

Balliemeanoch Pumped Storage Hydro

Environmental Impact Assessment
Report

Volume 2: Main Report
Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage

ILI (Borders PSH) Ltd

July 2024

Quality information

<u>Prepared by</u>	<u>Checked by</u>	<u>Verified by</u>	<u>Approved by</u>
Jonathan Shipley	Chris Moore	Amy Jones	David Lee
Associate Consultant	Heritage	Associate Director	Technical Director – Renewable Energy

Revision History

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Revision date</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1	July 2024	Submission	DL	David Lee	Technical Director

Distribution List

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

© 2024 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

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

Table of Contents

13.	Cultural Heritage.....	1
13.1	Introduction	1
13.2	Legislation and Policy.....	1
13.3	Consultation	5
13.4	Study Area	6
13.5	Methodology	7
13.6	Baseline Environment.....	10
13.7	Assessment of Effects	21
13.8	Cumulative Effects.....	26
13.9	Mitigation and Monitoring.....	27
13.10	Residual Effects	28
13.11	References.....	29

Tables

Table 13.1	Summary of Consultation	5
Table 13.2	Heritage Value (Significance) Criteria.....	8
Table 13.3:	Magnitude of Change Criteria	9
Table 13.4:	Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect.....	9
Table 13.5	Aerial Photographs Reviewed at the NCAP Archive, Edinburgh	17
Table 13.6	Summary of Effects: Construction.....	28
Table 13.7	Summary of Effects: Operation	29

13. Cultural Heritage

13.1 Introduction

This chapter of the EIAR provides an assessment of the effects on heritage assets (archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes) that are likely to arise from construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Development.

It identifies the location, type and significance of heritage assets and their setting and reports on the predicted impacts of the Development on this resource, and the likely significance of effect. The potential for combined effects and combined cumulative heritage effects of the Development with other developments are discussed in *Section 13.8 Cumulative Effects*.

This chapter is accompanied by:

- Volume 3: Archaeology Figures;
 - 13.1 (Sheets 1 & 2) Designated Heritage Assets within study area
 - 13.2 (Sheets 1 - 8) Non Designated Heritage Assets within study area
 - 13.3 Proposed Works and Heritage Assets within study area
 - 13.4 An Extract Plan of Inveraray in Argyllshire, The Seat of His Grace the Duke of Argyll and Greenick dated 1721
 - 13.5 Survey of Inveraray dated 1756
 - 13.6 Heritage Assets Assessed in Impact assessment
 - 13.7 Designated Heritage Assets within study area with ZTV - Operational Elements Combined and Permanent Tracks
 - 13.8 Heritage Assets Assessed for Impacts on Setting
- Appendix 13.1: Known Archaeology Gazetteers (Volume 5: Appendices);
- Appendix 13.2: Cultural Heritage Photographs (Volume 5: Appendices); and,
- Volume 4: Visualisations.

13.2 Legislation and Policy

13.2.1 Legislation

The assessment was conducted within the context of the legislative and planning framework designed to protect and conserve heritage resources. There are several statutory instruments and policies governing the approach to cultural heritage. The main pieces of legislation are:

- Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019) (Scottish Government 1997a);
- The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015) (Scottish Government 2013);
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (Scottish Government 1997b);
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (UK Government 1979); and
- Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014 (Historic Environment Scotland 2014).

13.2.2 National Planning Policy

The principal elements of national policy and guidance comprise:

- National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) (Scottish Government 2023);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (“HEPS”) (Historic Environment Scotland 2019);
- Our Past Our Future - The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (Historic Environment Scotland 2023);
- Planning Advice Note (“PAN”) 2/2011 – Planning and Archaeology (Scottish Government 2011);
- PAN 71 – Conservation Area Management (Scottish Government 2004); and
- The HES ‘Managing Change in the Historic Environment’ series of guidance notes (particularly *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (Historic Environment Scotland 2016).

NPF4 represents the latest national planning policy document relevant to the Development. Policy 7 relates to cultural heritage and key elements of the policy include ‘point h’ which relates to scheduled monuments and states:

“h) Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:

- *direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;*
- *significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided;*
or
- *exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.”*

Impacts on non-designated assets are covered by ‘points n and o’:

“n) Enabling development for historic environment assets or places that would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms, will only be supported when it has been demonstrated that the enabling development proposed is:

- *essential to secure the future of an historic environment asset or place which is at risk of serious deterioration or loss; and*
- *the minimum necessary to secure the restoration, adaptation and long-term future of the historic environment asset or place.*

The beneficial outcomes for the historic environment asset or place should be secured early in the phasing of the development, and will be ensured through the use of conditions and/or legal agreements.

o) Non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible. Where there is potential for non-designated buried archaeological remains to exist below a site, developers will provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource at an early stage so that planning authorities can assess impacts. Historic buildings may also have archaeological significance which is not understood and may require assessment.

Where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised. Where it has been demonstrated that avoidance or retention is not possible, excavation, recording, analysis, archiving, publication and activities to provide public benefit may be required through the use of conditions or legal/planning obligations.

When new archaeological discoveries are made during the course of development works, they must be reported to the planning authority to enable agreement on appropriate inspection, recording and mitigation measures.”

Policy 11 relates to energy and as such is also relevant to the Development. ‘point e’ relates to impacts resulting from renewable developments and states:

“e) In addition, project design and mitigation will demonstrate how the following impacts are addressed:

- *ii – significant landscape and visual impacts, recognising that such impacts are to be expected for some forms of renewable energy. Where impacts are localised and/ or appropriate design mitigation has been applied, they will generally be considered to be acceptable; ... [and]*
- *vii – impacts on historic environment”*

Historic Scotland released ‘Our Past, Our Future’ in June 2023 (Historic Scotland 2023). The three main priorities identified in this document are:

- Priority 1: Delivering the transition to net zero;
- Priority 2: Empowering resilient and inclusive communities and places; and
- Priority 3: Building a wellbeing economy.

13.2.3 Local Planning Policy

Regional and Local Policy and Guidance

The Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) (Argyll and Bute Council 2024) was adopted on the 28th February 2024 and replaced the original Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan which had been in place since 2015 (Argyll and Bute Council 2015a), and the policies relevant to this chapter of the EIAR are:

- *Policy 15 – Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment. Development proposals will not be acceptable where they fail to:*

- *protect, preserve, conserve or enhance the special characteristics and/or cultural significance of the historic built environment in terms of its location, scale, form, design or proposed use; or*
- *avoid any cumulative effect upon the special characteristics and/or cultural significance of designated built environment sites.*

Proposals for development that would affect either a designated or non-designated heritage asset or their setting will be expected to demonstrate that they would enable positive change by balancing the need to secure the long-term sustainability of the asset against the need to address the impacts of climate change and to meet the council's wider regeneration objectives, where appropriate.

- *Policy 16 – Listed Buildings.*

A development proposal which affects a Listed Building, its curtilage or its wider setting will only be supported when it meets the following criteria:

- *It respects the original structure in terms of setting, scale, design, materials and proposed use, OR*
- *The proposal is essential to securing an appropriate use of the Listed Building without undermining its architectural or historic character, or its setting, AND*
- *It conforms to national policy and guidance, including but not limited to those set out in the section above 'Related Documents'.*

The developer is expected to demonstrate to the planning authority's satisfaction, that the effect of a proposed development on a Listed Building, its curtilage and wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the special interest of the asset. The use of appropriate access statements, design statements and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment;.

- *Policy 17 Conservation Areas.*

Development: There is a presumption against development that does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of an existing or proposed conservation area or its setting. New development within these areas and on sites affecting their settings must respect the architectural, historic and other special qualities that give rise to their actual or proposed designation and conform to the following national policies and guidance including, but not limited to, those detailed as 'Related Documents' under section 4.39 above and the area's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (if in place).

The developer is expected to satisfactorily demonstrate to the planning authority that the effect of a proposed development on a conservation area and its wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to preserve or enhance the special interest of the area. The use of appropriate design statements, character appraisals and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment.

Applications for planning permission in principle will not normally be considered appropriate for proposed development in conservation areas. The contribution which trees make towards the character or appearance of a conservation area will be taken into account when considering development proposals

- *Policy 19 Scheduled Monuments*

There will be a presumption against development that does not retain, protect, conserve or enhance a Scheduled Monument and the integrity of its settings. Developments that have an adverse impact on Scheduled Monuments or their settings will not be permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances. New development on sites affecting the settings of scheduled monuments must respect their architectural, historic and other special qualities and conform to the national policies and guidance including but not limited to the 'Related Documents'.

The developer is expected to satisfactorily demonstrate to the planning authority that the effect of a proposed development on a scheduled monument and its wider setting has been assessed and that measures will be taken to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the special interest of the asset. The use of appropriate setting analysis, design statements, character appraisals and conservation plans are expected to facilitate this assessment

- *Policy 20 – Gardens and Designed Landscapes*

Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact upon important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.

Development proposals should protect and preserve in situ regionally or locally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes and their settings, wherever feasible. All proposals affecting designated or non-designated Gardens and Designed Landscapes or their settings shall be accompanied by an assessment that follows the principles set out in the most up-to-date relevant guidance published by Historic Environment Scotland.

In assessing proposals for development in or adjacent to gardens and designed landscapes particular attention will be paid to the impact of the proposal on all of the following:

- *The artistic, historical, horticultural, architectural, scenic, and nature conservation interest of the site, AND*
- *The site's original design concept, overall quality and setting, AND*
- *Trees and woodlands and the site's contribution to local landscape character within the site including the boundary walls, pathways, garden terraces or water features.*

- *Policy 21 – Sites of Archaeological Importance*

There is a presumption in favour of retaining, protecting, conserving and enhancing the existing archaeological heritage and any future discoveries found in Argyll and Bute. When a proposed development would affect a site of archaeological significance, ALL of the following will apply:

- *The prospective developer will be advised to consult the planning authority and its advisors the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WOSAS) at the earliest possible stage in the conception of the proposal, AND*
- *An assessment of the importance of the site will be provided by the prospective developer as part of the application for planning permission or (preferably) as part of the pre-application discussions, AND*
- *Relevant policies and guidance including but not limited to the 'Related Documents' must be conformed to.*

When development that will affect a site of archaeological significance is to be carried out, both of the following will apply:

- *Developers will be expected to make provision for the protection and preservation of archaeological deposits in situ within their developments, OR*
- *Where the planning authority deems that the protection and preservation of archaeological deposits in situ is not warranted for whatever reason, it shall satisfy itself that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation, recording, analysis and publication and, if appropriate preservation of, the remains.*

Where archaeological remains are discovered after a development has commenced both of the following will apply:

- *The developer will stop work and notify the WOSAS and the council immediately to enable an assessment of the importance of the remains to be made, AND*
- *Developers should make appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation, recording, analysis and publication of the remains. (Developers may see fit to insure against the unexpected discovery of archaeological remains during work).*

Guidance on the approach to the historic environment within the Argyll and Bute Council administrative area can be found within the Historic Environment Strategy 2015-2020 (Argyll and Bute Council and Historic Environment Scotland, 2015). This document, which had not been replaced at the time of writing in 2024, sets out a series of eight key objectives. Together, these provide a framework for the protection, conservation, management and interpretation of the historic environment to allow heritage to play a key role in economic and social growth and expansion in the region; and how to ensure that the heritage of the area continues to provide enjoyment to the local community.

The Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 (LDP) was adopted in February 2024. LDP2 contains the following policies of relevance to this chapter of the EIAR (Argyll and Bute Council, 2024).

- Policy 15 – Supporting the protection, conservation and enhancement of our historic built environment.
- Policy 16 – Listed buildings.
- Policy 17 – Conservation areas.
- Policy 19 – Scheduled Monuments.
- Policy 20 – Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
- Policy 21 – Sites of Archaeological Importance.

13.3 Consultation

Consultation carried out can be found within **Error! Reference source not found.** *Summary of Consultation*, below.

Table 13.1 Summary of Consultation

Consultee	Key Issue	Summary of Response	Action Taken
HES Pre-scoping	Early discussions were held regarding a possible workers village located in the grounds of Inveraray Castle.		Comment fed back to the design team and option eventually dropped.
HES	<p>HES provided feedback regarding the potential for impacts on the setting of a number of assets and noted that visualisations might be helpful in assessing impacts. These were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inveraray Castle (Inventory of Designed Landscapes DGL00223); • Balliemeanoch chapel and burial ground (Scheduled Monument SM4227); • Carn Dubh Crannog (Scheduled Monument SM4175); • Keppochan cup marked stone (Scheduled Monument SM4186). 	<p>Response noted and all assets considered as part of the setting assessment.</p> <p>The ZTV would suggest that there may be some views of the Tailpond from parts of the burial ground, although the site visit suggests that these should be limited due to existing tree cover.</p> <p>Impacts on the setting of Carn Dubh Crannog considered to be minimal. While the ZTV suggests there will be views from the crannog, the ZTV does not take into account tree cover, and mature trees on the headland between the Tailpond and crannog would suggest that there will be no views from the crannog and the Tailpond.</p>	<p>Photomontage created for Balliemeanoch Chapel and Keppochan cup marked stone (<i>Volume 4 Visualisations</i>).</p> <p>Agreed that wirelines sufficient for Carn Dubh Crannog. No visualisations required for Inveraray Castle Parkland due to the nature of the works in the final design, although visualisations prepared as part of the LVIA assessment, and a wireline produced from the Category A listed Aray Bridge.</p>

Consultee	Key Issue	Summary of Response	Action Taken
		Views from Keppochan cup marked stone will be limited to the upgraded Access Track servicing the Development Site from the north which is located approximately 800 m south of the asset. As works to the track will be minor, no impacts are predicted and a visualisation was not produced for this site. Further consultation noted that the limited and temporary nature of the works around Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape was unlikely to result in a permanent impact.	
WoSAS Scoping Opinion	Agreed that main concern was potential for major direct impact on non-designated assets and that mitigation would need to be developed. Also noted that they agreed with the need for a walkover survey of areas to be disturbed.	Scoping response noted.	Details of walkover survey covered in Section 13.6.7 Walkover Survey, details of impact assessment covered in Section 13.7 Assessment of Effects, and details of proposed mitigation covered in Section 13.9 Mitigation and Monitoring.
HES Post-Scoping Consultation	Email and call regarding ongoing impact assessment including visualisations and setting assessment. Provisionally agreed that wireframe from the following assets would be sufficient: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carn Dubh Crannog (Scheduled Monument SM4175); • Keppochan cup marked stone (Scheduled Monument SM4186). HES to talk to built heritage team to agree additional viewpoints from/around Inveraray Castle and the associated Park and Garden.		Visualisations produced where required, and included in <i>Volume 4 Visualisations</i>
WoSAS Post-Scoping Consultation	Email discussions with WoSAS regarding results of the archaeological walkover survey and possible mitigation. WoSAS agreed with the conclusions of the walkover survey of the Headpond, and mitigation suggested.	AECOM Heritage provided outline of results of walkover survey and put forwards mitigation.	Results of walkover survey covered in Section 13.6.7 Walkover Survey. Proposed mitigation outlined in Section 13.9 Mitigation and Monitoring.

13.4 Study Area

Two study areas were established to identify the assets and inform the baseline study. A study area of 1 km from the main red line boundary (covering the Headpond and Tailpond) was used to provide detailed baseline information for the assessment, with a reduced 500 m study area used for the red line boundary for the Marine Facility and temporary access works near Inveraray. This is due to the temporary nature of the Development near Inveraray as well as the large number of assets in the settlement.

A wider 3 km study area was also defined in order to identify assets which may be affected by the Development through change in their setting (*Figure 13.8 Heritage Assets Assessed for Impacts on Setting. (Volume 3 Figures)*). The assessment of effects on setting utilised Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) data as a filter to determine which designated and non-designated assets fall within areas from which the Development could potentially be visible. Assets which fall within the ZTV were reviewed to evaluate if the Development would be visible in practice (for

example, to account for screening) and, if so, to assess if the predicated visual change would affect the significance of the asset.

A full setting assessment has been undertaken on assets where setting contributed to the significance of the asset, to establish if the Headpond or associated infrastructure of the Development would impact upon this significance. Whilst the ZTV has been used to guide the selection of assets for setting assessment, assets which fell outside of the ZTV were still considered to ensure their setting did not include wider landscape views of, to or from the assets which would have the potential to be affected by the Development. Likewise, these assets were considered in so far as they contribute to the settings or group values of other assets within the assessment.

The study areas were agreed in consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and Argyll and Bute Council's Archaeological Advisor (WoSAS) through the Scoping Opinion.

Where no significant adverse effects on assets were predicted, no further assessment was undertaken. This review of assets within the wider 3 km identified four assets where the Development had the potential to result in impacts on their setting. These included the scheduled monuments of Balliemanoch Chapel (SM4227), Carn Dubh Crannog (SM4175), and Keppochan cup marked stone (SM4186), where there were the potential for impacts from the main works around the Headpond and associated access works. Potential impacts on setting resulting from the Marine Facility and associated access works near Inveraray were limited to Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223), and it was agreed with Historic Environment Scotland that a setting assessment would be undertaken for these assets.

13.5 Methodology

13.5.1 Guidance and Standards

This assessment has been undertaken following the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* (CIfA 2020).

13.5.2 Assessment Scope

The assessment considers the effects during the three phases of the Development lifespan as identified in *Section 2.17 Construction – 2.19 Decommissioning of Chapter 2: Project and Site Description*, and identifies the assets within the Development Site and the surrounding area and provides an assessment of the potential effects. This is undertaken in order to identify any residual significant effects, after taking into account mitigation by design, and additional mitigation measures to reduce identified effects. The phases include construction, operation, and decommissioning.

For the purpose of this assessment, cultural heritage assets consist of:

- Archaeological features, sites or deposits;
- Built heritage; and
- Historic landscapes.

Cultural heritage assets can be designated or non-designated. Designated assets are those which have been identified by the statutory or local authorities as being of considerable value and as having a series of identifiable characteristics. They consist of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Gardens and Landscapes, Historic Battlefields, Conservation Areas, and World Heritage Sites. These are assets which are either offered statutory protection, or are a material consideration in the planning process. Non-designated assets are identified at a local level and can consist of archaeological sites, features or findspots and locally significant buildings or landscapes. They can also consist of records of cropmarks or earthwork features.

The assessment considers and places a 'value/significance' upon these identified assets. The methodology for according a value is explained in detail below in the 'Assessment Methodology' section. The assessment then considers the impact of the Development upon these assets (without regard to the value). Impacts are considered as direct, indirect and cumulative and can result from a number of factors during the construction, operation and, decommissioning of the Development.

Direct impacts consist of physical impacts upon archaeological features and remains during construction. This can be caused by many construction activities such as excavation, construction of Access Tracks, construction of temporary works compounds, and general groundworks.

Indirect impacts occur as a result of change within the setting of an asset that affects its value (significance). This definition of setting impacts as indirect is set out in the HES guidance “Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook” (Historic Environment Scotland 2018). Paragraph 43 also notes that “*When considering setting impacts, visual change should not be equated directly with adverse impact. Rather the impact should be assessed with reference to the degree that the proposal affects those aspects of setting that contribute to the asset’s cultural significance*”.

13.5.3 Baseline Data Collection

The following sources of information have been reviewed to inform the baseline, and form the basis of the assessment of likely significant effects on cultural heritage:

- The WoSAS Historic Environment Record (HER);
- HES’ online data, including Canmore, (accessed through PastMap);
- Argyll and Bute Archive Centre, Lochilthead;
- Oban Library;
- Argyll Estate Archives, Inveraray Castle;
- The National Collection of Aerial Photographs (NCAP), Edinburgh;
- Historic mapping available on the National Library of Scotland website (NLS); and
- An archaeological walkover survey to assess known sites and to assess the area for the potential for additional unrecorded sites.

13.5.4 Assessment Methodology

The impact assessment has considered any impacts to the value (significance) of an asset, either physically or through changes to its setting.

The value (significance) of a heritage asset is determined by professional judgement, guided but not limited to any designated status the asset may hold. The value of an asset is also judged upon a number of different factors including the special characteristics the assets might hold which can include evidential, historical, aesthetic, communal, archaeological, artistic and architectural interests. This value of a heritage asset is assessed primarily in accordance with the guidance set out in SPP and the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HESP) (HES, 2019). The value (significance) is defined by the sum of its heritage interests. Taking these criteria into account, each identified heritage asset can be assigned a level of value (significance) in accordance with a three-point scale as set out in **Error! Reference source not found.** Heritage Value (Significance) Criteria, below.

Table 13.2 Heritage Value (Significance) Criteria

Value / Significance	Examples
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Heritage Sites (WHS); • Category A Listed Buildings; • Gardens and landscape on the Inventory of Designed Landscapes of outstanding archaeological, architectural or historic interest; • Registered Battlefields; • Scheduled Monuments; and • Non-designated sites/features of schedulable quality and national importance
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category B and C Listed Buildings; • Conservation areas; • Locally listed or non-designated buildings within a Conservation Area; and • Non-designated assets of a regional resource value.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-designated assets of a local resource value as identified through consultation; • Locally listed buildings; and • Non-designated assets whose heritage values are compromised by poor preservation or damaged so that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.

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

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

The level and degree of impact (magnitude of impact) will be assigned with reference to a four-point scale as set out in Table 13.3 Magnitude of Change Criteria, below **Error! Reference source not found.**. In respect of cultural heritage, the assessment of the level and magnitude of impact is made in consideration of any development design mitigation (embedded mitigation).

Table 13.3: Magnitude of Change Criteria

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

An assessment of the level of significant effect, having taken into consideration any embedded mitigation, will be determined by cross-referencing between the significance (heritage value) of the asset (**Error! Reference source not found. Heritage Value (Significance) Criteria**) and the magnitude of impact (*Table 13.3 Magnitude of Change Criteria*). The resultant level of significant effect (*Table 13.4 Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect*) can be negligible, minor, moderate or major and adverse or beneficial.

Table 13.4: Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect

Value (Significance)	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible

An assessment of the predicted significance of effect will be made both prior to and following the implementation of additional mitigation measures to identify the residual effects. This first highlights where mitigation may be appropriate, and then demonstrates the effectiveness of that mitigation, providing a framework for the assessment of the significance of effect which takes mitigation measures into consideration.

All archaeological work will be undertaken in line with guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA 2020). The setting assessment will follow the Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland 2016).

13.5.5 Limitations And Assumptions

Data was acquired from third parties; it is assumed that all information is accurate and fit for purpose.

The Historic Environment Records only list known archaeological sites or significant historic landscape features. There is a possibility for the discovery of previously unrecorded archaeological remains.

The proposed Headpond area represents the main focus of works, and this area is a remote upland landscape which is difficult to access. This, coupled with the rough grazing that occupies the Development Site, means that while a walkover survey was undertaken, previously unrecorded assets may survive within the Development Site.

13.6 Baseline Environment

13.6.1 Introduction

Due to the nature of the Development, two study areas were adopted for the assessment of existing baseline conditions. A study area of 1 km was used for the main Development Site (i.e. the Headpond and Tailpond works), while a reduced 500 m study area was used for the temporary work and Marine Facility near Inveraray due to the temporary nature of the works and the large number of assets within the settlement. These combined areas are referred to as the 'study area' throughout the baseline. A further 3 km study area was adopted for assessing the potential impacts on the setting of assets. This was taken from both the main works site and the temporary works areas near Inveraray and is referred to as the 'Wider study area'.

A total of 44 designated assets and 241 non-designated assets identified were recorded across the study area on the WoSAS HER and the Canmore database, with a further 12 assets identified through a review of historic mapping, documentary sources, and walkover survey. Therefore, the total number of assets recorded within the study area is 297.

Most of the non-designated assets recorded within the study area are recorded on both the WoSAS HER and the Canmore dataset. As such, when an asset is recorded in both datasets only the WoSAS reference is provided in the baseline, with a WoSAS prefix used. Where an asset is only listed on Canmore, a 'Canmore' prefix is used. A limited number of assets were recorded as part of the walkover survey, and these have an 'AECOM' prefix.

All assets are presented on *Figures 13.1 Designated Heritage Assets within study area*, and *13.2 (Sheets 1-8) Non-Designated Heritage Assets within study area (Volume 3: Figures)*, while an appendix of all recorded assets has been included as *Appendix 13.1 Known Archaeological Gazetteers (Volume 5: Appendices)*. Photographs, including site photos taken during the walkover survey, are included in *Appendix 13.2: Cultural Heritage Photographs (Volume 5: Appendices)*.

13.6.2 Landscape, Geology, and Land Use

The Development Site includes a large area of varied landscapes, with the main permanent works of the Headpond and Tailpond focused on the eastern shore of Loch Awe and the higher ground that rises above it, while the temporary works associated with the transportation of significant pieces of equipment such as transformers are located near Inveraray on the shore of Loch Fyne.

A full detailed study of the geology is provided in *Chapter 10: Geology and Ground Conditions*, with the following provided as a general overview of site conditions.

The geology of the area is shown on Geological Maps Sheet No. 37E – Lochgoilhead (British Geological Society; BGS, 1990), Sheet No. 29 – Rothesay (BGS, 1892) and Sheet No. 37W – Furnace (BGS, 2008) and on the Geology of Britain GeoIndex Viewer (BGS, 2021), and as also reviewed on the BGS Web Viewer ([BGS Geology Viewer - British Geological Survey](#)).

The bedrock geology of the Development is dominated by formations mostly Pre-Cambrian in age that are part of the Dalradian Supergroup. Some of these formations are part of the Tayvallich volcanic formation, which is composed of amphibolitic mafic rocks intercalated with metasedimentary rocks including conglomerates, and the Tayvallich slate and limestone formation. The thickness of the Tayvallich Subgroup is in the range of 100 m – 250 m in the area, with the parent unit being the Argyll Group which has a thickness up to 9 km (BGS, 2021). On the edge of Loch Awe, in the Balliemanoch region, is the Loch Avit Grit formation, consisting of psammites and pelites.

To the south of the Headpond area, along the proposed southern Access Track, the bedrock is primarily metamorphic rocks, including quartzite, limestone and phyllite, with occurrences of the Loch Tay and Shira Limestones; Tayvallich Slate and Limestone; and the Tayvallich and Loch Avich volcanics. There is an inferred fault line that runs approximately southwest to northeast through the southern edge of the Development Site, for approximately 10 km and terminates approximately 1 km north of Eredine, under Loch Awe. A larger inferred fault runs for 5 km along the western edge of the Development Site under Loch Awe, coming to within 200 m of the red line boundary.

A dyke is present within the red line boundary, about 2 km north of the fault line, the dyke is estimated to be around 5 km long. Of Silurian – Devonian period age range and composed of micro diorite and appinitic-dioritic rock, this igneous rock acts as an intruder to the characteristic sedimentary bedrock in the area.

The superficial deposits in the area appear to be limited, particularly in the areas of higher elevation. On the shore of Loch Awe, there is a mix of till, alluvium, and peat. The glacial history of the area has led to Hummocky Glacial Deposits, made up of diamicton, sand and gravel and formed up to 3 million years ago. On the shore of Inveraray there are raised marine deposits of clay, silt, and sand. Although the British Geological Survey have not mapped peat across the majority of the Development Site, the heritage walkover survey (as well as peat probing) has confirmed that peat deposits do survive in the Headpond area.

The Headpond is centred on the small upland loch of Lochan Airigh (NGR NN 04323 16440) which sits at approximately 357 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD). This is flanked to the west by a ridge of high ground which rises to 472 m AOD and includes the summit of Sròn Bhreac-liath, while to the east it is flanked by the ridge known as Creag na h-Iolaire and the summits of Cruach Mhor and Cruach na Gearr-choise which rise to a maximum height of 589 m AOD. There are currently no footpaths across the Headpond site, although there are a limited number of animal tracks as the area is used for grazing (sheep), as well as shooting/deer stalking. There have also been some attempts at drainage to improve the land/ground around Lochan Airigh.

The current main access to the site is currently from the west, and is a private farm track that runs from the farmstead of Balliemanoch which follows the water course of Allt Beochlich which runs from Lochan Airigh into Loch Awe. The upper section of this watercourse has been dammed and houses a small hydro scheme which the existing Access Track serves.

Commercial woodland occupies land to the north and south of the Headpond area, and an existing forestry track through the northern woodland provides a secondary access to the northern end of the Headpond site from the A819 on the eastern side of the Development Site.

The landscape of the Development Site drops from the high ground of the Headpond site, at over 350 m AOD, to the Tailpond area on the shore of Loch Awe at 36 m AOD. This lower landscape is dominated by enclosed improved and semi-improved fields used for pasture along the shore of Loch Awe, with small pockets of woodland. Settlement activity is limited, with the farmstead of Balliemanoch being the main farmstead, with a limited number of small private houses also located near the loch edge.

The landscape around the proposed Marine Facility site, and associated Access Tracks, is dominated by the designed landscape associated with Inveraray Castle (GDL00223), located on the shore of Loch Fyne to the east of the main Headpond site (centred on NGR NN 09543 08471).

The southern area, around the proposed Marine Facility, is dominated by the southern limits of the parkland which are used as pasture, while the proposed works to improve Access Tracks make use of existing tracks and roads. In the southern area the tracks consist of substantial tracks that serviced an estate quarry, while the track around the north section of the estate is a farm track of varying width.

All areas are dominated by mixed woodland, with the main settlement of Inveraray focused on the shore edge.

13.6.3 Designated Assets

A search of the Historic Environment Scotland database of designated assets recorded a total of 44 designated assets across the study area. This included three scheduled monuments and a single listed building within the larger 1 km study area adopted for the main site, and one scheduled monument, 39 listed buildings, and a single Garden and Designed Landscape for the 500 m study area associated with the temporary works near Inveraray.

While the scheduled monuments represent activity from the prehistoric period onwards, the listed buildings largely date to the post-medieval period with the vast majority located within the settlement of Inveraray, which is also a conservation area, or Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape which is associated with Inveraray Castle.

There are no World Heritage Site or landscapes on the Inventory of Battlefields within the 1 km and 500 m study areas used for the baseline studies, or the wider 3 km study area used for the setting assessment.

13.6.4 Non-Designated Assets

A total of 241 non-designated assets were recorded on the WoSAS HER and CANMORE Database, of which 181 are within the 1 km study area associated with the permanent works, and 60 in the smaller 500 m study area for the temporary works near Inveraray. A review of historic mapping and the walkover survey also recorded a further four assets within the 1 km study area, and eight assets within the 500 m study area. Like the designated assets discussed above, the non-designated assets represent sites from the various phases of land use and development

from the prehistoric period onwards. These include assets linked to prehistoric land improvement, agriculture and settlement, as well as post-medieval agriculture.

13.6.5 Baseline Conditions

Prehistoric (10,000BC to AD400)¹

A total of 31 assets dating to the prehistoric period have been recorded in the study area, of which 12 are within the 1 km study area for the main works, and nine are in the 500 m study area for the temporary works near Inveraray. These include two scheduled monuments, Carn Dubh crannog in Loch Awe (SM4175) and Keppochan cup marked stone (SM4186), both of which are within the 1 km study area.

While there is no evidence of Palaeolithic activity in the study area, evidence has been found in the wider Argyll area to suggest that humans were exploiting the landscape, if only on a seasonal basis, from as early as 11,000 BC, during the Upper Palaeolithic period. During this period most of Scotland would have been covered with glaciers, however, there would have been warmer periods (interglacial periods) when parts of the ice sheets would melt and withdraw. Flint tools and waste flakes discovered in a cave at Kilmelford (approximately 17 km to the west) could suggest the movement of hunters following migratory herds during one of these warmer periods (Saville and Ballin, 2009).

There is more evidence of human activity in Argyll during the Mesolithic (10,000 to 3,500 BC), with fieldwork over the last twenty years in Scotland identifying a number of sites, although the distribution of these sites would suggest that the main areas being exploited on a seasonal basis were islands/the coastline (Bonsall 1997). Sites dating to this period in the wider Argyll area include a number of sites around the Oban area some 25 km to the west such as Macarthur Cave, Druimvargie Rock Shelter, and Raschoille Cave.

The earliest evidence for human activity within the study area dates to the Neolithic period. Prehistoric assets recorded within the two study areas are largely located on lower ground near Loch Awe and Loch Fyne, or on the lower slopes of the higher ground, a pattern that probably represents the early population exploiting the better/more hospitable ground, as well as the natural marine resources offered by the lochs and watercourses. In most cases the dating of prehistoric assets is difficult due to a lack of excavation or detailed fieldwork, but the earliest remains that can be relatively confidently dated are two pieces of rock art, which are assumed to date to the Neolithic based on their style/form. These include the scheduled Keppochan cup marked boulder which commands views over the north end of Loch Awe (SM4186), as well as a boulder near Erallich Water with cup marks (WoSAS 1585), although recent surveys have been unable to locate the boulder and it is assumed to have been lost.

Other assets that potentially date to the Neolithic include a stone setting near Portsonachan (WoSAS 13846). As with rock art, these types of monument are usually dated to the Neolithic because of their style/form, and their purpose is not fully understood, although they are often found in association with other ceremonial monuments such as burials and rock art. The walkover survey of the Headpond site also noted a possible upright stone which has also been tentatively dated to the Neolithic, although further investigation is required to confirm it is an upright stone/an archaeological feature, or geological (AECOM002).

A number of the prehistoric assets recorded are linked to burial practices and include possible barrows/cairns on the south side of Inveraray (WoSAS 1503; WoSAS 1510; WoSAS 1518; WoSAS 1519), as well as near Loch Awe (WoSAS 1618; WoSAS 1632). Further possible burials had been previously recorded along the Loch Awe area, but recent work has suggested that most of these are probably natural (WoSAS 1573; WoSAS 1574; WoSAS 1603), or later field clearance cairns (WoSAS1635). While these possible burials are more difficult to date without excavation, the potential chambered cairn at Portsonachan is more characteristic of Neolithic burials (WoSAS1618), while the remaining round barrows are more characteristic of late Neolithic/Bronze Age burial practices.

Evidence for settlement activity is limited, and largely restricted to monument types more characteristic of the Iron Age. Settlement remains within the study areas include a crannog along the shore of Loch Awe (WoSAS 1630), as well as a number of possible duns (WoSAS 1639; WoSAS 58226; WoSAS 1735). A possible hut circle has also been recorded (WoSAS 15378), although the form of the structure means it could also be linked to later agricultural activities.

¹ Due to the varied nature of the Scottish landscape, and the resulting variations in settlement/land use, there is no agreed chronology at a national level. As such, the dates that have been assigned to the various periods for the baseline study are those set out in the Regional Archaeological Research Framework for Argyll (RARFA) which was produced as part of the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (ScARF) (Regional | The Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (scarf.scot))

No clear evidence of Roman activity has been recorded within the study areas, although this is typical for the area with evidence of Roman influence limited in many parts of Scotland including Argyll. Possible Roman pottery sherds were recorded during excavations for a new drain in Portsonachan in the 1960s, although their current location is not known (WoSAS 1615).

While the evidence for prehistoric activity is relatively limited within the study area, the distribution of sites suggests that the main focus of activity through much of the prehistoric period was on the lower-lying land on the lower slopes of the hills and the edge of the lochs. It is possible that the upland area where the proposed Headpond is located was exploited on a seasonal basis, however, the exposed nature of the site as well as the general remoteness would suggest that it was not extensively used during the prehistoric period.

Early Medieval (AD400 – AD1100)

Evidence for activity during the early medieval period is very limited within the study area, with only two assets recorded within the marine facilities study area. These consist of the find spot of a ring (WoSAS 1707), and a carved stone at Inveraray Castle that originally came from Iona (WoSAS 1500). This lack of evidence is common throughout Argyll, with the majority of the limited data available associated with the important religious site at Iona some 70 km to the west, or important sites such as Dunadd Royal Fort approximately 30 km to the southwest (Campbell and Batey 2017).

During the early medieval period, the landscape of the study area fell within the Kingdom of Dál Riata, a Gaelic speaking kingdom with strong ties to Ireland from where its founding members are reported to have originated (Nieke 2006). The Kingdom was divided into three tribal areas, with the study area located within the lands of *Cénel Loairn*, a name which survives in the district of Lorne which lies on the western side of Loch Awe.

While archaeological evidence for settlement activity is limited within the study area, as well as Argyll, documentary sources such as the *Senchus Fer nAlbanl*, record 'houses' in the Kingdom required to pay a tribute/provide military service (Lynch 2001). Limited archaeological evidence also suggests that some prehistoric sites, such as crannogs and duns, were reoccupied during the early medieval period, however, these 'high status' dwellings must have been accompanied by a large number of smaller farms/houses based on the number of 'houses' listed on the *Senchus Fer nAlbanl* (Nieke 2006).

What seems likely is that the main focus of settlement was, as with earlier periods, around the better agricultural land on the loch edges, with the upland areas used for grazing, woodland, or potentially hunting grounds. This distribution of settlements is, however, based on the distribution of the visible 'higher status' sites such as crannogs and duns which are often associated with cultivable land, and confirmed sites dating to the early medieval are limited.

The end of the early medieval period, and the end of the Kingdom of Dál Riata, starts with the Norse incursions of the 8th century, although these had a far larger impact on the islands and seaward coastline of Argyll. Evidence for Norse activity in the study area is also absent, while in the wider Argyll landscape it is largely limited to burials and occasional stray finds (Campbell and Batey 2017).

A brief review of placename evidence was undertaken as part of the assessment, but this has failed to identify any elements that are either characteristically Norse or that could be derived from the Gaelic of the period in question, with the exception of the tribal name *Cénel Loairn* discussed above. The one other exception is the term *Airigh*, a Gaelic term associated with sheiling grounds that were key to transhumance/the seasonal use of upland pasture (Bil 1990), with Lochan Airigh noted near the centre of the Headpond area. However, while this area is likely to have been used for transhumance, the term *airigh* continued to be used in the medieval and post-medieval periods, and as such its presence cannot be taken to assume early medieval activity.

Medieval (AD1100 – AD1600)

Only five assets dating to the medieval period have been recorded within the study area for the main works and the Marine Facility. These include the site of Balliemanoach Chapel located overlooking the farmstead of Balliemanoach (SM4186), and a cross in the grounds of Inveraray Castle (SM253), both of which are scheduled monuments. The remaining four assets are all non-designated and include a possible motte at Balliemanoach which has been recorded in documentary sources, but its current location is not known (WoSAS 43241), the original site of Inveraray Castle (WoSAS 1522), and the former church and burial ground of Kilmalieu/Glenaray near Inveraray (WoSAS 1708).

The scheduled cross, which is located within the grounds of Inveraray Castle, is not in its original position and is assumed to have stood in the centre of the old settlement of Inveraray. Recorded from at least 1474 when it was

made a burgh of a barony, the settlement was originally located to the north of its current location on the River Aray near the site of the earlier Inveraray Castle (Munro and Gittings 2006) (WoSAS 1522). Originally assumed to have been a fishing hamlet, the settlement grew in importance when the Campbells of Argyle made it their main seat in the 15th century, with courts held there and the growing settlement becoming the county town (Wilson 1868).

It is noted that the main access to Inveraray during this period was by sea, and this lack of good internal routes during the medieval period may have been partially to blame for the lack of development further inland. The remains around Balliemanoch, including the chapel (SM) and the documentary sources for a possible motte (WoSAS 43241) would suggest that there was some activity around the shore of Loch Awe, although activity on the upland area of the proposed Headpond is assumed to have been limited to pastoral activities/seasonal grazing.

Placename evidence further suggests medieval activity, with the second wave of Gaelic influence evident in place name elements such as *baile* meaning settlement (Duncan 2000) (i.e. Balliemanoch). However, based on current evidence it would appear that the uplands sections of the study area remained undeveloped during the medieval period, with the main focus of activity in the lower areas on the shore of Loch Awe and around Inveraray on Loch Fyne.

Post-Medieval (AD1600 – AD1900)

The post-medieval period is the best represented period, with a total of 205 assets recorded within the study area. As with the previous periods, assets in the upland area of the Headpond are limited and largely linked to pastoral activities, while the clear evidence for settlement is found around Loch Awe and Loch Fyne.

Early detailed mapping/surveys of the area are limited, with the county surveys produced during the 16th to early 18th century being relatively inaccurate due to their scale and the detail of the surveys undertaken. The maps produced by Pont between 1583-1614, Jansson between 1588 and 1664, and Schenk in 1690, do not show the Development Site in any detail, although the appearance of some settlement names does provide important information regarding the general settlement pattern and the key areas of activity, with all early surveys showing the main permanent settlements focused on the lower lying land on the edge of Loch Awe and Loch Fyne.

The Pont survey (undated, but assumed to be from 1583-1614) shows *Balemeanach* (AECOM012) as well as Blair Cusan (modern day Cruach Bheac) to the south, and the settlement of Inveraray to the east. While their scale means their accuracy is limited, they do suggest that the area of the Headpond was not settled and may have instead been used for seasonal grazing or transhumance as is supported by the presence of shielings within the Headpond area (WoSAS 44155). This practice was common throughout much of the uplands areas of Scotland, until it started to decline with new hardier breeds of sheep developed during the agricultural revolution of the late 18th and early 19th century (Bil 1990).

The early surveys also fail to provide any clear detail of roads or tracks in the study area, or the wider landscape, and the limited infrastructure was noted as a reason for the lack of development in the region, as well as making aspects such as the movement of cattle/livestock problematic (Duncan 2006). The Cowley Survey of 1734, although limited in detail, does depict a track running in a north-westerly direction from Inveraray, and crossing Loch Awe at an unnamed location. This crossing point is assumed to be the Portsonachan to Kilchrenan crossing, some 5 km north of the Headpond site, and it is possible that the track shown corresponds with a drove road recorded on the lower ground to the northwest of the Site near the alignment of the current A819 (WoSAS 13857).

This lack of good communications, and the problems that could arise from a poor road system, became apparent after the Jacobite rising of 1689, and by the early 18th century moves had been made to create a system of military roads in Scotland (Taylor 1996). The earliest of these roads were built under General Wade, however, a second phase of construction was undertaken under Major Caulfield, and this included a new road from Inveraray to Bonawe and Tyndrum which was constructed between 1757 and 1761. The alignment of this road follows Glen Aray, and the line of the modern A819, located on the eastern side of the study area, with sections incorporated into a modern forestry tack, although most of the original road material has been lost (WoSAS 22536; CANMORE127142; CANMORE 126792; CANMORE 126810). It seems likely that this section of road was, in some parts, an upgrade of the old drove road recorded on earlier surveys, as a road is certainly marked on the General Roy survey produced between 1747 and 1755, some two years before works started on the Caulfield Road in this area.

The Roy survey represents the first detailed mapping of the study area and shows the upland area, where the Headpond is located, as free from features/settlement activity. The focus of settlement continues to be the lower land along the shore of Loch Awe, with some areas of arable fields noted, although all of the uplands appears to be unimproved. This survey also shows the settlement of *Ballmeanach* as a small grouping of houses, while a second grouping of structures named *Curlrulunan* is depicted immediately to the north of *Ballmeanach*. This

settlement would appear to relate to the former township site recorded on the HER as Balliemanoch Cottage (WoSAS 44157).

The Roy survey also depicts a further grouping of structures to the south of *Ballmeanach* named as *Bonachaillich*. Located near a watercourse which appears to be that named Allt Beochlich on modern mapping, the small settlement appears to represent the township recorded on the HER as Allt Beochlich (WoSAS 1578; WoSAS 48741). This settlement survives as a series of earthworks near the proposed site access from the west.

The dominance of arable pastoral agriculture is noted in accounts of the area from the late 18th century, with the uplands described as heath, and the only areas of arable being near the loch edge where some efforts had been made to improve the ground (Campbell 1793). It was also noted that the area still retained extensive woodland around the lower slopes of the high ground, as well as loch edges, and this situation was little changed in the first half of the 19th century when the Second Statistical Account was published (Fraser 1793).

The first detailed and accurate mapping of the study area dates to the late 19th century when the Ordnance Survey produced detailed surveys. This shows the Headpond and Tailpond areas, with the landscape largely resembling the current situation with the upland landscape of the Headpond dominated by unimproved grazing, while the lower areas near Loch Awe have a limited number of enclosed improved fields around the area of Balliemanoch Farm. The buildings that form the farmstead of Balliemanoch, which can still be traced in the current farmstead, include the main house, out buildings, a sheepfold, and a small walled garden to the west (AECOM012).

At least one small building is also noted to the south of Balliemanoch, although the survey would suggest that this building was abandoned/roofless by the time of the survey (WoSAS 44156). A similar situation is also noted slightly further south at Allt Beochlich, where the structures are also depicted as being roofless (WoSAS 1578; WoSAS 48741), and this abandonment and 'rationalisation' of the agricultural landscape correlates with the agricultural revolution and clearances which dominated the uplands of Scotland in the late 18th and 19th centuries.

In the main Headpond site, features on the First Edition Ordnance Survey mapping are limited to three small structures marked near Lochan Airidh. Their position corresponds to the locations where shielings have been recorded, and the Ordnance Survey name book suggests that these were ruins at the time the survey was conducted, the surveyors account noting that the Lochan Airidh was most likely named after the ruined shielings (Ordnance Survey) (WoSAS 44155).

While the archaeology and historic mapping would suggest that the upland region of the study area remained undeveloped, with some seasonal grazing throughout the post-medieval period, the situation around Inveraray section of the study area was somewhat different with significant changes in the landscape in the 18th century.

A review of mapping held by the Argyll Archives at Inveraray Castle provided details regarding the development of the designed landscape associated with Inveraray Castle (GDL00223) as well as the village. The original castle, a modest 'Lairds house or tower' was located to the east of the current Category A listed castle and was surrounded by the original settlement of Inveraray (WoSAS 1522). However, moves to improve the residence commenced in at the turn of the 18th century when John, 2nd Duke of Argyll, asked Sir John Vanbrugh to design a house 'befitting the family's elevation to the Dukedom (Duchess of Argyll 2018).

The earliest detailed survey recorded dates to 1721 and shows an area of land, later known as Fisherland, to the south of the castle and the settlement of Inveraray as a complex parkland with paths cutting through what is assumed to be ornamental woodland (*Figure 13.4 An Extract Plan of Inveraray in Argyllshire, The Seat of His Grace the Duke of Argyll and Greenick dated 1721. Volume 3 Figures*). This survey also shows the area of the current settlement as woodland/parkland, with the original settlement originally located further to the north near the mouth of the River Aray. The southern limits of the parkland appear to be defined by a small water course, sometimes named on modern maps as Cròm Allt, with the area of the Marine Facility falling outside of the designed landscape.

The parkland, or policies, associated with Inveraray Castle represent an extensive designed landscape occupying the shore of Loch Fyne around the settlement of Inveraray. Consisting of extensive woodland, designed, planted, and managed by various Earls and Dukes of Argyll from at least the 17th century, it is the 18th century development of the estate that dominates the present layout. The Vanbrugh design proposed for the 2nd Duke was never to be realised, and it was not until the 1740s that works commenced under the Archibald, 3rd Duke of Argyll, who initially engaged the military engineer Dugal Campbell to design the new castle, before later changing to the English architect Roger Morris (MacInnes 2006). Morris consulted William Adam on the design, and works commenced in 1745 with the felling of 1,000 trees to provide scaffolding, as well as the removal of the existing castle and the relocation of the settlement to its current location.

The Jacobite Rebellion of 1745/46 slowed work, and in 1746 Morris appointed William Adam, supported by his sons John and Robert, to act as 'Intendant General', a role which resulted in William Adam having a greater input into the design of the house as well as features in the surrounding garden and village (Gifford 1989). This includes the Category B listed Bealach an Fhuarain well-house (LB11520) which is attributed to Adam.

The rebuilding of the castle also appears to have taken place alongside a redesign of the parkland, with an area of extensive woodland that previously existed in an area known as Fisherland, removed. This woodland appears to have been cleared as part of the 1740s work, possibly to supply some of the wood needed for scaffolding, as the General Roy Survey of 1747-1755 does not show extensive woodland in this area, although key routes/approaches on both the 1721 survey (*Figure 13.4 An extract plan of Inveraray in Argyllshire, The Seat of His Grace the Duke of Argyll and Greenick dated 1721 (Volume 3 Figures)*) and the Roy Survey can be clearly traced on the modern landscape including Upper Avenue, which will be upgraded as a temporary Access Track from the Marine Facility.

A survey dated 1756, held by the Argyll Estate Archives, also provides detailed information regarding the Fisherland area, with the cleared woodland now used for a mixture of arable and pasture, with four pockets of woodland retained, or replanted, as decorative features (*Figure 13.5 Survey of Inveraray dated 1756. Volume 3 Figures*). This survey also shows three quarries in the Fisherland area, along with Upper Avenue and an unnamed track/avenue running north-south through the Fisherland area. A structure named as *Bararay* is also marked near the southern end of Upper Avenue, although its purpose is not clear (AECOM006), and this feature now appears to be located under the existing reservoir.

The 1756 survey records a number of other features including the settlement of Inveraray shown in its new position near the shore of Loch Fyne, while other elements of the Inveraray Estate depicted include Bealach an Fhuarain well-house (LB11520), Malt Land with its walled garden (LB11530; LB11535; LB11536; LB11533 WoSAS 72177), and the folly on Dun Na Cuiache (LB11543). This latter asset, located on high ground overlooking the castle and parkland, commands fine views across the estate. A track that runs around the foot of the hill is also depicted on the 1756 survey (and possibly the 1721 survey). This track will be used as a temporary Access Track during construction of the Development.

By the end of the 18th century, it was reported that the population of Inveraray had decreased considerably due to the completion of the castle, and that the main occupation of most inhabitants had returned to fishing (Fraser 1793). It was also noted that the surrounding uplands represented some of the best pasture in Scotland, with some of the largest flocks of sheep recorded in this area.

The first half of the 19th century saw an expansion in woodland around Inveraray Castle and its policies by John, the 7th Duke of Argyll, with extensive areas of woodland planted on the hills surrounding the main parkland (Smith and Campbell 1845). This appears to have reached something of a peak in the 1830s with approximately 450,000 trees planted between 1832 and 1836, although it is noted that the primary type of agriculture practiced outside of the parkland was pastoral with sheep being the dominant form of livestock. Fishing also remained a main source of the town's wealth, with the herring fishing representing the primary activity of most inhabitants during the season.

The First Edition Ordnance Survey plan of the area published in 1871 shows the general layout of the policies much as they appear today, and the main settlement also resembles that which survives (Ordnance Survey Sheet CXXXIII.9, Published 1871). The plan does show two structures in the area of *Bararay* (AECOM006) although these are not named, while a quarry and a series of cisterns are marked on Upper Avenue (AECOM004 and AECOM007 respectively). The central avenue running through the Fisherland area had also been formalised and straightened by the 1871 survey, while the southern lodge is depicted at the southern end of The Avenue (LB13768), and Cherrypark is shown to the west of Inveraray Castle (LB11528). To the north of the Castle, the track that forms the proposed temporary workers access had also been formalised, and a number of features in the woodland to the north are also recorded including old limekilns (LB11541), Beehive Cottage (LB11542), cisterns (AECOM008-AECOM010), and an old quarry (AECOM011) (Ordnance Survey Sheet CXXXIII.6, Published 1871).

By the close of the 19th century, the general form of the policies associated with Inveraray Castle (GDL00223) largely represent those which survive into the modern day, while the settlement pattern of Inveraray Town also changes little from the late 19th century into the modern day.

Modern (AD1900 – Present)

A total of 13 previously recorded assets dating to the modern period were identified within the study area with a further two assets recorded as part of the walkover survey. The majority of the assets were recorded near the temporary works at Inveraray, with most linked to the military training camp established in the grounds in Inveraray Castle in the Second World War (WoSAS 87735; WoSAS 87736). Previously assets recorded around permanent

works for the Headpond and Tailpond are largely linked to continued settlement and commercial activity near the loch and include a pier (WoSAS 46067), fish farm (WoSAS 87702), and Tigh an Uisage house (WoSAS 72588).

The two new assets recorded as part of the walkover survey are both linked to quarrying in the Inveraray Estate and include a former quarry (AECOM004) and a series of concrete structures in the woodland near the quarry that were presumably used for loading stone (AECOM005).

As has been noted in the post-medieval section, Inveraray remained the main centre of settlement throughout the modern period, with the settlement pattern changing very little in the first half of the 20th century. The main focus of the settlement remained the area around the pier and Main Street, with a regular ferry service bringing tourists by boat from Glasgow until the outbreak of the Second World War (Smith 2001). The herring trade, that has also been a dominant industry within the town, had also declined by the middle of the 20th century. However, the war years saw the population of the settlement rapidly expand with the establishment of the Combined Operations Training Centre in the grounds of Inveraray Castle (WoSAS 72097; WoSAS 87735; WoSAS 87736).

The primary aim of the base was to train forces in the art of amphibious landings, with all three branches of the armed forces having a presence. Plans held by the Argyll Estate Archives show an extensive base covering the inner area of the Garden and Designed Landscape around Inveraray Castle, with accommodation buildings, messing facilities, ablutions, and training buildings, along with sports facilities such as a football pitch (WoSAS 87735; WoSAS 87736). The camp also extended onto the north side of the River Aray, in the area known as Dutchess Wood, as well as north as far as the estate complex known as Malt Land. The majority of the site was removed after the end of the Second World War, although the footprint of some buildings were observed in Dutchess Wood during the walkover survey, the football pitch remains for public use, and a number of new roads/tracks within the parkland were also retained.

Other assets also linked to the Combined Operations Training Centre include a memorial to a member of the Women's Royal Naval Service who was murdered in 1942 (WoSAS 66814), and a number of landing craft wrecks within Loch Fyne (WoSAS 78923; WoSAS 72227).

In the years that followed the Second World War the settlement of Inveraray expanded to the south, with a large housing estate built in the area of 'Newtown'. This development was within the southern area of the parkland that was originally woodland, but opened up to grazing as part of the 18th century development of the estate. A golf course was also opened in the second half of the 20th century, and this also occupies the southern section of the parkland, while a sewage treatment plant was also constructed in this area in 2002.

While there is clear evidence of development around Inveraray in the 20th century, land use around the Headpond and Tailpond areas appears to have remained dominated by agriculture. Mapping from the 20th century shows the upland area as rough grazing, while the land around Loch Awe has some evidence of improved grazing, with the situation continuing into the present day.

The major change in the landscape near the Headpond was the creation of a small reservoir in the last quarter of the 20th century for a hydroelectric scheme on upper reaches of the Allt Beochlich watercourse. Located some 1 km southwest of the proposed Headpond, and adjacent to two of the proposed temporary compounds, the scheme is serviced by a road running from Balliemanoch Farm near the shore of Loch Awe which will also provide access to the proposed Headpond.

13.6.6 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Data

A review of aerial photographs held by the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) in Edinburgh was undertaken as part of the desk-based research. This noted that only a limited number of photographs covered the site, and these were largely unsuitable for detailed consultation due to the quality of the images (i.e. some had cloud cover), or the scale of the images.

A review of satellite images, as well as historic satellite images on Google earth, was also undertaken. The following aerial photographs in the NCAP collection were reviewed (see Table 13.5 Aerial Photographs Reviewed at the NCAP Archive, Edinburgh).

Table 13.5 Aerial Photographs Reviewed at the NCAP Archive, Edinburgh

Sortie	Date	Scale	Frame
HSL/UK/82/0064	22/09/1982	35,000	1346
GEONEX/0021/84	08/06/1984	15,000	158, 159

Sortie	Date	Scale	Frame
MMC/0368	18/09/2001	26,000	0356
MMC/0605	23/05/2004	10,000	32-36, 62-66

A review of online LiDAR data was also undertaken, but this revealed that the Development Site is not covered by any open access LiDAR data, and a LiDAR survey was not commissioned as part of the Development.

No new archaeological or cultural heritage features were observed on the photographs viewed.

13.6.7 Walkover Survey

An archaeological site walkover survey was undertaken between the 24th and 29th September 2023, during which time the archaeologists undertaking the works examined the area of the Headpond, as well as other areas of key infrastructure including Access Tracks, Construction Compounds, and the Tailpond inlet / outlet in Loch Awe, as well as the area of temporary works near Loch Fyne. A number of assets in the surrounding landscape were also examined as part of the assessment into impact on the setting of heritage assets. Due to the varying landscapes of these work areas, they are discussed separately below. Photographs taken as part of the walkover survey are reproduced in *Appendix 13.2: Cultural Heritage Photographs (Volume 5: Appendices)*.

Headpond Area

The survey of the main Headpond area, including associated Construction Compounds, confirmed that the area of the proposed works is dominated by rough upland grazing, with some attempts at drainage/improvement visible in the form of drains cut across the area (see *Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.1 to 13.23 (Volume 5: Appendices)* for general site photos). There are no footpaths across the area of the Headpond which makes access difficult, although a number of sheep trails were observed. The topography, with high ground surrounding all sides of Loch Airigh and the Headpond, did enable views into/across the Headpond area.

An area of previously recorded shielings located within the Embankment 1 works were visited (WoSAS 44155). Located on the south side of Loch Airigh, the complex consists of at least four structures on the east side of a small stream, with a further one/two structures on the west side (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.13 to 13.17 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The structures vary in size from being small square buildings approximately 2.5 m x 2.5 m, to larger rectangular structures approximately 3-4 m long, suggesting that the site may also have been used for more permanent settlement due to the larger size of some structures.

The walkover did not positively identify any new assets, although four possible features were recorded. On the high ground on the western side of the Headpond, an area of rock outcrop appeared to have been enhanced to form a small cairn or windbreak type structure (*AECOM 001; Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.18 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Its prominent position suggests it could be a recent shepherds/walkers cairn, or possibly a windbreak/screen used by deer stalkers, and it did not appear to be of any antiquity.

A possible upright stone was also recorded on a ridge on the eastern side of Loch Airigh, and within the footprint of the Headpond (*AECOM 002; Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.19 to 13.21 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The feature was located midway along a slight ridge, the southern end of which sits above a relatively deep cutting formed by the water course named as Buinne Dhubh, with higher ground surrounding the feature to the northwest, north, and east. The stone appeared to have been positioned in an upright position, with areas of bedrock visible in the surrounding area laying on a different plain. At least one possible mound was also observed in the area, to the north, but this appeared to be natural.

A final possible feature was noted near the lower northeast slopes of Sròn Bhreac-liath, adjacent to a small watercourse (*AECOM003*). This feature appeared to be a stone pile, but was also associated with an area of better grazing, a feature characteristic of prolonged grazing associated with sheiling grounds (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.22 and 13.23 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The feature was located adjacent to a small stream/watercourse, and may represent stone being cleared from the watercourse to improve flow, although it may also represent an isolated shieling.

The proposed Access Tracks to be upgraded from the commercial plantation to the northeast were examined. In most cases, the existing tracks were found to be well constructed/recently resurfaced forestry roads up to 3 m wide. In most cases they were at grade, but in a number of areas they were on slight embankments, or in shallow cuttings. A side ditch was also visible in a large number of areas, with any area beyond the track occupied by commercial

forestry which has suffered from extensive ground disturbance (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.24 to 13.27 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

One section of track, approximately 400 m in length, is not currently occupied by an existing track, however, this is occupied by a mixture of mature woodland and recently felled woodland, and as such was very disturbed.

The Access Track in the Three Bridges plantation was also visited, with the existing Access Track also being relatively substantial, but not as well maintained. The proposed track in this area will only be used by the Development if constructed as part of the Blarghour Wind Farm project, and the necessary land rights secured, and as such potential impacts resulting from its construction do not form part of the assessment.

Tailpond/Loch Awe

The landscape of the Tailpond area, on the eastern side of Loch Awe around the farmstead of Balliemanoch, is dominated by smaller enclosed fields of improved grazing, as well as small pockets of woodland – many of which flank the watercourses that come off the high ground and discharge into Loch Awe (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.28 to 13.38 9 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

No new assets were recorded as part of the walkover survey in the Tailpond/Loch Awe area, although a number of previously recorded assets in this area were confirmed. The remains of a settlement depicted on historic mapping (WoSAS 1578) were noted adjacent to a temporary compound (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.31 and 13.32 (Volume 5: Appendices)*), and the structures nearest the temporary compound appear to have formed part of a more extensive settlement which extends to the south (WoSAS 1578) (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.33 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

Two areas of previously recorded agricultural remains were also visited (WoSAS 48743 & 96885). These features, possibly linked to field clearance and general land improvement, were relatively ephemeral in nature (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.30 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

Inveraray/Loch Fyne Works

The walkover survey of the Inveraray/Loch Fyne area included the proposed Access Track upgrades, as well as the jetty and Construction Compounds (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.43 to 13.60 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). All of the proposed works are located within Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223) which is associated with the Category A listed Inveraray Castle (LB11552).

Access was granted to the upper floors of Inveraray Castle, and this confirmed views were limited due to tree cover, with the areas of the proposed temporary works not visible (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.43 to 13.44 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). While no new assets were recorded in the surrounding woodland, traces of the former Combined Operations Training Centre (WoSAS 87736) were visible in the form of concrete building foundations within Duchess Lousie Wood (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.45 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

The proposed northern Access Track follows another existing track through the parkland which runs along the foot of Dùn Còrr-Bhile and Dùn na Cuaiche links and links the A83 to the A819. This track, which varies from 2 m to 3.5 m in width, is largely constructed of stone/gravel, although the northern section has been upgraded to tarmac. As with the southern track, it is also well screened by woodland for most of its length with views in/out very limited (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.46 to 13.48 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

No new assets were recorded on the track, although a possible 'ha-ha' type feature was observed on its southern side as it passed an area of pasture near the central section of the route (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.47 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

The folly on the top of Dùn na Cuaiche (LB11543) was visited as part of the initial assessment into potential setting impacts on the parkland. This demonstrated the fine views across the policies afforded from the prominent position, and historic photos taken from the same location also demonstrated how the settlement of Inveraray has grown over the 20th century as it encroached into the southern Fisherland area (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.49 to 13.52 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The development of the woodland is also clear from Dùn na Cuaiche, and it was noted that the southern Access Track, along Upper Avenue, was not visible, while views of the temporary Marine Facility and associated Compound were also limited due to tree cover and distance.

The southern track, which runs from the proposed jetty on Loch Fyne to the A819, largely follows the track known as 'Upper Avenue' which is recorded on early plans of the parkland. The track survives as a rough stone track between 2 m and 3 m in width, which is flanked by trees for most of its length limiting views to the settlement of Inveraray and Loch Fyne (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.54 to 13.56 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). A modern pumping

station is located near its southern end, while a former quarry is located near the northern end (AECOM004) (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.58 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Concrete structures observed in the woodland adjacent to the track, and near the quarry, are assumed to have been used to load stone from the quarry onto vehicles (AECOM005) (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.55 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

No previously unrecorded assets were located at the jetty site, or in the fields suggested for temporary compounds. The field in which the most southerly proposed compound is located is currently used for pasture, while the second compound is located in a field of rough pasture which was also found to be very wet and boggy (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.59 and 13.60 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

13.6.8 Archaeological Potential

There is considered to be low potential for assets of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic date to be present within the Development Site. There are very few assets from these periods from the wider region, and no assets from these periods within the study area. If artefacts of Palaeolithic or Mesolithic age are discovered, they are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about activity in the region during these periods and medium significance (heritage value) due to their scarcity in the region.

Although a number of sites have been dated to the prehistoric period, limited fieldwork over the years and a lack of detailed study means that many of these assets are not well understood, and their dating is based on form rather than excavated evidence. Assets include possible settlement remains assumed to date to the later prehistoric period (WoSAS 1639; WoSAS 15378), as well as earlier rock art (SM4186), and possible burials (WoSAS 1503; WoSAS 1510; WoSAS 1519; WoSAS 1574). While the study area has not previously been subject to detailed systematic studies, other large scale upland developments in the region (i.e. windfarms) have not found significant numbers of prehistoric assets on higher ground, and as a result, the potential for discoveries of previously unrecorded assets dating to the prehistoric period is considered to be low. This is also the case for the low-lying section of the study area near Inveraray, which has been better studied and subject to survey. Any prehistoric remains that are identified during construction are likely to be of medium significance as a result, due to the information they could provide relating to land use and development during the prehistoric period.

There is no evidence for Roman activity in the study area, with the assets identified more suggestive of Roman material reaching native sites (WoSAS 1615). Roman activity in the wider area is also very limited, and as a result, the archaeological potential for sites in this area dating to the Roman period is considered to be very low. However, if artefacts of Roman date are discovered they are likely to be of archaeological interest for their potential to provide evidence about activity in the region during these periods and medium significance (heritage value) due to their scarcity in the region.

Evidence for early medieval and medieval activity is also very limited with early medieval material limited to a ring found near Inveraray (WoSAS 1707) and a grave slab removed from Iona (WoSAS 1500), while medieval activity is limited to a former chapel and cemetery (WoSAS 1708). Documentary evidence would suggest that settlement activity within the study area was limited to the better land near the shores of Loch Awe and Loch Fyne, with activity in the upland area of the proposed Headpond limited to seasonal grazing. As a result, the potential for further discoveries dating to the early medieval or medieval period is considered to be low, although any further discoveries would be of archaeological interest and of moderate significance (heritage value) due to the relative scarcity of early medieval and medieval sites in the study area.

There is extensive evidence for activity dating to the post-medieval period within the red line boundary as well as in the study area. This suggests that the land inside the Headpond area was largely used for seasonal agriculture during the post-medieval period, with the pattern of settlement limited to the lower ground and largely representing that which survives today. As a result the potential for the discovery of additional assets dating to the post-medieval period is low. Any further discoveries dating to the post-medieval period would be of archaeological interest, but of low significance (heritage value) due to the volume of post-medieval assets previously recorded.

Although assets dating to the modern period are limited, the cartographic and documentary sources suggest that settlement activity has changed very little during the 20th century, and that the Headpond area has remained unsettled and used for pastoral agriculture. Likewise, the history and development of the area around Inveraray is also well understood, and as a result the potential for new features to be recorded in both the upland and lower lying areas of the study area is considered to be low. The significance (heritage value) of any assets dating to this period would also be considered to be low.

13.7 Assessment of Effects

An effect is defined as a change resulting from a development on the significance of a heritage asset. The following could have effects on assets:

- Physical impacts upon archaeological features and historic landscapes arising during the construction phase; and
- Impacts on the setting of assets arising during the construction and operational phases.

The cultural heritage baseline of the study area has been assessed against the Development to determine likely significant effects. Only those assets which have the potential to be affected, either by proximity to the Development or through changes to setting, are assessed below. All other assets are considered to be unaffected by the Development.

13.7.1 Construction Phase

Impacts resulting from the construction phase have been divided into the impacts resulting from the construction of the permanent works, such as the Headpond, permanent compounds, and Access Tracks, and those associated with the temporary works such as Construction Compounds, temporary Access Tracks, and the Marine Facility.

While a large number of non-designated assets have been recorded within the Limits of Deviation, the vast majority will not be subject to physical impacts as a result of works in the area being below ground (i.e. deep tunnelling), or because the surface works will avoid the assets. As such, assets within the Limits of Deviation that have been scoped out of the impact assessment because they will be avoided are listed in *Appendix 13.1-E (Volume 5: Appendices)*.

Assets where there is the potential for physical impacts are discussed below.

Lochan Airigh Sheilings (WoSAS 44155; CANMORE 153637)

A complex of possible shielings, consisting of at least five structures, has been recorded near the Buimme Dhubh burn under the footprint of the proposed Embankment 1 (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.13 to 13.17 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). While undated, the remains are assumed to date to the post-medieval period and represent a type of asset frequently found in the Scottish uplands linked to seasonal grazing. They have archaeological and historic significance due to the information they contain relating to the upland communities that farmed and occupied the land, although they are of a form/type found frequently in the uplands of Scotland, and better examples are known elsewhere in Argyll as well as Scotland in general. As a result, they are considered to be low significance (heritage value).

The Development will completely remove all features associated with the asset through the construction of Embankment 1. The magnitude of impact is considered to be High, which on an asset of low significance (heritage value) equates to a Moderate Adverse significance of effect. This is significant in EIA terms.

Possible Standing Stone (AECOM002)

A possible standing stone was recorded in the upland area of the Development during the walkover survey. Located near the southern end of a short shallow ridge that overlooks the valley of the Buimme Dhubh Burn, the possible upright stone is visible in the immediate surroundings (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.19 to 13.21 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). A search of the stone did not reveal any evidence of markings (such as cup marks), and while it may be a natural outcrop, the positioning of the stone appears to be different to other outcrops on the area. Discussions with WoSAS have also noted that the feature may be part of a long cairn. The possible feature is undated, however, if found to have been deliberately placed it could represent a prehistoric upright stone, or a later post-medieval marker used by shepherds. Features of this type have archaeological and historic significance due to the information their study could provide relating to the people who lived and worked, as well as those who used the landscape for ritual/ceremonial practices. If the feature is a boundary marker it would be considered to be low significance (heritage value) as it would represent a form of asset common in Scotland. If it is found to be a prehistoric upright stone it could be considered to be of regional significance and therefore of medium significance (heritage value). As the nature of the asset is currently not fully understood, a worst-case scenario approach has been taken, and the asset has been considered to be of medium significance (heritage value).

The Development will completely remove the feature through the construction of the Headpond. The magnitude of impact is considered to be High, which on an asset of medium significance (heritage value) equates to a Major

Adverse significance of effect. This is significant in EIA terms. However, it should be noted that this is a worst-case scenario based on the asset being a prehistoric standing stone, and investigations may find this not to be the case.

Possible Shieling/Area of Agricultural Activity (AECOM003)

A possible earthwork/stone feature was recorded during the walkover survey near a watercourse on the lower slopes of Sròn Bhreac-liath. The feature was very fragmentary, and may represent stone clearance from the nearby watercourse to help waterflow, however, the greener grass in the area may also suggest a possible shieling or area of seasonal grazing (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.22 and 13.23 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). If found to be a shieling, the remains would have archaeological and historic significance due to the information they contain relating to the upland communities that farmed and occupied the land. However, they are of a form/type found frequently in the uplands of Scotland, and better examples are known from elsewhere in the region as well as Scotland in general. As a result, they are considered to be low significance (heritage value).

The Development will completely remove all features associated with the asset through the construction of Embankment 1. The magnitude of impact is considered to be High, which on an asset of low significance (heritage value) equates to a Moderate Adverse significance of effect. This is significant in EIA terms.

Dumarton-Tarbet-Inveraray-Tyndrum Military Road (WoSAS 21741; WoSAS 21742; CANMORE127142)

The alignment of a section of the military road constructed as part of the 18th century road building programme under Major William Caulfield is located within the northeast section of the Development Site. Recorded through historic mapping, part of the course of the road remains in operation as a forestry track, while the remaining sections of the road have been lost as a result of commercial forestry operations. As such, much of the original road construction is assumed to have been destroyed as a result of later developments including road improvement (for the section used as a forestry track) and commercial planting (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.25 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Any remains that do survive have the potential to provide archaeological evidence linked to road building in the 18th century. As a relatively common asset type that extends over a large area outside of the Development Site with better preserved sections recorded, and as an asset that has been subject to subsequent developments and appears to have been largely destroyed within the Development Site/does not retain any of its original construction deposits, the asset is considered to be low significance (heritage value).

The Development will involve upgrading an existing Access Track as it crosses the alignment of the Military Road. All traces of the original Military Road would appear to have been lost in this area due to it being a main junction on the existing Access Tracks, and a turning point for forestry vehicles. As a result, the magnitude of impact is considered to be Negligible, which on an asset of low significance (heritage value) equates to a Negligible significance of effect. This is not significant in EIA terms.

Drove Road (WoSAS 13857; WoSAS 21766; WoSAS 1571; CANMORE 23416)

The alignment of a former road or track, assumed to have been used as a drove road, has been recorded through 18th century mapping, and survived as an earthwork into the 1970s². The possible drove road has now been lost as a result of commercial forestry operations in the area, and no remains were observed as part of the walkover survey (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.26 and 13.27 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Any remains that do survive have the potential to provide archaeological evidence linked to road building in the 18th century, and the development of droving. The asset is a relatively common feature found frequently throughout Scotland, with better preserved sections recorded elsewhere. Furthermore, the asset appears to have been largely destroyed within the Development Site. The asset is, therefore, considered to be low significance (heritage value).

The Development will involve upgrading an existing Access Track as it crosses the alignment of the drove road. All traces of the original drove road would appear to have been lost in this area due to the presence of an existing track and commercial forestry operations. As a result, the magnitude of impact is considered to be Negligible, which on an asset of low significance (heritage value) equates to a Negligible Adverse significance of effect. This is not significant in EIA terms.

Balliemanoch (WoSAS 44156; CANMORE 153636)

The remains of at least one unroofed building are recorded on the First Edition Ordnance Survey mapping of the area to the south of Balliemanoch Farm and the Allt na fainge burn. While this structure is not recorded on modern mapping, traces of a possible feature have been recorded on aerial photography and it is assumed to survive as an earthwork. Any remains that do survive have the potential to provide archaeological evidence linked to post-

² [Craig Nan Sassanach | Canmore](#)

medieval settlement and agriculture in the area. As a relatively common form of asset recorded widely throughout the study area, as well as upland regions of Scotland, the asset is considered to be low significance (heritage value).

The construction of the temporary Access Track should avoid the asset, and the asset would be fenced off during to construction to avoid any accidental damage. However, if the track had to be moved slightly due to ground conditions/topography, it has the potential to result in the partial loss of the feature. The magnitude of impact is considered to be Medium, and on assets of low significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect. This is not significant in EIA terms.

Allt Beochlich settlement remains (WoSAS 1578; CANMORE 23423)

Remains associated with the small settlement of Allt Beochlich (also recorded as Balliemanoch and Barr Beithe) are located near an area of an existing track that will be widened as part of the Development (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.31 to 13.33 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The remains are thought to relate to a small crofting settlement recorded on historic mapping from at least the mid-18th century, but abandoned by the last quarter of the 19th century when the First Edition Ordnance Survey map was produced. Although no detailed surveys have been undertaken, the complex appears to consist of a number of crofts, as well as earthwork dykes, and possible enclosures, most of which are located near the Allt Beochlich burn. The remains have the potential to provide archaeological evidence linked to post-medieval settlement and agriculture in the area, and as such have archaeological and historic value. As a relatively common form of asset recorded widely throughout the study area, as well as upland regions of Scotland, the asset is considered to be of low significance (heritage value)

The upgrade of the existing track should avoid all assets, and any features near the upgraded track would be fenced off during to construction to avoid any accidental damage. However, if the track widening did encroach on earthworks linked to the complex there is the potential for the construction to result in the partial loss of the features. The magnitude of impact is considered to be low, as the worse-case scenario would only see a small element of the complex removed. On assets of low significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect. This is not significant in EIA terms.

Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223) and Associated Assets

The following assessment examines the potential for physical impacts on Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223), as well as components of the estate that may experience physical impacts resulting from the Development. Works proposed within the Garden and Designed Landscape are limited to Access Track upgrades, and the construction of one temporary compound/laydown area, the installation of a temporary Marine Facility, and the construction of a short section of temporary Access Track to service the temporary Marine Facility. All works within the Garden and Designed Landscape are temporary, and are required to bring key components to the main construction site, as well as provide a temporary access for staff to avoid increased traffic movement within the settlement of Inveraray.

As such, assets that have to potential to suffer physical impacts from these temporary works are the Garden and Designed Landscape (DGL00233) and the Category B listed Bealach an Fhuarain well-house (LB11520), as well as a non-designated memorial (WoSAS 66814; WoSAS 92916; CANMORE 340415), and the Combined Operations Training Centre (WoSAS 87736) (see *Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.43 to 13.60* for representative site photos (*Volume 5: Appendices*)).

The policies associated with the Category A listed Inveraray Castle represent an extensive designed landscape occupying the shore of Loch Fyne around the settlement of Inveraray. Consisting of extensive woodland, designed, planted, and managed by various Earls and Dukes of Argyll from at least the 17th century, although it is the 18th century development of the estate that dominates the present layout. The original castle, a modest 'Lairds house or tower' was located to the east of the current Category A listed castle and was surrounded by the settlement of Inveraray.

Works to create a new house and settlement were started in the 1740s when Archibald, 3rd Duke of Argyll engaged the military engineer Dugal Campbell to design the new castle, before later changing to the English architect Roger Morris (MacInnes 2006). This was also accompanied by extensive works in the surrounding landscape, with a survey in the Argyll Estate Archives dated 1721 showing extensive woodland to the south of the house in the low-lying area now occupied by grazing and Inveraray Golf Course. This woodland appears to have been cleared as part of the 1740s work, possibly to supply some of the wood needed for scaffolding, as the General Roy Survey of 1747-1755 does not show extensive woodland in this area, although key routes/approaches on both the 1721 survey and the Roy Survey can be clearly traced on the modern landscape including Upper Avenue.

The policies have continued to be developed throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, with woodland being a dominant feature. In the Second World War, large areas of the estate were used as a military camp housing the main training centre for Combined Operations (WoSAS 87736; CANMORE 295425). The majority of the infrastructure linked to this camp was removed in the post-war period, however, a number of roads/tracks survive, while building foundations were identified in Duchess Louise Wood to the north of Inveraray Castle and the River Aray during the walkover survey.

While the southern extent of the policies are much altered, with trees removed as part of the mid-18th century works never replaced, a swath of agricultural land changed to a golf course, and a new sewage works and pumping station added near the southern limits of the designated area, the Inveraray Castle landscape represents an outstanding example of a designed landscape.

As a landscape designated a 'Garden and Designed Landscape' the policies are considered to be of High Significance (heritage value). The Category B Listed Bealach an Fhuarain well-house (LB11520) is also considered to be of High Significance due to its Category B status. Both the non-designated memorial (WoSAS 66814; WoSAS 92916; CANMORE 340415), and the Combined Operations Training Centre (WoSAS 87736; CANMORE 295425) are considered to be of regional importance, and therefore of Medium Significance, however, due to their positioning within the Garden and Designed Landscape, and their association with the designated asset, they have been assessed as being of High Significance.

Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape, and the assets within it that have been considered as part of the assessment, all have archaeological significance due to the information that could be gained from their study, as well as historic significance linked to their role in the overall development of the designed landscape. The well house also has architectural significance associated with its designer, the part it played in the creation of the designed landscape, and design features incorporated into the structure.

The proposed works within the Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape are limited in nature, with one of the proposed temporary compounds using an existing quarry, while the second has been located in the southern limits of the designed landscape in an area that has been used for pasture since at least the mid-18th century. Upgrade works to the northern track will be limited to local passing places, and these works will be constructed so they can be removed and reinstated.

Upgrade works to Upper Avenue have been consented as part of the An Carr Dubh Wind Farm scheme; however, if the An Carr Dubh scheme was not to go to construction, the works required for the Development would include minor widening of some sections of track and track redressing, with no tree removal required. These works would also be constructed so that the track could be reinstated post-construction.

A review of ZTV data has confirmed that there will be no views of the main permanent works at the Headpond or the Tailpond, and as such the impacts on setting are limited to the temporary works. Furthermore, a site visit confirmed that there will be no views from the upper floors of Inveraray Castle (LB 11552) (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.43 to 13.4 (Volume 5: Appendices)*), and only limited views of the temporary Marine Facility from the folly on Dùn na Cuaiche (LB11543) (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.49 to 13.52 (Volume 5: Appendices)*), and *Volume 4: Visualisations VP1*). A wireline undertaken from Aray Bridge noted that the existing northern staff access, which would be subject to temporary widening in localised areas, would be theoretically visible from the bridge (*Volume 4: Visualisations CH1*). However, there will be no actual views possible due to extensive woodland.

The temporary Construction Compound / laydown area and the jetty are both located near the southern limits of the designated landscape. This area of the parkland has been degraded more than other areas, with the construction of a golf course, water treatment works, and an area of houses and industrial units all encroaching on the parkland in the second half of the 20th Century landscape. While the temporary compound / laydown area and jetty will represent a new addition to the landscape in this area, the works will only be used for limited deliveries during the construction period. Furthermore, the works here will be decommissioned after construction.

Additional lighting used temporarily during deliveries will alter the appearance of the parkland as the visitor approaches from the south. However, existing street lighting and housing in this area has already altered the visitor's understanding of this section of parkland. Furthermore, the setting of key elements of the parkland, such as the extensive woodland, inner formal garden, and the various designated built components (such as Inveraray Castle, the well house, and Malt Land) will not be altered by the temporary work.

Due to the limited works required, the magnitude of impact, both within the landscape and upon its setting, is considered to be Negligible, and on assets of high significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect. This is not significant in EIA terms.

Impacts on Setting

Consultation was undertaken with HES to examine assets for which there was the potential for significant temporary impacts on setting during construction. This identified one asset, Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape which is discussed above (assets for which there is the potential for permanent impacts on setting are discussed in the Operational Assessment section) (see *Figures 13.6 and 13.7 (Volume 3: Figures)* for plans showing assets assessed and the ZTV associated with the Development).

13.7.2 Operational Phase

A review of designated assets within the 3 km Wider study area, as well as a review of ZTV data and consultation with stakeholders, identified a limited number of designated assets where the Development had the potential to result in a significant impact on their setting. The results of this consultation identified the following assets which were taken forward to full assessment on their setting:

- Balliemanoch Chapel Scheduled Monument (SM4227);
- Carn Dubh Crannog Scheduled Monument (SM4175); and
- Keppochan Cup Marked Stone Scheduled Monument (SM4186).

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

Balliemanoch Chapel Scheduled Monument (SM4227)

The site of Balliemanoch Chapel is located in a hollow on the side of a hill above Balliemanoch Farm and Loch Awe, and consists of a small enclosure and traces of a structure thought to represent a chapel (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.34 to 13.36 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). There is no documentary or cartographic evidence for a chapel in the area, while the placename evidence does not suggest the feature was a chapel, and its significance is largely associated with the archaeological information that it could hold. As a scheduled monument it is considered to be of high significance (heritage value).

As the feature is located in a slight hollow, the chapel does not appear to have been designed to be prominent in the landscape, or visibly domineering, and if this was indeed a chapel (or chapel of ease) it was likely placed to serve the local population. Topography dictates that views out from the asset are largely to the west and Loch Awe, and therefore away from the Headpond and towards the Tailpond.

While there will be some views of the Tailpond from the asset (See *Volume 4: Visualisations CH5 and CH6*), these will be limited due to existing and proposed woodland screening, as well as the design of the Tailpond infrastructure. Furthermore, the Tailpond will not block or obscure views into the asset, or reduce its dominance on the landscape, both of which are elements that do not appear to have been key to its setting. There will be no views of the Headpond from the asset. As a result, the Magnitude of Change is considered to be Negligible. On an asset of high significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

Carn Dubh Crannog Scheduled Monument (SM4175)

Carn Dubh Crannog is located near the west shore of Loch Awe near the settlement of Inverinan in the centre of a small bay like feature (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.39 to 13.42 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). The headland known as Rubha nan Eun to the south, and the loch edge to the north provide screening, and result in the crannog having something of an intimate setting. Archaeological work on the crannog has been limited, although some underwater surveys have confirmed that it is a crannog and not a geological feature. The assets significance is largely associated with the archaeological information that it could hold. As a scheduled monument it is considered to be of high significance (heritage value).

The setting of the crannog is largely limited to the bay in which it sits below the settlement of Inverinan. Views of the asset from the eastern side of the loch are limited due to its relatively small nature and the surrounding shoreline, while views towards and beyond the asset from western shore are also limited – largely because of the prominence of Rubha nan Eun headland. While wirelines (See *Volume 4: Visualisations, CH2 and CH3*) and ZTV data suggest there may be some limited views of the Development possible from the crannog, these are unlikely to be significant due to extensive vegetation and tree cover along both sides of the loch and Rubha nan Eun headland, as well as the distance between the asset and the Development. Furthermore, the setting of the asset does not appear to extend beyond the bay in which it is positioned. As a result, the Magnitude of Change is

considered to be Negligible. On an asset of high significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone 600m ESE of. Scheduled Monument (SM4186)

The prehistoric cup marked rock, located some 600 m east-southeast of Keppochan, is positioned in an elevated position at the north end of a ridge of high ground running along the eastern side of Loch Awe (*Appendix 13.2, Photographs 13.61 and 13.62 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Located at approximately 140 m AOD, the land rises steadily to the south until it reaches 589 m AOD around Cruach Mhòr, some 6 km away, while it drops rapidly to the north and Loch Awe approximately 2 km away. The asset's significance is largely associated with the archaeological information that it could hold. As a scheduled monument it is considered to be of high significance (heritage value).

While the asset is in a prominent position, its small size means that it is not visible from a wide area. The elevated position of the asset does afford it extensive views over the surrounding landscape, although these are most significant to the north and northeast and the north end of Loch Awe and the mountains that rise above it including Ben Cruachan (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.61 (Volume 5: Appendices)*). Views to the south, and the Development are somewhat limited as a result of the topography and the commercial woodland that dominates the landscape (*Appendix 13.2, Photograph 13.62 (Volume 5: Appendices)*).

ZTV data suggests there will be very limited views of the Development, and visualisations produced also demonstrate that views will be negligible due to the distance between the asset and the Headpond, as well as the topography and tree cover (See *Volume 4: Visualisations, Visualisation CH4*). Furthermore, views of the existing forestry track that will be upgraded are also extremely limited, and alterations to the track are unlikely to appear noticeable to the visitor due to the distance between the track and the asset. As a result, the Magnitude of Change to the setting of the asset is considered to be Negligible. On an asset of high significance (heritage value) this will result in a Minor Adverse significance of effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

13.7.3 Decommissioning Phase

The archaeological assets recorded within the footprint of the permanent works, as well as any features that are identified within the temporary works areas, will have been removed during the construction phase, with mitigation undertaken. Therefore there will be no effects on archaeological assets during the decommissioning phase.

Any assets that are avoided and protected by fencing etc during construction will also need to be protected during decommissioning, although the limited information currently available for decommissioning means it is not possible to assess the potential for other physical impacts.

No further effects on the setting of heritage assets will take place during the decommissioning of the Development as the decommissioning works will be temporary.

13.8 Cumulative Effects

The following section provides an assessment of potential cumulative effects on cultural heritage.

13.8.1 Inter-Cumulative Effects

The assessment of likely cumulative effects is based on the cumulative schemes identified in *Chapter 4: Approach to EIA (Volume 2: Main Report)*. A review of these projects was undertaken to see if any of the projects had the potential to result in cumulative impacts on heritage assets, either physical or on the setting of the assets.

The review noted that none of the projects identified as part of the Cumulative Assessment would result in physical impacts on assets assessed as part of the current assessment, and as such the potential for physical cumulative effects was scoped out.

The potential for Cumulative Effects on the setting of assets considered as part of the assessment on the setting of heritage assets was limited to impacts resulting from the permanent works (i.e. the Headpond and Tailpond). Projects more than 10 km from the Development were scoped out, as Significant Cumulative Impacts on the setting of Designated assets considered as part of the setting assessment from this distance were deemed unlikely. This was due to aspects such as distance and the topography. Five projects were identified as having the potential to result in inter-cumulative effects these are:

- Creag Dhubh Substation (Consented);

- Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL (Consented);
- Blarghour Wind Farm (Consented);
- Dalmally OHL (Consented); and,
- Balliemanoch PSH Grid Connection (assumed required to connect the project to the grid).

Balliemanoch Chapel Scheduled Monument (SM4227)

Due to the limited visibility in most directions from Balliemanoch Chapel, there is limited potential for any of the above schemes to have a significant impact on the setting of the asset. There are no views of the upper permanent works (i.e. the Headpond), and an assessment of the presence of the lower works (i.e. the Tailpond) will not significantly alter the way the asset is understood. As a result, there will be no cumulative effects when considering the Development against the identified schemes.

Carn Dubh Crannog Scheduled Monument (SM4175)

Carn Dubh Crannog is located in a natural bay on the western side of Loch Awe, with limited views towards the Development. Topography and tree cover also limit views to and from the monument, while its setting is very much the small bay on the loch. While there may be some limited views of both the Development and Blarghour Wind Farm, the distances involved and the extent of vegetation cover means that any impact will not be increased by the developments cumulatively. As a result, there will be no cumulative effects when considering the Development against the identified schemes.

Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone 600m ESE of. Scheduled Monument (SM4186)

The scheduled cup marked stone 600 m east-southeast of Keppochan is located in an elevated position overlooking Loch Awe to the north, but more restricted views to the south due to higher ground. As a result there are no views to the Headpond, and very limited views of the forestry track which will be upgraded. While there are fine views from the asset to the lower and more open land and loch to the north and northeast, it is not clear if these views were key considerations when the cup marks were added to the rock, and therefore it is not clear if its setting contributes to its significance. As a result, there will be no cumulative effects when considering the Development against the identified schemes.

13.8.2 Intra-Cumulative Effects

No intra-cumulative effects on heritage assets have been identified as part of the assessment.

13.9 Mitigation and Monitoring

13.9.1 Embedded Mitigation

Embedded mitigation measures are detailed in *Chapter 3: Evolution of Design and Alternatives (Volume 2: Main Report)*.

A number of embedded mitigation measures will be utilised to reduce potential effects resulting from the Development. Additional mitigation measures could include micro-siting of Access Tracks, or reducing the working width of Access Tracks within the Limits of Deviation, to avoid heritage assets, as well as the protection of assets near work areas through fencing.

Embedded landscape mitigation, such as planting to provide screening, as well as the design of the above ground infrastructure, has also been developed to reduce impacts on setting.

13.9.1.1 Additional Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement

In most cases the construction phase of the Development will result in the loss of assets identified within the Limits of Deviation, and a few different types of mitigation will be suitable. This includes detailed landscape survey to confirm / disprove the presence of previously recorded archaeological remains, archaeological evaluation, and archaeological excavation prior to works commencing. This is also likely to be supported by / followed by an archaeological watching brief of topsoil and subsoil removal during construction.

There is also the potential to add interpretation panels or undertake outreach work to disseminate information gathered as part of any future archaeological surveys or excavation, although this will need to be examined once the full extent of fieldwork is agreed.

All mitigation will be agreed and approved by the planning archaeologists for the area (i.e. WoSAS), with no works commencing on site until a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been agreed and approved.

No works will be undertaken within Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223) until the full extent of works have been agreed with HES. This includes, but is not limited to, tree clearance, vegetation removal, cutting back trees and scrub, and track widening.

13.10 Residual Effects

The assessment of residual effects considers various elements of additional mitigation including archaeological survey, excavation, and publication.

The construction phase of works falls into two phases, pre-construction and construction. For the purposes of the cultural heritage assessment, impacts associated with the two phases are considered as a single construction phase of works with sequenced activities extending over the seven-year construction period.

The following tables demonstrate that there are no expected significant effects at operation on cultural heritage assets.

Table 13.6 Summary of Effects: Construction

Receptor	Description of Effect	of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Significance
Loch Airigh Shielings (WoSAS 44155)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Moderate	Archaeological survey, excavation, and publication.	Minor	Not Significant
Possible standing stone (AECOM 002)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Major	Archaeological survey, excavation, and publication.	Moderate	Significant³
Possible Shieling/Area of Agricultural Activity (AECOM 003)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Moderate	Archaeological survey, excavation, and publication.	Minor	Not Significant
Dumarton-Tarbet-Inveraray-Tyndrum Military Road (WoSAS 21741; WoSAS 21742)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Negligible	Archaeological Monitoring	Negligible	Not Significant
Drove Road (WoSAS 13857; WoSAS 21766; WoSAS 1571)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Negligible	Archaeological Monitoring	Negligible	Not Significant
Balliemeanoch (WoSAS 44156)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Minor	Archaeological Monitoring	Negligible	Not Significant
Allt Beochlich (WoSAS 1578)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Minor	Archaeological Monitoring	Negligible	Not Significant
Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00223)	Physical impacts on heritage asset	Minor	Archaeological Monitoring	Negligible	Not Significant
Inveraray Garden and Designed	Temporary impacts on the setting of the asset	Minor	No suitable mitigation	Minor	Not Significant

³ It should be noted that this is a worst-case scenario based on the asset being a prehistoric standing stone, and further detailed investigations may find this not to be the case.

Receptor	Description of Effect	of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Significance
Landscape (GDL00223)					

Table 13.7 Summary of Effects: Operation

Receptor	Description of Effect	of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Significance
Balliemeanoch Chapel (SM4227)	Permanent impact on the setting of the asset	Minor	No mitigation other than embedded mitigation.	Minor	Not Significant
Carn Crannog (SM4175)	Permanent impact on the setting of the asset.	Minor	No mitigation other than embedded mitigation.	Minor	Not Significant
Keppochan Cup Marked Stone (SM4186)	Permanent impact on the setting of the asset.	Minor	No mitigation other than embedded mitigation.	Minor	Not Significant

13.11 References

- Argyll and Bute Council (2015) *Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan*.
- Argyll and Bute Council (2016) *Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan: Supplementary Guidance*,
- Argyll and Bute Council (2024) *Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2: Written Statement*.
- Argyll and Bute Council and Historic Environment Scotland (2015) *Historic Environment Strategy 2015-2020*, Lochgilphead, Argyll and Bute Council.
- Bil, A. (1990) *The Shieling 1600-1840: The Case of the Central Scottish Highlands*, Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers.
- Campbell, E. & Batey, C. (2017) 'Early Medieval Argyll and Norse/Viking Argyll (AD400-AD1100)' in Simpson, B. & Webb, S. (ed) *RARFA: A Regional Archaeological Research Framework for Argyll*; Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.
- Campbell, W. (1793) "United Parishes of Kilchrenan and Dalavich" in Sinclair, J. (ed). *The Statistical Account of Scotland, Volume V: The County of Argyle*, Edinburgh: William Creech.
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*, Reading: ClfA
- Duncan, A. A. M. (2000) *Scotland, Volume 1: The Making of the Kingdom*, Edinburgh: Mercat Press.
- Duncan, P. J. (2006) "The Industries of Argyll: Tradition and Improvement" in Omand, D. (ed.) *The Argyll Book*, Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited.
- Dutchess of Argyll (2018) *Inveraray Castle and Gardens*, Nick McCann Associates Ltd.
- Fraser, P. (1793) "The Parish of Inveraray" in Sinclair, J. (ed). *The Statistical Account of Scotland, Volume V: The County of Argyle*, Edinburgh: William Creech.
- Fraser, W. (1845) "United Parishes of Kilchrenan and Dalavich" in in n.d. (ed). *The New Statistical Account of Scotland, Volume VII: The County of Argyle*, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons
- Gifford, J. (1989) *William Adam, 1689-1748*, Edinburgh: Mainstream Published Limited.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2014) *Historic Environment Scotland Act*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2016) *Managing Change in the Historic Environment*, Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2018) *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook*, Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2019) *Historic Environment Policy for Scotland*, Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.
- Historic Environment Scotland (2023) *Our Past Our Future*, Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland.
- Lynch, M. (2001) *Scotland, A New History*, London: Pimlico.
- MacInnes, R (2006) "The Castle and Mansions of Argyll" in Omand, D. (ed.) *The Argyll Book*, Edinburgh, Birlinn Limited.

Munro, D., & Gittings, B. (2006) *Scotland: An Encyclopaedia of Place and Landscape*, Edinburgh: The Royal Scottish Geographical Society.

Nieke, M. R. (2006) 'Secular Society from the Iron Age to Dal Riata and the Kingdom of the Scots' in Omand, D. (ed). *The Argyll Book*, Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited.

Scottish Government (1997a) *Town and County Planning Act*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (1997b) *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2004) *Planning Advice Note 71 – Conservation Area Management*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2011) *Planning Advice Note 2/11 – Planning and Archaeology*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2013) *The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2023) *National Planning Framework 4*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Smith, C. & Campbell, D. (1845) 'The Parish of Inveraray' in n.d. (ed). *The New Statistical Account of Scotland, Volume VII: The County of Argyle*, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons.

Smith, R. (2001) *The Making of Scotland*, Edinburgh: Canongate Books Limited.

Taylor, W. (1996) *The Military Roads in Scotland: Revised Edition*, Colonsay: House of Lochlar.

UK Government (1979) *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act*, Edinburgh: HMSO.

Wilson, J. M. (1868) *The Imperial Gazetteer of Scotland*, Edinburgh: A Fullarton & Co.

Historic Maps

Crowley, John (1734) *A Map of Such Part of His Grace the Duke of Argyle's Heritable Dukedom*, viewed at [View map: Cowley, J. \(John\), A map of such part of his Grace the Duke of Argyle's heritable dukedom, and justiciary territories, ... - Counties of Scotland, 1580-1928 \(nls.uk\) https://maps.nls.uk/view/00000647](https://maps.nls.uk/view/00000647)

Jansson, J. (1588-1664) *Lorna, Knapdalia, Cantire, Jura, Ila, Glota, et Buthe Insulae*, viewed at [View map: Jansson, Jan, 1588-1664, Lorna, Knapdalia, Cantire, Jura, Ila, Glota, et Buthe insulae. - Counties of Scotland, 1580-1928 \(nls.uk\)](https://maps.nls.uk/view/00000647)

Ordnance Survey Sheet CXXXIII.9, Published 1871.

Ordnance Survey Sheet CXXXIII.6, Published 1871

Ordnance Survey 6" Survey, Sheet CXXIV, Published 1874

Ordnance Survey Name Book accessed at <https://scotlandsplaces.gov.uk/digital-volumes/ordnance-survey-name-books>

Pont, Timothy (1583-1614) *Mid-Argyll, from Dunoon to Inveraray and Loch Awe*, viewed at [View map: Pont, Timothy, 1560?-1614?, \[Mid-Argyll: from Dunoon to Inveraray and Loch Awe\] - Pont 14 - Maps by Timothy Pont \(nls.uk\) https://maps.nls.uk/view/00002307](https://maps.nls.uk/view/00002307)

Roy (1747-1755) *Military Survey of Scotland*, viewed at [Roy Maps and Gazetteer - Map images - National Library of Scotland \(nls.uk\) https://maps.nls.uk/geo/roy/#zoom=14.1&lat=56.29276&lon=-5.07638&layers=0](https://maps.nls.uk/geo/roy/#zoom=14.1&lat=56.29276&lon=-5.07638&layers=0)

Schenk, P (1690) *Lochabria, Omnesq Insulae Versus Occidentem Sitae*, viewed at [View map: Schenk, Peter, Lochabria, omnesq insulae versus occidentem sitae, ut Uisto, Mulla, alicequ.. - Counties of Scotland, 1580-1928 \(nls.uk\) https://maps.nls.uk/view/216442581](https://maps.nls.uk/view/216442581)

Argyll Estate Archives

Argyll Estate Archives Ref CP4, *Inveraray 1756*

Argyll Estate Archives Ref. CP5, *An Exact Plan of Inveraray in Argyllshire, The Seat of His Grace John Duke of Argyll and Greenick*, dated 1721

Web Sites

British Geological Survey, accessed 17th February 2024, [BGS Geology Viewer - British Geological Survey https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/](https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/)

Historic Environment Scotland PastMap, accessed 17th February 2014, <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/archives-and-collections/pastmap/>

National Library of Scotland, accessed 17th February 2024, <https://www.nls.uk/>

