Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage

Chapter 10
Cultural Heritage

Introduction

10.1 This chapter considers the potential effects of the construction and operation of the proposed An Càrr Dubh wind farm (hereafter referred to as the Proposed Development) on the historic environment, or, in the terminology of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, cultural heritage. This topic comprises *"the physical evidence for human activity that connects people with place, linked with the associations we can see, feel and understand"*. Its constituent parts are known as 'heritage assets'. These can be tangible features, or intangible stories, traditions and concepts linked to a place or locality, that provide physical evidence of past human activity and hold sufficient value (i.e. cultural significance) to this and future generations to merit consideration in the planning system. This assessment therefore focuses on if, and how, the Proposed Development will change the cultural significance of heritage assets within the Site and study areas as described below.

10.2 A number of heritage assets are also be discussed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) presented in **Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity** of the EIA Report. Where heritage assets are considered in both assessments, the LVIA focuses on the effect of a development's visibility from a location, such as a heritage asset, and the effect that visibility has on visitors to that location; i.e. on visual amenity. In contrast, the cultural heritage assessment focuses on effects to the cultural significance of heritage assets. Each assessment therefore considers different kinds of receptors (people vs. cultural significance) and effects, and can come to differing conclusions on levels of effect relating to the same asset.

10.3 The assessment was undertaken by LUC and full details of the authors are provided in **Appendix 1.1**.

10.4 This chapter is supported by a number of figures which are referenced throughout the text:

- Figure 10.1: Designated Heritage Assets in the Inner and Outer Study Areas
- Figure 10.2a: 5km Study Area with Cultural Heritage Assets
- Figure 10.2b-d: Cultural Heritage Assets within the Site (detail)
- Figure 10.3: Cumulative Zone of Theoretical Visibility and Cultural Heritage Visualisation Locations
- Figure 10.4: Zone of Theoretical Visibility, Visualisation Locations and Heritage Assets
- Figure 10.5.1-17: Visualisation Locations – Asset Level Detail

10.5 The chapter is supported by the following appendices:

- Appendix 10.1: Visualisations
- Appendix 10.2: Historic Environment Assessment (HEA)

10.6 The HEA contains full detail on the baseline and appraisal of assets. A summary of this content is presented in the chapter to contextualise the assessment of effects. Wireframes and photomontages have been prepared to aid this assessment and are included within **Appendix 10.1**. The visualisations have been produced in line with two separate approaches: planar projection, with a 50.3-degree field of view, being what would be experienced with the natural eye; and cylindrical projection with a 90-degree field of view. to enable the Proposed Development in its entirety, along with cumulative schemes, to be shown.

10.7 The following terminology will be used throughout this chapter:

- **(Cultural) heritage asset:** A physical element of the historic environment – a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having cultural significance.
- **Designated heritage asset:** Heritage assets which have been formally recognised (i.e. designated)[1] as meeting criteria for specific legal and/or policy protection. The following forms of designated heritage assets feature within the assessment:
  - **Scheduled monument:** An asset included on the schedule of monuments compiled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, as amended.
  - **Listed building:** An asset of special architectural or historic interest included in the statutory list compiled under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended ('the 1997 Act'). In determining applications affecting listed buildings, decision makers are required to have 'special regard' to the preservation of the asset and its setting[2].
  - **Conservation area:** An asset comprising an area of special architectural or historic interest designated by local planning authorities under powers delegated by the 1997 Act, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.
  - **Inventory-listed garden and designed landscape (hereafter 'GDL'):** A designed landscape included in the Historic Environment Scotland (HES) inventory of gardens and designed landscapes. Entry on the inventory recognises its national importance; it confers no statutory protection but can help to inform management decisions and is a material consideration in planning policy.
- **Non-designated heritage asset:** These assets are identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of their heritage interest but do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. These can include those assets identified by a local planning authority as having 'local interest'.
- **Cultural significance:** The reasons assets have importance stem from their physical, historical aesthetic and intangible characteristics and are referred to in historic environment policy as an asset's 'significance'. To avoid confusion with the EIA concept of the 'Significance of Effect' upon receptors the term 'cultural significance' will be used to express this quality within this chapter.
- **Setting:** The way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced. Setting often extends beyond the property boundary or 'curtilage' of an individual historic asset into a broader landscape context. Both tangible and less tangible elements can be important in understanding the setting. Less tangible elements may include function, sensory perceptions or the historical, artistic, literary and scenic associations of places or landscapes.
- **Zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV):** A computer-generated map which identifies the likely (or theoretical) extent of visibility of a Proposed Development. The ZTVs used do not feature buildings, vegetation or other boundaries which may alter the visibility of a Proposed Development. Further details on the use of ZTVs is provided in Chapter 6.
- **Sensitivity:** A measure of how likely the cultural significance of a heritage asset is to be affected by a specific proposed change. This can relate to direct physical change (e.g. change/removal of historic fabric) or change in setting (e.g. the introduction of a novel type of development or land use within the setting of an asset).

Scope of the Assessment

Effects Assessed in Full

10.8 The following effects were identified at the Scoping stage for consideration in this assessment:

- Effects resulting from physical change to assets within the Site during construction, hereafter referred to as 'direct physical effects'. Assets beyond the Site are not at risk of physical change as a result of the Proposed Development.
- Effects to designated and non-designated assets that are identified as being sensitive to setting change as a result of the presence of the Proposed Development when operational. These effects are considered in relation to different study areas as set out below in paragraph 10.16.

[1] Designation highlights a building, site or area's special interest and value to this and future generations and gives it protection under law or policy. Such assets meet the relevant designation criteria provided in Annexes 1-6 of Historic Environment Policy for Scotland.

[2] Section 59, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)(Scotland) Act 1997, as amended.

- Cumulative operational effects as a result of change to the setting of assets.
- The assessment assumes a maximum-case scenario, in which forest plantation is recognised as being transient. As such, it is assumed that the forestry cycle of plant, grow, fell, plant, grow, fell, etc, will continue.

Effects Scoped Out

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

- Direct physical effects to assets outside of the Site;
- Direct effects to non-designated heritage assets beyond the Inner 5 kilometres (km) study area as a result of setting change;
- Cumulative effects to heritage assets during construction as a result of setting change;
- Indirect physical effects on sites or features of national, regional or local cultural heritage value as a consequence of vibration, dewatering or changes in hydrology; and
- Cumulative direct physical effects.

10.10 The Scoping out of such effects from consideration in the ES was agreed by relevant consultees in the Scoping response (June 2021). Detail on consultee comments received at Scoping, as well as subsequent consultation as the scheme evolved, is presented in **Table 10.1**.

Assessment Methodology

Legislation and Guidance

Legislation

10.11 This assessment is carried out in accordance with the principles contained within the following legislation:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979); and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act (1997).

10.12 Relevant planning policy is covered in Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework.

Guidance

10.13 This assessment is carried out in accordance with the following:

- HES (2019) Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS);
- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (hereafter referred to as 'PCHIA');
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES (2020) Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance Notes – setting (hereafter referred to as the HES setting guidance);
- HES and Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (2018), Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (particularly the framework for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment provided in Appendix 1; hereafter this guidance is referred to as 'the EIA Handbook');
- The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2017), Code of Conduct;
- Charted Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2017), Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (hereafter referred to as 'the CIfA guidance'); and
- Scottish Government (2011), Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.

10.14 PCHIA lays out the approach for assessment of effects to assets, including within the context of EIA. Although the approach to this topic outlined in the Scoping Report was compliant with PHCIA some minor restructuring to how the methodology and assessment has been laid out in this chapter to more clearly align with the guidance. The approach taken for assessment does not materially differ from that set out in the Scoping Report.

Consultation

10.15 In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the Scoping responses and other consultation which has been undertaken as detailed in **Table 10.1**.

Table 10.1: Consultation responses

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), archaeological advisor to Argyll and Bute Council (ABC)	Scoping Response (January 2022)	Advised that the former non-statutory register of schedulable sites (NSR) should be added to the proposed assessment of setting effects out to 5km distance from the nearest turbine.	This dataset was provided as part of the HER data and has informed the assessment.
WoSAS	Scoping Response (January 2022)	Confirmed that they were content with the proposed visualisations.	Noted.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	Scoping Consultation (June 2021)	Confirmed that they were content with the approach and that they had not identified any assets beyond 10km that were sensitive to change.	Noted.
HES	Scoping Consultation (June 2021)	Requested that designated assets outside the ZTV should not be automatically excluded from detailed assessment.	Assets outside the ZTV have been appraised in relation to the potential for in-combination views and effects arising from such visibility.
HES	Scoping Consultation (June 2021)	Requested that assets excluded from detailed assessment should have the rationale for this exclusion set out clearly in the assessment report in order to allow stakeholders to reach a view as to whether an asset's exclusion was reasonable or not.	The appraisal of assets' susceptibility to effects, including grounds for whether further assessment has been undertaken or not, is included within the HEA (see **Appendix 10.2: Annex A**).
HES	Scoping Consultation (June 2021)	Requested that cumulative effects are assessed.	In line with relevant guidance cumulative effects have been assessed.
HES	Scoping Consultation (June 2021)	Agreed with the list of assets identified as being most sensitive to the Proposed Development but requested further consultation as the scheme progressed.	Further consultation has been undertaken.
HES	Post-Scoping Consultation (July 2022)	Remote meeting held to discuss revised access option, via Argyll Estates land to enable 'bypass' of Inveraray on existing and enhanced estate tracks. Solution partly within the Inveraray Castle GDL, therefore seeking HES feedback on potential sources of impact, necessary additions to scope of assessment and initial impression of key risks. Presented results of field visit (30.06.2022) to inform discussion.	Relevant assets added to scope of assessment (construction and operational effects). Influence of assessment/ advice on access track routeing and avoidance of key assets.

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
HES	Post-Scoping Consultation (October 2022)	Discussion of visualisations as design evolved. HES requested the inclusion of Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh Dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh (SM4120) and a photomontage of Ardchonnel Castle (SM291) from the south/west on Loch Awe.	Further consultation has been undertaken and the scheduled monument is included in the assessment. It was agreed that a wireframe will be produced from Loch Awe due to technical constraints involved in obtaining suitable photography from the loch. Visualisation location CH18. See **Figures 10.3**, **10.4** and **Appendix 10.1**, **Figure CH18**. Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh included as visualisation location CH17. See **Figures 10.3**, **10.4** and **Appendix 10.1**, **Figure CH17**.
HES	Post-Scoping consultation (October 2022)	Agreed revised visualisations based upon final layout and ZTV.	Agreed visualisations have been prepared – see **Appendix 10.1**.

Study Area

10.16 Direct physical effects are assessed within the Site only. Effects related to setting change are assessed using the following study areas as shown on **Figure 10.1**, **10.2a** and **10.2b-d**:

1. An Inner Study Area – comprising a 5km buffer from the turbine locations. Within this area all designated and non-designated heritage assets identified as sensitive to setting change as a result of the Proposed Development are assessed.
2. An Outer Study Area – comprising land between the 5km and 10km from the turbine locations. Within this area all designated heritage assets identified as sensitive to setting change as a result of the Proposed Development are assessed.

10.17 The study areas have been defined in response to the Proposed Development's ZTV[3] and an understanding of the distance over which significant visual effects are considered likely. Consideration has also been given to the potential for setting change to assets within the ZTV, between 10 and 20km and HES requested that a scheduled dun, Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh (SM4120) 11km north of the Site, be considered.

Desk Based Research and Data Sources

10.18 Desk-based assessment has been undertaken in line with the CIfA guidance to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment within the Study Areas and to establish the impact of the Proposed Development on the significance of the historic environment.

10.19 The following data sources have informed the desk-based assessment:

- HES spatial datasets and database for designated assets:
  - World Heritage Sites;
  - Scheduled Monuments;
  - Listed Buildings;
  - Inventory-listed Garden and Designed Landscapes;
  - Inventory-listed Battlefields; and
  - HES Canmore data.
- Local authority conservation area information;
- WoSAS Historic Environment Record (HER) data;
- Ordnance Survey (OS) current and historic mapping;
- Scottish Government LiDAR data;
- British Geological Survey mapping[4];
- Secondary published and online sources;
- Scheme plans and sections as provided in **Chapter 4: Project Description**; and
- Visualisations of the scheme and 3-D turbines viewable in Google Earth.

Field Survey

10.20 A walkover survey of the construction footprint and selected assets in the wider study area was undertaken in August and September 2021 and March 2022 to inform the assessment. Weather conditions during these surveys were mixed, but visibility was generally excellent. An additional survey was conducted in June 2022 to assess the proposed 'Inveraray Bypass' access route.

10.21 The field survey targeted the construction locations within the Site. It allowed for the verification of all recorded assets, confirming their interpretation, location, and likely sensitivity to change, and informed the assessment of potential effects on those assets. Few previously unrecorded assets were identified during the walkover. Selected assets beyond the Site were also visited to confirm their setting assessment.

10.22 A digital photographic record was made of the Site visit and selected photographs are included in **Appendix 10.2**.

Assessment Approach

10.23 The assessment approach follows the analytical steps set out in PCHIA for understanding cultural heritage assets and evaluating change:

- Understanding heritage assets:
  - Describe the asset;
  - Ascribe cultural significance; and
  - Attribute importance.
- Evaluating the consequences of change:
  - Understand change;
  - Assess impact; and
  - Weigh the effect – this is to be understood as establishing the level of effect to a heritage asset.

10.24 The methodology also draws on that set out in the EIA Handbook where it is compatible with, or complements, PCHIA.

Understanding Heritage Assets – Asset Description

10.25 All assets are described factually and in a manner proportionate to their importance. The description includes sufficient detail to understand the effect of the Proposed Development on their cultural significance.

[3] The ZTV suggests high visibility over much of the land within 5km of the Site. Beyond 5km there is almost no visibility to the north and south, widespread high visibility to the west and large patches of varying visibility to the east.

[4] British Geological Survey (undated) BGS Geology Viewer [online]. Available at: https://geologyviewer.bgs.ac.uk/

Understanding Heritage Assets – Cultural Significance

10.26 Heritage assets have value due to their cultural significance and this can be articulated in various ways. This assessment bases explains cultural significance in the following terms[5]:

- **Aesthetic value:** The sensory and perceptual experience of a place; that is, how people respond to visual and non-visual aspects such as sounds, smells and other factors having a strong impact on human thoughts, feelings and attitudes. Aesthetic qualities may include the concept of beauty and formal aesthetic ideals. Expressions of aesthetics are culturally influenced.
- **Scientific value:** The information content of a place and its ability to reveal more about an aspect of the past through examination or investigation of the place, including the use of archaeological techniques. The relative scientific value of a place is likely to depend on the importance of the information or data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and its potential to contribute further important information about the place itself or a type or class of place or to address important research questions.
- **Historic value:** This is typically either illustrative or associative and is intended to encompass all aspects of history; for example, the history of aesthetics, art and architecture, science, spirituality, and society. It therefore often underlies other values. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic event, phase, movement or activity, person or group of people. It may be the site of an important event. For any place, the significance will be greater where the evidence of the association or event survives at the place, or where the setting is substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of such change or absence of evidence.
- **Social/Spiritual value:** The associations that a place has for a particular community or cultural group and the social or cultural meanings that it holds for them. Spiritual value refers to the intangible values and meanings embodied in or evoked by a place which give it importance in the spiritual identity, or the traditional knowledge, art and practices of a cultural group. Spiritual value may also be reflected in the intensity of aesthetic and emotional responses or community associations and be expressed through cultural practices and related places.

10.27 All assets have a setting, but the contribution that it makes to their cultural significance varies. Setting can be integral to the cultural significance of an asset contributing to one of more of its heritage values or their appreciation. Therefore, a change in an important element of an asset's setting can equate to a direct impact to its cultural significance. Equally, where setting does not contribute to an asset's cultural significance or is not sensitive to change resulting from a Proposed Development, no effect can result from setting change. In this assessment, the contribution made by setting to an asset's cultural significance is set as part of the narrative text explaining its significance.

Understanding Heritage Assets – Asset Importance

10.28 Asset importance equates to the EIA concept 'receptor value/importance'. The heritage values discussed above allow explanation of an asset's cultural significance but do not automatically explain how important an asset is. Establishing the importance is a key stage of the assessment process as it influences both how decisions are made during the Proposed Development's design evolution and the weight to be given to effects to an asset by the decision-maker. Importance is determined using professional judgement alongside an understanding of local, regional, and national historic environment research objectives and, where appropriate, the use of the designation criteria. The criteria for establishing importance are stated in **Table 10.2**.

Table 10.2: Heritage asset importance

Importance	Criteria
High	Designated cultural heritage assets. Non-designated cultural heritage assets that meet the criteria for statutory designation.
Medium	Non-designated heritage assets of regional value.
Low	Non-designated cultural heritage assets of local value.
Very low	Non-designated cultural heritage assets of less than local value.
Uncertain	The heritage value of the asset could not be fully ascertained.

Evaluating the Consequences of Change

10.29 An asset's importance is not an automatic indication how sensitive it is to a Proposed Development. Sensitivity varies depending on the nature of a heritage asset's cultural significance, the contribution that setting makes to that cultural significance, and the character of the Proposed Development and the way in which it interacts with that cultural significance. As such, understanding if a heritage asset is sensitive to a particular development proposal determines which assets need to be subject to detailed assessment[6].

10.30 Unless otherwise stated, all heritage assets within the Site have been assumed to be of high sensitivity to physical change. This is because their cultural significance is derived primarily from their form and fabric and, as they are located within the area over which Proposed Development infrastructure is present, are at risk of alteration due to groundworks. Any assets that the Proposed Development could physically interact with, as they lay either in the development footprint or working areas, have been assessed in detail.

10.31 In terms of operation of the Proposed Development, the source of potential effects comes from change in the setting of assets. Visibility is typically a key factor in such effects and the most far-reaching, in spatial terms, experiential quality. Assets susceptible to effects associated with change in setting were identified via analysis of asset distribution and character, the ZTV and an understanding of the distance over which significant visual effects were likely. This latter aspect was informed by liaison with the LVIA authors. Assets within the study areas in the ZTV were subject to desk-based appraisal of their cultural significance and potential interaction with the Proposed Development. Assets in the study areas but not in the ZTV were subject to review to establish if they had the potential for change to their cultural significance as a resulting from being seen in combination with the Proposed Development (hereafter 'in combination views'). All assets identified as deriving significance from elements of their setting that could be changed by the Proposed Development have been assessed in detail.

Understanding Change

10.32 In line with the PCHIA (2021) guidance a concise factual statement of how the proposal will interact with the heritage asset or its setting/ experience has been provided.

Understanding Change – Assessing Impact

10.33 Impact in PCHIA terms equates to the EIA concept 'magnitude of change' and comprises an assessment of the scale to which the change will alter an asset's cultural significance. This is based upon understanding of the amount of cultural significance that will be affected and draws a distinction as to whether a change will affect a single, minor, component of an asset's cultural significance or whether it will affect its cultural significance on a more fundamental level. As per PCHIA, a simple scale is used for assessing impact and the criteria for this are set out in **Table 10.3**.

Table 10.3: Scale of impact criteria

Impact	Description
Large	Substantial, near total, or total loss of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Substantial level of change to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.
Medium	Medium loss or alteration of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Medium level of change to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.
Small	Slight loss or alteration of an asset's cultural significance either through physical and/or setting change. Small changes to how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.

[5] These are drawn from heritage values referenced by the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HES, 2019), which in turn derive from The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 2013) and detailed in the Australia ICOMOS (2013).

[6] Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland (2018) The EIA Handbook (pp. 179, paragraph 3)

Impact	Description
No change	No change to the cultural significance of the heritage asset, or how that significance is understood, appreciated, or experienced.

Understanding Change – Level of Effect

10.34 Level of effect in PCHIA terms equates to the EIA concept 'significance of effect'. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement to reflect the importance of the heritage asset using the scaled criteria in **Table 10.4** below. The justification for the level of effect is reported using narrative text which concludes with a clear statement as to whether it is considered a significant effect in terms of the EIA Regulations. **Major** and **Moderate** levels of effect are considered **significant** in the context of the EIA Regulations.

Table 10.4: Level of effect criteria

Level of Effect	Description
Major	A large scale of impact (e.g. total or near total loss) to the cultural significance of an asset of medium or high importance.
Moderate	A medium scale of impact (e.g. substantial loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of an asset of medium or high importance; or a large scale of impact (total or near total loss) to an asset of low importance.
Minor	A low scale of impact (slight loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of an asset of medium or high importance; a medium or low scale of impact (slight to substantial loss or alteration) to the cultural significance of an asset of low importance; or any change to an asset of very low importance.
No effect	No change to the cultural significance of an asset.

Cumulative Effects

10.35 Cumulative effects relating to change in the setting of assets have been considered in relation to three windfarms schemes listed in **Table 10.5** below, which fall within the Inner and Outer Study Areas. The locations of these schemes are shown on **Figure 10.4**. Schemes that are being built out or that are operational (e.g. An Suidhe and Carraig Gheal)[7] are considered part of the baseline.

Table 10.5: Cumulative wind farms considered

Name	Status	Number of Turbines	Maximum Blade Tip Height (metres (m))	Distance (kilometres (km)[8])
Blarghour	Scoping[9]	17	180[10]	0.5
Eredine	Scoping	26	230	5.1
Ladyfield	Scoping	18	200	5.7

Assessment Limitations

10.36 The assessment has been informed by a range of sources on the area's historic environment. Much of this is necessarily secondary information compiled from a variety of sources (e.g. HER data and grey literature reports). It has been assumed that this information is reasonably accurate unless otherwise stated.

10.37 There is an unavoidable inherent uncertainty in the discussion of buried archaeological remains and archaeological potential but this is always the case, and it is considered that there is sufficient information to enable an informed decision to be made in relation to the identification and assessment of likely significant environmental effects on cultural heritage as a result of construction and operation of the Proposed Development. A precautionary approach has been applied, based on the available information and the professional experience and judgment of the project team, to ensure that all likely significant effects have been assessed and reported. For the avoidance of doubt, when any asset is identified as being of 'uncertain' importance, a precautionary approach is applied, and the effect reported as potentially significant.

Existing Conditions

Archaeological and Historical Background

10.38 This section provides an overview of the archaeological and historical development of the Site and Study Areas; a more detailed account is included in the HEA in **Appendix 10.2**.

10.39 The Site lies on a ridge of upland between Loch Awe and Loch Fyne. Its topography, characterised by craggy ridges (varying from a level of 150m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) to 520m AOD), and landcover, mostly unimproved moorland and blanket bog, mean that it is unlikely to have been suitable for permanent settlement over much of the past. There is evidence that the Site was used as summer grazing, as evidenced by the presence of shielings adjacent to several of the burns which rise in the Site. The shielings are likely to be of medieval to post-medieval date.

10.40 The Site environs are characterised by good sea connections with sheltered bays on the mainland coast feeding into rivers inland. These resources have been exploited by humans since the Mesolithic period (10,000 BC to 4,000 BC), although it is only from the Neolithic period (4,000 BC to 2,200 BC) that in-situ evidence for human activity is present within the Study Areas, primarily in the form of burial monuments. From the prehistoric period onwards evidence for settlement and agriculture is concentrated on low-lying, loch-side locations. Several Iron Age (700 BC – AD 400) settlements, including crannogs, duns and enclosures, are recorded in these areas, many of which are scheduled monuments.

10.41 This pattern of settlement continued into historic periods. In the early medieval period (AD 400 – AD 1100), the culture of the area was influenced by Norse settlers but there is little recorded physical evidence of this in the study area. The growth of Christianity from the early medieval period into the established religion of the medieval period is attested by the many churches, graveyards and stone crosses of these periods in the study area, again many of these are scheduled monuments. The medieval period (AD1100 – 1600) also saw the development of new high status fortified residences in the form of castles. While fortifications were a feature of the landscape from at least later prehistory onwards, the castle, from its Norman earthwork beginnings, was specifically a symbol of feudal power and authority, conferred directly from the crown and quite unlike earlier forms. Medieval Scotland was comparatively lawless, and as Argyll was a long way from direct regnal authority, the need for secure centres of power, safe from the attentions of rival families, was critical to maintaining control – both for feudal lords and the crown they represented. The ruined remains of the 13th century Innis Chonnel Castle (HES ref: SM291) lies 1.5km west of the Site on an islet in Loch Awe. The original seat of the Campbell Lords of Argyll, Innis Connel's relatively utilitarian military design contrasts with the much more sophisticated 15th century Kilchurn Castle – the stronghold of the Campbells of Glenorchy – at the head of the loch. The 15th century castle at Inveraray, overlooking Loch Fyne, quickly superseded Innis Connel, but was demolished to make way for the elegant 18th century gothic revival style castle built for the 3rd Duke of Argyll (HES ref: LB11552).

10.42 The Duke of Argyll has historically been the major landowner in the area. The replacement of Inveraray Castle was part of a larger programme by Archibald Campbell, the third Duke of Argyll to modernise his holdings. This also involved the demolition of the medieval village of Inveraray and its replacement with a planned town laid out c. 600m south of the castle. Together, the castle and town form the foci of a designed landscape comprising parklands, garden buildings and vast woodland plantations. The designed landscape is a GDL (HES ref: GDL00223).

[7] An Suidhe is located 0.5km to the south of the Site and comprises 23 turbines measuring 80m to blade tip. Carraig Gheal is located 8.7km to the north-west of the Site and comprises 20 turbines 125m to blade tip.
[8] Approximate distance between the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development and other wind farms.
[9] In line with the LVIA, the consented Blarghour scheme – currently at Scoping for a proposal to increase the turbine tip height – is treated as part of the baseline.
[10] This scheme has been consented with a turbine height of 136m, however in June 2022 a request for a Scoping opinion was submitted which seeks to increase the tip height of the turbines to 180m. An application was subsequently submitted in March 2023 for the 180m tip height scheme, but with three of the turbines removed (T1, T4 and T7 in the north-west). The Scoping layout at 180m tip height has been used in the cumulative visualisations which presents the worst case scenario. The removal of three turbines will make no difference to the assessment of effects presented in this chapter.

Implications of Climate Change

10.43 The UK Climate Change Projections 2018 (UKCP18) indicate that in the future:

- Temperatures are projected to increase, particularly in summer;
- Winter rainfall is projected to increase and summer rainfall is most likely to decrease;
- Heavy rain days (rainfall greater than 25 millimetres (mm)) are projected to increase, particularly in winter;
- Near surface wind speeds are expected to increase in the second half of the 21st century with winter months experiencing more significant effects of winds; however, the increase in wind speeds is projected to be modest; and
- An increase in frequency of winter storms over the UK.

10.44 Increased hot weather may potentially affect the preservation of waterlogged deposits, causing them to dry and desiccate. Increased rainfall will change groundwater and soil conditions, potentially affecting the preservation of below-ground archaeology and eroding/ flooding above ground assets.

Future Baseline in the Absence of the Proposed Development

10.45 In the 'do nothing' scenario, there will be little physical change to the cultural significance of the heritage assets within the Site as current land use (rough grazing, grouse shooting, forestry) entails processes which cause little or no ground disturbance to areas which have not already been disturbed.[11] As such, only natural decay (weathering and erosion) is considered likely will affect any assets in the 'do nothing' scenario. It should, however, be noted that patterns of rural land use may change as a consequence of the UK leaving the European Union and as Scottish Government objectives drive an increase in woodland expansion.

10.46 Effects related to change in setting in a 'do nothing' scenario are impossible to quantify as it primarily rests on whether new proposals for development are brought forward elsewhere within the surroundings of the Site.

Design Considerations

10.47 The design ethos for the Proposed Development has been to avoid effects to heritage assets and, where that is not possible, to minimise or mitigate them. Each iteration of the design has been reviewed to ensure that direct physical effects to known assets are avoided. Similarly, how turbines will appear within the setting of assets has been a key consideration in design refinements, particularly with regard to avoiding/reducing effects to the Inveraray Castle GDL and associated assets – particularly in-combination views of the Castle itself from designed viewpoints (e.g. Aray Bridge). Care has been taken to avoid turbines being either skylined in views toward assets or being located on key lines of sight to and between assets. These considerations have been central to the reduction in turbine numbers and the finalised layout.

10.48 Infrastructure has been designed to avoid direct impacts on assets identified onsite as part of the desk-based assessment and walkover surveys.

Micrositing

10.49 A micro-siting allowance of 50m has been allowed for all infrastructure. Where a risk to assets has been identified as a potential consequence of micrositing, those assets have been specifically excluded from the allowance to avoid effects as noted below.

Good Practice Measures

10.50 Good practice measures to prevent, reduce, and/or where possible offset potential physical effects to unknown archaeological remains are proposed. Measures which may be adopted include:

- Exclusion of known assets from micro-siting areas, as follows:
  - Allt Bail' A' Ghobhainn 1, shielings (WoSAS 44193; WK-8);
  - Allt Bail' A' Ghobhainn 2, shielings (WK-4);
  - Loch Sionnach, shielings and enclosure (WK-5);
  - North Cromalt, memorial cairn to Gertrude Canning, WRN (WoSAS 66814); and
  - Upper Avenue, cisterns (WK-7).
- The fencing off or marking out of heritage assets in proximity to working areas.
- Implementation of a working protocol should unrecorded heritage assets (e.g. archaeological deposits and features) be discovered.
- The use a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), supplemented by of toolbox talks as appropriate, to highlight the historic environment sensitivities of the Site to those working on the Proposed Development. An outline CEMP is provided as **Appendix 4.2**.
- Appointment of an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) or Historic Environment Clerk of Works (HECoW) to supervise ground-breaking operations and provide on-site advice on avoidance of effects (e.g. working with Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW)) to make decisions on retention / conservation of specimen trees; providing on-site identification and recording of previously unrecognised assets, and liaising with the local authority archaeological adviser as necessary).

10.51 The local authority archaeological advisor (WoSAS) will provide guidance on appropriate conditions to be applied to any prospective consent.

Assessment of Effects

10.52 The assessment of effects is based on the project description as outlined in **Chapter 4**. Unless otherwise stated, potential effects identified are negative. No mitigation is possible for off-setting or reducing operational effects related to setting change and so residual effects are only presented for physical construction effects.

Assets within the Site

10.53 There are two designated heritage assets within the Site, a section of the Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL00223) and the Category B-listed well house at Bealach An Fhuarain (LB11520) (see **Figure 10.2a** and **10.2 d**). The well house lies within the GDL and is associated with it. As there is potential for both direct physical effects to the GDL during the construction period and effects during the operational period related to change in setting, these assets are described and assessed as part of the separate 'Inveraray Castle GDL' section below. This is so effects to this asset and its related assets can be dealt with in an appropriate context rather than artificially separating off elements dependent upon whether they intersect with/ lie within the Site or not.

10.54 The following non-designated assets are within the Site:

- North Cromalt Wren Memorial (WoSAS 66814)[12];
- Allt Na h-Airigh Maldain shielings (WoSAS 44789);
- Lochan Long shielings (WK-2);
- Lochan Dubh Mhuilinn shielings (WK-3);
- Allt Bail' A' Ghobhainn shielings 1 (WoSAS 44193; WK-8);
- Allt Bail' A' Ghobainn shielings 2 (WK-4);
- Loch an Eilein Duibh enclosures (WK-1);
- Eas an Amair enclosure (WK-9);
- Loch Sionnach, shielings and enclosure (WK-5);
- Upper Avenue, cisterns (WK-7);
- Military Road (WoSAS MR7); and

[11] This assumes that land and forest management will be undertaken in line with the UK Forestry Standards and appropriate archaeological mitigation measures required under relevant Felling Licence applications.

[12] A wrought iron gate belonging to the Inveraray Castle Estate is recorded on the HER as within the Site (WoSAS 66818). Walkover survey indicated that it no longer in situ so it has not been treated as a receptor in this assessment.

- Coille-Bhraghad, cottages and mill (possible) (WoSAS 72180; WK-6).

10.55 The locations of assets are shown on **Figures 10.2a** and **10.2b-d**.

10.56 No significant effects are anticipated to these assets as a consequence of either construction or operation of the Proposed Development. A full assessment is provided in **Appendix 10.2**, and is summarised in **Table 10.5** below.

Table 10.6: Summary of effects to non-designated assets within the Site

Asset Code	Asset Name	Asset Type	Importance	Level of Effect	Mitigation/Residual Effect
WoSAS 66814	North Cromalt Wren Memorial	Memorial; war memorial	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. Minor
WoSAS 44789	Allt Na h-Airigh Maldain	Shieling-huts	Low	No effect	-
WK-2	Lochan Long	Shieling-huts	Low	Minor	None (setting change). Minor
WK-3	Lochan Dubh Mhuilinn	Shieling-huts	Low	Minor	None (setting change). Minor
WoSAS 44193; WK-8	Allt Bail' A' Ghobhainn 1	Shieling-huts	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. None (setting change). Minor
WK-4	Allt Bail' A' Ghobainn shielings 2	Shieling-huts	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. None (setting change). Minor
WK-1	Loch an Eilein Duibh	Enclosures	Low	Minor	None (setting change). Minor
WK-9	Eas an Amair	Enclosure	Low	No effect	-
WK-5	Loch Sionnaich	Shieling-huts; enclosure	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. None (setting change). Minor
WK-7	Upper Avenue	Cisterns	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. None.
WoSAS MR7	Military Road	Military Road	Low	No effect	-
WoSAS 72180; WK-6	Coille-Bhraghad	Cottages; mill (possible)	Low	Minor	CEMP; removal from micro-siting allowance. None (setting change). Minor

Archaeological Potential

10.57 Review of the Site history, current conditions and baseline data indicate that the potential for further unknown heritage assets to exist within the upland portion of the Site ('archaeological potential') is considered to be **low**. Any such assts present are anticipated to be of **no more than low importance** (i.e. local importance) and, if identified in the course of construction, could be recorded in an appropriate manner to offset effects. Should any such assets present it is anticipated that a **small to medium impact** is likely to occur, giving rise to Minor to **Moderate** effects. Mitigation in the form of archaeological monitoring and recording will help to offset the (partial) loss through preservation by record.

10.58 The archaeological potential of the access track is considered to be low to medium, due to the possible presence of features relating to the development of the Inveraray estate and designed landscape. While the probability of discovery of such features is considered to be relatively slight, as repeated track repair and strengthening conducted over the past 200 years is likely to have truncated extant remains, they are likely to be of low importance in their own right, depending on their relationship to the heritage values and significance of the GDL. Interaction with assets from periods predating the estate is considered to be unlikely.

10.59 Should any such assets present it is anticipated that a small to medium impact is likely to occur, giving rise to Minor to **Moderate** effects. Mitigation in the form of archaeological monitoring and recording will help to offset the (partial) loss through preservation by record.

Mitigation

Construction Period

10.60 Good practice measures to prevent, reduce, and/or where possible offset potential physical effects to unknown archaeological remains are proposed. Measures which may be adopted include:

- The fencing off and/or marking out of heritage assets in proximity to working areas. In particular, the memorial to Gertude Canning, WRN, (WoSAS 66814) located on a bend adjacent to the access track where upgrades are proposed on the Upper Avenue. While the design has been altered to enable preservation in-situ, all appropriate care must be taken to avoid accidental damage.
- Provision of detailed constraints mapping to contractors working on the Site to enable avoidance of accidental damage.
- Implementation of a working protocol should unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.
- The use of toolbox talks/a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to highlight the cultural heritage sensitivities of the Site to those working on the Proposed Development.
- ACoW or HECoW to supervise ground-breaking operations and provide on-site advice on avoidance of effects (e.g. working with ECoW to make decisions on retention / conservation of specimen trees; providing on-site identification and recording of previously unrecognised assets, and liaising with the local authority archaeological adviser as necessary).

10.61 The local authority archaeological adviser (WoSAS) will provide guidance on appropriate conditions to be applied to an eventual consent.

Operational Period

10.62 How turbines will appear within the setting of assets has been a key consideration in design refinements. Care has been taken to avoid turbines being either skylined in views toward assets or being located on key lines of sight to and between assets. These considerations have been central to the reduction in turbine numbers and the finalised layout. There are no appropriate mitigation measures for operational effects as any measures to mitigate visibility of turbines are likely to be more visually intrusive than the turbines themselves.

Residual Effects

10.63 As indicated above, appropriate provision of archaeological supervision during ground-breaking works will ensure that any archaeological assets uncovered can be effectively understood, characterised and recorded, reducing residual effects to Minor.

10.64 Should assets of regional or national importance be identified, the ACoW/HECoW will liaise with WoSAS to agree an appropriate conservation strategy and, where necessary, micrositing of infrastructure to avoid/reduce effects.

Offsite Assets

10.65 Assets are discussed below thematically and chronologically. Where assets are of a similar date and form (e.g. duns, crannogs in Loch Awe) general aspects on their description, cultural significance and importance are laid out under 'General considerations'

before each asset is discussed in turn. All offsite assets are not susceptible to construction period effects so the assessment below relates solely to operational period effects. The location of assets is shown on **Figures 10.1**, **10.2a**, **10.3** and **10.4**.

Ardchonnel Long Cairn

Description

10.66 Ardchonnel long cairn (Asset ref. SM4173) lies on the lower reaches of a hillside on the eastern shore of Loch Awe (at c. 120m AOD) within a clearing in commercial forestry. Long cairns are elongated rubble mounds that acted as funerary monuments during the Early and Middle Neolithic periods (c.3400-2400 BC) and are one of the oldest forms of monuments to survive. Many excavated examples appear to have been used for communal burial. The cairns also sometimes display evidence of internal structures, e.g. stone-lined compartments (cists) and tomb chambers, and some examples have edge-set kerb stones around the cairn perimeter. Some excavated examples have produced evidence for funerary activity preceding construction of the cairn, indicating that they were important ritual sites over a considerable period. It has also been suggested that they acted as territorial markers. The Ardchonnel long cairn survives relatively well and has remains of a burial chamber partially intact and visible at its wider end (north-east). It is aligned north-east to south-west, parallel to Loch Awe. Prior to tree plantation, there will have been wide visibility from the cairn westward to the loch, historically, the main transport route, while the visibility to the east was curtailed by the slight rise in topography.

10.67 The cultural significance of this asset is derived primarily from its scientific value and its ability to inform our understanding of Neolithic ritual practices, treatment of the dead, and regional variations therein. Its upstanding remains also have some illustrative value, as a rare example of a relatively intact Neolithic ritual monument. It may also have some limited aesthetic value, as it contributes to the historic character of the area, but its condition and the presence of forestry brash around the asset mean it is not appreciable as a burial mound unless at, or adjacent, to the cairn. The cairn's siting, particularly, its relationship to the loch, would have been important to its monumental function and visibility within the landscape. However, this cannot currently be appreciated or experienced as it is surrounded by plantation forestry. This setting may change as parts of the forest are felled, but this will be temporary if the forestry continues to be cropped as the felled areas will be replanted.

10.68 Neolithic long cairns are one of the earliest forms of human monuments and, as a result, Ardchonnel Long Cairn is one of the rarest to survive, especially with upstanding remains. Given this, this asset is of high importance, as reflected by its status as a scheduled monument.

Assessment

10.69 Ardchonnel long cairn lies 3.5km from the nearest turbine in the Proposed Development (T13). The ZTV indicates that five turbines could be visible from the cairn, and up to six potentially visible in combination with it from the surrounding area. Two wireframes have been prepared to illustrate the potential visibility from the cairn (**Appendix 10.1: Figure CH1a** and **CH1b**), taken from location CH01 (**Figure 10.5.1**).[13] The wireframe of the view from the asset shows that five turbines will be visible (one hub (T13) and four blade tips (T9, T10, T11 and T12)). These turbines will only be visible during the temporary felling cycle of the surrounding forestry and, depending on the felling rotation, may not be visible all at once. Given the distance and intervening topography they would be experienced as a clearly separate feature behind the cairn, when viewed in-combination with the asset from down or across slope. Nine turbines at the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm[14] are already theoretically experienced from and within the setting of the cairn. In the event of large-scale temporary felling, the Proposed Development's turbines will appear larger and closer than those at An Suidhe turbines, despite less of them being visible, owing to their greater height.

10.70 In a maximum case scenario (i.e. removal of all forestry cover), visibility of the five Proposed Development turbine tips will not affect the primary, scientific, value of the asset. It will also not change the illustrative value of its upstanding remains. This is firstly, because in-combination visibility with the cairn is along its long axis (i.e. on its principal axis toward the loch) and the turbine tips will be clearly separate and distant, and, secondly, as the turbines will not interrupt or alter its key setting relationship with Loch Awe. Any visibility of the turbine tips will not materially alter the cultural significance of the asset, or the appreciation, understanding, or experience of that significance so no effect will arise.

Duns

10.71 Two duns have been considered for effects:

- Barr Mor Dun (Asset ref. SM4159) (CHVP04); and
- Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh (Asset ref. SM4120) (CHVP25).

General Considerations

10.72 A dun is a small, defended settlement of the Atlantic Roundhouse form thought to represent the remains of residence of small groups or single families. The majority are in coastal locations and tend to be located on relatively high ground, along prominent coastal routes or within easy reach of the coast. They are often associated with areas of cultivated land. In terms of date, they tend to be either Iron Age or early medieval. The cultural significance of duns is primarily scientific and derives from their ability to inform our understanding of the monument type, its date and use. Where duns include visible above ground remains, they also have some historic (illustrative) value, as a legible example of this type of asset. Their setting can contribute to this value by demonstrating the strategic positions they were sited in (e.g. via being able to appreciate that the dun is on a hilltop with visibility in many directions).

10.73 The two duns are good examples of a relatively rare monument type with the potential to make a significant addition to our understanding of the past, particularly the design and construction of small, defended settlements in western Scotland during later prehistory and their place in the wider economy and society. As scheduled monuments the assets are of high importance.

Barr Mor Dun

Description

10.74 Barr Mor Dun (Asset ref. SM4159) lies on the eastern side of Loch Awe, south of Ardchonnel. This small undated dun is located on the tree-covered summit of a low hill, Barr Morr, to the east of Loch Awe, and surrounded by moorland and large areas of forestry plantation. The small steep sided hill will have enabled views in all directions (across the loch to the west and along the hill line to the east), although these views cannot currently be experienced due to dense tree cover on the asset itself and along the loch shoreline. The dun's fortification is oval in plan and formed of a dry-stone wall, much of which has been robbed of stone and appears only as a low bank. The interior contains no traces of structures.

Assessment

10.75 This asset is located 3.5km from the nearest turbine in the Proposed Development (T13). The ZTV indicates that up to four turbines could be visible from the asset, and in combination with it from the surrounding area on the eastern side of the loch. Beyond this area, the ZTV indicates that there will be greater visibility of the Proposed Development. The limited visibility of the upstanding remains of the dun mean it is not visible from beyond immediately adjacent to the asset. Two wireframes have been prepared to show the view from the asset (**Appendix 10.1: Figures CH4a** and **CH4b**, taken from location CHVP04 (**Figure 10.5.4**)). **Figure CH4b** shows that intervening topography means only the tips of the blades on four turbines (T9, T10, T12 and T13) would be visible from the asset if the native woodland on it were cleared and the intervening forestry also felled. In the unlikely event that visibility of the turbines becomes possible, it will be temporary as any plantation would be re-planted with fast-growing conifers if the plantation continues to be cropped.

10.76 The ability to perceive the four turbine tips from and/ or in-combination with the asset cannot affect its primary scientific value. Nor will the illustrative value of its limited upstanding remains be affected as, due to the intervening topography, the turbine tips will be clearly read as a separate feature in the distance. The presence of the turbine will also not affect the understanding of the dun's defensive function, which is legible through its topographical siting and, whilst the turbines will be theoretically visible in some views out from the asset (i.e. to the north-west), it will not change the ability to understand or appreciate the strategic importance of the dun's siting – although these potential views are obscured by dense native woodland onsite. As the key elements of its significance will remain unchanged, its experience as related to the understanding and appreciation of its cultural significance, will not be affected. There will be no change to the cultural significance of this asset nor meaningful change to how it is experienced and appreciated so no effect would arise.

Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh

Description

10.77 Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh (Asset ref. SM4120) lies 11km north of the Site. The dun is almost circular with walls up to 5m thick and up to a height of 2m. An excavation was undertaken of the interior in the 1890s with hearths and bones belonging to horse

[13] **Figure CHV1a** is a cumulative view and **Figure CHV1b** is just the view of the Proposed Development.

[14] 80m to tip and c. 3.5km to the south-west of the cairn.

and deer recovered. Its location is typical of its type being on an elevated position overlooking the valley between Kilchrenan and Taynuilt. There are steep slopes on all sides except the west where the approach is along the crest of the ridge. From its north-east entrance, there is direct line of sight towards Ben Cruachan, presumed to be deliberate.[15] The dun is more substantial than most in the west of Scotland, suggesting it was of a higher status, perhaps having functions over and above a dwelling. It is also of some historic (associative) value, with the Gaelic name translating to 'fort' or 'seat' or 'resting place of Kenneth' which indicates the same tradition of it being associated with a particular individual or family. The setting of the dun contributes to its cultural significance by allowing appreciation of its defensive position and oversight over the surrounding landscape. From this position, the Site appears as a part of the ridge of high ground on the eastern side of Loch Awe. The existing An Suidhe Wind Farm lies on the same ridge. No particular strategic relationships or conscious design are evident between the dun and the Site. Existing wind farms lie 4.8km north-west of the asset (Beinn Ghlas) and 5.8km south-west of the asset (Carraig Gheal).

Assessment

10.78 The dun lies 11.km north of the Proposed Development's nearest turbine (T13). The ZTV indicates that between nine and 12 turbines of the Proposed Development will be visible from the asset. Two wireframes were produced to show views south from the asset. These show the Proposed Development partially visible adjacent to and in front of An Suidhe Wind Farm, with the tips of four turbines (T3, T4, T5 and T8)) and hubs/towers of five turbines (T9, T10, T11, T12 and T13) visible (**Appendix 10.1: CH17a** and **CH17b**, taken from location CHVP25 (**Figure 10.5.17**)).

10.79 Other wind turbines are already experienced in views from and in combination with the dun and at a much closer proximity to it (albeit that these are not visible in the wireframe due to the direction of the view). These include turbines on the section of the ridge on which the Site lies. This means the turbines would be read as a reinforcement of existing wind infrastructure rather than a novel element in the setting of the asset. The presence of the Proposed Development would not alter the dun's inherent cultural significance deriving from historic and scientific value. It would also not affect the aspects of the asset's setting which appear to be significant, i.e. views to the surrounding landscape (Ben Cruachan and the valley below as well as east and the valley of Loch Awe) nor challenge its prominence in the landscape. As there would be no change to the cultural significance of this asset nor meaningful change to how it is experienced and appreciated, no effect would arise.

Crannogs, Loch Awe

10.80 Three crannogs, all scheduled monuments, lie within the study areas:

- Innis Chonnel Crannog (Asset ref. SM4146);
- Loch Awe, Carn Mhic Chealair, crannog (Asset ref. SM4141); and
- Carn Dubh, crannog E of Inverinan (Asset ref. SM4175).

General Considerations

10.81 Crannogs are partial or wholly artificial islands built within waterbodies to house a domestic structure with a bridge or causeway connecting them to land. Some date to as early as the Neolithic and as late as the medieval period in Scotland. Those in the study area are assumed to be of later prehistoric date. The reasoning behind crannogs' siting over water has been interpreted as a mix of being a status symbol for leaders, offering a defensive advantage and optimising the convenience of water-borne transport. The setting of crannogs factors into their significance by, firstly, enabling understanding and appreciation of their position within the relevant waterbody, contributing to understanding the nature of the structure (where possible), and understanding their relationship to other crannogs and strategic contemporaneous assets as part of the wider settlement pattern. In this part of Argyll, the dense distribution of crannogs is perhaps related to the relative paucity of other later prehistoric settlement remains.

10.82 The cultural significance of crannogs is derived from both historic and scientific value. Their historic value relates to them being a high status later prehistoric dwelling with probable defensive aspects. Through future excavation there is a possibility to enhance our understanding of crannog construction, use and of the society which utilised them. Their setting allows understanding of crannogs as a liminal structure – a domestic site not on land but over water – and their interpretation as a status symbols and/or defensive dwellings.

10.83 The three assets are of high importance, surviving as a rare example of later prehistoric domestic forms and construction techniques. This is reflected in their status as scheduled monuments.

Carn Dubh, Crannog E of Inverinan

Description

10.84 Carn Dubh crannog (Asset ref. SM4175) is assumed to be of later prehistoric date and excavation has indicated that the islet is wholly artificial. It is currently covered in trees and there is currently no visible trace of a causeway. Its causeway would have connected back to the shore, west towards Inverinan. Due to the effect of surrounding topography, the setting of the asset is confined to the small bay in which its sits and the adjacent eastern side of Loch Awe. The tree-covered nature of the asset means it appears similar in character to the natural islets which exist at points along the lochside and is not readily appreciable as a crannog.

Assessment

10.85 The crannog is 5.7km north-north-west of the nearest turbine (T13). The ZTV suggests that between ten and 13 turbines of the Proposed Development will be visible from the crannog and from the adjacent bayside. A wireframe (**Appendix 10.1: Figure CH16b**, taken from location CHVP24 (**Figure 10.5.16**)) looking south-west and centred on the crannog indicates that 11 turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible to the left of the operational An Suidhe Wind Farm. The Proposed Development's visibility would be of tips of six turbines (T3, T4, T5, T6, T7 and T8) and hubs/towers of five turbines (T9, T10, T11, T12 and T13). The turbines of the Proposed Development would appear closer than turbines at An Suidhe Wind Farm. This would be a worst-case level of visibility and does not take into account the tree cover on the crannog and lochsides. In this scenario, the crannog would be seen from the western side of Loch Awe with the turbines visible on the ridge of the western side of the loch at some distance. This visibility does not affect the crannog's historic illustrative value nor its scientific value. Whilst its setting would alter slightly, this would not affect how the key aspects of the crannog's setting (i.e. relationship to the loch and adjacent land and its place in the landscape) would not be affected by the presence of the Proposed Development. As such, no effect would arise.

Loch Awe, Carn Mhic Chealair, Crannog

Description

10.86 The Carn Mhic Chealair crannog (Asset ref. SM4141; see **Figure 10.1**) lies off the western loch shore between Kilmaha and Dalavich. It comprises a crannog that is now largely submerged. It was investigated in 1972 as part of a survey on Loch Awe which revealed that the crannog was joined to the mainland via a stone-built causeway. This causeway is no longer visible and the crannog is currently covered in vegetation. The crannog lies in a small embayment on western lochside, opposite Eredine, which is wooded and can be seen from adjacent stretches of the lochside and seen from the opposite side of the loch around Eredine. As with Carn Dubh, it is likely to appear as a vegetated islet from these locations rather than being readily understandable as a prehistoric settlement.

Assessment

10.87 The crannog is situated 5.9km south-west of the nearest turbine (T13) of the Proposed Development. The ZTV indicates that 12 turbines would be visible from the asset in views east across the loch. From the asset, the Proposed Development would be on the ridgeline north of the An Suidhe Wind Farm. This visibility would be at distance and does not affect the crannog's historic illustrative value nor its scientific value. Whilst its setting would alter slightly, this would not affect how the key aspects of the crannog's setting (i.e. relationship to the loch and adjacent land and its place in the landscape) are experienced. As such, no effect would arise.

Innis Chonnel Crannog

Description

10.88 Innis Chonnel Crannog (SM4146) comprises of a crannog approximately 200m from the eastern shore. It lies north of Ardchonnel Castle (Asset ref. SM291). It is one of the largest crannogs in Loch Awe measuring approximately 35m in length. Depending on the height of the water in the Loch, the crannog can appear as two smaller islands. The whole asset is covered with trees. Excavation has shown the crannog to be partially artificial (i.e. an existing rocky protuberance was augmented) unlike other crannogs on Loch Awe. The crannog lies in a small embayment on eastern lochside, opposite Dalavich, and can be seen from

[15] Historic Environment Scotland (1978, amended 2013) Caisteal Suidhe Cheannaidh, dun 470m NW of Achnacraobh (SM4120) [online]. Available at: http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/SM4120) [Accessed on 21.11.2022]

adjacent stretches of the lochside and the unwooded opposite side of the loch around Dalavich. As with the other crannogs, it is likely to appear as a vegetated islet from these locations rather than being readily understandable as a prehistoric settlement.

Assessment

10.89 The crannog lies 3.6km west of the closest Proposed Development turbine (T8) with the ZTV indicating that 7-9 turbines would be visible from the crannog. The turbines will be visible in views east from the asset towards the ridge of high ground between Loch Awe ad Loch Fyne. This visibility would be at distance and does not affect the crannog's historic illustrative value nor its scientific value. Whilst its setting would alter slightly, this would not affect how the key aspects of the crannog's setting (i.e. relationship to the loch and adjacent land and its place in the landscape) are experienced. As such, no effect would arise.

Christian Sites

10.90 The following Christian sites, all sited around Loch Awe, were assessed for effects:

- Rubha na Fidhle, chapel, settlement and rock carvings, Loch Awe (Asset ref. SM288) – scheduled monument;
- Balliemeanoch chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4227) – scheduled monument (CHVP10);
- Kilmun chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4140) – scheduled monument (CHVP07);
- Innis Errich chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4214) – scheduled monument; and
- Dalavich Kirk (Asset ref. LB11891) – listed building, Category C (CHVP06).

10.91 As designated heritage assets, these are all of high importance.

General Considerations

Early Christian Foundations

10.92 Argyll was a key centre of early Christianity in the west of Scotland during the early medieval period. The remote and craggy landscapes around its lochs and isles attracted monks and nuns in search of 'desert places'[16] to establish small communities from the 6th century onwards. These generally began life as a place where a single religious or small group of them set up ascetic communities to live closer to God. Many grew to become the focus of larger monastic communities by the latter part of the first millennium AD as new devotees were attracted by the lifestyle and godly examples of their founders.

10.93 Whilst the cultural significance of early Christian sites derives mainly from their historic (illustrative) and scientific values, often historic (associative) and aesthetic values can also be present. In historic (illustrative) terms, the early Christian foundations are a testament to the way in which Scotland was colonised by Christianity from religious foundations established along its coasts. Much of this process is know from quasi-historical accounts so the scientific evidence held by archaeological deposits is invaluable in corroborating or challenging the received understanding of how this happened. In historic (associative) terms, many of the sites preserve what is thought to be the name of the monk or nun responsible for their foundation. In aesthetic terms, the majority of foundations are now ruinous and being reclaimed by vegetation, and this, combined with their remote locations, often means they are appreciated as picturesque ruins. Whilst the role of setting varies, it typically factors in their historical (illustrative) value by allowing an appreciation of the kinds of remote locations sought out by the early monastic pioneers and the central role of waterborne access in their development. It can also factor by contributing to how they are perceived as picturesque ruins.

Medieval and Later Churches

10.94 As Christianity became the established religion toward the latter part of the early medieval period, ordinary settlements began to need parish churches to minister to the resident community. Whilst these, or their sites, often survive in use as the local parish church, many others have fallen out of use as a result of rural depopulation. Church sites still used for worship often retain little of their medieval fabric, having been repeatedly modernised to suit the needs of their community, the nature of the established religion and changing testes in polite architecture. Of the disused churches, often all that survives is a ruined medieval church building set in a contemporary graveyard. In many cases, the graveyards have continued to be used for the community's burials after the church went into disuse.

10.95 The cultural significance of these churches derives from a combination of many forms of value. In historic (illustrative) terms, they are a testament to the central place of the religion in community life and the way in which worship and rituals and the associated structures have evolved, often in response to wider religious upheaval or changing architectural fashions. The scientific evidence held by buildings, historic landscape features and associated archaeological deposits is invaluable in evidencing this process, often over several hundreds of years. In historic (associative) terms, many retain aspects sponsored by powerful local families. In aesthetic terms, churches are often one of the largest and most consciously designed features in a settlement and the multiple phases of work often sit harmoniously together. In the case of ruined churches and as with their early Christian predecessors, their condition, ruinous and being reclaimed by vegetation, combined with their remote locations means they are appreciated as picturesque ruins. Whilst the role of setting varies, it typically factors in their historical (illustrative) value by allowing an appreciation of them as central to the local community. It can also factor by contributing to how they are perceived as picturesque ruins. Churches also have social/spiritual value owing to heir central place in community and its rituals.

Rubha na Fidhle, Chapel, Settlement and Rock Carvings

Description

10.96 Rubha na Fidhle (SM288) is an early Christian foundation on a headland southwest of Kilmaha on the west side of the loch. It survives as a series of turf covered mounds which include remains of a chapel and boundary wall and some carved stones (grave slabs). It is likely that it was a small religious community founded from Iona in the late 6th century. It is surrounded by dense woodland and not visible from the public road. These surroundings combined with the very ruinous nature of the component structures mean it is unlikely that it would be recognised as an early Christion community at any distance from the asset. As well as the general aspects of significance described above, Rubha na Fidhle is one of the Argyll's earliest Christian sites. Its lochside location and raised position over the loch show some of the considerations important in siting early religious communities outlined above and it is this aspect of its setting which contributes to its cultural significance.

Assessment

10.97 The asset is situated 8.5km south-west of the nearest turbine (T13). The ZTV indicates that between ten and 13 turbines will be visible from the asset. The turbines will appear as distant features in views north-east from the asset on the ridgeline between Loch Awe and Loch Fyne. The An Suidhe Wind Farm already lies on this ridge, south of the Proposed Development, and their presence does not affect the ability to experience this asset and understand it as a remote early Christian monastic foundation. Visibility of the Proposed Development from, or in combination with, the asset will similarly not meaningfully alter this experience nor affect the historic (illustrative) and scientific values which make up the significance of the asset. As such, no effect would arise.

Balliemeanoch Chapel and Burial Ground

Description

10.98 Balliemeanoch chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4227) lies north-east of the modern settlement Balliemeanoch on the eastern lochside, 3.6km north of the Site. The structures at the Site are in ruinous state and survive only as earth and stone banks. The chapel is approximately 6m by 2.5m and a small sub-circular building lies to its east but it is not known if it is contemporary with the chapel. The buildings are located within an enclosure that is 35m by 29m with a small standing stone which may be a headstone or revetting of the enclosure. It is presumed that the burial site was in use prior to the Reformation however there is uncertainty over the date of the chapel. The asset lies on a shelf in a west-facing hillside next to a burn that flows into Loch Awe. A small belt of woodland grows around the burn and the chapel site lies at the transition of this to bracken cover. The survival level of the asset means it is not readily appreciable as a former chapel unless in or directly adjacent to the asset, particularly in the summer months when the bracken is up. The chapel lacks a placename element (e.g 'Kil') which indicates it is an early church site so is likely to be a medieval chapel serving a nearby, now cleared, settlement. The setting of the asset contributes little to its significance, aside from allowing an understanding of it as a feature of a settlement which is no longer in existence.

Assessment

10.99 The asset is situated 4.1km north of T18 of the Proposed Development and does not lie within the ZTV. A wireframe produced on request of HES (**Appendix 10.1: Figure CH9a**, taken from location CH9 (**Figure 10.5.9**)) shows that there would be no visibility of

[16] i.e. difficult to access and subsist in as well as at distance from existing settlements to provide a fitting atmosphere for solitude and contemplation.

the Proposed Development from the asset as it is obscured by undulating hills. As the Proposed Development is not visible from the asset nor in combination views of the asset, there is no change to its setting and therefore there will be no effect on the asset.

Kilmun Chapel and Burial Ground

Description

10.100 Kilmun chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4140) lies north of Kilmun on the western side of the loch. It is within dense forestry on a south-east facing slope. The chapel walls survive as turf covered stone banks and sits within a stone walled, sub-rectangular enclosure, used as a burial ground, approximately 30m by 26m. The dimensions and shape are similar to other contemporaneous chapels in Argyll which date to the 13th century. There are no obvious grave markers within the burial ground. Although now located within forestry, it is likely that there would have been views from the chapel over Loch Awe, 700m to the east, and the mouth of the River Avich to the south. The asset's setting does not contribute to its significance as it renders it impossible to either appreciate it or understand how it fits into the landscape and contemporary settlement features.

Assessment

10.101 The chapel and burial ground lie 5.2km north-west of T14 of the Proposed Development and the ZTV suggests up to 13 turbines would be visible from the asset. A wireframe from the chapel facing east across Loch Awe indicates that, if trees were removed, the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm would be visible (**Appendix 10.1: CH6a**, taken from location CH6 (**Figure 10.5.8**)). The Proposed Development would also be visible in this scenario, adjacent to An Suidhe Wind Farm. If the forestry were cleared and visibility from the asset to its surroundings restored, the visibility of the Proposed Development would not affect the asset's historic (illustrative) nor its scientific value. Even though the Proposed Development's turbines would be visible, in this scenario they would be read as a reinforcement of existing wind infrastructure at distance rather than a novel element in the setting of the asset. As such, there will be no effect on the asset.

Innis Errich Chapel and Burial Ground

Description

10.102 Innis Errich chapel and burial ground (Asset ref. SM4214) lies on an islet (Innis Errich) in eastern side of Loch Awe south of Ardchonnel. The chapel is late medieval, and its graveyard was in use into the mid-20th century. The church dedication is unknown, but it served the parish of Inishail until 1736, although it was described as ruinous from the late 18th century. The chapel is roofless, and its walls survive to their highest (c. 2m) on the western side. The entrance is towards the west end of the north wall and there are windows in the east and west walls and towards the east end of the north wall. The chapel stands within an enclosure measuring about 28m square, defined on the north-west and south-west by an earthen bank and, to the north-east and south-east by ground which falls steeply away. The entrance is at the north-east where the bank curves inwards. The entire site is contained within a stone wall of recent date and overgrown, with the whole island covered in vegetation meaning that it is difficult to perceive the asset from beyond the islet (e.g. from the loch or its shoreline).

10.103 The cultural significance of this asset is derived primarily from the scientific value of the building and the burial ground and their ability to inform our understanding of late medieval local vernacular and religious practice, with the burials having the ability to inform our understanding of post-medieval social practices, disease and mortality. The upstanding remains of the asset also have some historical illustrative value as an example of, an albeit ruinous, rural church and cemetery of late medieval date, a time when there was great diversity and change in Christian practice and structure. Its siting on the island within the loch is probably practical as the loch would have been the major transport route for the area until the development of the modern road system. However, it is also an isolated location helping to separate the sacred from the mundane. As a Christian site that was used for burials into the last century, the asset will also have some social/spiritual value. It will also have some fortuitous aesthetic value with its ruinous and overgrown character being appreciated as romantic and picturesque, where appreciable views of the loch and wider landscape will contribute to this aesthetic value.

Assessment

10.104 The chapel and burial ground are located 4km west of the nearest turbine (T13). The ZTV indicates that there will be no visibility of the Proposed Development from the asset itself. Two wireframes and a photomontage illustrate the in-combination visibility of the Proposed Development and the cumulative schemes from the western shore of Loch Awe (**Appendix 10.1: Figures CH3a-c**, taken from location CH03 (**Figure 10.5.3**)) . These indicate that 11 turbines will be partially visible, along with the blades of several turbines of the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm, and the whole of the consented Blarghour scheme to the north. The ruinous state of the asset, combined with the distance from the western side of the loch means that, even if all intervening vegetation were removed, Innis Errich chapel and burial ground would not be perceptible from this location. As such, there would be no in-combination view of the asset and the Proposed Development so no effect would arise.

Dalavich Kirk

Description

10.105 Dalavich lies on the western side of Loch Awe and Dalavich Kirk (Asset ref. LB11891) lies just south of what is now the core of the settlement. The church, remodelled in 1898, has been in use since 1770 and replaced an earlier church on the same site. It is of rubble masonry construction with whitewashed exterior walls and slate roof, a small belltower was added to the gable end to celebrate the Millennium.[17] The windows are round headed featuring decorative stained glass with one commemorating schoolmaster MacPherson who lived across the Loch at Ardchonnel. The church lies within a graveyard down a track accessed via the main road running through Dalavich. On all but its northern side the graveyard is surrounded by mature broadleaved woodland, to its north are allotments. The woodland obscures direct views from the church to Loch Awe and also means the church is only readily visible from close range. In addition to the general aspects of significance laid out for churches above, Dalavich Kirk's commemorative stained-glass window to MacPherson is of historic (associative) and social/spiritual value, displaying important individuals to the community of Dalavich and how they have chosen to memorialise them in recent history. Its setting, on the edge of the settlement and within a secluded graveyard, contributes to its historic (illustrative) value by allowing appreciation of the functional relationship between the building and graveyard and its relationship to the settlement.

Assessment

10.106 Dalavich Kirk lies 4.6km north-west of the nearest turbine of the Proposed Development (T17) and the ZTV indicates that all turbines are potentially visible from the asset. Two wireframes have been produced to understand the level of visibility should the woodland east of the church no longer exist (**Appendix 10.1: Figure CH5a** and **CH5b**, taken from location CHVP06 (**Figure 10.5.5**)). **Figure CH5b** shows that the turbines will be visible in views east across Loch Awe, appearing on and behind the ridgeline. **Figure CH5a** illustrates that the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm would also be visible in views south-east from the kirk, and the consented Blarghour scheme would be entirely visible to the north. In this scenario, the visibility of the Proposed Development in views east across Loch Awe would not affect the kirk's historical or scientific values nor how its relationship to its graveyard or the settlement is appreciated. Owing to the wooded nature of the kirk's environs there are no meaningful views of it in combination of with the Proposed Development. As there would be no change to the significance of the asset, nor meaningful change in how it is understood or experienced, no effect would arise.

Ardchonnel Castle

Description

10.107 Ardchonnel Castle (Asset ref. SM291) lies on Innis Chonnel, a small islet situated halfway along Loch Awe, just off its eastern shore, opposite Dalavich. The castle was built in the early 13th century, but it is not known who by. It may have been built by the Campbells (later the Dukes of Argyll), or by their local political rivals, the McDougalls. The castle covers most of the islet and comprises a tall three storey rectangular tower, a similarly sized square middle bailey to its north-east, and an oval `outer bailey' attached to the inner bailey.[18] The castle was altered at various times before the Campbells made Inveraray Castle their principal residence in the later 15th century. Ardchonnel Castle was recorded as being ruinous by the early 19th century and today only the main tower and the middle bailey's southern and eastern walls survives to any height (c. 15m (full height) and 2.4m, respectively).[19] The principal tower is mostly covered in ivy; while the middle and outer baileys are also covered by vegetation, including trees.

10.108 The surrounding shorelines are wooded, save for some small bays and jetties along the opposite shore by Dalavich. Beyond this, the rising hillslopes are largely moorland, with some areas of commercial forestry. An Suidhe Wind Farm is just perceptible in-combination with the castle from the western side of Loch Awe.

10.109 The cultural significance of this asset is derived from a combination of its scientific, historical, and aesthetic values. In terms of scientific value, the whole castle has the potential to inform our understanding of medieval warfare and defence, as well as wider

[17] Sacred Scotland (undated) Dalavich Church [online]. Available at: https://www.sacredscotland.org.uk/church/dalavich-church [Accessed on 21.11.2022]

[18] A plan of the castle is available online at https://canmore.org.uk/collection/1166971.
[19] A section drawing of the castle is available online https://canmore.org.uk/collection/1166985.

domestic and social aspects of contemporary society. The above ground remains have historical illustrative and architectural value as a nationally rare example of an early stone castle, which helps to tell the wider story of the political and civil unrest in the medieval period. It also has historical associative value as a result of its ownership by the Campbells and, potentially, the McDougalls and the Scottish Wars of Independence. The upstanding remains also have some aesthetic value as a picturesque ruin and historical landmark adding time-depth to the landscape. Unlike many castles, Ardchonnel is not prominently or dominantly sited, however, the castle's island location is integral to its defensive function and illustrative value and may also have been intended to be a conspicuous display of wealth. Its strategic positioning is best understood from the castle itself, via the views up and down the loch, as well as to shore. However, the vegetation at the castle makes it difficult to appreciate and experience these views at ground level, and they are best appreciated from the wallhead. Aside from the islet itself, the architectural and illustrative value of the castle is best understood via views of the asset from the closer eastern shoreline, although vegetation at the castle and shorelines conceal much of the structure. Due to distance and vegetation cover, it is difficult to discern the castle in views from the western shore. The largely undeveloped and picturesque nature of the castle's setting (i.e. the loch and wooded hills), as well as the vegetation covering it, also contribute to the fortuitous aesthetic value of the asset (although the ivy covering the castle is detrimental to its condition). As an island castle, accessed presumably by water whilst in use, the approaches from the loch play a role in the asset's cultural significance – to the extent that they enable appreciation of the strategic and defensive functions of the island, and an understanding of the critical role of the waterways and naval power in medieval Argyll, and to the Campbells in particular.

10.110 Ardchonnel Castle is a relatively well-preserved example of a nationally rare monument type and consequently is of high importance. This is reflected by its status as a scheduled monument.

Assessment

10.111 Ardchonnel Castle lies 2.6km west of the nearest Proposed Development turbine. The ZTV indicates that at ground level one to three turbines would be visible from the asset and that there is the potential for in-combination views of the asset from the western shore, of up to 13 turbines. Eight visualisations – five wireframes and a photomontage – have been prepared to understand the operational setting change (**Appendix 10.1: Figures CH2a-b** (taken from location CH02 (**Figure 10.5.2**)), **CH18a-b** illustrating approaches from Loch Awe (taken from CH18) and **CH3-a-c**,taken from location CH03 (**Figure 10.5.3**)). **Figure CH2b** is from the castle wallhead (i.e. above the treeline) and shows that the blade tips of five turbines will be visible from this part of the castle (T5, T6, T8, T9, T11 and T12) with the hub/tower of T9 and T10 also visible. **Figures CH3b** and **CH3c**, as well as the photomontage (**Figure CH3c**), show that eleven turbines will be visible in in-combination views of the castle from New York Jetty. Due to intervening topography, only the blades of six turbines would be visible (T3, T4, T5, T6, T7 and T8) with the hubs/towers of a further five turbines visible (T9, T10, T11, T12 and T13). These would be seen in the context of the consented Blarghour and operation An Suidhe schemes.

10.112 Visibility of the Proposed Development in views from the asset will not change its primary cultural significance as derived from its scientific, illustrative, and architectural value. The views from the castle are strategic and principally defensive and therefore contribute to its illustrative value, and the presence of the turbines at the termination of these views in one direction will not change the ability to understand or appreciate this function. The turbines visible in the in-combination views will be clearly read as separate features behind the hill line but will change the picturesque nature of the landscape setting and in turn diminish the fortuitous aesthetic value of the castle. This change will be **small** as its picturesque setting will remain intact, albeit that the contribution that it makes to the experience of the asset's aesthetic value will be slightly affected. It will not, however, prevent understanding and appreciation of the castle's strategic role, its defensive function and the role of waterborne access to its cultural significance.

10.113 The Proposed Development will result in a small change to the appreciation of one strand of the asset's cultural significance (i.e. its aesthetic value). As such, the level of effect is judged to be Minor and non-significant in EIA terms.

Enclosures at Kilmun

10.114 The following enclosed settlements, all sited near Kilmun on the west side of Loch Awe, were assessed for effects:

- Kilmun Enclosure (Asset ref. SM4189) – scheduled monument, north-east of Kilmun; and
- Kilmun Enclosure (Asset ref. SM4190) – scheduled monument, south-west of Kilmun.

10.115 Both assets consist of circular enclosures, defined by an earth and stone bank, in dense forestry. They have been interpreted as homesteads dating to the medieval period or earlier. Based on excavations of morphologically similar enclosures in Perthshire, a prehistoric date is possible for these assets. Their cultural significance primarily relates to their scientific value as the archaeological deposits they comprise will contain evidence for farmsteads of this kind, their construction and the society which built and used them. They also have some historic (illustrative) value as an example of a now defunct form of settlement. Setting can contribute to the significance of assets of this type by allowing an understanding of how they were sited in the landscape relative to contemporary settlements and the resources they would have exploited (e.g. the loch as a source of communications and food). As scheduled monuments, these assets are of high importance.

Kilmun Enclosure, north-east of Kilmun

Description

10.116 Kilmun Enclosure (Asset ref. SM4189) lies in woodland north-east of Kilmun. It lies in deciduous woodland between the road along the west side of the loch and the shore. It is on a south facing slope of Creagh Dubh above Kames Bay and consists of a circular enclosure approximately 15 meters in diameter. Its walls are eroded and are less than one meter in height. Its entrance would have been in its north-west side but this section has been robbed to surface the adjacent road. The setting of the asset contributes to its significance to an extent by allowing an understanding of how it was sited relative to the loch, a key source of resources. Owing to the eroded nature of the asset and its location in deciduous woodland it is not possible to appreciate it as a former settlement unless in or immediately adjacent to it.

Assessment

10.117 The enclosure lies 5.1km north-west of the nearest turbine (T13) and the ZTV indicates that all turbines may be visible from the asset. Two wireframes have been produced to aid the assessment (**Appendix 10.1: CH8a** and **CH8b**, taken from location CH08 (**Figure 10.5.8**)). These show that, without woodland cover, An Suidhe Wind Farm would be visible in views south-east from the asset. All turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible in this scenario, reading as a large extension of the consented Blarghour scheme, with the smaller An Suidhe machines also visible, but at greater distance.

10.118 While the Proposed Development will theoretically be visible from the asset, it is currently screened by native woodland to the south and east. It is therefore unlikely that the Proposed Development will be perceptible, except perhaps in winter. Regardless, the contribution of setting to the asset's cultural significance relates to the ability to understand its position in the local landscape, the builder's decisions in choosing its location and its potential relationships to contemporaneous settlement. The presence of turbines in distant views will not, therefore, affect these factors.

10.119 As such there will be **no impact** and **no effect**.

Kilmun Enclosure, south-west of Kilmun

Description

10.120 Kilmun Enclosure (Asset ref. SM4190) lies west of Kilmun. It is on shelf within the Inverinan Forest, above Avich Falls, and survives in poor condition having had stone robbed for wall construction in the late 19th century. The asset's setting does not contribute to its significance as it renders it impossible to either appreciate it or understand how it fits into the landscape and contemporary settlement features. While the asset is set within non-native conifer forest, it is screened by a belt of native broadleaves immediately to the south, which are unlikely to be felled. In the absence of woodland, the contribution of setting to the asset's cultural significance would relate to the ability to understand its position in the local landscape, the choice of location and its potential relationships to contemporaneous settlement. However, none of this can currently be experienced.

Assessment

10.121 Situated 5.8km north-west of the nearest turbine (T13), the ZTV indicates that all 13 turbines are potentially visible from the asset. Two wireframes have been produced to aid the assessment (**Appendix 10.1: CH7a** and **CH7b**, taken from location CH07 (**Figure 10.5.7**)) which show that, without woodland cover, An Suidhe Wind Farm would be visible in views south-east from the asset. All turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible in this scenario and they would be adjacent to those of Blarghour, with An Suidhe in the background to the south-east. It is therefore unlikely that the Proposed Development will be perceptible. The presence of turbines in distant views will not, therefore, affect these factors.

10.122 As such there will be **no impact** and **no effect**.

Inveraray Conservation Area

Description

10.123 Inveraray Conservation Area (CA467) located on the western edge of Loch Fyne, was designated a conservation area in 1972. It encompasses the planned layout of the new town developed in the 18th century south of the castle. The layout of the town was planned by the Dukes of Argyll in the 18th century with the church at its centre and has remained largely unaltered since then.

10.124 The New Town was created on a different site to preceding settlement to separate it from Inveraray Castle's expanded parklands. An avenue of beech trees was used to underscore this separation. The town was designed along a single north-east – south-west axis, now Main Street, and a coastal frontage, now Front Street. Design and construction of the town spanned most of the latter half of the 18th century and was finally complete in 1805. The buildings are set on the roadside with narrow lang rigs or tacks behind. Houses are either detached or terraced and built largely in the same style. They were constructed from local materials, including included slate from Duke's island slate quarries. The public buildings, such as the church, were also constructed in the same style and materials.

10.125 Within the conservation area there are 94 Listed Buildings of all categories and one scheduled monument. The scheduled monument is the Inveraray Mercat Cross which was used in the old town and dates to the 15th century. It is thought to be of ecclesiastical origin and set up in the new town in 1839. The land around the conservation area is largely part of the Inveraray Castle Inventory-listed GDL.

10.126 The conservation area is significant for its historic (illustrative and associative) and aesthetic values. It is a rare example of a largely unaltered improvement new town. Its historical association with the Dukes of Argyll and its development alongside the revamped Inveraray Castle are significant and help to understand the relationship between the society that have lived within the town and the Dukes of Argyll. It also provides information and understanding for the way in which the dukes transformed their holdings in the 18th century and have continued to exercise control of the town. As a conservation area, the asset is of high importance.

Assessment

10.127 The conservation area lies 5km south of the closest turbine (T1) of the Proposed Development and does not lie within the ZTV. There will be no visibility of the Proposed Development from within the town itself. In combination views will only be possible from the eastern side of Loch Fyne at a distance of 2.5km, from this location visibility will be confined to the tips of four turbines. As the conservation area does not lie in the ZTV there would be no alteration to how it is experienced when inside the town, nor of the views outward from the principal streets and axes. There would be some visibility of turbines visible in combination with the conservation area from the from the opposite side of Loch Fyne around St. Catherine's. This would not affect the asset's heritage values but may very slightly alter how the town is experienced in its surroundings. LVIA **Figures 6.2.10a** and **6.2.10f** show the view toward the town from the jetty at St. Catherine's, on the eastern shore of Loch Fyne. This shows that there would be minimal visibility of the scheme (tips of 4 turbines) from this location. The experience of the town as separate, and subservient, to Inveraray Castle would remain clearly appreciable from this location despite visibility of the Proposed Development. This level of visibility would leave the significance of the conservation area unaltered and does not affect how the asset and its significance are understood or experienced, particularly how to its relationship to Inveraray Castle can be understood. As such there is no change and there would be no effect to the asset.

Inveraray Castle Inventory-Listed Garden and Designed Landscape, and Constituent Assets

10.128 The following assessment covers the Inveraray Castle Inventory-listed GDL, and constituent listed buildings with the potential to experience effects as a consequence of the Proposed Development. Other assets not functionally or historically connected to the GDL, but contained within its bounds, are discussed in **Appendix 10.2**, as no significant effects are assessed as likely to arise.

10.129 This includes the following designated assets:

- Inveraray Castle GDL (GDL00223);
- Inveraray Castle, Category A-listed building (LB11552), hereafter referred to as 'Inveraray Castle Listed Building';
- Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche, Category A-listed building (LB11543);
- Aray Bridge, Category A-listed building (LB11545);
- South Cromalt Lodge, Category B-listed building (LB11521); and
- Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain, Category B-listed building (LB11520).

Description

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.130 Inveraray Castle (GDL00223) comprises one of the grandest, most elaborate and extensive 18th century designed landscapes in Scotland, representing an early and nationally important example of the highly fashionable, naturalistic 'Sublime' movement in landscape design. The GDL encompasses a broad range of environments and historic environment interest – from the formal gardens adjacent to Inveraray Castle, 'wilderness' planting of native broadleaves and extensive parkland, through to extensive forested uplands. As befits an iconic Improvement-era estate centre, the GDL takes in the 18th century planned village of Inveraray – laid out by William Adam in 1747 and executed between 1750 and 1790 – as well as extensive planned fields and accompanying 'improved' farm buildings.

10.131 The influence of the designed landscape stretches from the public road, skirting the shores of Loch Shira, with the assets Garron Bridge (1775, Category A-listed building, LB11550; Screen Walls, LB11549; Lodge, LB11550) and Aray Bridge (1771-3, category A-listed building, LB11545) providing a sense of grandeur and structured views into the designed landscape, while South Cromalt Lodge (LB11521) creates a sense of arrival. The folly on the summit of Dun na Cuaiche, designed to give broad views across the Argyll Estates, is also widely visible in the environs, extending the influence of the design.

10.132 The landscape revolves around the castle, taking advantage of the local topography and dramatic setting on Loch Shira, and is a confection of work by some of the most important designers of the mid-to-late 18th century. It is generally in excellent condition, with evidence of extensive management and maintenance.

Inveraray Castle Listed Building

10.133 Inveraray Castle (LB11552) is a late-18th century (1744-61) Gothick mansion, built to a quadrangular plan around a taller central tower, with distinctive cylindrical corner towers with conical roofs, added along with the third storey after a major fire (1877). The design, perhaps inspired by Vanbrugh's 1720s sketches, by Roger Morris – selected by the 3rd Duke over more militaristic or neoclassical alternatives – blends Gothick and castellated elements with classical order and proportion. Located approximately on the site of its medieval predecessor, the castle forms the centrepiece of its designed landscape, carefully aligned to take advantage of pre-exiting planting and the ambitious reworking of the policies undertaken from the mid-18th century.

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche

10.134 Located on the summit of Dun Na Cuaiche, a subsidiary summit of the larger Dùn Còrr-Bhile at the head of Loch Shira, this asset is a mid-18th century rustic Gothick folly (LB11543). Its setting provides extensive views out over upper Loch Fyne and Inveraray Castle, Inveraray and the wider designed landscape to the south (there is no window on its eastern façade). It was one of the earliest ornamental buildings commissioned by the 3rd Duke from Roger Morris, built in 1747-8. It stands within a roughly triangular enclosure on the hilltop, which appears to correlate to a crenelated wall with loopholes and intermediate towers, proposed by John Adam around 1750 but never fully realised. The asset is in fair condition, with evidence of relatively recent conservation work – although it is understood to be very vulnerable to lighting strikes.

Aray Bridge

10.135 The asset is a very fine, two-span road bridge (LB11545) that carries the A83 over the mouth of the River Aray, 0.5km north of Inveraray. Following the 1715 Jacobite Rising, a network of military roads was established throughout the Highlands between 1725 and 1767. The Dumbarton to Inveraray road, of which Aray Bridge was part, was overseen by Maj. William Caulfield and was begun in 1743 but, due to interruption by the second Jacobite Rising of 1745, was not completed until 1749 – after the Aray Bridge was in place.

10.136 Although ostensibly a utilitarian structure, it is very finely crafted using polished ashlar for the whole structure, with the exception of the rubble wing walls. Above the central pier, a large circular void ('oculus') passes through the structure giving the bridge a highly distinctive character. This has been posited to be a response the previous 'King's Bridge' by John Adam being lost to flooding in 1773, although an aesthetic role (alignment on the monumental Carloonan doocot) has also been suggested. Balustraded sections of the parapet, above the supporting piers, facilitate views to Inveraray Castle and out over the loch. Although monumental in design and scale, this was a piece of public works on the military road from Dumbarton to Inveraray – although certainly influenced by the 5th Duke. On close inspection, use of different stone types in the bridge – green chlorite schist in the cutwaters and arch spandrels, buff sandstone in the buttresses, and pink sandstone in the voussoirs, parapets and balusters – creates a striking polychromatic effect in certain lights.

South Cromalt Lodge

10.137 South Cromalt Lodge (LB11521) is a two-storey late-18th / early 19th century lodge house, in broadly vernacular style, located adjacent to the public road (A83) at the southern extremity of the Inveraray Castle designed landscape. It is highly distinctive, with its three-bay and porch façade and central chimney suggesting a diminutive caricature of a much larger Georgian house. Although now closed off, it marked a private entrance to a private drive linking South and North Cromalt Lodges, and accessing: The Avenue (the principal axis of Inveraray), farm tracks through the Fisherlands meadows, and the Upper Avenue which connects to the main drive to the Castle.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain

10.138 This evocative, mid-18th century classical well house (LB11520) encloses a natural spring on the flanks of Creag Dubh. Set on a loop track above the Upper Avenue, the building is approximately square in plan, with oversized and rusticated classical features, emphasised by elaborate vermiculation on the voussoirs to the entrance arch, and heavy stone slab roof. From the rock-cut wellhead, a serpentine channel cut in paving carries the water to the door – although time and erosion has resulted in water penetration through pointing/grouting and the water has undermined the slabs at the entrance. The water is then carried away by a small stone-lined channel. The asset is in poor condition, with clear evidence of slippage of roofing stones, loss of stonework and extensive water penetration. Substantial pieces of fallen masonry were observed at the time of field inspection, although no sign of the lost ball finials was noted.

Cultural Significance

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.139 The GDL's cultural significance is drawn from the full gamut of heritage values, such is its complexity and importance.

10.140 The landscape contains extensive evidential value, with regard to the remains of both archaeological assets pre-dating the design, and relict elements of the designed landscape itself. Key features include medieval sculpture, in the form of Inveraray Mercat Cross (SM254) – thought to date from the 15th century and relocated from the old town, razed in the construction of the 'new' Georgian castle; and, the Kirkapoll Cross (SM253), also dating from the 15th century and relocated from the Kirkapol burial-ground on Tiree. A putative later prehistoric / early medieval fort, with the superimposed folly tower (LB11543), occupies the summit of Dun Na Cuaiche – although its origins and state of preservation are unclear. A somewhat truncated, but otherwise legible, cairn cemetery of uncertain (probable Bronze Age) date lies within the planned fields to the south and west of the planned village. These elements of past landscape add interest, and underline the importance of their survival in the face of wholesale change in the 18th century.

10.141 The site of old Inveraray village and the old castle (1450-1775) is located around and to the south of the present castle. Roy's Map (1747-55) captures the landscape in a state of flux, with the old castle and town in situ, but with extensive formal landscape extending up Glen Aray. While subsequent landscaping and afforestation is likely to have compromised the preservation of remains, there nonetheless exists the potential for unparalleled evidence of an 18th century burgh, with medieval origins, levelled and fossilised on the orders of its proprietor to facilitate wholesale redesign of a vast area.

10.142 The historic (associative) value of the asset derives principally from its centuries-long ownership by the Earls, later Dukes, of Argyll – powerful political and military figures in early modern Scotland, Chiefs of Clan Campbell and advisors to the crown both before and after the 1707 Act of Union. Because of their political power, wealth and connections, the Dukes of Argyll were able to secure the services of highly influential, and fashionable, designers throughout the core periods of the estate's development. Sir John Vanbrugh supplied the 2nd Duke with a sketch design for a square-plan Gothic replacement for the medieval castle. William Boutcher, Snr, noted Edinburgh nurseryman and garden designer, prepared a prospective plan for the Inveraray policies (1721), and subsequent mapping shows the influence on the estate, with networks of formal rides radiating from the (old) castle. This use of natural topography and 'borrowing' landscape elements to extend the design of the garden, along with a more naturalistic approach to design was emerging in England during the same period, and Inveraray is an important early example in Scotland. The 3rd Duke, Archibald Campbell, in addition to his military and political accomplishments was a keen plantsman with a strong interest in landscape and architectural design, and on inheriting the estate implemented his father's plans to rebuild the castle and 'improve' the policies. Walter Patterson, another prominent Edinburgh nurseryman, was contracted to rework the gardens and establish large numbers of exotics – as Campbell had done at his London villa. Building on Vanbrugh's sketches, Roger Morris – an assistant of Palladian pioneer Colen Campbell, and the architect to the 9th Earl of Pembroke – designed the replacement castle, begun in 1746. Morris also designed the folly atop Dun Na Cuaiche (LB11543), Garron Bridge (LB11550) and Carloonan Dovecot (LB11540). William Adam – considered to be Scotland's pre-eminent architect during his lifetime – and his eldest son John were initially superintendents of works for Morris's designs. John Adam contributed buildings across the estate, including finishing and the internal fitting out of the castle, Cherrypark (the estate offices (LB11528)), the former Town House on Front Street and the Great Inn, while the picturesque well house (LB11520) is attributed to his father. Robert Mylne, appointed by the 5th Duke, added ambitious model farms, a number of key buildings in the town (including the centrepiece parish church), the screen wall on the public road, and the distinctive Aray Bridge (LB11545). Further works by Alexander Nasmyth in the early 19th century continued the tradition of quality, albeit with a more vernacular flavour. The work of successive Dukes and their designers had a major influence on Scottish landscape and architectural design, attracting a range of notable visitors and shaping tastes on a national scale.

10.143 During the Second World War, the park was used as a headquarters for Combined Operations Training ('No.1 Combined Training Centre' / HMS Quebec) that spanned much of upper Loch Fyne. The location was chosen due to the profusion of suitable training beaches, space for accommodation and relative safety from the Luftwaffe. An estimated 250,000 joint service personnel are believed to have passed through the various training centres in preparation for the re-invasion of mainland Europe. Large numbers of temporary buildings were established across the park, necessitating extensive felling, to house personnel and equipment, although few now survive. Although largely invisible today, the park and town played a critical role in ensuring Allied personnel were suitably trained and experienced to successfully execute the D-Day campaigns.

10.144 Inveraray illustrates perhaps the most complete example of a holistic approach to the reworking and 'improvement' of a highland estate in the country. The integrated vision of great house, naturalistic landscape gardens and a wider design drawing in, adapting and borrowing from the natural topography, and the reshaping of a whole burgh to an ambitious and integrated design is almost unparalleled in Scotland. The singular vision, embodied most strongly by the 3rd and 5th Dukes and their appointed designers, created a unified whole that remains almost entirely intact.

10.145 The strong natural setting of the castle, town and designed landscape epitomised the romantic ideals that informed 18th century tastes and continues to influence both domestic and overseas visions of rural Scotland. The composition of the design enables appreciation of the whole, and of key elements, from a number of locations and as a sequential experience of arrival – particularly from the east. The drama of the castle and town's setting is revealed to travellers arriving at Garron Bridge (and the estate lodge), as the wooded shoreline gives way to open views to the town, set against the surrounding hills with Loch Shira in the foreground. On arrival at Aray Bridge, the vista to the north up the canalised River Aray frames the castle, while the unified design of the town's frontage becomes apparent in line with the road. This, along with the finely-wrought buildings of the estate and town create an extremely strong aesthetic experience, underpinning the singularity of the Dukes' approach to design. The castle itself, set within formal Victorian gardens and the wider 18th century designed landscape, has a strong 'fairy-tale' character – enhanced in part by Anthony Salvin's conical corner towers, added after the 1877 fire.

10.146 The aesthetic qualities of the place, as well as its accessibility, have conspired to make Inveraray an iconic tourist destination and visitor hub for Argyll. It therefore has substantial social value, both to local people as an engine of the visitor economy, and to generations of tourists that have visited. As the seat of the Chiefs of Clan Campbell, Inveraray also has wider importance to locals and the diaspora alike. Similarly, the communal memory of service personnel that passed through Inveraray is likely to be particularly strong, although numbers of Second World War veterans are dwindling. Nevertheless, commemorative activities take place regularly – including restoration of a memorial cairn to Gertude Canning, WRN, who was murdered while on service at HMS Quebec (WoSAS PIN 66814).

Inveraray Castle Listed Building

10.147 As noted above, it is likely that the immediate environs of Inveraray Castle contain substantial evidence for the medieval castle that stood on a broadly similar site and is potentially overlain by the Victorian formal gardens. The present castle itself provides evidence of 18th century construction techniques applied to a more traditional semi-castellated form.

10.148 The asset's historical (associative) value is drawn from its indivisible relationship to the Dukes of Argyll – major figures in Scottish and British history, as senior counsellors to monarchs, military leaders and latterly politicians. Inveraray has been the principal seat of the Campbell Earls and Dukes of Argyll since 1450. It comprises the work of a series of highly influential and important architects: Roger Morris, William and John Adam (1744-61), Robert Mylne (1772-85), Joseph Bonomi (1806), and Anthony Salvin (1877).

10.149 The Castle illustrates a very particular approach to improvement taken by the Dukes of Argyll, blending historicist references to traditional castellated seats of power, whilst introducing classical proportions and features suggestive of (then) modernity, fashion and progress. This Gothick theme embodied in the castle is widely echoed across the estate, from gate lodges to farm buildings, reflecting the overarching ethos of the Dukes and making a powerful statement of intent and ambition.

10.150 The aesthetic value of the Castle is undoubtedly very high, due to the aforementioned attention to detail in delivering a highly distinctive Gothick package with pleasing classical proportions, exuding both history and stability, with ambition, modernity and

progress. It is an asset designed with its setting – both natural topography and designed landscape – very much in mind, both in terms of framing vistas from the castle, and in establishing dramatic views to the asset from the surrounding landscape.

10.151 As a well-loved tourist destination, and the subject of innumerable picture postcards, Inveraray Castle has substantial social value to local people and visitors alike, coupled with the economic role the Castle – as the hub of Argyll Estates – still plays in the community.

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche

10.152 While a fort underlying the tower on Dun Na Cuaiche has been depicted on maps dating back at least to the first edition of the Ordnance Survey, there is some doubt as to the date and provenance of the apparent ramparts. The site therefore has the potential to provide, through excavation and dating of deposits and artefactual evidence, definitive evidence of the origins and function of the earthworks. The tower itself is a physical document of 18th century folly construction, employing age-old techniques to achieve a rustic, ancient appearance.

10.153 The tower has considerable historical (associative) value through its origins in the improvement ideas of the 3rd Duke of Argyll, and its role at one of the first buildings by Roger Morris on the estate, with its construction overseen by William and John Adam – the former considered in his lifetime to be the greatest Scottish architect.

10.154 Its illustrative value is drawn from the role of the folly within the 18th century picturesque landscape, enhancing, enlivening and calling attention to specific features and to themselves. Its location atop Dun Na Cuaiche is highly prominent, and serves to catch the eye from the waterfront at Inveraray, from The Avenue, and from numerous locations within the designed landscape – including from the Castle itself. It also adds to the experience and influence of the landscape design from the public road (now the A83). Similarly, for visitors to the folly, commanding views over Inveraray, the Castle and designed landscape from its west and south-facing windows facilitate the understanding and experience of the whole of the Inveraray estate and appreciation of the harmonious design integration of buildings and landscape.

10.155 As a structure purely concerned with aesthetic experience, the folly's aesthetic value is particularly high – both in its own right as a pleasing, whimsical interpretation of castellated structures, and in the undoubted interest and beauty within the views afforded, highlighting the juxtaposition of formal architectural endeavour, naturalistic landscape design, and the rugged 'natural' landscape around Loch Fyne.

Aray Bridge

10.156 Aray Bridge is a fine example of 18th century design and engineering, providing evidence of careful foundation and cutwater design, stone choice to facilitate both resilience and longevity, and aesthetic appearance. Sited adjacent to John Adam's 'King's Bridge' that was lost to flooding, there may be physical evidence of this predecessor structure in the channel of the Aray, or adjacent to the extant structure.

10.157 Like the rest of the designed landscape, the association with the Dukes of Argyll is a strong source of historical value. Its role as part of the military road network adds to this value. The Dukes of Argyll were staunch Unionists, allied to the Government side during the Jacobite Risings,[20] therefore the presence of the military road perhaps lacked the symbolism locally it acquired in much of the Gaelic-speaking, predominantly Catholic Highlands. Nevertheless, the military road network has come to symbolise the subjugation of Highland and Gaelic culture, so the highly ornamental design of the Aray Bridge is particularly striking and redolent of the positive relationship between the Dukes of Argyll and the British Government.

10.158 The bridge is an excellent illustration of the role of seemingly ancillary structures in creating interest and drama within 18th century picturesque landscapes, establishing views into the private core of the estate to be enjoyed by the general public – whilst neatly enforcing the social hierarchy. It also potentially illustrates creative 18th century engineering responses to the risk of damage from excessive loading from floodwater on masonry bridge spandrels.

10.159 The bridge, in addition to its utilitarian function, has considerable aesthetic value – from the polychromatic effect of the choice of construction stone, the distinctive oculus and ornate balustrade sections over the piers – as a structure meant to impress. It plays a key role in public appreciation and visual access to the designed landscape, affording framed, scenic views of the Castle and River Aray, and across Loch Shira to the planned town of Inveraray.

South Cromalt Lodge

10.160 The evidential value of South Cromalt Lodge is generally restricted to its ability to evidence late-18th / early-19th century construction techniques, and also any extant archaeological evidence for the former gate to the private drive to North Cromalt Lodge and on into the policies. The route of the former drive, depicted as a metalled road on the first edition of the Ordnance Survey 25-inch map (Argyllshire, CXXXIII.13, Surveyed 1870; Published 1871), is clearly visible on contemporary aerial imagery and on the ground due to differential vegetation growth. It remains a well-walked path.

10.161 Like the wider designed landscape, the associations of the lodge with the Dukes of Argyll affords it substantial historical (associative) value. Although not definitively ascribed, the lodge has been attributed to Alexander Nasmyth, celebrated romantic landscape painter and skilled amateur architect.

10.162 The lodge provides an excellent illustration of the role of the lodge houses in marking the boundaries of the estate, both in practical terms through control of access to private roads, and in serving as a strong visual marker for travellers on the public road that they are entering the Argyll Estate. The latter function remains extant, with the whitewashed house standing out in marked contrast to its forest backdrop.

10.163 The asset has high aesthetic value with pleasing, if a little unusual, proportions, and an authoritative character that belies its diminutive stature.

10.164 It is unlikely that the asset has significant social value, although its landmark function for Inveraray residents may afford it some value.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain

10.165 The asset provides evidence of the 18th century romanticisation of prosaic features, and the monumental construction techniques applied to the creation of what was essentially a folly – and evidence of their failure. The asset bears clear indications of the roof structure being inadequate to support the massive schist flagstone roof covering, with evidence of slumping due to great weight and failure of fixings. Similarly, the oversized ball finials originally at the apices of the pediment were lost due to their weight and inherent instability. There is potential archaeological evidence for the semi-circular forecourt attributed to William Adam that was subsequently removed by Mylne. Similarly, it may be possible to determine whether Adam's structure was intended to be semi-subterranean, or whether it was partially buried by Mylne's landscaping works.

10.166 Like the rest of the designed landscape, the association of the well house with the Dukes of Argyll (in this case built for the 3rd Duke) gives it substantial historical (associative) value. Similarly, its attribution to William Adam, the 3rd Duke's Master of Works and widely considered in his lifetime to be Scotland's foremost architect, affords further value. The well was also the source of Inveraray's public water supply during the late 18th and early 19th century – potentially explaining the extant 1803 iron gates, due to the need to exclude access. There is also profuse incised graffiti on the asset, including the date 1757 and other 18th century dates.

10.167 The asset serves to illustrate both the practical and ornamental function performed by well houses within designed landscapes. In this particular instance, the architectural sophistication and elaborate craftsmanship underline both the wealth and influence of the landowners, but also their fashionable taste and romantic inclinations.

10.168 The asset has a high level of aesthetic value, if anything augmented by its overgrown and partially dilapidated condition. Although the spring still flows, the structure is verging on being a romantic ruin, rewarding the visitor for taking the steeper and more challenging looped path off the North Avenue. Its setting within dense broadleaved policy woodland is highly evocative, even in typical Argyll weather.

10.169 While the asset is unlikely to have substantial social value, it is likely to be a frequently visited and enjoyed point of interest along what is a relatively well-used network of paths.

Importance

10.170 All of the assets detailed above are designated heritage assets. They are therefore treated as being of **high importance** for the purposes of this assessment.

[20] The 2nd Duke was the commander of Government forces during the 1715 rising; the 5th Duke, a serving officer at the time of the 1745 rising, was redeployed to Scotland and participated in much of the campaign, including the Battles of Falkirk (BTL9) and Culloden (BTL6).

Understanding Construction Change

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.171 Physical changes arising from the Proposed Development relate principally to works to upgrade the existing access network within the designed landscape to facilitate access by abnormal and heavy loads.

10.172 A new section of access track will be cut through woodland to the south of South Cromalt Lodge, parallel to the A83, starting just south of Auchnabreac and joining the estate roads around 70m north-west of the lodge. At this point, the new track is outside the GDL, but enters the designated area approximately 210m north-north-west of the lodge. The new section of track will require the removal of a mix of woodland (natural regeneration of native pioneer species, and planted non-native conifer) to achieve the necessary breadth for the track and associated infrastructure.

10.173 The first section of track within the GDL follows the edge of the designated area to the junction of the North Avenue. Widening and selective felling will be required in this section, which is entirely within non-native conifer forest.

10.174 The track then follows the estate North Avenue for approximately 1.5km to re-join the public road (A819) on the bend adjacent to the end of the Lime Avenue (no longer a functional entrance to the Castle, but retained as a footpath). Selective felling will be required to allow track construction. It is anticipated that, where necessary, this will occur on the uphill (west) side of the track through the open, recently felled, section of GDL between the Scottish Water pumping station and approximately the median belt of trees in the Fisherlands meadow, where the track enters the policy woodlands proper. This will ensure that the few extant specimen trees on the downhill side can be effectively conserved. In this section, felling will prioritise preservation of specimen trees.

10.175 The access route then follows the public road to the junction of the existing forest road just south of Electric Cottage. The forest road network is generally adequate for the intended purpose, with strengthening required in places and some improved corner radii. Any woodland removal in this section will involve non-native conifers planted as timber crop.

10.176 The existing large quarry at Bealach an Fhuarain will be used to provide roadstone.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain

10.177 Construction-related change to the well-house is anticipated to relate to widening of the existing upper Avenue, and associated selective tree felling on the terrace below the asset. There is potential for damage to the asset as a consequence of vibration caused by blasting and other extractive processes and haulage movements at the existing quarry at Bealach an Fhuarain.

10.178 It is unclear whether blasting will be employed, but it has been assessed as part of a maximum case scenario.

Understanding Operational Change

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.179 There is theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development across the west-facing slopes and summits of the GDL. Theoretical visibility from the core of the estate is very limited, as illustrated in **Figures 10.2** and **10.4** with a maximum of two blade tips visible from the lawns to the rear (north-east) of the castle, and parkland on the north side of the River Aray.

10.180 The upgraded access routes through the GDL will represent a change in character due to increased size, and uniform appearance of the road surface.

Inveraray Castle Listed Building

10.181 Operational change to Inveraray Castle is confined to the theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development. One such view is possible from the courtyard to the rear of the building of very small portions of the blade tips of Turbines 2 and 3, at a minimum distance of 4.9km, and a short section of access track at a minimum distance of approximately 4.5km. Similarly, there is the potential for theoretical in-combination views of the Proposed Development with the Castle from Aray Bridge, of a very small proportion of a single blade tip.

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche

10.182 Operational change to the folly tower on Dun Na Cuaiche arises from visibility of the Proposed Development, at a minimum distance of 5.5km west-north-west. Eight turbines (T3, T4, T1, T5, T2, T8, T6 and T7) are visible to hub height, and the tips of three more (T11, T9 and T10) are also visible.

Aray Bridge

10.183 Operational change to Aray Bridge is confined to theoretical in-combination visibility of Inveraray Castle and a very small proportion of a single turbine blade tip, from the apex of the bridge.

South Cromalt Lodge

10.184 Change arising to the lodge house is anticipated to relate to the insertion of a new length of access track to the west of the asset, necessitating a corridor of woodland removal, and widening of existing forest/estate road through conifer plantation to the north-north-west of the lodge.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain

10.185 Operational change to the well house is anticipated to relate to widening of the existing Upper Avenue and associated selective tree felling on the terrace below the asset.

Assessment of Construction Impact

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.186 The very limited physical effects, arising from selective felling/woodland removal to facilitate the upgrading of existing tracks through the GDL, along the North Avenue, will have a very localised impact on the character of the policy woodland. However, the existing access tracks outside the main policy woodlands have a strong ‘forest road’ character, rather than relating to their estate heritage. Where the track passes through the policy woodlands, it is of sufficient dimensions that felling is likely to be relatively limited and veteran/specimen trees will be preserved wherever possible, with felling of such only required at key pinch-points such as sharp bends. In the context of the overarching cultural significance of the GDL, and the role that such a comparatively small area of woodland plays in that significance, the scale of impact is assessed as being none.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain

10.187 The removal of trees from the terrace below the asset will result in a slight thinning of what is very dense native woodland, however this appears to be minimal in the area adjacent to the asset. The scale of impact arising as a consequence of setting change from construction is assessed as being none.

10.188 While there is risk of damage arising from vibration from stone extraction from the existing quarry c.65m to the south-west, there is no evidence of damage having occurred as a consequence of previous phases of extraction. While the risk of impact is likely to be low, it is currently assessed as being **uncertain** due to a lack of information on extraction techniques to be employed and relevant precautions.

Assessment of Operational Impact

Inveraray Castle GDL

10.189 While there will be intervisibility with the Proposed Development from the more elevated, west-facing slopes within the GDL, much of this area comprises recent conifer forest that makes little contribution to the cultural significance of the asset, and where longer views to the west play little role in informing that significance. Full visibility of the Proposed Development is only available from the summits of the hills either side of the head of Loch Shira – Dun na Cuaiche, Dùn Còrr-Bhile, and the apparently unnamed hill above Strone Point. However, the Proposed Development would be seen in the context of the consented Blarghour wind farm, and the 400kV transmission line that already passes through the north-west portion of the GDL.

10.190 The core of the designed landscape, comprising the Castle, ornamental plantings, estate offices, Carloonan and Maam farm complexes, and the planned town of Inveraray, appears to be unaffected, despite the slight theoretical visibility indicated by the ZTV (see **Figure 10.4** and **Figure 10.5.10**) and wireframe visualisation (see **Figures CH15a-b**), as confirmed by photomontage visualisations (see **Figure CH15c**). The carefully planned and designed relationships of the GDL will therefore remain intact and unaffected by direct intervisibility with the Proposed Development. While there will be intervisibility with the Proposed Development from near the Tower on Dun Na Cuaiche, designed views from the folly itself – deliberately aligned to the south and west – will remain unaffected.

10.191 Perceptions of the scale, complexity, and design intent of the GDL, laid out below the viewer in the views from the hilltop, will remain unaffected. The ability to understand, appreciate and experience the significance of the asset, as expressed through its setting, will remain largely unchanged – with the key internal relationships of the GDL and its place within the landscapes of Loch Fyne intact. In views to the west, over Carloonan Farm, the Proposed Development will appear on the skyline, but emerging from

behind the most distant ridgelines, clearly in a separate landscape unit from the GDL and with the 400kV overhead transmission line appearing prominently in the middle distance.

10.192 The scale of the impact arising from intervisibility with the Proposed Development in the context of the overarching cultural significance of the GDL, and the role that the Site of the Proposed Development plays in its setting, is therefore assessed as being none.

10.193 The very limited physical effects, arising from selective felling/woodland removal to facilitate the upgrading of existing tracks through the GDL, along the North Avenue, will have a very localised impact on the character of the policy woodland. However, the existing access tracks outside the main policy woodlands have a strong 'forest road' character, rather than relating to their estate heritage. Where the track passes through the policy woodlands, it is of sufficient dimensions that felling is likely to be relatively limited and veteran/specimen trees will be preserved wherever possible, with felling of such only required at key pinch-points such as sharp bends. In the context of the overarching cultural significance of the GDL, and the role that such a comparatively small area of woodland plays in that significance, the scale of impact is assessed as being none.

Inveraray Castle Listed Building
10.194 While there is very slight theoretical visibility indicated by the ZTV and the wireframe visualisations (see **Figure 10.4** and **Figure 10.5.15** and **Figures CH15a & b**), photomontage visualisations from Aray Bridge (**Figures CH1c**) clearly illustrate that the scale of effect will be none**,** as the turbine tips are effectively screened by topography and intervening vegetation (native woodland).

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche
10.195 The Proposed Development will be visible at a minimum distance of 5.5km west-north-west. The windows of the tower are carefully designed to: frame views to the south, over the core of the GDL and Inveraray; and, frame the vista over Loch Fyne to the east. There is no window on the western side of the structure – indicating a specific design intention to exclude that view from visitors (looking towards land not owned by the Dukes of Argyll). Instead, there is a niche in the wall, originally intended to hold a cupboard.

10.196 While it would be possible to achieve in-combination views of the tower with the Proposed Development in the background, the sheer scale of the vista involved would serve to render the Proposed Development a small component of a much wider 'working' landscape. That section of the view features very large-scale on-native conifer forest, 400kV transmission lines, and extensive and ongoing forest operations within the GDL itself. Similarly, the Proposed Development would be seen in the context of the consented Blarghour wind farm to the north-west, and the operational An Suidhe Wind Farm to the west-south-west – albeit at greater distance in the case of the latter. Views towards the Proposed Development are represented by **Figures CH10a** and **CH10b**, and more widely in Volume II, **Figures 6.2.4a-f**.

10.197 The ability to understand and appreciate the cultural significance of the asset will therefore remain unchanged, while the experience of visiting the asset will undergo a very small-scale change. This is therefore assessed as a **small** scale of impact.

Aray Bridge
10.198 While there is very slight theoretical visibility indicated by the ZTV and the wireframe visualisations (**Figure 10.4** and **Figure 10.5.15**), photomontage visualisation (**Figures CH15a-b**) clearly illustrate that the scale of effect will be none, as the turbine tips are effectively screened by topography and intervening vegetation (native woodland).

10.199 The scale of impact will therefore be none.

South Cromalt Lodge
10.200 It is likely that South Cromalt Lodge will experience a small degree of setting change, as a consequence of the felling associated with the creation of a new access to the south-west of the asset, through existing woodland. Similarly, selective felling to facilitate widening of the existing track is likely to be perceptible as a thinning of the woodland in the backdrop of views to the asset from the A83. However, the key visual and functional relationships of the asset will remain unaffected, as it will remain clearly identifiable as the entry point to the estate and the private drive through the fields to North Cromalt Lodge and beyond. The new track is sufficiently set back within existing woodland that it should not be visible from the public road, and will not either introduce a sense of confusion as to historic routes, or compromise the visible hierarchy between the public road and the now-closed private drive.

10.201 The scale of impact is therefore assessed as being **small**, as the experience of the asset as being nestled in policy woodland (although not strictly part of the GDL) will be slightly reduced in the medium term.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain
10.202 The upgrading of the existing North Avenue track on the terrace below the asset to the east, will require limited tree felling to facilitate the necessary widening in places. This will result in a slight thinning of what is very dense native woodland, although from the proposed infrastructure plan, this appears to be minimal directly adjacent to the asset.

10.203 The setting of the asset relates principally to the immediately adjacent woodland and slopes into which it is set and forms the backdrop for evocative views of the asset available to visitors ascending the loop path from either north or south, and the very dense (potentially overstocked) trees within the 'loop' between the North Avenue and the subsidiary path on which the asset is located. Such is the density of the woodland that no views out are possible from the asset, and the North Avenue can only be glimpsed through the foliage. The scale of impact arising from the necessary level of felling locally is therefore assessed as none.

Level of Construction Effect

Inveraray Castle GDL
10.204 The level of construction effect on Inveraray Castle GDL is assessed as being none. This is due to the very slight impacts identified as being likely to occur, across what is a very small proportion of the asset and minimal interaction with its cultural significance. The character of the short section of Upper Avenue (c.750m) through the extant policy woodlands will change somewhat due to widening and resurfacing. However, in the context of the whole asset, this is a negligible change and in line with the numerous changes that have already occurred to the estate access network over time.

10.205 Good practice measures set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will enable avoidance of the majority of sources of physical effects. Not only will this enable conservation of cultural significance, but will also aid the conservation of biodiversity, forestry and landscape interests.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain
10.206 The level of construction effect arising from setting change due to tree felling is assessed as being negligible.
10.207 The level of construction effect arising from potential vibration is uncertain, but likely to be negligible.

Level of Operational Effect

Inveraray Castle GDL
10.208 The level of operational effect on Inveraray Castle GDL is assessed as being none. This is due to the very slight impacts identified as being likely to occur, across what is a very small proportion of the asset and minimal interaction with its cultural significance.

Inveraray Castle Listed Building
10.209 The level of operational effect on Inveraray Castle is assessed as being none. There will be no real-world intervisibility with the Proposed Development, therefore its setting will remain entirely unchanged.

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche
10.210 The level of operational effect on the Dun Na Cuaiche is assessed as being Minor and not significant. While the turbines will be visible from adjacent to and in-combination with the tower from the hilltop, the view to the west is not part of the asset's intentional design and relationships. There is no window in the structure to the west, instead its fenestration frames the views to the south – over the Castle, Inveraray and the core of the designed landscape – and to the east, over Loch Fyne. The Proposed Development will appear with other wind turbines and major grid transmission infrastructure, but it can readily be understood as being in a separate landscape unit – appearing from behind distant ridges – and very clearly outside the bounds of the designed landscape. The experience of visiting the asset would change very slightly, but the critical sense of place, relationships with, and the ability to understand the components and complexity of the GDL would remain unchanged.

Aray Bridge
10.211 The level of operational effect on Aray Bridge is assessed as being none. There will be no real-world intervisibility with the Proposed Development, therefore its setting will remain entirely unchanged.

South Cromalt Lodge
10.212 The level of operation effect is assessed as being Minor, due to a small degree of setting change arising from adjacent woodland removal.

Well House, Bealach An Fhuarain
10.213 The level of operational effect arising from setting change is assessed as being none, as the necessary woodland removal in the vicinity will be minimal, and the affected area contributes virtually nothing to the significance of the asset.

Assessment of Other Effects

In-Combination Effects with the Blade Transfer Areas

10.214 The only effects identified by the preceding assessment were effects related to setting change for assets within the Site and section of Loch Awe and Loch Fyne in proximity to the Site. Owing to the distance from these assets and intervening topography, the Blade Transfer Areas (BTAs) do not lie within the setting of the assets identified as susceptible to effects from the Proposed Development. This means that construction and operation of the BTAs would give rise to no effects to these assets so there is no potential for in-combination effects.

Cumulative Effects

Construction Period

10.215 The effects which arise during the construction period are confined to direct physical effects to heritage assets. As heritage assets are spatially discrete entities, cumulative effects arising from direct physical effects are rare since assets often do not continue into the nearby or adjacent development sites under consideration as cumulative schemes. There are no assets identified as experiencing effects from the Proposed Development which continue beyond the Site and would be affected by the cumulative schemes. This means that there is no potential for cumulative effects during the construction period. The full consideration of cumulative schemes which underpins this conclusion is presented in the HEA (**Appendix 10.2**).

Operational Period

10.216 Operational period effects relate to change in the setting of assets. The following assets were identified where the presence of a cumulative scheme would give rise to a greater effect than caused by the Proposed Development in its own right:

- Inveraray Castle GDL; and
- Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche.

10.217 These assets are shown on **Figures 10.3** and **10.4**. A full description of considerations of cumulative schemes to underpin this conclusion is presented in the HEA.

Inveraray Castle GDL
10.218 The Proposed Development will be visible in the context of the consented Blarghour wind farm, approximately 5km from the GDL boundary at its closest point, and the operational An Suidhe scheme, c.5.5km from the GDL boundary at its closest point. The Proposed Development will therefore extend the visible spread of turbines from the GDL, although its effect on the cultural significance of the GDL will be minimal, the experience of visiting the upland sections of the asset will change.

10.219 Cumulative operational impact is assessed as being **small**, principally related to changes in experience of, rather than effects to, cultural significance from upland areas of the GDL, notably Dun Na Cuaiche.

10.220 The level of cumulative effect experienced by the GDL will be Minor.

Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche
10.221 The Proposed Development will be visible in the context of the consented Blarghour wind farm, approximately 5km from the GDL boundary at its closest point, and the operational An Suidhe scheme, c.5.5km from the GDL boundary at its closest point. The Proposed Development will therefore extend the visible spread of turbines from the asset, although its effect on the cultural significance of the asset will be minimal, the experience of visiting it will change slightly.

10.222 Cumulative operational impact is assessed as being **small**, due to the addition of the Proposed Development to in-combination views of the asset already affected by consented and operational wind farms. See **Figure: CH10a-b**, **Appendix 10.1**, and **Figure 6.2.5a-d**, Volume II.

10.223 The tower/folly will experience Minor cumulative effects as a consequence of the Proposed Development.

Interrelationship Between Effects

10.224 Heritage assets are also discussed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in **Chapter 6**. As detailed above, however, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and LVIA consider different kinds of receptors and effects, and hence can come to differing conclusions on levels of effect relating to the same heritage asset without this indicating an error in either assessment.

Further Survey Requirements and Monitoring

10.225 Mitigation and monitoring is recommended in the following form:

- ACoW or HECoW to supervise ground-breaking operations and provide on-site advice on avoidance of effects (e.g. working with ECoW to make decisions on retention / conservation of specimen trees; providing on-site identification and recording of previously unrecognised assets, and liaising with the local authority archaeological adviser as necessary).
- Preparation of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be submitted to the decision-maker's archaeological adviser (in this case WoSAS) for approval prior to any construction works (including enabling works) commencing onsite. Measures within the WSI are likely to include:
  - The fencing off or marking out of sites or features of cultural heritage importance in proximity to working areas. In particular, the war memorial (WoSAS 66814) located on a bend adjacent to the access track where upgrades are proposed on the Upper Avenue.
  - Removal of assets from the micrositing allowance, as indicated above.
  - Implementation of a working protocol should unrecorded archaeological features be discovered, and provision of written guidelines and constraints mapping to all contractors, accompanied by appropriate briefing (as below) to ensure sensitivities are understood.
- The use of toolbox talks/a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to highlight the cultural heritage sensitivities of the Site to those working on the Proposed Development.

10.226 It is considered that, following construction of the Proposed Development, no further surveys or monitoring will be required.

Summary of Significant Effects

10.227 As discussed within this chapter, there are no anticipated residual effects which are significant in terms of EIA Regulations.