

Red John Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme

Volume 2, Chapter 13:
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

ILI (Highlands PSH) Ltd.

November 2018

Quality information

| <u>Prepared by</u> | <u>Checked by</u> | <u>Verified by</u> | <u>Approved by</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Dr J Shipley | Helen Maclean | Catherine Anderson | Catherine Anderson |
| Senior Consultant | Technical Director | Associate Director | Associate Director |

Revision History

| <u>Revision</u> | <u>Revision date</u> | <u>Details</u> | <u>Authorized</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | November 2018 | Submission | CA | Catherine Anderson | Associate Director |

Distribution List

| <u># Hard Copies</u> | <u>PDF Required</u> | <u>Association / Company Name</u> |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| 13 | Archaeology and Cultural Heritage | 1 |
| 13.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 13.2 | Legislation, Policy and Guidance | 1 |
| 13.3 | Method | 4 |
| 13.4 | Baseline Environment..... | 7 |
| 13.5 | Assessment of Effects | 17 |
| 13.6 | Cumulative effects | 21 |
| 13.7 | Mitigation and Monitoring..... | 22 |
| 13.8 | Residual effects..... | 23 |
| 13.9 | References..... | 25 |

Tables

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 13.1 | Criteria for Establishing the Significance (Heritage Value) of Heritage Assets | 6 |
| Table 13.2 | Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Impact on Heritage Assets | 6 |
| Table 13.3 | Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect..... | 7 |
| Table 13.4 | Aerial Photographs Reviewed at the NCAP Archive, Edinburgh..... | 15 |
| Table 13.5 | Summary of Residual Effects..... | 24 |

© 2018 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

13 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

13.1 Introduction

- 13.1.1 This chapter provides an assessment of the effects on heritage assets (archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes) that are likely to arise from construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Development.
- 13.1.2 It identifies the location, type and significance of heritage assets and their setting and reports on the predicted impacts of the Development on this resource, and the likely significance of effect. The potential for combined effects and combined cumulative heritage effects of the Development with other developments are discussed in section 13.6.
- 13.1.3 This Chapter is accompanied by:
- Figure 13.1: Known Archaeology (Volume 3);
 - SNH Cultural Heritage Figure 11.29 Viewpoint A: View from Caisteal an Dunriachaidh (Volume 4);
 - SNH Cultural Heritage Figure 11.30 – Viewpoint B: Local road near Caisteal an Dunriachaidh (Volume 4);
 - SNH Cultural Heritage Figure 11.31 – Viewpoint C: View from B862 to the south-west of Caisteal an Dunriachaidh (Volume 4);
 - Appendix 13.1: Known Archaeology (Volume 5),
 - Appendix 13.2: Walkover Photos (Volume 5);
- 13.1.4 Any numbers contained in brackets within this chapter correspond to features within Appendix 13.1 (Volume 5) and Figure 13.1 (Volume 3).
- 13.1.5 Heritage assets include buried archaeological remains, above ground remains, historic buildings, historic landscapes and “*any trace or sign of the previous existence of the thing in question*” (Ref 1). This is as defined in the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement and in line with the Ancient Monuments and Areas Act of 1979.
- 13.1.6 Heritage assets or monuments include those which are designated under legislation (such as listed buildings and scheduled monuments), as well as non-designated sites. Non-designated heritage assets are assets that are considered to have a degree of local interest or significance usually recognised by Local Planning Authorities (LPA) by their inclusion within the local Historic Environment Record (HER). Designated assets are considered to be of regional, national or international significance.

13.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

National Legislation

- 13.2.1 There are a number of statutory instruments and policies governing the approach to cultural heritage. The main pieces of legislation are:
- Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014;
 - Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011;
 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997;
 - Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997; and,

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
- 13.2.2 The principal elements of policy and guidance comprise:
- Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, June 2016 (Ref 1);
 - Historic Environment Circular 1. Historic Environment Scotland, 2016 (Ref 2);
 - Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) Paragraphs 135-151: Valuing the Historic Environment, 2014 (Ref 3);
 - Our Place in Time - The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland, 2014 (Ref 4);
 - Planning Advice Note 2 / 2011 – Planning and Archaeology (Ref 5);
 - Planning Advice Note 71 – Conservation Area Management (Ref 6); and
 - The 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' series of guidance notes (Historic Environment Scotland (HES) 2016).
- 13.2.3 Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement June 2016 (Ref 1), SPP (Ref 3), Historic Environment Circular 1 (Ref 2) and HES' Managing Change in the Historic Environment guidance note series are the documents to which planning authorities are directed in their consideration of applications for conservation area consent, listed building consent and their consideration of planning applications affecting the historic environment and the setting of individual elements of the historic environment. The most significant for this appraisal is *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*. It sets out the principles that apply to developments which affect the setting of a historic asset. It clarifies what is meant by 'setting' (page 6), considers what contributes to setting (pages 6-7), discusses the stages of assessing the impact of change (pages 8-11), and discusses methods of mitigating impacts and enhancing setting (page 12).
- 13.2.4 Scheduled monuments are of national or international importance and are protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011.
- 13.2.5 Listing of a building or structure with special architectural or historic interest is provided through legislation and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. HES is responsible for listing buildings of particular historical or architectural merit. Buildings are assigned to one of three categories according to their relative importance. All listed buildings receive equal legal protection, which applies to the interior and exterior of the building, regardless of its category.
- Category A: buildings of national or international importance, either architectural, historical, or fine, little altered examples of a particular period, style or building type.
 - Category B: buildings of regional (or more than local) importance, or major examples of a particular period, style or building type, which may have been altered.
 - Category C: buildings of local importance, lesser examples of any period, style or building type, as originally constructed or moderately altered, and simple traditional buildings that group well with others in categories A and B.
- 13.2.6 The Historic Environment (Amendment) Scotland Act (2011) made it a statutory duty for HES to compile and maintain an Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland. Sites on the inventory of Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes are of national importance and should be taken into account during the planning process.
- 13.2.7 Conservation Areas are described by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 "as *areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance*". Local planning authorities are

required to determine which parts of their area should be safeguarded due to their architectural or historic interest, to ensure that any new development pays respect to or enhances their character.

- 13.2.8 HES compiles the Battlefield Inventory which is the first dedicated designation for nationally important battlefields in Scotland. Additional protection of battlefield features is provided through existing legislation for scheduled monuments, listed buildings, gardens and designed landscapes, and conservation areas through the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014. HES works closely with planning authorities and relevant public bodies to ensure that Inventory sites are taken into account in their plans, policies and decision-making processes.
- 13.2.9 Most of the historic environment is not covered by statutory designation and therefore is not afforded national protection from development. Protection of these assets of local interest is covered by individual local authorities and recorded on the Historic Environment Record (HER).
- 13.2.10 The importance placed on cultural heritage is set out in *Our Place in Time – The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland, 2014* (Ref 4), which sets out a 10-year strategy for protecting and managing heritage assets.

Local Planning policy

- 13.2.11 The *Highland-wide Local Development Plan* (Ref 7) was adopted by the Highland Council in April 2012. The plan replaced The Highland Structure Plan (2001).
- 13.2.12 There is one policy which relates to cultural heritage within this plan. This is Policy 57 - Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage. As a result of this policy, development proposals will be assessed taking into account the level of importance and type of heritage features, the form and scale of the development, and any impact on the feature and its setting. The following criteria also apply:
- For features of local / regional importance, developments will be allowed if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the heritage resource.
 - For features of national importance developments that can be shown not to compromise the natural environment, amenity and heritage resource will be allowed. Where there may be any significant adverse effects, these must be clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance. It must also be shown that the development will support communities in fragile areas who are having difficulties in keeping their population and services.
- 13.2.13 Features of local / regional importance include:
- Category B and C(S) listed buildings;
 - Sites and Monuments Record archaeological sites;
 - War memorials;
 - Archaeological Heritage Areas (a local Highland Council designation); and
 - Conservation areas.
- 13.2.14 Features of national importance include:
- Scheduled monuments;
 - Category A listed buildings; and
 - Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment

13.2.15 The assessment has been undertaken following the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* (Ref 8).

13.3 Method

13.3.1 This section of the chapter presents the sources that have been consulted throughout the preparation of this chapter.

13.3.2 The following sources of information that define the Development have been reviewed and form the basis of the assessment of likely significant effects on Cultural Heritage:

- The Highland Council Historic Environment Record (HER);
- HES' online data (accessed through PastMap (Ref 9));
- Highlands Archive Centre, Inverness;
- Inverness Library;
- The National Collection of Aerial Photographs (NCAP), Edinburgh;
- Historic mapping available on the National Library of Scotland website (Ref 10); and
- An archaeological walkover survey to assess known sites and to assess the area for the potential for additional unrecorded sites.

Methodology for determining the heritage baseline

13.3.3 A study area of 1 km around the Development's Site boundary (Figure 13.1, Volume 3) was considered in order to understand the nature of the cultural heritage landscape surrounding the Development. Cultural heritage in this context is inclusive of the above and below ground archaeological resource, built heritage, the historic landscape, and any other elements which may contribute to the historical and cultural heritage of the area, in accordance with guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Ref 8).

13.3.4 A wider 3 km search of designated assets was also reviewed for assets where the Development might have an impact on setting. This review used zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) data, and examined whether or not the setting contributed to the significance of the asset, and if the construction of the Development would result in an adverse impact. Consultation was also undertaken with HES and the Highland Council.

13.3.5 Where no significant adverse effects on assets were predicted, no further assessment was undertaken. This review of assets within the wider 3 km identified one site where an impact of setting might result from the Development, Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort, and it was agreed that a setting assessment would be undertaken on this asset.

Consultation

13.3.6 A Scoping Report (Appendix 4.1, Volume 5) was prepared and submitted to the ECU on the 29 September 2017 (a full review of the scoping process undertaken can be found in Chapter 4: Approach to EIA). This was coupled with direct consultation with HES in relation to the potential impacts on the setting of designated assets in the study area and wider landscape. This consultation included a meeting with HES on the 25 September 2017 in which HES confirmed they preferred Option B with the Headpond located away from Caisteal An Dunriachaidh fort, which is a scheduled monument. They also confirmed that they had consulted with their colleagues in the designed landscapes team and that they had no issues with gardens or designed landscapes in the area.

- 13.3.7 Scoping responses were received from HES and the Highland Council, in which the potential setting impacts on Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort were raised.
- 13.3.8 A data search with the Highland Council Historic Environment Team was undertaken in May 2018. This was followed with telephone and e-mail consultation with the Highland Council Archaeologist in June 2018 during which the Highland Council Historic Environment Team confirmed they were happy with HES to lead on setting impacts on designated assets, and on considering viewpoints for photomontages.
- 13.3.9 Further telephone consultation was undertaken after the site walkover survey in July 2018, with some discussions regarding initial geotechnical Site Investigation (SI) works proposed for August 2018. These discussions included an agreement regarding archaeological on-site review of works locations to confirm that there would be no impacts on archaeological assets when accessing borehole and test pit locations, and archaeological monitoring of test pits as part of the geotechnical work.

Limitations and assumptions

- 13.3.10 Data was acquired from third parties; it is assumed that all information is accurate and fit for purpose.
- 13.3.11 The Historic Environment Records only list known archaeological sites or significant historic landscape features. There is a possibility for the discovery of previously unrecorded archaeological remains.

Impact Assessment Methodology

Importance of heritage assets

- 13.3.12 The significance of a heritage asset is determined by professional judgement, guided but not limited to any designated status the asset may hold. The significance of an asset is also judged upon a number of different factors including the special characteristics the asset might hold which can include evidential, historical, aesthetic, communal, archaeological, artistic and architectural values. The importance or value of a heritage asset is assessed primarily in accordance with the guidance set out in SPP (Ref 3) and Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) (Historic Scotland, 2011). The setting of an asset can also contribute to significance.
- 13.3.13 SHEP sets out criteria which should be considered when assessing the significance of cultural heritage assets, which include archaeological, architectural, historical, physical and cultural significance. These criteria have therefore been used in the assessment of sensitivity for each asset. The information, in conjunction with professional judgement, has been used to assess the significance of heritage assets.
- 13.3.14 Table 13.1 summarises the relative importance of key cultural heritage resources.

Table 13.1 Criteria for Establishing the Significance (Heritage Value) of Heritage Assets

Significance (Heritage Value) Criteria

| | |
|--------|---|
| High | Assets of inscribed international importance, such as World Heritage Sites, Category A and B listed buildings, Landscapes on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory of Historic Battlefields, Scheduled monuments, Non-designated archaeological assets of schedulable quality and importance. |
| Medium | Category C listed buildings, Conservation Areas, Locally listed buildings included within a conservation area, Non-designated heritage assets of a regional resource value. |
| Low | Non-designated heritage assets of a local resource value as identified through consultation, Locally listed buildings, Non-designated heritage assets whose heritage values are compromised by poor preservation or damaged so that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade. |

13.3.15 Having identified the significance of the heritage asset, the next stage in the assessment is to identify the level and degree of impact to an asset arising from the development. Impacts may arise during construction or operation and can be temporary or permanent. Impacts can occur to the physical fabric of the asset or affect its setting.

13.3.16 When professional judgement is considered, some sites may not fit into the specified category in this table. Each heritage asset is assessed on an individual basis and takes into account regional variations and individual qualities of sites.

13.3.17 The level and degree of impact (impact rating) is assigned with reference to a four-point scale as set out in Table 13.2. In respect of cultural heritage, an assessment of the level and degree of impact is made in consideration of any development design mitigation (embedded mitigation).

Table 13.2 Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Impact on Heritage Assets

Magnitude of Impact Description of Impact

| | |
|------------|--|
| High | Change such that the significance of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting significance, resulting in a serious loss in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset. |
| Medium | Change such that the significance of the asset is affected. Noticeably different change to setting affecting significance, resulting in erosion in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset. |
| Low | Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. Slight change to setting affecting significance resulting in a change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset. |
| Negligible | Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. Minimal change to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance resulting in no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset. |

13.3.18 An assessment of the level of significant effect, having taken into consideration any embedded mitigation, is determined by cross-referencing between the significance (heritage value) of the asset (Table 13.1) and the magnitude of impact (Table 13.2). The resultant level of significant effect (Table 13.3) can be negligible, adverse or beneficial.

Table 13.3 Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect

| Significance (Heritage Value) | Magnitude | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| | High | Medium | Low | Negligible |
| High | Major | Major | Moderate | Minor |
| Medium | Major | Moderate | Minor | Minor |
| Low | Moderate | Minor | Minor | Negligible |

13.3.19 Effects of major or moderate significance are considered to be significant.

13.3.20 All archaeological work will be undertaken in line with guidance published by the ClfA (2014 & Ref 8). The setting assessment will follow the HES Guidance *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (Ref 10).

13.3.21 The archaeological potential of the Development Site will be assessed by chronological period and rated as high, medium, low or unknown. This rating is based on an understanding of the archaeological resource as a whole and its national, regional and local context. This includes the number, proximity and significance of known and predicted archaeological / historical sites or find spots within the Development Site and surrounding study area, and is guided by statutory and non-statutory designations, national, regional and local policies, archaeological research frameworks and professional judgement.

13.4 Baseline Environment

Introduction

13.4.1 The assessment of existing baseline conditions identified 157 heritage assets within a 1 km study area of the Development Site boundary on the Highland HER and Pastmap, with a further 17 assets identified through a review of historic mapping, documentary sources, aerial photography and walkover survey. A further 13 assets were recorded by the HER, but were not plotted as their location was uncertain (location provided as a four figure grid reference). Therefore, the total number of assets recorded within the study area is 187.

13.4.2 Heritage assets are identified in the baseline by a known archaeology number attributed to them for the purpose of this report. They are presented on Figure 13.1: Known Archaeology Plan), while an appendix of all recorded heritage assets has been included as Appendix 13.1 (Volume 5).

Location and Geology

13.4.3 A number of land use types fall within the Development Site boundary, although the dominant type is commercial forestry which occupies most of the land on the higher ground and upper slopes. Other land use includes open moorland, improved agricultural land used for pasture, and an area of ancient woodland on the lower slopes.

13.4.4 Due to the size of the Development Site boundary, the geology encompassed varies and a full discussion can be found in Chapter 5: Geology and Ground Conditions. However, the solid geology of the majority of the Development Site consists of sandstones of the Inshes Flagstone Formation, changing at the shore of Loch Ness where Hillhead Sandstones are

encountered (Ref 12). Pockets of sandstone of the Inverness Group have also been recorded in areas of the Development Site boundary.

- 13.4.5 The superficial geology again varies across the Development Site, although the vast majority consists of till of the Quaternary period (Ref 12). Pockets of peat, as well as alluvium, have been recorded in the upper moorland section of the Development Site, while the shore of Loch Ness is recorded as Lacustrine beach deposits. Soil types vary with clayey loam to sandy loam being the dominant type, although sandy loam has been recorded in the fields near the shoreline and above the outcrops of sandstone, and clay loam in the areas of alluvium (Ref 13).

Designated Assets

- 13.4.6 There are no World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, or landscapes on the inventory of battlefields within the study area.
- 13.4.7 A total of 13 designated heritage assets were identified within the study area, including eight scheduled monuments, four listed buildings and one designed landscape which is recorded on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes. These represent the development of the landscape from the prehistoric period through to the modern period, and include assets representing settlement activity and the religious and spiritual needs of the population, as well as sites associated with infrastructure and defence.
- 13.4.8 The majority of the scheduled monuments date to the prehistoric period and relate to land use and burial practices in the prehistoric period. They include possible burial related cairns (**1 & 5**), as well as a possible ceremonial site represented by a large circle visible on aerial photography as a series of pits (**6**). The majority of the remaining prehistoric scheduled monuments are associated with settlement activity and include hut circles (**3, 4 & 7**), as well as at least one burnt mound (**8**). More substantial evidence of defensive forms of settlement activity includes the small hill fort known as Caisteal an Dunriachaidh (**2**).
- 13.4.9 Of the four listed buildings that are recorded in the study area, two are Category B listed and two are Category C listed, and all date to the post-medieval period with two being churches and their associated features (**9 & 10**). The remaining listed buildings are both linked to the farmstead known as Tigh-na-Coille, which also functioned for a time as the Manse for the Dores Church of Scotland church (**11 & 12**).
- 13.4.10 The remaining designated asset within the study area is the landscape associated with 17th century Aldourie Castle which is listed on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes (**13**). Although the Category A listed house and its associated gate piers and walls falls outside of the 1 km study buffer, the south-eastern limits of the grounds fall within the study area.

Non-Designated Assets

- 13.4.11 A total of 157 non-designated assets were recorded on the Highland Council HER, although accurate location data was unavailable for 13 assets and as a result they could not be plotted, along with three assets recorded from a review of historic mapping and 13 sites recorded during the walkover survey. A single site was also recorded through a review of a previous desk-based assessment for a proposed water main scheme. Like the designated assets discussed above, the non-designated assets represented sites from the various phases of land use and development from the prehistoric period onwards. These included assets linked to prehistoric land improvement, agriculture and settlement, as well as post-medieval agriculture.

Prehistoric (up to AD 43)

- 13.4.12 There is extensive evidence for prehistoric activity within the study area, with a large number of assets dating from the Neolithic period (3,500 BC to 2,000 BC) onwards, identified through earthwork evidence and aerial photography. These sites represent evidence for settlement and land improvement associated with agriculture, as well as burial and ritual activities. However, the dating of many of the prehistoric assets is difficult due to a lack of fieldwork and excavation, as well as the style and form of the assets encountered changing very little during parts of the prehistoric period, and indeed later periods. This is especially true for features such as field clearance cairns and hut circles. Some sources have gone as far as to say it is impossible to differentiate between features such as Bronze Age and Iron Age hut circles without excavation (Ref 14, 86). As a result, over 60 assets have been tentatively dated to the prehistoric period, but only a limited number of these have been assigned to a more specific period.
- 13.4.13 Although evidence for very early activity is limited, it seems likely that the wider area would have been exploited from at least the Late Mesolithic period onwards. The retreat of the ice sheets saw much of the British Isles covered in woodland, with species such as pine and birch covering the Highlands, while birch, hazel and oak were more prevalent in the lower lands of the Moray Firth (Ref 14, 12). Such areas represented rich hunting and foraging grounds for the transient hunter-gatherers of the Mesolithic period, and evidence of activity during this period has been found in a number of places in the Highlands, including Inverness, to the east of the study area (Ref 16, 3). Evidence of the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods are generally limited to find spots and scatters of stone and flint artefacts, and as such they do not survive well in areas that have been subject to intensive agriculture, while they can be difficult to identify as surface finds in moorland areas due to vegetation cover. Evidence for Mesolithic activity has been identified at the eastern and western ends of the Great Glen, and it has been suggested that the corridor of the Great Glen with Loch Ness at its heart would have formed a passable corridor for people attempting to cross the country (Ref 17, 20).
- 13.4.14 The introduction of farming, and more sedentary forms of living, during the Neolithic period means that evidence for activity during this period is more visible, with at least four assets dating to the Neolithic period (**52, 56 & 65**) and two assets dating to the Neolithic or Iron Age (**42 & 58**). The majority of these assets, both those dating to the Neolithic and those that could be Neolithic or Iron Age in date, are clearance cairns representing some of the first land improvement in the area, with stones cleared to allow arable cultivation to take place. However, as this practice has continued through to the post-medieval period, the dating of these assets is extremely difficult and as a result it is possible that some of the clearance cairns could be of a later date.
- 13.4.15 Neolithic activity in the wider area has been recorded at a number of locations, although remains linked to burial seem to be more common (Ref 18, 129), and a concentration of sites, including burial mounds and cup and ring marked stones, have been recorded on the north side of Loch Ness in Glenurquhart (Ref 17, 21). Within the study area, it has been suggested that at least one of the cairns might represent a burial rather than a clearance cairn (**65**).
- 13.4.16 A further four areas of clearance cairns have also been located in the study area with two dated to the Neolithic (**52 & 56**), and two dated to the Neolithic or Iron Age (**42 & 58**). Although dating of such assets is difficult without excavation, the tentative date assigned to

these sites would suggest that at least some land improvement and activity was taking place in the study area during the Neolithic period.

- 13.4.17 Evidence for Bronze Age activity is again dominated by monuments potentially linked to burial, although the dating of sites is once again problematic due to a lack of excavation. A number of burial mounds have been recorded in the wider area varying from the monumental tombs of the Clava type to smaller localised barrows (Ref 19), with possible burial mounds also recorded in the study area. These include at least two of the scheduled cairns which are possibly Bronze Age in date (**1 & 5**), as well as the cairn at Torness which might be Neolithic or Bronze Age in date and falls a short distance outside of the study area.
- 13.4.18 Confirmed sites dating to the Bronze Age within the study area are limited to a single find spot (**46**), although a Bronze Age hoard was discovered within the study area in recent years (location currently protected as the hoard is not yet published). A number of sites dated to the prehistoric period have also been tentatively dated to the Bronze Age period based on style and form (**94, 97 & 103**). These latter sites are all linked to settlement activity and consist of possible hut circles, along with the scheduled burnt mound which might also be Bronze Age in date (**8**). However, a lack of excavation means that the dating of these assets is not definite. The general form of structures changed very little from the Bronze Age into the Iron Age, and a number of other hut circle sites could date to the Bronze or Iron Age (**15, 54 & 88**).
- 13.4.19 The problem of assigning positive dates to assets continues into the Iron Age, with no assets positively dated to the Iron Age. However a number of assets have been tentatively dated to the Iron Age, and these again are linked to land improvement and settlement activity and include the remains of field systems, clearance cairns and round houses (**16, 67, 73, 75 & 76**). A number of the designated assets may also date to the Iron Age, and include additional hut circles (**3, 4 & 7**), as well as Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort (**2**). Furthermore, a large number of assets have not been assigned a date more specific than prehistoric, and a number of these are round houses that could be Iron Age (**35, 36, 57 & 77**). As discussed above, none of these sites have been subject to excavation or detailed survey and therefore the date assigned to them remains unconfirmed.

Roman (AD43-410)

- 13.4.20 Roman activity in the north of Scotland is very limited and there are no sites dating to the Roman period within the study area. Roman sites in the wider Highlands area are also limited, although a possible Roman camp has been recorded adjacent to the River Nairn at Cawdor to the east (Ref 20), while a further possible site dating to the Roman period has been identified at Tarradale (Ref 21, 70).
- 13.4.21 The limited level of Roman activity and influence in the study area did not, however, mean that the landscape was depopulated or abandoned, and instead there was continuity in the activity taking place during the Iron Age period through to the early medieval period. It is possible that some of the sites described in the prehistoric section date to this period.

Early Medieval (AD410-1066)

- 13.4.22 Evidence for activity within the study area during the early medieval period is sparse, being limited to the finds of two sculptured stones in the Dores area (**44 & 51**). The first find represents a small fragment of a possible cross slab found by the shore of Loch Ness, while the second carried the carving of a boar and was found during excavation for land

improvement works (Ref 22, 104). This latter stone has been dated to the 8th century based on the style of the shoulders of the boar (Ref 23, 31).

- 13.4.23 Although evidence for settlement activity within the study area is limited to the two find spots, the wider landscape continued to be exploited throughout the early medieval period. Inverness, approximately 14 km to the north-east, is recorded as being an important centre by the mid-6th century when the Pictish High King Bridei I was visited by St Columba (Ref 24, 488). Although there is some debate around the exact location of the meeting, it is recorded that during this visit St Columba travelled up Loch Ness and the Great Glen, which acted as a route-way linking the east and west, and stopped at Drumnadrochit / Urquhart Castle, which was also an important centre at this time (Ref 25, 242). Excavations undertaken at Urquhart Castle, approximately 6 km to the south-west, has confirmed that a substantial site existed there, with work revealing evidence for early medieval fortifications (Ref 25, 257-259).
- 13.4.24 While there is no clear evidence for settlement activity or structures at Dores, the presence of carved stones from Dores does suggest there may have been activity during this period in the study area. This is further supported by some authors who suggested that Dores was established around a chapel founded by St Columba (Ref 26, 50).

Medieval (AD1066-1500)

- 13.4.25 There are no assets within the study area dating to the medieval period, although it is clear that the Great Glen continued to act as a route-way linking the east and west coasts, with Inverness to the east representing the main centre and continuing to expand and prosper. Urquhart Castle continued to develop as a key strongpoint monitoring traffic along the Great Glen, and it was expanded and strengthened on a number of occasions (Ref 17). Many of these major improvements followed episodes of conflict centred on the castle, which became the focus of a lot of activity due to its important position on the Great Glen, and the castle was taken by Edward I in the late 13th century and then again in the early 14th century (Ref 27, 44). The castle changed hands again over the subsequent centuries, and the importance of the Great Glen, with the castle at its centre, would suggest that the landscape around it was also the focus of activity during the medieval period, although no evidence from this period has yet been identified within the study area.

Post-Medieval (AD1500-1900)

- 13.4.26 The post-medieval period is by far the best represented period with 61 assets dating to the period recorded in the study area, along with a further 57 assets whose dates are unknown but are assumed to date to the post-medieval period. The majority of these assets are linked to the settlement of the area and agricultural improvements, although a number of churches and burial grounds have also been recorded.
- 13.4.27 The main focus of activity within the study area appears to have been agriculture, although the relatively rough unimproved upland landscape points to pastoral agriculture being the dominant practice. Documentary records suggest that large areas may have been under woodland during the 17th and early 18th centuries, with the wood used for smelting iron ore in Glen Urquhart and at Dores (Ref 28, 283). It is reported that this industrial process resulted in large-scale deforestation in the area, but that much of this activity and woodland management stopped after the Jacobite Rebellions of the 18th century (Ref 28, 284).
- 13.4.28 Although the date at which the settlement Dores was established is uncertain, it is possible that it has its origins in the early medieval period (see above) and cartographic sources from

the mid-17th century depict the settlement at the eastern end of Loch Ness. A survey by Robert Gordon dated 1632-52 names the village as *Dorris*, and also marks the adjacent settlements of *Achnabat* and *Troming* to the west, and *Alturie* to the east. The latter site relates to the Grade A listed Aldourie Castle, part of whose grounds fall within the study area (13), while the two former sites seem to correspond with Achnabat and Drummond respectively. Although the survey also shows Loch Ashie and Loch Duntelchaig, it fails to show any significant settlements in the areas of the lochs suggesting that the farmsteads on higher ground are later than the survey, or were too small to record.

- 13.4.29 The Gordon survey also shows a settlement named as *Lopen* located between Dores and Aldourie, although it is unclear what this site relates to in the contemporary landscape. Its position appears to match that of Tor Point, although it may be a misrepresentation of Lochend which lies on the north shore of Loch Ness.
- 13.4.30 Although the Blaeu survey is in less detail, it shows a similar situation with *Darris* (Dores) depicted alongside *Troming* (Drummond), *Achnabat* (Achnabat) and *Altaurie* (Aldourie), as well as *Lopen*. A similar situation is observed on the Moll survey of 1745, and it is not until the second half of the 18th century, and the Roy survey of 1747-55, that a detailed survey of the area is available. This survey was just one of a number of large projects that came out of the Jacobite rebellions of the 18th century, the first being the construction of roads that would have a large impact on the study area.
- 13.4.31 The problem of moving troops around the Highlands was realised after the rising of 1715, and by the 1720s, work had started on the first major road building scheme from Fort William to Killichuimen / Fort Augustus, the western part of the Great Glen (Ref 29, 44). However, it was decided in 1726 that the road should be continued to Inverness and by the following year, the first military road was completed (18). The rapid construction would suggest that the works on the road between Killichuimen / Fort Augustus and Inverness represented an upgrade to existing tracks rather than full new construction, and documents report that although the road was constructed by 1727 the bridges along the route were still not complete by 1728 (Ref 29, 44-45). It is possible that a number of road stone quarries or borrow pits (158-160, & 162-170) and a possible milestone (161) identified during the walkover survey might relate to the original building or later improvements.
- 13.4.32 Although the road was built in a relatively short space of time, the rushed nature seems to have resulted in problems and by 1732 there was a need for it to be realigned as it was often impassable in bad weather (Ref 29, 45). A second alignment along the edge of Loch Ness, and passing through Dores, was adopted (17) and in 1775 when Johnson travelled along the route on his trip to the Western Isles, he commented on the fine and level nature of the road (Ref 29, 46).
- 13.4.33 Both the upper (18) and lower (17) roads are depicted on the Roy survey of 1747-55, along with the settlement of Dores which is depicted with a church. This survey shows the majority of the study area as unimproved moorland, with pockets of woodland near Loch Ness in the area of Dirr Wood and Erchite Wood, and small areas of improved (arable) land near Dores.
- 13.4.34 This lack of improvement was to change in the closing years of the 18th century and the opening years of the 19th century, with landowners pushing for land improvement in an attempt to improve profitability. The majority of the study area, as well as the Parish of Dores, was part of the Aldourie Estate held by the Frasers of Balnain and initial improvement saw the number of crofts reduced and the formation of a limited number of farms (Ref 26, 52-4). In many cases conditions were written into tenant agreements and the Aldourie Estate papers (series D766) now held by the Highland Archive Centre, Inverness,

record the improvement made by tenants. Examples include agreements between the landowner and the tenants with the landowner providing funds for improvements to houses and bridges (D766/5/5/2) with William Clark who tenanted various holdings including the Tack of Dores, Balnafoich Park and Claddich (D766/3/10/5) paid to improve bridges, and these papers are crucial when attempting to understand the development of the post-medieval landscape.

- 13.4.35 Many of the papers from the early years of the 19th century confirm that rough grazing was the main land use in the study area (D766/22/17), but some areas of summer grass on the higher ground are mentioned (D766/3/10/5). This reference to summer grass in the early 19th century suggests that transhumance might still be taking place in the upland areas of the study area, but by the mid-19th century such references disappear hinting at the practice coming to an end. A note accompanying a now lost survey dated to 1802 lists holdings, and clearly include totals for areas of 'good land' and areas of 'improvable and pasture' including many of the farm names that survive in the landscape today including Drummond, Kindrummond, Balnafoich and Dirr (D766/22/17/1).
- 13.4.36 By the middle of the 19th century, estate papers started to document some of the improvements that had been made, although progress seems to have been slow. A survey of the Mains of Erchite noted that just over three acres had been improved representing less than 1 % of the hill pasture and low pasture of the holding (D766/22/17/1). The slow progress of improvement was no doubt down to the poor stony ground, as well as the very prescribed methods of drainage. A document dated 1847 and covering the holdings within the study area, including Dores farm, Drummond Farm, Kindrummond Farm and Easter Erchite Farm noted that drainage should be
"30" deep and then filled with 9" of screened beech gravel, while leader drains should be 3'3" deep and filled with 14" of screened beech gravel" (D766/5/9/11).
- 13.4.37 In the absence of detailed mapping, these estate papers are crucial in understanding the landscape of the first half of the 18th century, as they provide lists of the farmsteads existing in a period when detailed cartographic sources do not survive. The names of the majority of the farmsteads that survive today can be seen in these documents, with detailed mapping of the area not available until the first Ordnance Survey maps in the second half of the 19th century. These surveys confirm that land improvements were limited, with most of the study area remaining unimproved grazing with woodland, improved pasture and arable, although it is possible that a number of the undated features that might date to the post-medieval period in Dirr Woods relate to 19th century improvements (**104-157**). These assets are located throughout Dirr Woods and suggest that some effort at clearance and land division was attempted in this area.
- 13.4.38 The first detailed cartographic survey of the area is the First Edition Ordnance Survey plan of 1875, which shows the landscape of the study area largely as it appears today. Some farmsteads have changed such as 'The Park' recorded as 'Midtown', and this farmstead represents one of the main farmsteads with improved land accompanying the farm. Other farmsteads retain their names including Kindrummond (**24**), which is recorded as having a whin mill, Balnafoich (**66**), and West Town (**41**). The survey also seems to show a number of unnamed farmsteads, one of which appears to be habitable (**32**), while others appear to be derelict (**20 & 21**), as well as the settlement of West Town which also seems to have been abandoned before 1875 (**74**). The farmstead of Wester Drumashie is depicted with a small associated area of enclosed land (**172**).

- 13.4.39 Other features marked on the first edition survey include the Merchant Stone (**171**), as well as a number of cairns near the centre of the proposed head pond area which are depicted as antiquities (**73**). The Merchant Stone survives as a large boulder on the edge of the upper military road (**18**) with the name suggesting a possible meeting place for traders or merchants, although there are no references to the stone in texts on the history of the area. The cairnfield site is named as *Cathair Fhionn*, a name that appears to relate to a local legend stating this was the place of Fingal after he killed *Ashi* the son of the Danish king (Ref 30, 361).
- 13.4.40 Infrastructure and land use on the 1875 Ordnance Survey map largely correlates with the current view of the landscape. Large areas of woodland and open moor cover most of the study area, while the key roads passing through are the two military roads (**17 & 18**). A number of the footpaths and tracks that still link the farmsteads and act as firebreaks through the modern forestry plantations are also evident on the 1875 survey, thus suggesting that the landscape of 1875 very much resembles the landscape of the 21st century.
- 13.4.41 By the end of the 19th century, the village of Dores (**37**) represented the main focus for settlement in the study area, with a church, built in 1828, providing seating for 500 (**9**) (Ref 30, 361). The settlement also had a saw mill and a corn mill powered by a small reservoir on the high ground (**80, 83 & 84**), pointing to some cereal cultivation taking place, although pastoral agriculture and forestry clearly dominated the landscape.

Modern (1901 – date)

- 13.4.42 Although there is only a single asset, a Clan memorial (**47**), dated to the modern period within the study area, it is clear that land use and activity continued to take place throughout the 20th and early 21st century. The closing years of the 19th century appear to have marked a change in land use as large areas of woodland within the immediate study area appear to have been felled. By the time of the Second Edition Ordnance Survey plan of 1902, most of the woodland to the south-east of the upper military road (**18**) is shown as open moor rather than woodland. This clearance seems to have continued, as by the mid-20th century, aerial photographs of the study area show most of the upland areas having been cleared, with forestry limited to the lower slopes and the shore of Loch Ness. A full discussion on the aerial photographs of the Development Site can be found below, but the images from the 1940s onwards would suggest that the land that forms the main focus of the Development Site was moorland from the early 20th century, with woodland clearances until the 1960s when modern forestry plantation commenced. It is possible that this intensive arboriculture resulted in the removal of many of the early monuments that had survived on the uplands.
- 13.4.43 The major change in settlement within the study area during the 20th century was the growth of Dores. Although still a relatively small settlement, there was growth with additional houses constructed throughout the 20th century. Early changes by the time of the 1902/04 Ordnance Survey plans include the addition of the Aldourie House Arts Pottery. The building that housed this short-lived pottery survived until the 1950s when it was demolished to make way for the village hall (**173**) (Ref 31).
- 13.4.44 Settlement change outside of the village has been limited to the rebuilding of a number of the older farmsteads, as well as the construction of a new building known as Ach-na-Sidhe bed and breakfast. Other minor additions to the landscape include the construction of a monument to the Clan MacBain erected in 1961 (**47**), and elements such as the addition of

a fish farm on the shore of Loch Ness. However, in general, the landscape of the study area has changed very little since the First Edition Ordnance Survey plan of the 1870s.

Aerial Photography

13.4.45 A review of aerial photographs held by the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) in Edinburgh was undertaken as part of the desk-based research. The following aerial photographs were examined at the NCAP reading room in Edinburgh on Friday 6 July (see Table 13.4).

Table 13.4 Aerial Photographs Reviewed at the NCAP Archive, Edinburgh

| Sortie | Date | Frame | NCAP Ref |
|------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|
| CPE/Scot/UK/0255 | 09/08/1947 | 3049-3058 | SB_001123 |
| CPE/Scot/UK/0255 | 09/08/1947 | 4065-4070 | SB_001126 |
| CPE/Scot/UK/0255 | 09/08/1947 | 4184-4188; 4287-4293 | SB_001127 |
| 58/2699 | 02/02/1959 | 221-229 | SB_002921 |
| 543/0451 | 03/02/1959 | 013-019 | SB_002399 |
| OS/63/189 | 30/07/1963 | 002-005 | SB_004642 |
| OS/64/185 | 02/09/1964 | 020-025 | SB_003707 |
| 97/0919 | 20/09/1997 | 265-270; 287-292 | SB_004745 |

13.4.46 No new archaeological or cultural heritage features were observed on the photographs viewed, although a number of the assets recorded on the HER were clearly visible. The photographs also showed peat cutting taking place in the late 1950s (including sortie 58/2699) although some of the images from the 1960s suggest that peat cutting may have reduced (see sortie OS/63/189).

13.4.47 The images also showed phases of woodland management taking place, with early photos from the 1940s showing the land near the Headpond being free from forestry. The images from 1964 show a similar situation with the majority of the area free from woodland, while the images from 1997 (sortie 97/0919) show clear-felling taking place.

Walkover Survey

13.4.48 An archaeological site walkover survey was undertaken on the 3 and 4 July 2017. During this survey the archaeologists undertaking the works examined the area of the Headpond, as well as other areas of key infrastructure including Access Tracks, Compounds, and the Tailpond Inlet / Outlet Structure in Loch Ness. Photographs of surveyed features are available in Appendix 13.2: Site Walkover Photographs (Volume 5).

13.4.49 Large areas of the Development Site are still under managed forestry plantation and older sections of woodland, which made identifying archaeological features difficult. Visibility was further hampered by thick heather growth in the area of the Headpond.

13.4.50 However, a number of possible road stone quarries, or borrow pits, were identified along the line of the upper military road as it passed through the Headpond area (**158-160, & 162-170**). These varied in size, but some may have been formed when winning stone to construct the original road, or used for later road improvements. At least one of these was extremely large in size (**160**) (Photo 13.1, Appendix 13.2) while another (**162**) (Photo 13.2,

Appendix 13.2) contained mature trees suggesting it had not been used for some time, and may be earlier than other quarries.

- 13.4.51 Furthermore, a single large stone, possibly representing a milestone or road marker, was recorded near the road with a level mark engraved / cut into the stone (**161**) (Photos 13.3-13.4, Appendix 13.2), while the Merchant Stone was also observed as surviving near the road (**171**) (Photo 13.5, Appendix 13.2).

Site Investigation (SI) Monitoring

- 13.4.52 In addition to the archaeological walkover survey, archaeological monitoring was undertaken as part of an initial phase of SI works between the 20 and 23 August 2018. This monitoring included checking all borehole and test pit locations for visible above ground archaeological or cultural heritage remains before works commenced, as well as monitoring the excavation of test pits to look for archaeological deposits and examine levels of made ground.
- 13.4.53 Monitoring works observed very shallow deposits of peat up to 0.4 m thick, over silts and eroded sandstone, before hitting the sandstone bedrock in the test pits on the upper area. The depths varied to between 1.5 m and 2.5 m, and bedrock was visible outcropping on the surface in some areas, with a maximum depth of c. 1.5 m.
- 13.4.54 In the lower area, adjacent to Loch Ness, bedrock was not reached in either the test pits or the boreholes, with gravels, sands and silts recorded up to 22 m in depth in the boreholes. Test pits in the lower area reached c. 4 m, with gravels, sands and silts encountered throughout.
- 13.4.55 A full review of the results can be seen in the SI report (see Chapter 5: Ground Conditions and Geology).

Archaeological Potential

- 13.4.56 There is considered to be low potential for heritage assets of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic date to be present within the Development Site. There are very few assets from these periods from the wider region, and no assets from these periods within the study area. If artefacts of Palaeolithic or Mesolithic age are discovered, they are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about activity in the region during these periods and medium significance (heritage value) due to their scarcity in the region.
- 13.4.57 Although a number of sites have been tentatively dated to the Neolithic (**52, 56 & 65**) or the Neolithic and / or Iron Age (**42 & 58**), the potential for the discovery of further assets dating to the Neolithic is also considered to be low. Assets tentatively dated to the Neolithic represent sites linked to land clearance / improvement for agriculture (**42, 52, 56 & 58**), and possibly burial (**65**), but are limited in number with many similar sites in the wider area found in lower lying positions. As a result the potential for further discoveries dating to the Neolithic is considered to be low. If further assets dating to the Neolithic date are discovered they are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about human activity in the region during this period and be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.4.58 A large number of earthworks have been provisionally dated to the Bronze Age and Iron Age including evidence for field clearance, settlement and burial. As discussed above, the dating of these sites is very difficult due to the form of these monuments not changing over time, and a lack of excavation. Many of the assets were recorded through field survey and aerial photography undertaken before the development of late-20th century forestry plantations in the area, and it is possible that some sites may now have been destroyed.

The relatively extensive aerial photographic coverage of the area would also suggest that the potential for new assets dating to the Bronze Age or Iron Age to be discovered is low. Additional discoveries of Bronze Age or Iron Age assets are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about activity in the area during these periods and be of no more than low significance (heritage value).

- 13.4.59 There is no evidence for Roman activity in the study area, and evidence for Roman activity in the wider area is also very limited. The archaeological potential for sites in this area is therefore very low. However, if artefacts of Roman date are discovered they are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about activity in the region during these periods and medium significance (heritage value) due to their scarcity in the region.
- 13.4.60 Evidence for early medieval and medieval activity is also very limited with only two find spots dating to the early medieval period (**44 & 51**) and no assets dating to the medieval period. However, documentary evidence suggests a chapel was established at Dores during this period, and the Great Glen appears to have been a relatively important strategic highway during the period, although activity would appear to have been centred at or near Dores. As a result, the potential for further discoveries dating to the early medieval or medieval period is considered to be low, although any further discoveries would be of archaeological interest and of moderate significance (heritage value) due to the rarity of early medieval and medieval sites in the study area.
- 13.4.61 There is extensive evidence for activity dating to the post-medieval period within the Development Site boundary as well as in the study area and wider (3 km) study area. This suggests that the land inside the Development Site boundary was largely used for agriculture during the post-medieval period, with the pattern of settlement largely representing that which survives today. As a result the potential for the discovery of additional assets dating to the post-medieval period is low. Any further discoveries dating to the post-medieval period would be of archaeological interest, but of low significance (heritage value) due to the volume of post-medieval assets previously recorded.
- 13.4.62 Although only a single site dating to the modern period has been recorded within the study area, the cartographic and documentary sources suggest that settlement activity has changed very little during the 20th century, and most of the landscape has been used for forestry. As a result the potential for further discoveries dating to the modern period is low, and the significance (heritage value) of any assets dating to this period would also be considered to be low.

13.5 Assessment of Effects

- 13.5.1 An effect is defined as a change resulting from a development on the significance of a heritage asset. The following could have effects on heritage assets:
- Physical impacts upon archaeological features and historic landscapes arising during the construction phase; and
 - Impacts on the setting of heritage assets arising during the construction and operational phases.
- 13.5.2 The cultural heritage baseline of the study area has been assessed against the Development to determine likely significant effects. Only those heritage assets which have the potential to be affected, either by proximity to the Development or through changes to setting, are considered below. All other assets are considered to be unaffected by the Development.

Construction Phase

- 13.5.3 Two sections of military roads constructed as part of the 18th century road building programme under General Wade, run through the Development Site, and represent the original road alignment (**18**), and the later road alignment (**17**). Both alignments continue to serve as roads, and as such much of the original road construction may have been lost due to later developments including road building and the insertion of utilities which often follow roads. However, any remains that do survive have the potential to provide archaeological evidence linked to road building in the 18th century. As a relatively common asset type that extends over a large area outside of the Development Site boundary, and as assets that have been subject to subsequent developments and may not retain any of their original construction deposits, both assets are considered to be low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.4 The Development will involve removal and realignment of 1.8 km of the original 50 km road alignment (**18**). It also has the potential to impact on a short (up to 50 m) section of the lower road (**17**) as the Temporary Access Track and Spillway will cross the road near Loch Ness. The magnitude of impact on both of these alignments is considered to be medium negative, which on an asset of low value equates to a minor adverse significance of effect.
- 13.5.5 A number of possible road stone quarries or borrow pits have been identified along the line of the original military road (**158-161, 165, 167, 168 & 170**). These features survive as overgrown scoops or hollows of varying size and depth along the edge of the military road (**17**), and have limited archaeological significance for their potential to provide evidence linked to the construction of the road. As a type of asset common in the Scottish landscape they are considered to be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.6 The Development would result in the loss of all of the possible quarry sites, and therefore the magnitude of impact is considered to be high. On assets of low value this will result in a moderate adverse effect. However, given the low significance (heritage value) of these assets, the effect is not considered to be significant and is therefore no more than minor adverse.
- 13.5.7 The single recumbent stone pillar with bench mark, possibly representing a fallen milestone or marker, was observed during the walkover survey (**169**). Although possibly moved from its original location, the asset has historical significance linked to its operational role as part of the road system and as a bench mark used in mapping the landscape. However, as a common form of asset it is considered to be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.8 The Development will result in the removal of the asset, although the asset could be relocated. The magnitude of impact is considered to be medium, which on an asset of low significance (heritage value) results in a minor adverse effect. However, if this asset can be relocated, and therefore avoided, there would be no impact upon it.
- 13.5.9 The Merchants Stone (**171**) is a large boulder marked on mapping from at least the first edition Ordnance Survey plan as an antiquity, although it is not recorded on the Highland Council HER or other national databases (**171**). It is possible that the asset was a meeting place for merchants or drovers, hence the name, although it is possible that there is no specific history linked to the asset. As such the stone is considered to be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.10 The construction of the Headpond will result in the total loss of the asset, although it could be relocated. The magnitude of impact is considered to be high, and on an asset of low significance (heritage value) this results in a moderate adverse effect. However, if this asset can be relocated, and therefore avoided, there would be no impact upon it.

- 13.5.11 A survey of Dirr Wood, near the shore of Loch Ness, revealed a large number of assets, most of which are undated but all are thought to date to the post-medieval period (**104-157**) some of which fall within the Limits of Deviation (**22, 98, 101, 122, 125, 126, 140, 146, 151 & 153**) (Figure 13.2, Volume 3). These assets within the Limits of Deviation form part of a large concentration of sites recorded in Dirr Wood, and all appear to relate to post-medieval agricultural land use and management. As such the assets have archaeological and historical significance as their study and / or excavation could provide information linked to post-medieval land use and settlement. They are of a form common throughout many upland regions of Scotland and as such they are considered to be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.12 The construction of the Temporary Access Track, as well as the temporary compounds near Dirr Wood, will result in the destruction of these assets (**22, 98, 101, 122, 125, 126, 140, 146, 151 & 153**), although associated assets outside of the Limits of Deviation will remain undisturbed. The magnitude of impact is considered to be high, and on assets of low significance (heritage value) this will result in a moderate adverse effect.
- 13.5.13 Loch Ashie cairnfield (**56**) and Loch Ashie field system (**63**) are located in the forestry plantation to the east of the Headpond, and represent field clearance cairns and roundhouses / field systems possibly dating to the prehistoric period. Identified through field survey and aerial photography prior to intensive forestry being planted in the last third of the 20th century, many of the features are not thought to survive. This lack of / or poor survival is further supported by the Highland HER records which state that at least some of the earthworks had been damaged by ploughing associated with tree planting when examined in 1973, while other features were thought to be more recent in date. Any remains that do survive will have archaeological value as their study could provide further information linked to the development or settlement of the area. However, their uncertain condition and date, as well as their being of a type of asset common in the uplands of Scotland, means they are of no more than low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.14 Construction of the Headpond will result in the loss of a small percentage of the area where the assets are thought to survive, with the majority of the area falling outside of the Limits of Deviation, although any assets that do survive within the Limits of Deviation will be destroyed. The Highland Council HER polygon that covers the assets (**56 & 63**) in this area is a large buffer rather than a site specific buffer, and as a result the section of the buffer that falls within the Limits of Deviation might not actually contain any archaeological remains. Any remains that may survive in the woodland are thought to be outside of the Limits of Deviation, and any remains that do fall within the Limits of Deviation represent a small percentage of the assets. As a result, the effect on the assets is considered to be low, and on assets of low significance (heritage value) this results in a minor adverse significance of effect.
- 13.5.15 Another area of possible clearance cairns dating to the Iron Age has been recorded near the centre of the Headpond area (**73**). Identification of this type of asset was difficult due to heather growth, although it is possible that they have been destroyed by forestry operations when the last plantation was cleared. Local legend suggests that it was the burial place of the dead from the battle in which Fingal defeated Ashie, although it is assumed that they are field clearance cairns. Although any surviving examples would have archaeological and historic significance due to the information they might contain relating to settlement and landscape development, they are considered to be of low significance (heritage value) due to their frequency in upland landscapes.

- 13.5.16 Construction of the Development would result in the destruction of any features that survive. As a result, the magnitude of impact is considered to be high, resulting in an impact of moderate adverse. However, given the low significance (heritage value) of these assets, the effect is not considered to be significant and is therefore, using professional judgement, considered to be no more than minor adverse.
- 13.5.17 The site of Wester Drumashie Farm (**172**) is located on the edge of the Headpond area at the point at which the new Permanent Access Track will leave the old military road. Recorded on historic mapping, very little now survives of this farm, and it is thought that most may have been destroyed by forestry activities. Any remains that might survive would have archaeological and historical significance linked to the information the asset could provide about settlement activity and agriculture in the area. However, as the asset is of a type common in Scotland it is considered to be of low significance (heritage value).
- 13.5.18 Construction of the new Permanent Access Track could result in the loss of any remains linked to Wester Drumashie that might survive. As a result the impact is considered to be high, which will result in a moderate adverse impact.
- 13.5.19 A review of designated assets within 3 km was undertaken to review impacts caused by changes to the significance of heritage assets resulting from changes to their setting caused by the Development. This was undertaken alongside the production of ZTVs and in consultation with HES and the Highland Council archaeologists. Although a number of designated assets fall within the wider 3 km study area, including the designated assets considered in the baseline study, as well as the Caledonian Canal (SM6498), Dalcrombie hut circles (SM11436), Ruthven Crannog (SM11476) and Dochfour garden and designed landscape (GDL00137), no significant effects were predicted, as their setting does not contribute to their significance, or else impacts were predicted to be negligible on their setting due to their distance from the Development and / or extensive vegetation / tree cover and topography.
- 13.5.20 Where no significant adverse effects on assets were predicted no further assessment was undertaken. This review of assets within the wider 3 km identified one site where an impact of setting might result from the Development, this being potential impacts on the setting of Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort (**2**). Furthermore, potential impacts on the setting of Urquhart Castle were also assessed, although this site lies beyond the search area.
- 13.5.21 Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort (**2**) is a scheduled monument located to the south-west of the Headpond in an area of open moorland. Although no excavations have been undertaken on the Development Site, the form of the monument has been provisionally dated to the Iron Age, although many hillforts were later reused in the early medieval and medieval periods. A number of other non-designated prehistoric assets have been recorded across Ashie Moor in the area immediately surrounding the fort (**36, 42, 76 & 88**), and it is possible that the fort was linked to these settlement remains, if they were contemporary. It has been suggested that the fort was the "*stronghold of a relatively small group and held sway over the agricultural land overlooked by the fort*" (Ref 32). The Development Site also represents one of the highest areas of land on Ashie Moor, standing above the surrounding archaeological remains and acting as a local focal point with its highest point standing at 266 m above sea level. As such, it commands views across the landscape to the north, east and west, although it is dwarfed by various hills including Creag Bhreac (at 357 m AOD) and Tom Bailgeann (464 m AOD) to the south. It is also relatively prominent in the wider landscape, especially from the north side of Loch Ness, although it only appears to have been designed to be prominent over the immediate Ashie Moor area of settlement. Therefore, as a

monument that was designed to be prominent in the landscape (albeit the immediate landscape of Ashie Moor) and have outward views, the setting contributes to its significance. Any remains that might survive would have archaeological and historical significance linked to the information the asset could provide about settlement activity, agriculture, and social hierarchy in the area, and as a designated asset it is considered to be of high significance (heritage value).

- 13.5.22 The construction of the Headpond would introduce a new area of high ground to the north-east of Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort (2). This will reduce views from the monument to the north-east, although views in this direction will largely be restricted to the area of the proposed Headpond, due to the height of the ground in this area (ranging from 260 to 270 m AOD) and tree cover. As a result, the loss of views outwards from the monument will be limited. Furthermore, as discussed above, it is assumed that the most important outward views from the fort are over the immediate surroundings and Ashie Moor and not over the wider landscape.
- 13.5.23 The prominent appearance of the asset on the skyline / within the wider landscape also contributes to its significance. Construction of the Headpond will result in the area of Ashie Moor that is above 270 m AOD being increased, with the newly created high ground of the Embankment extending out to the north. This will effectively result in the high ground to the north-east of the asset increasing in area when viewed from the lower area of Ashie Moor adjacent to the asset (Figures 11.29 – 11.31, Volume 4: Visualisations). The structure on the top of the Headpond (the mechanical equipment building – see 2.4.17 in Chapter 2: Project and Site Description) will also be visible on the horizon in the distance.
- 13.5.24 However, as the key contribution of the setting of the asset to its significance is linked to its prominence over the sections of Ashie Moor that immediately surround it, the overall effect of the Development on the setting will be limited. As a result, the magnitude of impact is considered to be low, and on an asset of high significance (heritage value) this will result in a moderate adverse effect.

Operational Phase

- 13.5.25 The archaeological assets will have been removed during the construction phase therefore there will be no effects on archaeological assets during the operational phase. No further effects on the setting of heritage assets will take place during the operation of the Development.

Decommissioning Phase

- 13.5.26 The archaeological assets will have been removed during the construction phase and therefore there will be no effects on archaeological assets during the decommissioning phase. No further effects on the setting of heritage assets will take place during the decommissioning of the Development.

13.6 Cumulative effects

Inter-cumulative Effects

- 13.6.1 Three projects were identified as having the potential to result in inter-cumulative effects these are:
- Scottish Water Main;
 - Coire Glas extension; and
 - Tulloch Homes.

- 13.6.2 There are no cumulative effects predicted with the Development and these schemes. In the case of the Coire Glas extension and the Tulloch Homes development this is due to the schemes being more than 3 km away from the Development. The new Scottish Water Main is only 1.2 km away from the Development, but it was stated that no EIA would be required at scoping, although an archaeological desk-based assessment and walkover survey was undertaken (Ref 33). This work identified boundaries and an enclosure in the area adjacent to the Temporary Access Track and Spillway in Dirr Wood (174). These features were tentatively dated to the prehistoric period, but are the same as post-medieval features identified elsewhere in the area such as Dores Wood. The Development would pass near to these assets, although they do not appear to impact on them. As a result, no inter-cumulative effects are predicted.

Intra-cumulative Effects

- 13.6.3 A review of the assets within the study area, as well as the wider landscape, has revealed that no intra-cumulative effects resulting from the Development are predicted.

13.7 Mitigation and Monitoring

- 13.7.1 Embedded mitigation measures are detailed in Chapter 3: Evolution of Design and Alternatives, and include an archaeological watching brief being undertaken during stripping in areas of known archaeology and virgin ground.
- 13.7.2 A number of additional mitigation measures will also be utilised to reduce potential effects resulting from the Development. Additional mitigation measures could include micro-siting of Access Tracks, or reducing the working width of Access Tracks within the Limits of Deviation, to avoid heritage assets.
- 13.7.3 However, in most cases the engineering of the Development will result in the loss of assets identified within the Limits of Deviation, and a number of different types of mitigation will be suitable. This includes detailed landscape survey to confirm / disprove the presence of previously recorded archaeological remains, archaeological evaluation, and archaeological excavation prior to works commencing, followed by archaeological watching brief of topsoil and subsoil removal during construction.
- 13.7.4 Suggested mitigation works include the relocation of the possible milestone / road marker (161) and the Merchants Stone (171), as well as detailed field survey to record the road stone quarries (158-161, 165, 167, 168 & 170). Field survey should also be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of the possible clearance cairns within and around the Headpond area (56, 63 & 73), and if remains are found to survive, further mitigation might include accurate recording of the assets, along with archaeological excavation or an archaeological watching brief during construction. This is also the case for the site of Wester Drumashie Farm (172).
- 13.7.5 The remains recorded in Dirr Wood (22, 98, 101, 122, 125, 126, 140, 146, 151 & 153) have already been subject to basic archaeological recording, so additional mitigation might include archaeological excavation to confirm their date, or monitoring by archaeological watching brief during construction works.
- 13.7.6 It is unclear if any sections of the Military Roads are preserved under the existing roads due to later road rebuilding (17 & 18). Archaeological mitigation in the areas of the Military Road could include archaeological evaluation once the upper road (18) has been closed to traffic. This could be followed by excavation of a section of road if remains are found to survive and / or a watching brief.

13.7.7 The mitigation best suited should be agreed with the Highland Council Archaeologist.

13.8 Residual effects

13.8.1 The implementation of additional mitigation, outlined in section 13.7 above could potentially reduce the effect resulting from the Development.

13.8.2 A summary of residual effects on cultural heritage and their significance is provided in Table 13.5. A residual effect of moderate or above is considered to be significant in EIA terms.

13.8.3 This chapter provides an assessment of the effects on heritage assets (archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes) that are likely to arise from construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Development. The assessment of existing baseline conditions identified 157 heritage assets within the study area (being a 1 km buffer on the Development boundary) on the Highland Historic Environment Record and Pastmap, with a further 17 assets identified through a review of historic mapping, documentary sources, aerial photography and walkover survey. A further 13 assets were recorded by the Historic Environment Record but were not plotted as their location was uncertain (location provided as a four figure grid reference). Therefore, the total number of assets recorded within the study area is 187.

13.8.4 A total of ten assets, or groups of assets, fall within the Limits of Deviation, and as a result could be impacted by works during the construction phase. However, with mitigation in place significant effects are only predicted on four assets or groups of assets. These are remains identified in Dirr Wood (**22, 98, 101, 122, 125, 126, 140, 146, 151 & 153**), Loch Ashie cairnfield (**56**), Loch Ashie field system (**63**), and Wester Drumashie Farm (**172**).

13.8.5 There is also a moderate adverse impact predicted on the setting of Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort (2).

13.8.6 No impacts are predicted during the operation or decommissioning phases.

Table 13.5 Summary of Residual Effects

| Receptor | Description of Effect | Effect | Additional Mitigation | Residual Effects | Significance |
|--|---|------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|
| 2 – Caisteal an Dunriachaidh fort | Impact on the setting of the asset | Moderate Adverse | No mitigation | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| 17 – Military Road | Partial loss due to construction of the Headpond. | Minor Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| 18 – Military Road | Partial loss due to works on infrastructure | Minor Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| 22, 98, 101, 122, 125, 126, 140, 146, 151 & 153 – Enclosures and clearance cairns in Dirr Wood | Possible total loss due to construction of Temporary Access and Ancillary Tracks, Compounds and Spillway. | Moderate Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| 56 – Loch Ashie Cairnfield | Partial loss of any surviving assets due to Headpond construction | Moderate Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| 63 – Loch Ashie field system | Partial loss of any surviving assets due to Headpond construction | Moderate Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| 73 – Ashiemoor Cairnfield. | Total loss due to construction of the Headpond | Minor Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| 158-161, 165, 167, 168 & 170 Possible road stone quarry | Total loss due to construction of the Headpond | Minor Adverse | Survey / recording | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| 161 Possible road marker with bench mark | Total loss due to construction of the Headpond | No impact | Relocation to new track | No impact | Not Significant |
| 171 Merchants Stone | Total loss due to construction of the Headpond | No impact | Relocation to new track | No impact | Not Significant |
| 172 Wester Drumashie Farm | Total loss due to construction of the new public access | Moderate Adverse | Archaeological excavation and / or watching brief if remains survive | Moderate Adverse | Significant |

13.9 References

- Ref 1. HES. (2016). Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement June 2016 (replaces the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) for operational matters).
- Ref 2. HES (2016) *Historic Environment Circular 1*. Historic Environment Scotland. 1 June 2016.
- Ref 3. Scottish Government. (2014). Scottish Planning Policy 2014 (SPP). Paragraphs 135-151: Valuing the Historic Environment.
- Ref 4. Scottish Government. (2014). Our Place in Time - The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland. Scottish Government / APS Group Scotland.
- Ref 5. Scottish Government. (2011). Planning Advice Note: PAN 2/2011 Planning and Archaeology, July 2011.
- Ref 6. Scottish Government. (2004). Planning Advice Note: PAN 71 Conservation Area Management, December 2004.
- Ref 7. The Highland Council. (2012). The Highland wide Local Development Plan. [Online]. Available:
https://www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/local_and_statutory_development_plans/199/highland-wide_local_development_plan. [Accessed 04/10/18].
- Ref 8. ClfA. (2017). Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments.
- Ref 9. Website: PastMap (<https://www.pastmap.org.uk/>). Accessed: 10th September 2018.
- Ref 10. Website: National Library of Scotland Maps (<https://maps.nls.uk/index.html>). Accessed: 10th September 2018.
- Ref 11. HES. (2016). Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting. Historic Environment Scotland.
- Ref 12. Website: British Geological Survey website (<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/>) Accessed: 10th September 2018.
- Ref 13. Website: Soil map of Scotland (http://map.environment.gov.scot/Soil_maps/). Accessed: 10th September 2018.
- Ref 14. Small, A. (1975) 'The hill forts of the Inverness area' in anon (1975) *The hub of the Highlands: The book of Inverness and district*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 78 to 90).
- Ref 15. Noble, G. (2006). *Neolithic Scotland: timber, stone, earth and fire*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ref 16. Miller, J. (2004) *Inverness*, Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited.
- Ref 17. Bridgland, N. (2005) *Urquhart Castle and the Great Glen*, Batsford: London.
- Ref 18. Barclay, G. J. (1997) "The Neolithic" in Edwards, K. J. & Ralston, I. B. M. (eds) *Scotland: Environment and archaeology 8,000 BC to AD 1,000*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ref 19. Henshall, A. S. & Ritchie, J. N. G. (2001). The chambered cairns of the Central Highlands Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ref 20. Frere, S. S., Hassall, M. W. C & Tomlin, R. S. O. (1987). "Roman Britain in 1986" in *Britannia* Volume 18: pages 301-377.
- Ref 21. Jones, B., Keillar, I. & Maude, K. (1993) "The Moray Aerial Survey: Discovering the Prehistoric and proto-Historic Landscape" in Seller, W. D. H. (ed) *Moray: Province and People*, University of Edinburgh: Edinburgh.
- Ref 22. Henderson, I. (1975). 'Inverness, a Pictish capital' in n.d. *The hub of the Highlands: The book of Inverness and district*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 91 to 108).
- Ref 23. Henderson, G. & Henderson, I. (2004). *The art of the Picts: Sculpture and metalwork in early medieval Scotland*, Thames and Hudson: London.

- Ref 24. Smith, R. (2001). *The making of Scotland: A comprehensive guide to the growth of its cities, towns and villages*, Edinburgh: Canongate Books Limited.
- Ref 25. Alcock, L. & Alcock, E. A. (1992). "Reconnaissance excavations on Early Historic fortifications and other royal sites in Scotland, 1974-84: A, Excavations and other fieldwork at Forteviot, Perthshire, 1981; B, Excavations at Urquhart Castle, Inverness-shire, 1983; C, Excavations at Dunnottar, Kincardineshire, 1984" in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, Volume 122: pages 215-287.
- Ref 26. Barron, H. (ed.) (1985). *The Third Statistical Account of Scotland Volume 16: The County of Inverness*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Ref 27. Smith, J. D. (1845). "The Parishes of Urquhart and Glenmoriston" in *The new statistical account of Scotland: Volume XIV – Inverness, Ross and Cromarty*, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons.
- Ref 28. Innes, R. (1975) 'Woods and forest', anon (1975) *The hub of the Highlands: The book of Inverness and district*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 281 to 290).
- Ref 29. Taylor, W. (1996) *The Military Roads in Scotland*, Colonsay: House of Lochar.
- Ref 30. Groome, F. H. (1882) *A Gazetteer of Scotland Volume II* London: William Mackenzie.
- Ref 31. Website: South Lochs Heritage (<http://southlochnessheritage.co.uk/aldourie-pottery/>). Accessed: 10th September 2018.
- Ref 32. Website: Historic Environment Scotland website (<http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/SM11817>). Accessed: 13th September 2018.
- Ref 33. West Coast Archaeological Service (2015) Loch Ness to Loch Ashie Pipeline Does, Highland, Unpublished Report for Scottish Water Solutions.

Bibliography

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) (as amended). 1979.
- Bradley, R. (2000) *The good stones: A new investigation of the Clava Cairns*, Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.
- Haldane, A. R. B. (1962) *New ways through the Glens* Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited.
- Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011.
- Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014. Hunter-Gordon, P. (1975) 'Commercial and industrial progress' anon (1975) *The hub of the Highlands: The book of Inverness and district*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 249 to 267).
- MacAskill, E. H. L. (1991) 'Journeying through the Great Glen' in anon (1991) *Loch Ness and thereabouts*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 3-19).
- MacPherson, J. (1975) 'Glossary of some place names' in anon (1975) *The hub of the Highlands: The book of Inverness and district*, Inverness: The Inverness Field Club (pages 370 to 377).
- N.D. (200) *Abriachan: The story of an upland community*, Inverness: Abriachan Forest Trust.

The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. 1997 c. 8. Wilson, J. M. (ed) (1854) The imperial gazetteer of Scotland: topographical, statistical and historical, Edinburgh: A. Fullarton & Co. Surveys

- Blaeu, Joan (1654) *Extima Scotiae septentrionalis ora, ubi Provinciae sunt Rossia, Sutherlandia, Cathenesia, Strath-Naverniae, cum vicinis regiunculis quae eis subsunt*,

etiamque Moravia / R. Gordonius à Strath-loch collegit et descripsit Gordon (1836-52) A detailed map including Glenmore, Lochs Arkaig and Garry, the basins of the Nairn, Findhorn, and Spey, Lochs Ericht and Laggan, and the River Spean; also in outline Lochs Garry, Rannoch, and Tummel Moll (1745) The East Part of the Shire of Inverness with Badenoch

Ordnance Survey Maps

6"

Sheet XIX, 1875

Sheet XXX, 1875

Sheet XIX, 1902

Sheet XXX, 1902

25"

Sheet XIX.10, 1873

Sheet XIX.11, 1871

Sheet XIX.11, 1904

Sheet XIX.12, 1892

Sheet XIX.12, 1904

Sheet XIX.14, 1873

Sheet XIX.14, 1904

Sheet XIX.15, 1892

Sheet XIX.15, 1904

Sheet XIX.16, 1871

Sheet XXX.2, 1872

Sheet XXX.2, 1904

Sheet XXX.3, 1892

Sheet XXX.3, 1902

Documents held by the Highlands Archive Service, Inverness

The D766/22/4 to D766/22/17 series cover various farms, with most papers covering leases etc. Documents reviewed are as follow:

D766/22/4 = Aldourie Farm 1865-1960

D766/22/5 = Achnabat Farm 1870-1904

D766/22/6 = Balcladdich Farm 1897-1899

D766/22/7 = Balnafoich Farm 1885-1964

D766/22/8 = Bochrubin 1898-1956

D766/22/9 = Dirchurachan 1896

D766/22/10 = Dores 1849-1903

D766/22/11 = Drumashie 1890-1891

D766/22/12 = Drummond Farm 1889-1894

D766/22/13 = Erchite 1846

D766/22/14 = Inverfarigaig 1880

D766/22/15 = Kindrummond 1877-1899

D766/22/16 = Red Cottage 1958

D766/22/17 = General Estate Papers 1802-1850

D766/3/10/5 – Tack of Dores, Balnafoich Park and part of Claddich by Mrs Fraser Tytler and Lord Woodhouselee her husband in favour of William Clark dated 1805.

D766/5/5/2 – Legal papers of William Fraser Tytler covering the estate from 1811-1847.

D766/22/17/1 – General estate papers dated 1802-1850.

D766/22/5/1 papers regarding Achnabat 1870 to 1904

D766/5/9/11 papers of William Fraser Tytler relating to drainage at Dores Farm, Drummond Farm, Easter Erchite Farm, Bunchrubin Farm, Kindrummond Farm, Aldourie Mains Farm, Achnabat Farm.

Documents held at the Inverness Library

Highland Roads and Bridges Volume 1, 1802-1815

