Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Figures

- Figure 10.1: Cultural Heritage: Outer Study Area and ZTV
- Figure 10.2: Cultural Heritage Visualisations: Dail Langwell – Baseline Photograph and Cumulative Wireline Drawing
- Figure 10.3: Cultural Heritage Visualisations: Dail Langwell – Wireline Drawing
- Figure 10.4: Cultural Heritage Visualisations: Dail Langwell – Photomontage

Technical Appendices

- Technical Appendix 10.1: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area (including tabulated setting assessment)

10. Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

10.1. Executive Summary

10.1.1. This chapter considers the potential effects of the proposed variation to the consented Achany Extension Wind Farm (hereafter the Proposed Varied Development) on cultural heritage. This assessment has scoped out any , impacts which may occur within the Proposed Varied Development Site Boundary, as these have previously been assessed in an EIAR and AIR (SSE Renewables 2021 and 2022).

10.1.2. Assessment of the operational impacts of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of heritage assets within 10km of the Proposed Development Site Boundary has resulted in the identification of one effect of **moderate** significance (significant in EIA terms). All other effects on the settings of heritage assets within the Outer Study Area are assessed as being of no greater than **minor** significance (not significant in EIA terms).

10.1.3. A **moderate** impact on the setting of Dail Langwell Broch (**SM1852**), resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance, has been identified. The asset's key relationship with the River Cassley and surrounding river valley would remain appreciable, and the ability to understand its strategic and defensive position would not be diminished as a result of the Proposed Varied Development.

10.1.4. Although the Proposed Varied Development will introduce a notable change to this monument's setting, it would remain possible to experience, appreciate, and understand the broch's cultural significance. It is therefore considered that the key setting aspects of Dail Langwell Broch, and their capacity to inform and convey cultural significance, would be adequately retained such that the integrity of their settings would not be significantly compromised.

10.1.5. The possibility of cumulative effects has been assessed. No additional significant cumulative effects were identified, and the impact on the setting of Dail Langwell Broch (**SM1852**) remains assessed as **moderate**, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance.

10.2. Introduction

10.2.1. This chapter considers the potential effects to cultural heritage of the Section 36C application for the Proposed Varied Development. The Proposed Varied Development is a variation to the Consented Development for the Achany Extension Wind Farm and comprises 18 Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) with a maximum tip height of up to 200m. This is an increase in tip height from the Consented Development. The Proposed Varied Development is described in detail in **Chapter 2: Design Iteration and Proposed Development**.

10.2.2. Taking into account the comparative changes between the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development, the scope of this cultural heritage assessment, as set out in the 2025 EIA Scoping Report (**Technical Appendix 3.1: Scoping Report**), addresses only those cultural heritage aspects where there may be a change in the predicted effects of the Consented Development (see Section 10.3: Scope of Assessment).

10.2.3. As such, the specific objectives of this cultural heritage assessment were to:

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

10.2.4. All other baseline information, assessment of effects, and agreed mitigation outwith the scope of this chapter are the same as the Consented Development and are not repeated here.

10.2.5. The cultural heritage assessment was prepared by Gina Daly (BA MA MSc ACIfA) of CFA Archaeology Ltd (CFA). CFA is a Registered Organisation (RO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), based in Musselburgh, East Lothian.

10.3. Scope of Assessment

Effects Scoped Out

10.3.1. There are no proposed changes to the Proposed Varied Development Red Line Boundary or turbine locations and other infrastructure, with the exception of some minor changes to proposed track layout, from that assessed in the 2022 Additional Information Report (AIR) (SSE Renewables 2022). Heritage assets within the Red Line Boundary and the findings of the 2022 AIR, as presented in paragraphs 8.1.2-8.1.4 in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology** of the **AIR**, remain valid. Therefore, direct (physical) effects on cultural heritage resulting from the Proposed Varied Development have been scoped out.

10.3.2. Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of World Heritage Sites, Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, and Conservation Areas has been scoped out. There are no assets with those designations within 10km of the site boundary of the Proposed Varied Development.

10.3.3. Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of designated heritage assets more than 10km from the Site boundary has been scoped out.

10.3.4. Assessment of the effect on the settings of heritage assets during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Varied Development has been scoped out. Any such effects would be short-term and temporary. The operational phase represents the worst-case scenario and is sufficient for assessing setting impacts overall.

Effects Scoped In

10.3.5. The Proposed Varied Development will increase turbine tip height from 149.9m to up to 200m, and this could result in an increase in effects on the settings of cultural heritage assets, particularly those that are in close proximity to the Proposed Varied Development. Assessment of the effect of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and Inventory Historic Battlefields within 10km of the Site boundary (**Volume 3, Figure 10.1: Cultural Heritage Study Area and ZTV**) have been scoped in.

10.3.6. Assessment of the cumulative effects on the setting of heritage assets during operation of the Proposed Varied Development in combination with other developments in the surrounding area has been scoped in.

10.4. Consultations

10.4.1. Following submission of the original 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR, consultation responses, as detailed in **Table 10.1**, were received from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Energy Consent Unit (ECU).

Table 10.1: Relevant Consultation Responses Received Following Submission of the 2021 EIAR and 2022 AIR

Consultee	Response
Historic Environment Scotland (Planning Application response letter dated 9 September 2021)	Advised that the Proposed Varied Development did not raise historic environment issues of national significance and that they did not object to the Proposed Varied Development.
	Advised that, although they did not object to the proposals, should the design change, consideration should be given to further reductions of the adverse impact on the character of the landscape in outward views from Dail Langwell Broch (SM1852). The setting impact could be reduced by relocating or deleting the following turbines: T2, the turbine that appears significantly higher on the skyline than the other turbines when viewed from the broch, and T8, the turbine footed on the western side of the ridge, which would also remove encroachment of the development into the valley surrounding the broch.
Historic Environment Scotland (Additional Information response dated 16 May 2022)	Advised that they had no comments to make on the additional information.
Historic Environment Scotland (Further Comments dated 12 January 2023)	Advised that they did not originally object to the wind farm proposals as they considered that the proposal's impacts on their historic environment interests were not of a level that would raise issues of national interest.
	Advised that the provisions of Policy 11 on Energy did not change their previous view on the proposals.
Energy Consents Unit (Decision Notice dated 22 May 2023)	Noted that HES does not object to the proposals. Advised that, although HES recognises that there will be significant impacts upon the setting of the Iron Age Dail Langwell broch, they consider that the significance of this impact did not raise issues of national interest.

10.4.2. A Scoping Report was submitted for the Proposed Varied Development in June 2025 (SSE Renewables 2025). Consultation responses, as detailed in **Table 10.2**, were received from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (Archaeology).

Table 10.2: Relevant Consultation Responses Received Following Submission of the 2025 Scoping Report

Consultee	Response
Historic Environment Scotland (Scoping Report response letter dated 16 July 2025)	Advised that they considered that the Proposed Varied Development, namely the increase in turbine height, will not lead to additional impacts on any assets other than Dail Langwell broch (SM1852). As such, all other heritage assets may be scoped out of the EIA. It is expected that the increase in turbine height may lead to an increased adverse impact on the setting of Dail Langwell broch (SM1852). The provision of updated photomontages and wireline visualisations will allow for assessment of the extent of this impact. Advised that the methodology outlined in the Scoping Report is acceptable. No comments on potential mitigation options were able to be given at this stage.
The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (Archaeology) (Scoping Report response letter dated 25 July 2025)	Advised that the EIAR must identify designated sites which may be affected by the Proposed Varied Development. Setting assessments are to be included for these assets, and visualisations presented for any which are assessed as having significant impacts. Noted that HES are anticipated to provide additional comment. Advised that the methodology outlined in the Scoping Report is acceptable.

10.5. Legislation, Policy, and Guidance

10.5.1. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK' (IEMA 2021), the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 'Code of Conduct' (CIfA 2022) and 'Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment' (CIfA 2020a), and with reference to the relevant statutory and planning framework for cultural heritage.

Legislation

10.5.2. Relevant legislation and guidance documents have been reviewed and taken into account as part of this assessment. Of particular relevance are:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeology Areas Act 1979 (as amended by Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015);
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015);

- Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 as amended; and
- Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

Planning Policy

10.5.3. Planning policy relevant to archaeology and cultural heritage that has been considered as part of this assessment includes:

- National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (HES 2019);
- The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (2012);
- Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage; and
- Appendix 2: Definition of Natural, Built & Cultural Heritage Features.

Guidance

10.5.4. The cultural heritage assessment has been carried out in accordance with the following best practice guidance:

- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH, now NatureScot) and HES Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (SNH & HES 2018);
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2016, updated 2020a);
- Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES 2019, updated 2020b);
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (IEMA 2021);
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (CIfA 2020a);
- Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment (CIfA 2014, updated 2020b);
- Code of Conduct (CIfA 2022);
- Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013); and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (PAN 2/2011).

10.6. Assessment Methodology

Study Area

10.6.1. One study area has been used for the assessment:

- The Outer Study Area (**Figure 10.1**). A study area extending 10km from the Proposed Varied Development Site Boundary was used for the identification of designated heritage assets which have a setting that may be affected by

the operation of the Proposed Varied Development. **Figure 10.1** shows the infrastructure of the Proposed Varied Development alongside the blade-tip height ZTV, in addition to the location of designated heritage assets. A list of these heritage assets is provided in **Volume 4, Appendix 10.1 Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area**, which also provides a tabulated summary assessment of the predicted effects on their settings on a case-by-case basis.

Desk Study

10.6.2. The following information sources were consulted as part of the assessment to obtain information about designated heritage assets and undertake an appraisal of their key setting characteristics:

- HES Spatial Data Warehouse (HES 2025b): for up-to-date data on the locations and extents of designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Listed Buildings);
- Historic Land-Use Assessment Data for Scotland (HLAMap) (HES 2025a): for information on the historic land use character of the site and the surrounding area;
- Modern aerial photographs available through Google Earth and Bing Maps;
- *Achany Extension Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment Report*, and its Appendices (SSE Renewables 2021): for baseline conditions and assessment;
- *Achany Extension Wind Farm – Additional Information Volume 1: Main Report* (SSE Renewables 2022): for updates to the Proposed Development; and
- Relevant bibliographic references and online historic resources were consulted to provide background and historic information.

Setting Visits

10.6.3. Visits were made to key designated heritage assets on the 24th and 25th June 2025, to inform a setting impact assessment.

Criteria for Assigning Sensitivity to Heritage Assets

10.6.4. 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 2020b).

10.6.5. The effects of the Proposed Varied Development on heritage assets have been assessed on the basis of their type (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.

- 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.

10.6.6. **Table 10.3** summarises the relative sensitivity of heritage assets (including their settings) based on the guidance set out in the SNH/HES EIA Handbook (version 5, 2018).

Table 10.3: 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);

Sensitivity of Asset	Definition / Criteria
	• 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 Magnitude of Impact

10.6.7. The magnitude of impact (adverse or beneficial) will be assessed in the categories: high, medium, low, or negligible as described in Table 10.4.

Table 10.4: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Adverse Effect	Beneficial Effect
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	Changes that result in elements of a heritage asset's fabric or setting that detract from its

Magnitude of Impact	Adverse Effect	Beneficial Effect
	cultural significance such that this quality is slightly altered.	cultural significance being removed.
Negligible	Changes to fabric or setting of a heritage asset that leave its cultural significance unchanged.	

Significance of Effect

10.6.8. The sensitivity of the asset (Table 10.3) and the magnitude of the predicted impact (Table 10.4) will be used to inform an assessment of the significance of the effect, summarised using the formula set out in the matrix in Table 10.5, 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.

Table 10.5: 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

10.6.9. 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'.

Assessing Effects on Setting

10.6.10. 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".

10.6.11. Historic Environment Scotland's guidance document, 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' (HES 2020a), 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".

10.6.12. 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".

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

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

10.6.14. 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".

10.6.15. For the purpose of this assessment, the integrity of the setting of a heritage asset is considered to be maintained if the setting's contribution to the cultural significance of the monument would not be compromised by the Proposed Varied Development.

10.6.16. Following these recommendations, the blade tip height ZTV has been used to identify those heritage assets from which there would be 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 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.

10.6.17. Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Historic Battlefields, and Category A, B, and C Listed Buildings, where present within the ZTV and within the Outer Study Area, are included in the assessment. These assets are included in the tabulated assessments in **Volume 4, Technical Appendix 10.1: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area**, using the parameters set out in **Table 10.3**, and they are shown on **Figure 10.1**.

10.6.18. Consideration has also been given to any designated heritage assets beyond the Outer Study Area where long-distance views and intervisibility are considered to be an important aspect of their settings. No such assets were identified.

10.6.19. Three visualisations, **Figures 10.2** to **10.4** have been produced to inform the setting assessment of Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (**SM1852**) Scheduled Monument. These visualisations were selected during the assessment for the Consented Development based on the asset's proximity to the Proposed Development, in combination with an initial appraisal of the blade-tip ZTV which highlighted the theoretical visibility. The visualisations have been updated for the assessment of the Proposed Varied Development.

Table 10.6: Visualisations used in the Proposed Varied Development cultural heritage assessment

Figure	Asset Name and Ref.	Easting	Northing	Comments
10.2	Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (**SM1852**)	241170	911213	Baseline Photograph and Cumulative Wireline Drawing
10.3				Wireline Drawing
10.4				Photomontage

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

10.6.20. 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 within the Outer Study Area, in addition to the likely effects of cumulative developments. Figure 5.9 shows the Proposed Varied Development along with other cumulative developments within 60km radius of the Site (and addressed as required in the other technical chapters). For assessment of the potential cumulative effects on heritage assets, cumulative developments with footprints situated within the Outer Study Area are considered.

10.6.21. 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.

10.6.22. Other cumulative developments which are consented, at the application stage, or are reasonably foreseeable are considered as being potential additions to the baseline and considered in the cumulative impact assessment.

10.6.23. 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.

Requirements for Mitigation

10.6.24. NPF4 (2024) provides a mitigation strategy: 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.

Limitations to Assessment

10.6.25. Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (**Figure 10.1**) have been identified from the HES database downloaded from the HES website in February 2025. That data is assumed to have been current and up to date at the time of acquisition.

10.6.26. Cultural heritage visualisations for Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (**SM1852**) have used the same baseline photographs as those used in the 2021 EIAR (SSE Renewables 2021). A setting visit in June 2025 confirmed that there have been no major changes to the condition of the broch, nor to the surrounding landscape, which would require new photography.

10.7. Baseline

10.7.1. There are 25 Scheduled Monuments within the Outer Study Area. These include examples of prehistoric stone circles and standing stones (**SM1761**, **SM1791**, **SM1801**), prehistoric cairns (**SM1758**, **SM1759**, **SM1768**, **SM1792**, **SM1817**, **SM1818**), prehistoric settlements or structures (**SM1784**, **SM1812**, **SM1825**, **SM1878**, **SM1882**, **SM2208**, **SM5462**, **SM5470**, **SM5497**, **SM5498**), prehistoric brochs (**SM1829**, **SM1852**, **SM1883**), a prehistoric homestead (**SM5563**), a prehistoric fort and dun (**SM5302**), and a post-medieval settlement (**SM5153**).

10.7.2. The majority of the Scheduled Monuments in the Outer Study Area are located at distances between 7.9km and 15.5km from a closest turbine of the Proposed Varied Development. Most of these relate to prehistoric activity, including: monumental landscape features, such as standing stones and chambered cairns; settlement remains, such as hut circles, field systems, and field clearance cairns; and structures, including brochs and a fort. Together, they reflect an active prehistoric landscape, particularly to the east and south-east of the Proposed Varied Development. In general, most Scheduled Monuments included in this assessment have a landscape relationship to the river valleys, including those of the River Shin and River Oykel/Kyle of Sutherland, or to

Loch Shin or other lochs in the area, with views over these being defining aspects of the monuments' settings.

10.7.3. The closest Scheduled Monument to the Proposed Varied Development is the broch at Croich Dail Langwell (**SM1852**), which is located 3.41km west of the nearest turbine (T02). This is a prehistoric stone-built broch sited in Glen Cassley, and is discussed in greater detail in Sections 10.9.5-10.9.8 of this chapter.

10.7.4. There is one Inventory Historic Battlefield in the Outer Study Area (**BTL19**). This denotes the location of the Battle of Carbisdale which took place in 1650. The battle was significant as the last battle of James Graham, the 1st Marquis of Montrose, in support of the Royalist cause during the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. The battlefield lies approximately 15km south-east of the nearest turbine (T19).

10.7.5. There are 25 listed buildings in the Outer Study Area: one Category A, 12 Category B, and 12 category C. The closest Listed Building to the Site is the Category B Listed Rosehall Cassley Bridge (**LB277**), which is 4.56km south of T19. This is a double span rubble bridge over the River Cassley, dated to approximately 1830.

10.7.6. Overall, the majority of the listed buildings in the Outer Study Area are rural residences, such as farms and farmhouses, along with functional and commemorative structures such as bridges and memorials. The settings of these designated assets are generally localised, with long-distance views not representing important aspects of the assets' settings.

10.7.7. A complete list of the heritage assets in the Outer Study Area is provided in **Technical Appendix 10.1**.

10.8. Summary of Effects Predicted for the Consented Development

10.8.1. The following effects were predicted for the Consented Development (SSE Renewables 2021 & 2022) as result of impacts to the setting of designated heritage assets.

10.8.2. A **moderate** significant residual effect was predicted to one Scheduled Monument: Croich Dail Langwell, Broch (**SM1852**).

10.8.3. **Minor** significant residual effects were predicted to four Scheduled Monuments:

- Balcharn, chambered cairn 120m W of (**SM1768**);
- Lairg Muir North, chambered cairn 500m NW of Culbuie (**SM1817**);
- Altbreck, broch 1650m ESE of Dalchork Bridge (**SM1829**); and
- Loch Dola, hut circles & clearance cairns 270m E of (**SM1878**).

10.8.4. Either no impact or negligible significant residual effects were predicted for the rest of the designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and one Inventory Historic Battlefield) which were assessed for the Consented Development.

10.8.5. Following revision of the Consented Development in 2022 (SSE Renewables 2022) and removal of two Turbines (T10 and T20), examination of the revised ZTV for the Consented Development indicated that two Scheduled Monuments were located outside the revised ZTV (Invershin Farm settlement and burnt mound 1200m E of (**SM5470**); and Creag Innse Chomhraig, hut circles SSW of (**SM1882**)). Chapter 12 of the EIA report (2021) had predicted negligible and not significant effects on these assets. The AIR (2022) confirmed that, after revision, no turbines would be visible from these monuments and there would be no effect on the setting of these assets from the Consented Development.

10.8.6. It was assessed that, although the revised layout of the Consented Development would result in a reduction of the number of turbines visible from the other designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and Inventory Historic Battlefield), the reduction would not be such that it would reduce the magnitude of impact (including cumulative impacts) or residual level of effect previously predicted.

10.9. Revised Assessment of Effects for the Proposed Varied Development

Assessment of Operational Effects

10.9.1. The Proposed Varied Development could result in adverse effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets within the Outer Study Area, although such effects would diminish with increasing distance from the site. At distances greater than 10km, it is considered that, in most instances, the Proposed Varied Development would not appreciably alter the settings of heritage assets, or the contributions which setting makes to an asset's cultural significance. Neither would it appreciably alter how a heritage asset is experienced, appreciated, and understood.

10.9.2. The assessment of operational effects has been carried out with reference to the layout of the Proposed Varied Development and the locations of heritage assets shown on Figure 10.1: Cultural Heritage Outer Study Area and ZTV. The criteria detailed in Tables 10.3 to 10.5 have been used to assess the magnitude of impact and significance of the effect. A tabulated summary for all of the designated heritage assets included which have been assessed is presented in Technical Appendix 10.1: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area.

10.9.3. A moderate effect (significant in EIA terms) was previously predicted for one Scheduled Monument, Croich Dail Langwell, Broch (SM1852), as a result of impacts to its setting. This asset has been brought forward for a detailed setting impact assessment, presented below.

10.9.4. No other significant effects resulting from changes to the setting of designated heritage assets in the Outer Study Area were predicted for the Consented Development. Following a reappraisal of likely setting impacts to these assets (presented in Technical Appendix 10.1), it is predicted that the effects for any of these assets will be no greater than that predicted for the Consented Development (and not significant). Therefore, no

additional assets have been brought forward for more detailed setting impact assessment within the report.

Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (SM1852)

10.9.5. The monument comprises an Iron Age stone-built broch sited 1.7km north-west of Croich. It is located on the south side of Glen Cassley, on a north-east facing slope approximately 24m above the River Cassley. Some walls remain standing, although there has been significant collapse, consequently forming a large debris field around the broch. The outer wall measures 21m in diameter and is up to 3.4m in height, suggesting it was built as a tall broch tower. There is surviving evidence of an entrance passage, guard cell, and intramural cell within the broch. Some of the structure has collapsed, and some of the stone has likely been used in the construction of an adjacent sheep fank. As a Scheduled Monument, the broch is of national heritage value and high sensitivity.

10.9.6. The broch is positioned in a prominent position on a hillock overlooking the River Cassley, within an area of rough grazing. The River Cassley valley is fairly wide and flat at this location, with hills rising steeply at the edges of the valley. The broch is located above a narrow and relatively shallow area of the river, which may have served as a natural fording point (Photograph 10.1). The broch's relationship to the possible fording point, and its commanding position overlooking it, suggests it may have been positioned to control access. From this location, it also has long distance views to the north and south along the river valley as well as along the adjacent hillsides. As a tall broch tower, it would have been highly visible on these approaches (although it is now a less prominent feature due to the level of collapse). This broch was likely built with the intention of commanding views of the valley, travel routes, and the surrounding hillsides. This landscape position overlooking a ford, and intervisibility to approaches along the valley, are considered to be key aspects of the monument's setting which allow for it to understood, appreciated and experienced, thereby contributing to its cultural significance.

Photograph 10.1: Photograph of Dail Langwell broch (SM1852) from the east side of the River Cassley, highlighting the topographic position of the broch overlooking a possible natural ford.

10.9.7. The Proposed Varied Development would introduce a windfarm development into views to the south-east of the broch. The nearest turbine (T02) will be located approximately 3.41km to the east-southeast. The blade-tip height ZTV suggests that 17 turbines would be visible from the broch (**Figure 10.1**). Wireline visualisations and a photomontage (**Figures 10.2** to **10.4**) have been produced to illustrate the visibility of the Proposed Varied Development from the Scheduled Monument. These demonstrate that 12 of the turbines would be visible to hub height. The most prominently visible turbines would be T1-T11 located at the northern half of the Proposed Varied Development, with T13-T19 appearing less prominently above the hill to the south (together with the blade tips of three turbines of the operational Rosehall Wind Farm) at approximate distances of 5km to 7.2km. The Proposed Varied Development would, therefore, affect outward views from the broch. This visual impact would primarily affect the aesthetic experience of the monument. The key aspects of the broch's setting which contribute to its cultural experiences, including its commanding position overlooking a natural ford and views along the River Cassley valley, would not be impeded by the Proposed Varied Development and it would still be possible to understand, appreciate, and experience these important characteristics.

10.9.8. Overall, the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the setting of the Dail Langwell Broch is assessed to be of **moderate** magnitude, resulting in an adverse effect of **moderate** significance (significant in EIA terms). As the key aspects of the monument's setting would be retained, it is assessed that the integrity of the setting would not be compromised.

Cumulative Effects

10.9.9. 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 Technical Appendix 10.1. Figure 5.9 provides details of the developments (consented or in-planning) which have been identified for consideration in the cumulative impact assessment.

10.9.10. Based on professional judgement, one cumulative development has been identified as most likely to have a cumulative effect on heritage assets in combination with the Proposed Varied Development:

Allt An Tuir Wind Farm (Scoping Stage)

10.9.11. This development has been identified as it is possible that turbines from the Allt An Tuir Wind Farm could appear in viewsheds from the Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (SM1852) in combination with the Proposed Varied Development. No other assets in the Outer Study Area (Technical Appendix 10.1) have been identified as likely to be subject to adverse effects resulting from the Proposed Varied Development in combination with Allt An Tuir Wind Farm or any other cumulative developments. As such, no other assets have been included within the cumulative assessment.

Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (SM1852)

10.9.12. Based on the available information, it is possible that turbines from the Allt An Tuir Wind Farm could appear on the western side of Glen Cassley, either in views from the Dail Langwell broch (SM1852) or in views when approaching the broch through the valley. These turbines could appear together with turbines from the Proposed Varied Development. As assessed for the Proposed Varied Development alone, this visual impact would primarily affect the aesthetic experience of the monument, though this effect may be increased. However, the key aspects of the broch's setting which contribute to its cultural experiences, including its commanding position overlooking a natural ford and views along the River Cassley valley, would not be impeded by this cumulative visual change and it would still be possible to understand, appreciate, and experience these important characteristics.

10.9.13. Overall, it is predicted that the cumulative impact on the setting of the Dail Langwell broch resulting from the Proposed Varied Development in combination with the Allt An Tuir Wind Farm will be no greater than predicted for the Proposed Development alone, being of moderate magnitude, and resulting in an adverse effect of moderate significance (significant in EIA terms).

10.10. Revised Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Varied Development

10.10.1. No new mitigation measures are suggested for the Proposed Varied Development.

10.11. Comparison of Effects of the Proposed Varied Development with the Effects of the Consented Development

10.11.1. A **moderate** effect on the setting of Dail Langwell Broch (**SM1852**), which is **significant** in EIA terms, has been assessed for both the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development.

10.11.2. There are no predicted increases in effects as a result of the Proposed Varied Development compared to the Consented Development, and no additional significant effects are predicted.

10.12. Conclusion

10.12.1. This chapter has considered the potential operational effects of the Achany Extension Wind Farm (the Proposed Varied Development) on the settings of cultural heritage (designated) assets within a 10km Outer Study Area from the site's boundary. A desk-based assessment has been conducted and setting visits have been made to key designated heritage assets to establish baseline conditions of assets in the Outer Study Area and to inform a setting impact assessment.

10.12.2. Within the Outer Study Area there are: 25 Scheduled Monuments, one Inventory Historic Battlefield, and 25 Listed Buildings (one Category A, 12 Category B, 12 Category C; Figure 10.1). There are no Inventory Garden and Designed Landscapes, Conservation Areas, or World Heritage Sites.

10.12.3. Assessment of the impact of the Proposed Varied Development on the settings of these assets has resulted in the identification of an effect of **moderate** significance (significant in EIA terms) on the setting of one Scheduled Monument: Dail Langwell, broch 1675m NW of Croich (**SM1852**). In this regard, the assessment concluded that, although the Proposed Varied Development will introduce a notable change to this monument's setting, it would remain possible to experience, appreciate, and understand the cultural significance of the broch, and it is therefore considered that the key setting aspects of Dail Langwell broch, and their capacity to inform and convey cultural significance, would be adequately retained such that the integrity of its setting would not be significantly compromised. All other effects on the settings of heritage assets within the Outer Study Area are assessed as being of no greater than **minor** significance (not significant in EIA terms).

10.13. References

Planning Legislation and Guidance

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014, updated 2020a) 'Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment', CIfA, London, available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2023-11/CIfA-SandG-DBA-2020.pdf

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014, updated 2020b) 'Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment', CIfA, Reading, available at: CIfA-SandG-Archaeological-Consultancy-2020.pdf

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014, updated 2022) 'Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology', CIfA London, available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2022.pdfs

The Highland Council (2012) 'The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP)', available at: https://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/development_plans/199/highland-wide_local_development_plan

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2019, updated 2020b) '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 (2019) 'Historic Environment Policy for Scotland', Edinburgh, available at: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7

HM Government (1979) 'Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (reprinted 1996)', HMSO, London, available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46/pdfs/ukpga_19790046_en.pdf

IEMA (2021) 'Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact assessment in the UK', IEMA, IHBC & CIfA, Lincoln, available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/publications/principles-cultural-heritage-impact-assessment-uk-2021

Scottish Government (1997) 'Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997', KPS, Edinburgh, available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/pdfs/ukpga_19970009_en.pdf

Scottish Government (2011) 'Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology', Edinburgh, available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/

Scottish Government (2013a) 'Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment', Edinburgh, available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/

Scottish Government (2013b) 'The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013', KPS, Edinburgh, available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2013/155/made/data.pdf

Scottish Government (2017) 'The Electricity Works (Environmental impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.' KPS, Edinburgh, available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/made

Scottish Government (2024). 'National Planning Framework for Scotland 4 (NPF4)', available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2023/02/national-planning-framework-4/documents/national-planning-framework-4-revised-draft/national-planning-framework-4-revised-draft/govscot%3Adocument/national-planning-framework-4.pdf

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

UK Government (1989) 'Electricity Act 1989', available at https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/29

Online Resources

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2025b) 'Spatial Data Warehouse: GIS downloader' [Online] Available at https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/apex/f?p=PORTAL:downloads:::::DATASET:ALL [Accessed 28/07/2025]