM4567 (EIAR Site 2) Levishie Cottage, fort and earthwork 1050m NE of
Scheduled Monument

7.6.7. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **Minor** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development in views both from the fort and towards the fort from the valley is negligible.

7.6.8. The negligible increase in anticipated visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is not considered to bring about an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **Minor**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB14996 (EIAR Site 12) Torgyle Bridge Category A Listed Building

7.6.9. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **Neutral** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The increase in anticipated visibility of

the Proposed Varied Development is not considered likely to result in an impact upon the monument's cultural significance.

- 7.6.10. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a negligible magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **neutral**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.
- 7.6.11. LB15017 (EIAR Site 15) 'Barracks' And Servant's Tunnel, Invermoriston House Category B Listed Building
- 7.6.12. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **negligible** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is negligible and the increase in anticipated visibility is not considered likely to result in an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase.
- 7.6.13. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **negligible**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB15019 (EIAR Site 16) Smithy House & Smithy Studio, Invermoriston Category C Listed Buildings

- 7.6.14. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **negligible** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is negligible and the increase in anticipated visibility is not considered likely to result in an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase.
- 7.6.15. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a negligible magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **negligible**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB15020 (EIAR Site 17) Gazebo, Invermoriston House Category B Listed Building

- 7.6.16. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **Minor** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed

Varied Development in views both from the fort and towards the fort from the valley is negligible.

7.6.17. The negligible increase in anticipated visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is not considered to bring about an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **Minor**, which is not significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB15022 (EIAR Site 19) Church Of Scotland, Invermoriston Category B Listed Building

7.6.18. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **neutral** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The increase in anticipated visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is not considered likely to result in an impact upon the monument's cultural significance.

7.6.19. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a magnitude of impact of negligible, and the overall effect is **neutral**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB15023 (EIAR Site 20) Burial Ground and Gate Piers, St Columba's Church, Invermoriston Category B Listed Building

7.6.20. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **negligible** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is negligible and the increase in anticipated visibility is not considered likely to result in an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase.

7.6.21. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **negligible**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

LB15024 (EIAR Site 21) Invermoriston Old Bridge Category B Listed Building

7.6.22. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **negligible** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is negligible and the increase in anticipated

visibility is not considered likely to result in an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase.

7.6.23. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **negligible**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

[LB15025 \(EIAR Site 22\) Invermoriston New Bridge Category B Listed Building](#)

7.6.24. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **neutral** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The increase in anticipated visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is not considered likely to result in an impact upon the monument's cultural significance.

7.6.25. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a negligible magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **neutral**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

[LB19486 \(EIAR Site 23\) Shooting Box And Bothy, Loch Ashlaich Category C Listed Building](#)

7.6.26. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **negligible** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is negligible and the increase in anticipated visibility is not considered likely to result in an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase.

7.6.27. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **negligible**, which is Not Significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

[SM90309/ PiC323 \(EIAR Site 25\) Urquhart Castle Scheduled Monument](#)

7.6.28. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR concluded **Minor** operational effects as a result of the Consented Development. There would continue to be no visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from Urquhart Castle itself. The difference in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development in views towards the castle from

the surrounding area, including from the ferry 'Jacobite Warrior' which follows a route towards the castle on Loch Ness, is negligible.

7.6.29. The negligible increase in anticipated visibility of the Proposed Varied Development is not considered an increase in the magnitude of impact upon the monument's cultural significance such that an EIA effect threshold would increase. It is concluded that the Proposed Varied Development would result in a low magnitude of impact, and the overall effect is **Minor**, which is not significant in EIA terms. No change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

Night time Operational Effects of Proposed Varied Development Aviation Lighting

7.6.30. SM90309/ PiC323 (EIAR Site 25) Urquhart Castle Scheduled Monument lies outwith the ZTV for the Proposed Varied Development and therefore a viewpoint positioned on the ferry 'Jacobite Warrior' which follows a route towards the castle on Loch Ness, within the ZTV, was agreed as a proxy for the assessment. It is understood that the ferry does not operate at night and therefore no night time impact is anticipated.

7.6.31. LVIA Viewpoint 2, **Volume 3a, Figure 2.5, Photomontage from LB15024 Invermoriston Old Bridge night time visualisation** has been consulted as representative of the potential impact of aviation lighting upon heritage assets in Invermoriston. This shows that one aviation light would be visible from Invermoriston.

7.6.32. However, no heritage assets assessed in this chapter have been identified as intended to be appreciated in the dark, and none have lit features which are understood, appreciated or experienced at night. Therefore, the presence of aviation lighting of the Proposed Varied Development might would not impact on the cultural significance of any heritage assets.

7.6.33. No impact of night time aviation lighting is anticipated upon cultural heritage assets.

Comparative Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Varied Development

7.6.34. A cumulative effect occurs where the magnitude of the combined effect of two or more developments is greater than that of the developments considered individually. The cumulative impact assessment follows the same impact assessment methodology as for assessment of the Proposed Varied Development alone, combined overall with the impact of other wind farm developments that are visible in the agreed viewpoints. Developments

considered as part of the cumulative assessment are identified from the agreed list presented in **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual**.

- 7.6.35. The 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR identified no increased or Significant effects as a result of the Consented Development's cumulative assessment.
- 7.6.36. Cumulative effects are considered for heritage assets where an effect of **Minor** or greater significance has been identified as a result of the Proposed Varied Development only. The purpose of this threshold is to ensure that the assessment remains proportionate and focused on those cases where there is potential for a significant effect (in EIA terms) to arise were the Proposed Varied Development to be consented.
- 7.6.37. An increase in magnitude of cumulative impact is not anticipated because the anticipated increase in visibility of the Proposed Varied Development accounting cumulatively for the operational Bhlaraidh Wind Farm as well as other consented/application/appeal wind farms in views from or towards SM4567 (EIAR Site 2) Levishie Cottage fort (see **Volume 2, Figure 7.3**), LB15020 (EIAR Site 17) Gazebo, or SM90309/ PiC323 (EIAR Site 25) Urquhart Castle (see **Volume 2, Figure 7.5**) is negligible and therefore EIA effect threshold would not increase.
- 7.6.38. No significant cumulative effects are therefore identified and no change is therefore assessed in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR conclusions.

7.7. **Revised Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Varied Development**

- 7.7.1. No cultural heritage mitigation was required for direct physical impacts of the construction phase and no planning conditions were imposed on the Consented Development. This is supported by THC HET in consultation through scoping for the Proposed Varied Development.
- 7.7.2. As with the Consented Development, no significant operational setting effects have been identified as a result of the Proposed Varied Development, with setting effects concluded as ranging from **Neutral** to **Minor**. On this basis no additional mitigation or enhancement measures, beyond those embedded in the design, are warranted.

7.8. Conclusion

7.8.1. No changes have been identified through assessment of the Proposed Varied Development in comparison with the 2021 EIAR/2022 AIR Consented Development conclusions. On this basis no additional mitigation or enhancement measures, beyond those embedded in the design, are warranted.

7.9. References

Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension EIA Report (2021), Chapter 7

Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension AI Report (2022), Chapter 7

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

IEMA, IHBC and ClfA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK

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

SSE Renewables (May 2025) Bhlaraidh Extension Varied Development S36C Scoping Report