

# 9 Cultural Heritage

## Contents

9.1	Executive Summary	9-1
9.2	Introduction	9-1
9.3	Response to Consultation Responses	9-2
9.4	Assessment of Residual Effects	9-2
9.5	Additional Mitigation	9-4
9.6	Assessment of Cumulative Effects	9-4
9.7	Comparison of Effects	9-5
9.8	References	9-8

This page is intentionally blank.

# 9 Cultural Heritage

## 9.1 Executive Summary

- 9.1.1 AOC Archaeology Group prepared Chapter 9 of the 2019 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report and 2020 Supplementary Environmental Information (the 2020 SEI).
- 9.1.2 This chapter identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the site (refer to Figure 9.1) and its surrounding area (i.e. the 10 km study area as defined in the 2019 EIA Report and shown in SEI 2 Figure 9.2) and assesses the potential for significant effects on both archaeological features and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. This chapter also identifies measures that should be taken to mitigate predicted adverse effects.
- 9.1.3 This assessment focuses on the reassessment of effects on cultural heritage in respect of the 2021 Layout (refer to Figure 9.1).
- 9.1.4 The removal of turbines in the west of the site would reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development when viewed from the Burgi Geos fort scheduled monument (Site 1 located approximately 230 m west of the Site Boundary as shown on Figure 9.2). However, the overall level of effect would remain unchanged from that identified in the 2020 SEI.

## 9.2 Introduction

- 9.2.1 This chapter considers the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the study area and reassesses the potential for significant effects on archaeology and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the 2021 Layout.
- 9.2.2 AOC Archaeology Group prepared Chapter 9 of the 2019 EIA Report which established a baseline for the study area and assessed in detail the potential for effects on archaeology and heritage assets arising from the 2019 Layout. AOC Archaeology Group subsequently prepared Chapter 9 of the 2020 SEI which considered potential for significant effects on archaeology and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the 2020 Layout.
- 9.2.3 This assessment considers any changes to the baseline since completion of the 2020 SEI. Having established the heritage baseline, an assessment is made of the potential for significant effects on archaeological features and heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
- 9.2.4 This chapter also identifies measures that should be taken to mitigate predicted adverse effects.
- 9.2.5 This chapter has been produced by AOC Archaeology Group. AOC is a Registered Archaeological Organisation of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). This chapter conforms to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CIfA 2017); Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment (CIfA 2014) and follows the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Guidelines (as updated) (IEMA, 2016).
- 9.2.6 There have been no substantive changes to relevant legislation or national and local planning policy since the production of the 2020 SEI. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) was updated in December 2020. However, paragraphs 145-151 of SPP remain unchanged from SPP 2014 and thus the national planning policy considered in the 2019 EIA Report and again in the 2020 SEI remains relevant for assessment of the 2021 Layout in this SEI 2.

## 9.3 Response to Consultation Responses

### ***Historic Environment Scotland (HES)***

- 9.3.1 HES provided a consultation response to the 2020 SEI by letter on 9th October 2020 (HES 2020) (refer to Appendix 2.1 for full response). HES noted that having reviewed the 2020 SEI they agreed that the impacts of the Proposed Development on the setting of Burgi Geos fort would be reduced to a level that preserves the integrity of the fort's setting and therefore no longer objected to the Proposed Development.
- 9.3.2 HES welcomed the constructive response that the Applicant (Energy Isles Shetland Limited) made to HES's previous concerns over the 2019 Layout. The 2020 Layout provided mitigation that directly addressed the objection raised to the 2019 Layout, specifically through the deletion of T1, T2 and T3, which were the closest turbines to the fort. HES further noted that the effectiveness of the mitigation is increased by a ridge of hills between the fort and the proposed turbines in the 2020 Layout. These hills screen the lower parts of the proposed turbines and related infrastructure when viewed from the fort. This helps to reduce the prominence of the proposed turbines in these important views and introduces a sense of topographic separation between the fort and the Proposed Development.
- 9.3.3 The Applicant can confirm that the 2021 Layout further removes turbines T5, T6, T8, T9 and T10. All access tracks and hardstanding associated with these turbines have also been removed and thus there would be no visible infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development located to the west of the topographic ridge formed by the Hill of Vigon and the Hill of Markamouth. The removal of T5, T6, T8, T9 and T10 would further increase the separation distance between the Burgi Geos fort and the Proposed Development.

### ***Shetland Regional Archaeologist***

- 9.3.4 The Shetland Regional Archaeologist responded to the 2020 SEI by email on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2020 (Turner 2020). She noted that she was content with the additional information supplied in Chapter 9 of the 2020 SEI including the additional mitigation and the removal of turbines which impacted significantly on the setting of Burgi Geos Iron Age fort. The Applicant can confirm that the 2021 Layout removes T5, T6, T8, T9 and T10. All access tracks and hardstanding associated with these turbines have also been removed. Three borrow pit search areas (B, F & H) and their associated tracks have also been removed and all turbine hardstandings have been reduced in size. There will thus be an overall reduction in the ground-breaking works required for the Proposed Development.

## 9.4 Assessment of Residual Effects

- 9.4.1 Following the change in design of the Proposed Development, a re-assessment of the residual effects of the Proposed Development upon the receptors identified in the 2019 EIA Report and 2020 SEI has been undertaken. This assessment assumes that all mitigation detailed within the 2019 EIA Report and 2020 SEI is undertaken.

### ***Construction***

- 9.4.2 The Proposed Development has been designed, where possible, to avoid direct impacts on known heritage features. There have been no changes to the heritage baseline within the study area since the 2020 SEI. The implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the 2019 EIA Report and subsequently clarified in the 2020 SEI will prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage features within the site as shown on Figure 9.1, and will involve the investigation of the potential for previously unknown features. Following the completion of construction works no further groundworks would be undertaken. No significant residual direct effects are anticipated.

## **Operation**

- 9.4.3 Direct effects upon any previously unknown archaeological remains which may be present on the site would cease with the completion of the groundworks stage of construction and consequently no direct effects are predicted during the operational phase of the development.
- 9.4.4 Operational phase effects include impacts upon the settings of assets such as Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas and Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs). While there are no designated heritage assets within the site, this assessment has identified 44 Scheduled Monuments, 37 Listed Buildings and two GDLs within 10km of the site.
- 9.4.5 All designated assets located within the 10 km study area and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) were subject to detailed setting assessment for the 2019 EIA Report and were reassessed in light of the 2020 Layout. A total of 31 Scheduled Monuments, 24 Listed Buildings and two GDLs were subject to setting assessment (Figure 9.2). These assets have been reassessed in light of the 2021 Layout and this assessment is presented in Appendix 9.1.f
- 9.4.6 The revised settings assessment found that the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of designated assets would not be significant as the effect levels would be neutral to minor/moderate in each case. These findings are listed in Table 1 within Appendix 9.1 and have been informed by ZTV modelling, site visits, photomontages and wireframes as appropriate.
- 9.4.7 A detailed reassessment of Burgi Geos fort which was the subject of the HES objection to the 2019 Layout has been undertaken and is presented below.

### **Burgi Geos Fort (Site 1)**

- 9.4.8 The Scheduled Burgi Geos fort (Site 1 on Figure 9.2) comprises a promontory fort of later prehistoric, perhaps Iron Age, date. The monument occupies a promontory set between steep cliffs of the North and South Burgi Geos. Approached from the east, the entrance way leading onto the narrow promontory is lined by a row of stone slabs to the north, while on the south it is flanked by a mound studded with upright stones, forming a chevaux de frise. The inner defences are set to the west on the promontory beyond and comprise a rectangular blockhouse set slightly to one side, with a walled enclosure to its rear. The fort has a coastal setting defined by near vertical drops to the sea on the north, west and south sides. To the east, the setting comprises open low rolling semi-improved grazing land. The wider setting extends from south-east through east to north-east beyond the semi-improved land to the open moorland of the site, including the summits of the Hill of Markamouth and Hill of Vigon, with the post-medievalcrofting settlement of Vigon set to the north-east.
- 9.4.9 The remote and precipitous coastal setting of the fort contributes to the understanding of the asset as a defensive monument constructed in an isolated location with excellent surveillance opportunities across both sea and land. The hills of the site form part of the wider setting of the fort and their low rolling nature form a contrast to the steep cliffs of the coastal setting in other directions. The setting of the fort thus contributes to an understanding of its cultural value and it is of high sensitivity to changes within its setting.
- 9.4.10 The removal of T5, T6, T8, T9 and T10 for the 2021 Layout would result in the removal of the five turbines closest to the fort. T5, T6, T8 and T10 were identified as being relatively prominent in views from the fort in the 2020 Layout and thus their removal would further reduce visibility of the Proposed Development when viewed from Burgi Geos fort. The nearest turbine of the 2021 Layout (T11) would be set at a distance of approximately 2.85 km east-south-east of the fort (compared with 500m for the 2019 Layout and 1.87 km for the 2020 Layout). The remaining visible turbine tips would be located within an upland moorland setting, beyond the immediately adjacent land which relates to the defensive setting of the fort. The turbines would also be seen beyond the intervening landforms of the Hill of Vigon and the Hill of Markamouth and there would be a clear separation between the more fertile flatter land, which may once have been exploited by occupiers of the fort, and the remote upland moorland interior in which the Proposed Development would be located. The landform of the Hill of Vigon and Hill of Markamouth would also block visibility of the proposed

access track and borrow pit infrastructure as well as the hubs and towers of all turbines and only seven turbines' tips would be visible.

- 9.4.11 The increased distance between the fort and the proposed turbines would see turbines placed behind a topographic ridge, providing clear separation between the fort and the Proposed Development. In addition, T5, T6, T8 and T10 (of the 2020 Layout) were visible below hub height from the fort (refer to Figure 9.5.1 of the 2020 SEI), and by the removal of these from the 2021 Layout, the visibility of the Proposed Development from the fort has been further reduced. However, while there would be a marked reduction in visual impact, the Proposed Development would still introduce new and modern features into a view that currently does not feature any modern development and thus the overall magnitude of impact would not be reduced and is considered to be low. The level of residual effect for the 2021 Layout would be **minor/moderate**. As per paragraph 9.5.24 of the 2019 EIA Report and with reference to the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment (IEMA, 2016), effects determined to be minor/moderate and less are considered not significant.

### ***Decommissioning***

- 9.4.12 It is anticipated that direct impacts during the decommissioning phase would be limited and would only occur if new ground works are required beyond the areas disturbed during the original construction works. All operational effects upon the settings of designated assets would be reversed with the removal of the turbines following decommissioning, leading to a neutral residual impact.
- 9.4.13 Detailed assessment of impacts on cultural heritage assets arising from the decommissioning phase have been scoped out of this assessment. A detailed assessment of the cultural heritage impacts of decommissioning the Proposed Development was not undertaken as part of the 2019 EIA Report because:
- the future baseline conditions (environmental and other developments) cannot be predicted accurately at this stage;
  - the detailed proposals for decommissioning are not known at this stage; and
  - the best practice decommissioning guidance methods will likely change during the lifetime of the Proposed Development.

## **9.5 Additional Mitigation**

- 9.5.1 National planning policies and planning guidance as well as local planning policies require that account is taken of potential effects upon heritage assets/features by proposed developments and that where possible such effects are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible these policies require that any significant effects on assets/features be minimised or offset. There would be no significant direct effects upon known heritage features as a consequence of the Proposed Development. To prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage features during construction, all known heritage features within 50 m of working areas will be fenced off.
- 9.5.2 To mitigate the potential for previously unrecorded features to be impacted during the construction phase, an archaeological watching brief will be undertaken on ground breaking works. The purpose of such works will be to identify any archaeological remains threatened by the Proposed Development, to assess their significance and to mitigate any impact upon them either through avoidance or, if preservation in situ is not warranted, through preservation by record. Depending upon the results of any watching brief works there is the potential that further works, such as excavation and post-excavation analyses, could be required. Details of mitigation will be agreed in consultation with Shetland Amenity Trust through a Written Scheme of Investigation.

## **9.6 Assessment of Cumulative Effects**

- 9.6.1 The cumulative effects identified in the 2019 EIA Report and reconsidered in the 2020 SEI arose largely from the combined views of the Proposed Development with operational, consented and

within-planning wind farm developments at distances up to 35 km from the Proposed Development. There are no new cumulative developments within the study areas used for the 2019 EIA Report and the 2020 SEI. Therefore, there would be no change in the level of cumulative effect identified as a consequence of the 2021 Layout.

## 9.7 Comparison of Effects

- 9.7.1 The removal of turbines T5, T6, T8, T9 and T10 and associated access track and hardstanding and removal of borrow pits B, F and H for the 2021 Layout would result in a reduction in total numbers and proportions of turbines and associated infrastructure visible from heritage assets across the 10km study area. A re-assessment of the residual effects of the Proposed Development upon the receptors identified in the 2020 SEI has been undertaken. The removal of turbines in the west of the site would reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development when viewed from the Burgi Geos fort (Site 1 on Figure 9.2). However, the overall level of effect would remain unchanged from that identified in the 2020 SEI.

**Table 9.1 – Summary of Effects (with reference to Figure 9.2)**

Description of Effect	2020 SEI Effects		SEI 2 Effects	
	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Partial damage to former road from Heatherdale to Cullivoe (Site 148)	Negligible	Adverse	Negligible	Adverse
Damage to hitherto unknown archaeological remains	Negligible	Adverse	Negligible	Adverse
Effect on setting of Burgi Geos, promontory fort (Site 1)	Minor/Moderate	Adverse	Minor/Moderate	Adverse
Effect on settings of Sites 2, 4, 7, 21, 28, 39, 40, 41, 61, 66, 67, 68, 75, 8 and 81	Minor/Moderate	Adverse	Minor/Moderate	Adverse
Effect on settings of Sites 3, 5, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, 27, 29, 37, 39, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52	Minor	Adverse	Minor	Adverse
Effect on settings of Sites 9, 19, 20, 31, 36, 43, 47, 54-58, 70 and 74	Negligible	Adverse	Negligible	Adverse
Effect on setting of Site 32	None	N/A	None	N/A



**Table 9.2 – Summary of Cumulative Effects**

Receptor	Effect	Cumulative Developments	2020 SEI Cumulative Effect		SEI 2 Cumulative Effect	
			Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Cumulative Effect on Sites 4, 7, 8, 21, 28, 40	Changes to setting	Garth Wind Farm, Beaw Field Wind Farm.	Minor	Adverse	Minor	Adverse
Cumulative Effect on Sites 2, 39 and 41	Changes to setting	Garth Wind Farm, Beaw Field Wind Farm.	Minor	Adverse	Minor	Adverse
Cumulative Effect on Sites 80 and 81	Changes to setting	Garth Wind Farm, Beaw Field Wind Farm.	Negligible	Adverse	Negligible	Adverse

## 9.8 References

Historic Environment Scotland (2020) The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 Energy Isles (formerly Yell) Wind Farm, Island of Yell, Shetland Islands. Letter to Energy Consents Unit 9<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Turner. V.E (2020) *ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 SECTION 36: APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED ENERGY ISLES WIND FARM ON THE ISLAND OF YELL*. Email correspondence to Energy Consents Unit: 23 September 2020.

This page is intentionally blank.