



Chapter 11

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table of Contents

11.1	Executive Summary	4
11.2	Introduction	5
11.2.1	Chapter Outline	5
11.3	Legislation and Policy Context	6
11.3.1	Legislation	6
11.3.2	Planning Policy	6
11.3.3	Local Policy	7
11.3.4	Guidance	7
11.3.5	Consultation	8
11.4	Methodology	10
11.4.1	Assessment	10
11.4.2	Study Areas	10
11.4.3	Data Sources	11
11.4.4	Definition of Baseline Conditions	11
11.4.5	Identification of and Evaluation of Impacts	12
11.4.6	Mitigation Measures and Identification of Residual Effects	12
11.4.7	Impact Assessment Criteria	12
11.5	Baseline conditions	16
11.5.1	Geology and Geomorphology	16
11.5.2	Previous Investigations	16
11.5.3	Overview of the Historic Environment	16
11.5.4	Archaeological Background	17
11.5.5	Heritage Assets in the ISA	17
11.5.6	Potential for Undiscovered Heritage Assets within the ISA	19
11.5.7	Heritage Assets in the OSA	21
11.6	Identification and Evaluation of Effects	23
11.6.1	Construction Impacts	23
11.6.2	Operational Effects	24
11.6.3	Mitigation Measures	35
11.6.4	Residual Effects	36
11.7	Summary of Effects	37
11.8	References	38

List of Tables

Table 11.1: Summary of Issues Identified Through Consultation8
 Table 11.2: Archaeological Potential 12
 Table 11.3: Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets 13
 Table 11.4: Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impacts on Heritage Assets 14
 Table 11.5: Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects on Heritage Assets 15
 Table 11.6: Known Heritage Assets Within the Corranbuie Forestry Area of the ISA 18
 Table 11.7: Known Heritage Assets Within the Skipness Forestry Area of the ISA 18
 Table 11.8: Summary of Effects 37

Figures

- Figure 11.1: Known heritage assets within the Inner Study Area (ISA)
 Figure 11.2: Known heritage assets within the Outer Study Area (OSA)
 Figure 11.3: Photomontage, Kibrannan Chapel and Skipness Castle (SM13225)
 Figure 11.4: Photomontage, Skipness Castle (SM13225)
 Figure 11.5: Wireline, View towards Skipness Castle (SM13225) from Kilbrannan Sound – Skipness Castle indicated at NGR 190799, 657770
 Figure 11.6: Wireline, Skipness Country House (WoSAS 4374)
 Figure 11.7: Wireline, St Brendan’s Church of Scotland (WoSAS 4375)
 Figure 11.8: Wireline, Cnoc na Sgratha cairn (SM3651)
 Figure 11.9: Wireline, View towards Glenreasdell Chambered Cairn (SM3281)– cairn indicated at NGR 186491, 658252
 Figure 11.10: Photomontage, View from Lochranza Castle (SM90206) at ground level. Skipness Castle indicated at NGR 190799, 657770.
 Figure 11.11: Wireline, View from Lochranza Castle (SM90206) hall-house level (a height of 4m above ground level)
 Figure 11.12: Wireline, View from Lochranza Castle (SM90206) tower level (a height of 6.5m above ground level)
 Figure 11.13: Photomontage, View from Dun Skeig (SM2491)
 Figure 11.14: Wireline, View towards Dun Skeig from north of Isle of Gigha. Location of Dun Skeig indicated at NGR 175787, 657198
 Figure 11.15: Photomontage, View from Caisteal Aoidhe Fort (SM3523)
 Figure 11.16: Viewpoint location map, including bare earth zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV)



Chapter 11

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

11.1 Executive Summary

1. This Chapter has assessed potential direct impacts from the construction of the proposed Development and the potential impact upon heritage assets from its operation within their setting. The assessment has been compiled with reference to all relevant planning policy and guidance documents of Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists. Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd, part of the RSK Group, has consulted with the statutory consultees in order to agree the methodology employed by the assessment and for them to identify specific assets of particular concern to them. The methodology and Study Areas employed by the assessment have been formulated as a result of this consultation.
2. The Inner Study Area (ISA) corresponds to the application boundary. Within this area, all heritage assets are assessed for potential construction and operational effects. The Outer Study Area (OSA) is defined by the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) to identify any heritage assets that may be affected by the construction and operation of the proposed Development, i.e. through effects on their settings and the contribution made to their cultural significance. The baseline for the assessment has been informed by a comprehensive desk-based study, based on all readily available documentary sources and a targeted walkover survey of the ISA carried out on 1st September 2021.
3. No direct impacts upon any known heritage assets within the Inner Study Area (ISA) are anticipated during construction and no construction-phase effects upon the setting of heritage assets have been identified. Any effect resulting from an impact upon archaeological remains discovered during the construction phase, is unlikely to be of greater than Minor adverse significance. Following implementation of a programme of mitigation agreed with the West of Scotland Archaeological Service (WoSAS) in advance of the works, no residual effects are anticipated upon any hitherto unknown potential heritage assets that may be preserved within the ISA.
4. An effect of Minor Significance, which is Not Significant in EIA terms as a result of the operation of the proposed Development, is predicted within the setting of one scheduled monument, Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225). Iterative design measures have been applied to minimise the level of visual change experienced in views towards Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel, and from the north west running track leading to the castle, implemented following design review; this took the form of the removal of one turbine (Turbine 10) and the relocation of Turbine 5 further north to further screen it from view. The residual effect on the cultural significance of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel as a result of these mitigation measures would be an effect of Minor Adverse Significance. The assessment of potential setting impacts upon heritage assets in the OSA as a result of the construction stage of the proposed Development, through the introduction of cranes etc into the landscape, is the same as those assessed under 'operational impacts', although construction impacts would be temporary in nature. No increased cumulative impacts are predicted for known cultural heritage assets from any combination of nearby developments.

11.2 Introduction

11.2.1 Chapter Outline

1. This Chapter presents an assessment of the effects of the proposed Earraghail Renewable Energy Development (hereafter referred to as 'the proposed Development') on the local historic environment (archaeology and cultural heritage).
2. The proposed Development comprises 13 wind turbines with a rated output of around 78 megawatts (MW), a 5MW solar array, and BESS with installed storage capacity around 25 MW of energy. The Site is located approximately 1.2 km south west of the village of Tarbert, 2.1 km north of the village of Skipness, situated within the northern part of the Kintyre Peninsula in Argyll & Bute. The nearest turbines are located approximately 5.7 km south of the village of Tarbert and 2.6 km north of the village of Skipness. The Site is located within the forestry areas of Skipness and Corranbuie, centred on National Grid Reference NR 88732 63637, as shown on Figure 1.1, and the land consists predominantly of commercial forestry. The Site lies wholly within the administrative boundary of Argyll and Bute Council.
3. The objectives of this assessment are to:
 - describe the location, nature and extent of any known heritage assets or areas of archaeological potential which may be affected by the proposed Development;
 - provide an assessment of the importance of these assets;
 - assess the likely scale of any impacts on the historic environment and/or known heritage assets posed by the proposed Development;
 - outline suitable mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or offset significant adverse effects; and
 - provide an assessment of any residual effects remaining after mitigation.
4. A heritage asset is any element of the historic environment which has cultural significance. Both discrete features and extensive landscapes defined by a specific historic event, process or theme, can be defined as heritage assets; and assets may overlap or be nested within one another.
5. For the purposes of this assessment the historic environment and cultural heritage is considered to consist of a variety of historic assets, including the following types of designated assets:
 - Scheduled Monuments (SMs);
 - Listed Buildings (LB);
 - World Heritage Sites (WHS);
 - Conservation Areas;
 - Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs);
 - Inventory Historic Battlefields; and
 - Historic Marine Protected Areas (MPA).
6. The majority of heritage assets are not designated. Some non-designated assets are recorded in Historic Environment Records (HERs) and are maintained by local authorities and other agencies. However, many heritage assets are currently unrecorded, and the information contained in HERs is not definitive, since they may include features which, for instance, have been entirely removed, or are of uncertain location, dubious identification, or negligible importance. The identification of non-designated heritage assets is therefore to some extent a matter of professional judgement.
7. Some heritage assets may coincide with visual receptors or landscape character areas, which are assessed in **Chapter 7**, and in such cases, it is important to recognise the difference in approach between these two topics. Historic environment assessment addresses effects on the cultural significance of heritage assets, which may result from, but are not equivalent to, visual impacts. Similarly, an effect on a landscape character area does not equate to an effect on the cultural significance of heritage assets within it.

11.3 Legislation and Policy Context

8. The assessment has been undertaken with reference to relevant legislation, policy and guidance relating to the historic environment.

11.3.1 Legislation

9. Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings are protected by statute.
10. Legislation regarding Scheduled Monuments is contained within The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Legislation regarding Listed Buildings is contained in The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.
11. The 1979 Act makes no reference to the settings of Scheduled Monuments. The 1997 Act does, however, place a duty on the planning authority with respect to Listed Buildings, and their settings and Conservation Areas. Section 59 of the 1997 Act states (in part):

“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, a planning authority or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

12. Section 64 states:

“In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

13. The Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014 defines the role of Historic Environment Scotland (HES), and the processes for the designation of heritage assets, consents and rights of appeal.

11.3.2 Planning Policy

14. The Scottish Government’s planning policies in relation to the historic environment are set out in paragraphs 135-151 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (The Scottish Government, June 2014). The historic environment is defined as *“the physical evidence for human activity that connects people with place, linked with the associations we can see, feel and understand”* and includes *“individual assets, related settings and the wider cultural landscape”*.

15. The policy principles are stated in paragraph 137:

“The planning system should:

- *promote the care and protection of the designated and non-designated historic environment (including individual assets, related settings and the wider cultural landscape) and its contribution to sense of place, cultural identity, social well-being, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning; and*
- *enable positive change in the historic environment which is informed by a clear understanding of the importance of the heritage assets affected and ensure their future use. Change should be sensitively managed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the fabric and setting of the asset, and ensure that its special characteristics are protected, conserved or enhanced.”*

16. The SPP applies these principles to all designated assets (paragraphs 141-149). In particular, it states that:

- *Regarding developments affecting Listed Buildings, “special regard must be given to the importance of preserving and enhancing the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest”;*
- *Proposals “which will impact on its appearance, character or setting [of a Conservation Area], should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area”;*
- *“Where there is potential for a proposed development to have an adverse effect on a scheduled monument or on the integrity of its setting, permission should only be granted where there are exceptional circumstances”;*

- “Where a development proposal has the potential to affect a World Heritage Site, or its setting, the planning authority must protect and preserve its Outstanding Universal Value”;
 - “Planning authorities should protect and, where appropriate, seek to enhance gardens and designed landscapes included in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes and designed landscapes of regional and local importance”; and
 - “Planning authorities should seek to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the key landscape characteristics and special qualities of sites in the Inventory of Historic Battlefields”.
17. The SPP also requires planning authorities to protect archaeological sites and monuments, preserving them in situ where possible, or otherwise ensure “appropriate excavation, recording, analysis, publication and archiving before and/or during development” (paragraph 150). “Non-designated historic assets and areas of historical interest, including historic landscapes, other gardens and designed landscapes, woodlands and routes such as drove roads” should also be preserved in situ wherever feasible” (paragraph 151).
18. ‘Our Place in Time: the Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland’ (2015) presents the Scottish Government’s strategy for the protection and promotion of the historic environment. The Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, 2019) and the Historic Environment Scotland Circular (2019) complement the SPP and provide further policy direction. In particular, HEPS provides more detailed policy on historic environment designations and consents.

11.3.3 Local Policy

19. The Argyll and Bute Council Local Development Plan was adopted in 2015 and is currently under review. Excerpts of the 2015 Plan relevant to this assessment include:

“POLICY LDP STRAT 1 – Sustainable Development

In preparing new development proposals, developers should seek to demonstrate the following sustainable development principles, which the planning authority will also use in deciding whether or not to grant planning permission...: h) Conserve and enhance the natural and built environment and avoid significant adverse impacts on...built heritage resources (p7-8).

4.4 Policy LDP 6 – Supporting the Sustainable Growth of Renewables

All applications for wind turbine developments will be assessed against the following criteria:...Impacts on the historic environment, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and their settings. (p39).

5.4 Policy LDP 9 – Development Setting, Layout and Design

The Council will require developers and their agents to produce and execute a high standard of appropriate design in accordance with the following criteria:

...Development Design (C) The design of developments and structures shall be compatible with the surroundings. Particular attention shall be given to...Conservation Areas, Special Built Environment Areas, Historic Landscapes and Archaeologically Sensitive Areas, Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes and the settings of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Within such locations, the quality of design will require to be higher than in other less sensitive locations and, where appropriate, be in accordance with the guidance set out in “New Design in Historic Settings” produced by Historic Scotland, Architecture and Place, Architecture and Design Scotland (p48).”

11.3.4 Guidance

20. Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology provides technical advice to planning authorities and developers on dealing with archaeological remains. Among other issues it covers the balance in planning decisions between the preservation of archaeological remains and the benefits of development, and measures that can be taken to mitigate adverse impacts.
21. PAN 71 Conservation Area Management provides local government and stakeholders with planning advice with regard to conservation areas.

22. HES published Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (DPSG, 2019) to accompany HEPS. DPSG outlines the policy and selection guidance used by HES when designating sites and places of National Importance.
23. HES provides guidance on how to apply the policies set out in the SPP in a series of documents entitled 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment'. These provide guidance to planning authorities and stakeholders regarding key issues relating to development, the planning process, and key issues pertaining to the historic environment. Most relevant is the guidance note covering *Works on Scheduled Monuments* (November 2016) and *Setting* (February 2020).
24. Standards and Guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) have been followed in preparing this assessment, in particular the 'Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment' (2020) and the 'Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment' (2020).

11.3.5 Consultation

25. Consultee comments arising from scoping and other consultation carried out during the archaeology and cultural heritage assessment are summarised in **Table 11.1**.

Table 11.1: Summary of Issues Identified Through Consultation

Consultee	Comment	Action taken
West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS)	No formal input to the Scoping Opinion was received by Argyll and Bute Council from WoSAS, however, consultation undertaken by email directly by the archaeological consultant responsible for the EIA Report Chapter confirmed that a study area of 10 km would be necessary to assess potential setting effects upon non-designated heritage assets of possible schedulable significance.	Screening of non-designated heritage assets up to 10 km from the proposed turbine locations has been undertaken, presented in full in Technical Appendix 11.1 . Two non-designated heritage assets are identified as requiring detailed assessment in this Chapter.
Argyll and Bute Council Scoping Opinion, September 2020	The Council notes that no viewpoints are provided from the Scheduled Monument Dun Skeig or Barmore Island, Stonefield Castle GDL, as referred to previously, it is considered that it would be beneficial to see wirelines from these locations before the provision of viewpoints is ruled out.	Dun Skeig Scheduled Monument (SM2491) is included in the detailed assessment in this Chapter, supported by photomontage (Figure 11.13 , view from Dun Skeig) and wireline visualisations (Figures 11.14 , view towards Dun Skeig from sea to north of Isle of Gigha) With confirmation from HES, Barmore Island, part of Stonefield Castle GDL is scoped out of detailed assessment due to lack of intervisibility with the proposed Development.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) Scoping Opinion, 4 th June 2020	Annex to HES' response letter gives details of a number of assets which appear likely to experience impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM 13225 & Property in Care) Cnoc na Sgratha, cairn 550m N of Glenbuie (SM 3651) 	Technical Appendix 11.1 was provided to HES in full, identifying the heritage assets proposed for detailed assessment in this Chapter. (See HES's Pre-Application consultation response below).

Consultee	Comment	Action taken
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glenreadell Mains, chambered cairn 200m SE of (3281) • Sliabh nan Dearc, enclosure 570m E of Cnoc Moine Railbeirt (SM 3650) • Caisteal Aoidhe, fort, Ardmarnock (SM 3523) • Tarbert Castle (SM 276) and Tarbert, medieval burgh & environs (SM 3410) • Lochranza Castle, Arran (SM 90206) • Dun Skeig, duns & fort (Index no.2491) • Stonefield Castle Hotel (GDL 00350) <p>HES have confirmed where visualisations/ photomontages would be expected to illustrate the assessment conclusions.</p>	<p>Photomontages and visualisations have been provided in full in accordance with the HES Scoping Opinion.</p>
<p>Historic Environment Scotland (HES), Pre-Application Consultation, 23 August 2021</p>	<p>HES have confirmed the cultural heritage viewpoint locations proposed in the Technical Appendix 11.1 are appropriate, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would welcome clarity on the location of viewpoint CH12 (in the vicinity of Lochranza Castle) to assess the likely impacts on the setting of this asset. The grid reference would suggest it is taken at ground level adjacent to the castle, rather than from the upper levels of the castle, which is what we would recommend. • We are content with the locations of the viewpoints for Dun Skeig. However, there may be value in seeking an additional viewpoint from further west on the ferry route at a location to the north of Gigha, as these views are also important. • We acknowledge the information provided in the baseline assessment and ZTVs, that the existing woodland screening within Stonefield GDL will largely provide sufficient cover on the visibility of the proposed windfarm. • We disagree with the finding that Glenreadell Mains, chambered cairn 200m SE of (SM3281) should be screened out from further assessment because the cairn itself lies outwith the ZTV. • We are content with the finding that Sliabh nan Dearc, enclosure 570m E of Cnoc Moine Railbeirt (SM3650) can be screened out from further assessment. • We are content with the finding that Tarbert Castle (SM276) and Tarbert, medieval burgh & environs (SM3410) can be screened out from further assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To illustrate the assessment a suite of visualisations are provided, comprising a photomontage from ground level (as the upper floors of the castle are inaccessible) (Figure 11.10), and wirelines from both the mid-level (4.5 m above ground level) and top-level (6.5 m above ground level) of the ruin. • Figure 11.14, view towards Dun Skeig from sea to north of Isle of Gigha is included in the suite of visualisations illustrating the assessment. • Detailed assessment of Stonefield GDL has been scoped out of the assessment. • Glenreadell Mains, chambered cairn 200 m south east of (SM 3281) has been scoped in for detailed assessment in this Chapter. • Detailed assessment of SM3650 has been scoped out of the assessment. • Detailed assessment of SM276 and SM3410 has been scoped out of the assessment.

11.4 Methodology

11.4.1 Assessment

26. The historic environment assessment has been carried out in the following stages:

- desk-based study leading to the identification of heritage assets potentially affected by the proposed Development;
- definition of baseline conditions, based on results of the desk-based study and visits to assets;
- assessment of the importance of heritage assets potentially affected by the proposed Development;
- identification of potential impacts on heritage assets, informed by baseline information, site visits, zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) mapping, wireframes and photomontages;
- proposal of mitigation measures, to eliminate, reduce or offset adverse effects;
- assessment of the magnitude of residual effects;
- assessment of the significance of residual effects, broadly a product of the asset's importance and the magnitude of the impact; and
- assessment of cumulative effects.

11.4.2 Study Areas

27. The Inner Study Area (ISA) corresponds to the application boundary. Within this area, all heritage assets are assessed for potential construction and operational effects.

28. The Outer Study Area (OSA) is defined by the bare earth ZTV presented on **Figure 11.16** to identify any heritage assets that may be affected by the operation of the proposed Development, i.e. through effects on their settings and the contribution made to their cultural significance. Within the OSA, assets have been included in the assessment based on the level of importance assigned to the asset through statutory designation (see **Section 11.4.7.1**), so as to ensure that all likely significant effects are recognised, as follows:

- up to 2 km from proposed turbines: Category C Listed Buildings.
- up to 10 km from proposed turbines: Scheduled Monuments, Category A and B Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields and non-designated assets of equivalent importance.
- up to 20 km from proposed turbines: any asset which is considered exceptionally important, and where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to be particularly sensitive, in the opinion of the assessor or consultees.

29. Criteria for the identification of assets of particular sensitivity to change is based on the approach set out in "*Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*" (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020) that sets out a range of factors which might form part of the setting of a heritage asset as follows:

- current landscape or townscape context;
- views to, from and across or beyond the historic asset or place;
- key vistas: for instance, a 'frame' of trees, buildings or natural features that give the historic asset or place a context, whether intentional or not;
- the prominence of the historic asset or place in views throughout the surrounding area, taking into consideration that sites need not be visually prominent to have a setting;
- aesthetic qualities;
- character of the surrounding landscape;
- general and specific views including foregrounds and backdrops;
- views from within an asset outwards over key elements in the surrounding landscape, such as the view from the principal room of a house, or from a roof terrace;
- relationships with other features, both built and natural;
- non-visual factors such as historical, artistic, literary, place name, or scenic associations, intellectual relationships (e.g. to a theory, plan, or design), or sensory factors; and
- a 'sense of place': the overall experience of an asset which may combine some of the above factors.

11.4.3 Data Sources

30. The baseline for the ISA has been informed by a comprehensive desk-based study, based on all readily available documentary sources, following the 'Standard and Guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment' (ClfA 2020). The following sources of information were referred to:
- designation data downloaded from the Historic Environment Scotland website in January 2021;
 - the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), including the Canmore database and associated photographs, prints/drawings and manuscripts held by HES;
 - the Historic Environment Record (HER) data, digital extract received from West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS), April 2021;
 - the Historic Landscape Assessment (HLA) data, viewed through the HLAMap website;
 - the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP);
 - geological data available online from the British Geological Survey;
 - historic maps held by the National Library of Scotland;
 - unpublished maps and plans held by the National Records of Scotland;
 - relevant internet resources, including Google Maps, Google Earth, Bing satellite imagery and PastMap; and
 - readily available published sources and unpublished archaeological reports.
31. A targeted walkover survey of the ISA was carried out on 1st September 2021, guided by up-to-date mapping and a handheld GPS system. The intention of this walkover survey was to assess the presence/absence, character, extent and condition of known assets and to identify any previously unrecorded assets. Heritage assets considered likely to be affected by operational effects in the ISA were visited during the walkover survey.

11.4.4 Definition of Baseline Conditions

11.4.4.1 Known Heritage Assets

32. Designated heritage assets are referenced in this Chapter by their HES list entry number (prefixed 'SM' for Scheduled Monuments, 'LB' for Listed Buildings, and 'GDL' for Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes). Non-designated assets are referenced by their Canmore/WoSAS HER reference. Any heritage assets discovered during research for this assessment have been assigned a number prefixed HA for 'Heritage Asset'. A single asset number can refer to a group of related features, which may be recorded separately in the HER and other data sources.
33. Heritage assets within the application boundary are described in **Section 11.5.5, Tables 11.6 & 11.7** and shown on **Figure 11.1**. All heritage assets within the OSA are shown on **Figure 11.2**. Assets within the OSA that meet the appraisal criteria for detailed settings assessment (presented in full in **Technical Appendix 11.1**) are described in **Section 11.4.7** and shown on **Figure 11.16** along with the location of all photomontage and wireline visualisations generated to illustrate the assessment. Visualisations used in this assessment, through consultation with HES, were positioned to illustrate the 'worst-case' potential impact, through use of the ZTV and site visits.

11.4.4.2 Potential for Unknown Heritage Assets within the ISA

34. The likelihood that undiscovered heritage assets may be present within the ISA is referred to as archaeological potential. Overall levels of potential can be assigned to different landscape zones, following the criteria in **Table 11.2**, while recognising that the archaeological potential of any zone will relate to particular historical periods and types of evidence.
35. The following factors are considered in an assessment of archaeological potential:
- the distribution and character of known archaeological remains in the vicinity, based principally on an appraisal of HER data;
 - the history of archaeological fieldwork and research in the surrounding area, which may give an indication of the reliability and completeness of existing records;
 - environmental factors such as geology, topography and soil quality, which would have influenced land-use in the past and can therefore be used to predict the distribution of archaeological remains;
 - land-use factors affecting the survival of archaeological remains, such as ploughing or commercial forestry planting; and
 - factors affecting the visibility of archaeological remains, which may relate to both environment and land use, such as soils and geology (which may be more or less conducive to formation of cropmarks), arable cultivation (which has potential to show cropmarks and create surface artefact scatters), vegetation, which can conceal upstanding features, and superficial deposits such as peat and alluvium which can mask archaeological features.

Table 11.2: Archaeological Potential

Potential	Definition
High	Undiscovered heritage assets of high or medium importance are likely to be present.
Medium	Undiscovered heritage assets of low importance are likely to be present; and it is possible, though unlikely, that assets of high or medium importance may also be present.
Low	The study area may contain undiscovered heritage assets, but these are unlikely to be numerous and are highly unlikely to include assets of high or medium importance.
Negligible	The study area is highly unlikely to contain undiscovered heritage assets of any level of importance.
Nil	There is no possibility of undiscovered heritage assets existing within the Study Area.

11.4.5 Identification of and Evaluation of Impacts

36. Effects on the historic environment can arise through direct physical impacts, impacts on setting or indirect impacts:

- **Direct physical impacts:** describe those development activities that have the potential to cause physical damage to the fabric of a heritage asset. Typically, these activities are related to construction works and would only occur within the application boundary;
- **An impact on the setting of a heritage asset:** occurs when the presence of a development changes the surroundings of a heritage asset in such a way that it affects (beneficially or adversely) the contribution made to cultural significance of that asset by its setting. Visual impacts are most commonly encountered but other introduced environmental factors can affect setting such as noise, light or air quality. Impacts may be encountered at all stages in the life cycle of a development, but they are only likely to lead to significant effects during the prolonged operational life of a development; and
- **Indirect impacts:** describe secondary processes, triggered by a development, that lead to the degradation or preservation of heritage assets. For example, changes to hydrology may affect archaeological preservation; or changes to the setting of a building may affect the viability of its current use and thus lead to dereliction.

37. Likely significant direct or indirect effects on known and unknown heritage assets are discussed in terms of the risk that a significant effect could occur. The level of risk depends on the level of archaeological potential combined with the nature and scale of disturbance associated with construction activities and may vary between high and negligible for different elements and/or activities associated with a development.

38. Likely significant effects on the settings of heritage assets are identified from an initial desk-based appraisal of data from HES and the HER, and consideration of current maps and aerial images available from online sources. Photomontage and wireline visualisations have been prepared to illustrate changes to key views, and to aid assessment where potential setting effects have been identified (**Figures 11.3 – 11.15**). The visualisations have been produced by Stephenson Halliday, the methodology for preparing the photomontage is described in **Chapter 7**.

11.4.6 Mitigation Measures and Identification of Residual Effects

39. For any identified impact, the preferred mitigation option is always to avoid or reduce impacts through design, or through precautionary measures such as fencing off heritage assets during construction works to avoid accidental direct impacts. Impacts which cannot be eliminated in these ways would lead to residual effects.

40. Adverse direct or indirect physical effects may be mitigated by an appropriate level of survey, excavation, recording, analysis and publication of the results, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (SPP paragraph 150 and PAN2/2011, sections 25-27).

11.4.7 Impact Assessment Criteria

11.4.7.1 Heritage Importance and Cultural Significance

41. Cultural heritage impact assessment is concerned with effects on cultural significance, which is a quality that applies to all heritage assets, and as defined by Historic Environment Scotland (Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, SNH & HES 2018, Appendix 1 page 175), relates to the ways in which a heritage asset is valued both by specialists and the public. The cultural significance of a heritage asset will derive from factors including the asset's fabric, setting, context and

associations. This use of the word ‘significance’, referring to the range of values attached to an asset, should not be confused with the unrelated usage in EIA where the significance of an effect reflects the weight that should be attached to it in a planning decision.

42. The importance of a heritage asset is the overall value assigned to it based on its cultural significance, reflecting its statutory designation or, in the case of non-designated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (see **Table 11.3**). Assets of National Importance and inter National Importance are assigned a High and Very High level respectively. Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields and Historic Marine Protected Areas are, by definition, of National Importance.
43. The criterion for Listing is that a building is of ‘special architectural or historic interest’; following DPSG Annex 2.19, Category A refers to ‘outstanding examples of a particular period, style or building type’, Category B to ‘major examples of a particular period, style or building type’, and Category C to ‘representative examples of a particular period, style or building type’. Conservation Areas are not defined as being of National Importance and are therefore assigned to a medium level.
44. Any feature which does not merit consideration in planning decisions due to its cultural significance may be said to have negligible heritage importance; in general, such features are not considered as heritage assets and are excluded from the assessment.

Table 11.3: Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance of the asset	Criteria
Very High (International)	World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal inter National Importance, that contribute to international research objectives
High (National)	Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Category A and B Listed Buildings, Historic Marine Protected Areas, and non-designated heritage assets of equivalent importance that contribute to national research objectives
Medium (Regional)	Conservation Areas, Category C Listed Buildings, non-designated assets of regional importance except where their particular characteristics merit a higher level of importance, heritage assets on local lists and non-designated assets that contribute to regional research objectives
Low (Local)	Locally listed heritage assets, except where their particular characteristics merit a higher level of importance, non-designated heritage assets of Local importance, including assets that may already be partially damaged

45. Cultural significance is assessed in relation to the criteria in DPSG Annexes 1-6, which are intended primarily to inform decisions regarding heritage designations but may also be applied more generally in identifying the ‘special characteristics’ of a heritage asset, which contribute to its significance and should be protected, conserved and enhanced according to SPP paragraph 137. Annex 1 is widely applicable in assessing the cultural significance of archaeological sites and monuments, for instance, while the criteria in Annex 2 can be used in defining the architectural or historic interest of buildings, whether listed or not.
46. The special characteristics which contribute to an asset’s cultural significance may include elements of its setting. Setting is defined in ‘Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting’ (HES 2020, Section 1) as ‘*the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced*’. The setting of a heritage asset is defined and analysed according to Stage 2 of the three-stage approach promoted in ‘MCHE: Setting’, with reference to factors listed on pages 9-10. The relevance of these factors to the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset determines how, and to what extent, an asset’s cultural significance derives from its setting. All heritage assets have settings; however, not all assets are equally sensitive to impacts on their settings. In some cases, setting may contribute very little to the asset’s significance, or only certain elements of the setting may be relevant.

11.4.7.2 Assessment of the Magnitude of Impacts on Cultural Significance

47. The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of a heritage asset will potentially change as a result of the proposed Development (SNH & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, Appendix 1, para 42). This definition of magnitude applies to likely impacts on the setting, as well as likely physical impacts on the fabric of an asset. Impacts on the settings of heritage assets are assessed with reference to the factors listed in ‘MCHE: Setting’ Stage 3 (evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes, pages 10-11). It is important to note that the magnitude of an impact resulting from an impact on setting is not a direct measure of the visual prominence, scale, proximity or other attributes of the proposed Development itself, or of the extent to which the setting itself is changed. Moreover, it is necessary to consider whether, and to what extent, the characteristics of the setting which would be changed contribute to the asset’s cultural significance (SNH & HES 2018, Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, Appendix 1, paras 42 and 43).
48. The methodology adopted for the identification and assessment of potential impacts on setting follows the approach set out in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2020) and the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (Ver 5, SNH & HES, 2018, Appendix 1). The guidance sets out three stages in assessing the impact of development on the setting of a heritage asset or place as follows:
- **Stage 1:** Identify the historic assets that might be affected by a development;
 - **Stage 2:** define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated and experienced; and
 - **Stage 3:** evaluate potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative impacts can be mitigated.
49. Magnitude is assessed as High/Medium/Low/Negligible, Adverse or Beneficial, or No Impact, using the criteria in **Table 11.4** as a guide. In assessing the likely effects of a development, it is often necessary to take into account various impacts which affect an asset’s significance in different ways, and balance adverse effects against beneficial effects. For instance, there may be adverse impacts on an asset’s fabric and beneficial impacts on cultural significance resulting from change in setting arising from a development which would not otherwise occur in a ‘do-nothing’ scenario; a heritage asset that might otherwise degrade over time could be preserved or consolidated as a consequence of a development. The residual effect, given in **Section 11.6.4**, is an overall measure of how the asset’s significance is reduced or enhanced.

Table 11.4: Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impacts on Heritage Assets

Magnitude of impact	Criteria
High beneficial	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in considerable enhancement of cultural significance. Or: Preservation of an asset and/or its setting where it would otherwise suffer considerable loss of cultural significance in the do-nothing scenario.
Medium beneficial	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in moderate enhancement of cultural significance. Or: Preservation of an asset and/or its setting where it would otherwise suffer moderate loss of cultural significance in the do-nothing scenario.
Low beneficial	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a slight enhancement of cultural significance. Or: Preservation of an asset and/or its setting where it would otherwise suffer slight loss of cultural significance in the do-nothing scenario.
Negligible beneficial	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a very slight enhancement of cultural significance. Or: Preservation of an asset and/or its setting where it would otherwise suffer very slight loss of cultural significance in the do-nothing scenario.
No Impact	The asset’s cultural significance is not altered.
Negligible adverse	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a very slight loss of cultural significance.
Low adverse	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a slight loss of cultural significance.
Medium Adverse	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a moderate loss of cultural significance.
High Adverse	Alterations to an asset and/or its setting resulting in a considerable loss of cultural significance.

11.4.7.3 Assessment of the Significance of Effects

50. The significance of an effect ('EIA significance') on the cultural significance of a heritage asset, resulting from a direct or indirect physical impact or an impact on its setting is assessed by combining the magnitude of the impact and the importance of the heritage asset. The matrix in **Table 11.5** provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the asset importance or impact magnitude levels are not clear or are borderline between categories. EIA significance may be described on a continuous scale from negligible to major.

Table 11.5: Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects on Heritage Assets

Asset importance	Magnitude of impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Very High	Major	Major	Major or moderate	Negligible
High	Major	Major or moderate	Moderate or minor	Negligible
Medium	Major or moderate	Moderate or minor	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate or minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible

51. It is common practice to identify effects as significant or not significant, and in this sense major and moderate effects are regarded as significant in EIA terms, while minor and negligible effects are 'not significant'.

11.4.7.4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

52. Cumulative effects can occur when other existing or proposed (typically wind energy) developments would also be visible in views that are relevant to the setting of a heritage asset. Cumulative effects are considered in cases where an effect of more than negligible significance would occur as a result of the proposed Development.
53. Proposed wind energy developments are included in the cumulative assessment where they also feature within views of, or towards, assets affected by the proposed Development, as demonstrated by photomontage visualisations. A cumulative effect is considered to occur where the magnitude of the combined effect of two or more developments is greater than that of the developments considered separately.

11.4.7.5 Limitations of Baseline Data

54. Information held by public data sources is generally considered to be reliable; however, the following general points are noted in relation to this assessment:
- no LiDAR data was available for this region of Scotland for interrogation during the assessment;
 - documentary sources are rare before the medieval period (c.AD900);
 - wherever such documentary sources are used in assessing archaeological potential, professional judgment is used in their interpretation in that the functionality of the document is considered;
 - HER records can be limited because opportunities for research, fieldwork and discovery depend on the situation of commercial development and occasional research projects, rather than the result of a more structured research framework. A lack of data within the HER records does not necessarily equal an absence of archaeology;
 - where archaeological sites have been identified solely from aerial imagery, without confirmation from archaeological excavation or supporting evidence in the form of find-spots for example, it is possible the interpretation may be revised in the light of further investigation.
 - the significance of sites can be difficult to identify from HER records, depending on the accuracy and reliability of the original source.
 - there can often be a lack of dating evidence for archaeological sites; and
 - any archaeological site visit has inherent limitations, primarily because archaeological remains below ground level may have no surface indicators.

11.5 Baseline conditions

11.5.1 Geology and Geomorphology

55. The bedrock geology within the ISA mainly comprises metamorphic Beinn Bheula Schist Formation dating to between 541 to 1000 million years ago (BGS 2021). No superficial deposits are recorded for this area. The National Soil Map of Scotland (consulted September 2021) records peaty gleys as being present within the ISA. The presence of watercourses in the vicinity of the ISA as well as free-draining drift geology in some areas may have made the ISA attractive to settlement historically, and the soils are suitable for farming.

11.5.2 Previous Investigations

56. The WoSAS HER records three previous investigations within the ISA: WoSAS Pin 3907, WoSAS Pin 3923 and WoSAS Pin 3931. These were all surveys pre-dating the establishment of commercial forestry at the site in the 1970s and which covered the majority of the Corranbuie forestry area, the area of open moorland and a portion of the northern extent of the Skipness forestry area. A pre-forestry survey of the Skipness River, WoSAS Pin 3887, partially overlapped with the south-western area of the ISA. The results of these surveys were not available for consultation but results of hitherto unknown heritage assets have been transcribed into the WoSAS HER.

11.5.3 Overview of the Historic Environment

11.5.3.1 Inner Study Area (ISA)

57. There are no designated heritage assets within the ISA.

58. There are 50 non-designated heritage assets recorded by WoSAS HER within the ISA. Of the assets recorded on the WoSAS HER a total of 24 are located within the northern extent of the ISA within the Corranbuie forestry area and 26 are located within the southern extent of the ISA within the Skipness forestry area.

59. The 24 potential heritage assets within the Corranbuie forestry area at the north of the ISA are of likely post-medieval date (1500 - 1799): 12 shielings; three sheepfolds; three platforms; two charcoal burning platforms; one croft; two townships; and one enclosure.

60. Of the 27 potential heritage assets within the Skipness forestry area which comprises the southern portion of the ISA nine are of likely prehistoric date: six cup markings and three cup and ring markings. Of these, WoSAS considers five to be of almost certain National Importance. Sixteen of the potential heritage assets are of likely post-medieval date: seven shielings; three platforms; two sheepfolds; one farmstead; a bloomery; one potential heritage asset comprising platforms; a building and a bloomery; and one potential heritage asset comprising shielings, banks, enclosures, a rig, a trackway and cultivation remains.

61. A stone of unknown provenance and date is recorded in the HER as 'an enormous boulder' (Canmore ID 39853) present within a riverbed within the Skipness forestry area of the ISA. There is no further information available and it is very likely this is in fact a natural landscape feature.

11.5.3.2 Outer Study Area (OSA)

62. Within the 2 km OSA from the proposed turbine locations (within the Skipness forestry area of the ISA) there is one Scheduled Monument and 90 non-designated heritage assets recorded by WoSAS HER. Of the non-designated assets, WoSAS considers one to be of probable National Importance and two to be of 'almost certain' National Importance.

63. Within the OSA (2-5 km from the proposed turbine locations) there are three Scheduled Monuments, one Category B Listed Building and 168 non-designated heritage assets. Of the non-designated heritage assets, WoSAS considers 13 to be of 'almost certain' National Importance and three to be of probable National Importance.

64. Within the OSA (5-10 km from the proposed turbine locations) there is one Inventoried Garden and Designed and Landscape, 10 Scheduled Monuments, 13 Category B Listed Buildings and 369 non-designated heritage assets. Of the Non-designated heritage assets, WoSAS considers 16 to be of 'almost certain' National Importance and seven to be of 'probable' National Importance.

65. Within the OSA (10-20 km from the proposed turbine locations) there are 15 Category A Listed Buildings, two Scheduled Monuments and two Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

11.5.4 Archaeological Background

11.5.4.1 Prehistoric and Roman Periods

66. There is evidence of prehistoric activity within the ISA in the form of six cup marked and three cup and ring marked stones which are recorded on WoSAS HER. These are all present within the southern Skipness forestry area of the ISA. No prehistoric activity is recorded in the northern Corranbuie forestry area or in the area of open moorland of the ISA.
67. Within the 2 km OSA there is one Scheduled Monument - a prehistoric defensive enclosure. There is a total of six non-designated heritage assets of likely prehistoric date within the 2 km OSA: four cup-markings, a possible standing stone and a cist.
68. There is no evidence of Roman activity recorded on WoSAS HER within the ISA or within the 2 km OSA.

11.5.4.2 Medieval and Post-Medieval Periods

69. There is no evidence of medieval activity recorded on WoSAS HER within the ISA or within the 2 km OSA.
70. There is a total of 43 potential heritage assets recorded on WoSAS HER within the ISA which are likely to date to the post-medieval period: 24 within the Corranbuie forestry area at the north of the ISA and 19 within the southern Skipness forestry area. These assets largely relate to post-medieval agricultural practice evidenced by the shielings and sheepfolds present within both parts of the ISA and the cultivation remains present within the Skipness forestry area. Evidence of post-medieval settlement is seen by the presence of two townships present in the northern Corranbuie forestry area as well as by a farmstead in the southern Skipness forestry area. As well as agricultural activity there is evidence of industrial processes taking place within the Skipness forestry area of the ISA as seen by the presence of two bloomeries in this area.
71. Within the 2 km OSA there is a total of 85 heritage assets of likely post-medieval date. 62 of the recorded heritage assets relate to post-medieval agriculture and settlement with shielings, sheepfolds, crofts, a township and farmsteads all present, broadly reflecting the pattern of settlement within the ISA. A whisky still is recorded and a corn drying kiln are both recorded on WoSAS HER within the 2 km OSA, showing that, as was the case within the ISA, a variety of activities took place outside of agricultural and pastoral practices in the 2 km OSA. The remaining heritage assets include trackways, buildings, banks, platforms, a cairn, a pier and mounds, further showing the variety of post-medieval remains in the 2 km OSA.

11.5.4.3 Modern Period

72. There are no recorded modern (post-1900) features on WoSAS HER within the ISA or within the 2 km OSA. One cairn (HA1), likely to be a marker cairn, was noted on modern mapping on the peak of Cruach na Machrach in the Skipness forestry area.

11.5.5 Heritage Assets in the ISA

11.5.5.1 Designated Heritage Assets

73. There are no designated heritage assets located wholly or partly within the ISA.

11.5.5.2 Non-designated Heritage Assets

74. There are 50 previously known potential heritage assets recorded on the WoSAS HER within the ISA. 24 of the WoSAS HER records are located in the northern Corranbuie forestry area and 26 are in the southern Skipness forestry area. No additional heritage assets were noted during the walkover survey of the ISA for this assessment. All 50 heritage assets within the ISA are described in detail in **Technical Appendix 11.1** and summarised in **Table 11.6** (for the Corranbuie forestry area of the ISA) and **Table 11.7** (for the Skipness forestry area of the ISA) below.
75. There are nine non-designated potential heritage assets of likely prehistoric date located in the Skipness forestry area at the south of the ISA: six cup marked and three cup and ring marked stones. Five of these assets are considered by WoSAS to be of almost certain National Importance and can therefore be considered as being of High (national) importance. The remaining four assets can be considered as being of Medium (Regional) importance as they have the potential to contribute to the Regional Archaeological Research Framework for Argyll.
76. 16 potential heritage assets within the Skipness forestry area are of likely post-medieval date: seven shielings; three platforms; two sheepfolds; one farmstead; a bloomery; one potential heritage asset comprising platforms; a building and a bloomery; and one potential heritage asset comprising shielings, banks, enclosures, a rig, a trackway and cultivation remains.

77. The 24 potential heritage assets within the Corranbuie forestry area at the north of the ISA are of likely post-medieval date: 12 shielings; three sheepfolds; three platforms; two charcoal burning platforms; one croft; two townships; and one enclosure.
78. The post-medieval remains within the ISA are all non-designated but provide direct evidence of post-medieval settlement, upland pasture, agricultural practices and industrial practices. These remains can therefore be considered as being of Low (local) importance.
79. The undated stone, simply recorded as ‘an enormous boulder’ (Canmore ID 39853), present in a riverbed the Skipness forestry area at the south of the ISA is unlikely to be a heritage asset and is considered as being of uncertain importance.

Table 11.6: Known Heritage Assets Within the Corranbuie Forestry Area of the ISA

HER Ref	Name	Description	Period	Importance
58837	Creag na Cairte	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58836	Allt Beithe	Charcoal Burning Platform	Post-medieval	Low
58835	Mealldaroch	Charcoal Burning Platform	Post-medieval	Low
58826	Mealldarroch	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58825	Mealldarroch	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58291	Tarbert	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58290	Allt Beith	Sheepfold	Post-medieval	Low
58289	Tarbert	Sheepfold	Post-medieval	Low
59285	Corranbuie	Sheepfold	Post-medieval	Low
58838	Cnoc na Chroicinn	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
19223	Allt Beithe	Platforms	Post-medieval	Low
19221	Allt Beithe	Platforms	Post-medieval	Low
19214	Cnoc a' Chroicinn	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
19213	Creag na Cairte	Shieling-hut	Post-medieval	Low
19212	Creag na Cairte	Shieling-huts; Platforms	Post-medieval	Low
19211	Cnog Glas	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
19210	Cnoc Glas	Shieling-hut	Post-medieval	Low
58287	Tarbert	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58282	Cnoc A Bhadain	Enclosure	Post-medieval	Low
58281	Cnoc A Bhadain	Croft	Post-medieval	Low
3914	Creag na Cairte	Shieling-huts; Platforms	Post-medieval	Low
3913	Creag na Cairte / Skipness	Platform	Post-medieval	Low
3912	Allt Beithe / Tarbert	Township	Post-medieval	Low
3912	Allt Beithe / Tarbert	Township	Post-medieval	Low

Table 11.7: Known Heritage Assets Within the Skipness Forestry Area of the ISA

HER Ref	Name	Description	Period	Importance
58758	Skipness River	Cup and Ring Marking	Prehistoric	Medium
58755	Glenskible	Cup and Ring Marking	Prehistoric	Medium
58751	Alt Airigh Fhuair	Cup and Ring Marking	Prehistoric	Medium
3930	Gleann Baile na h-Uamha	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	Medium
3929	Glenskible	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	High

HER Ref	Name	Description	Period	Importance
4439	Altagalvash	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	High
4439	Altagalvash	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	High
4436	Altagalvash	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	High
4436	Altagalvash	Cup-markings	Prehistoric	High
58854	Cnoc Ceann Tamhuis	Bloomery	Post-medieval	Low
44882	Altagalvash / Croit	Farmstead	Post-medieval	Low
4446	Camas na Ceardaich	Platform	Post-medieval	Low
4438	Camas na Ceardaich	Platform	Post-medieval	Low
4437	Camas na Ceardaich	Platform	Post-medieval	Low
4445	Camas na Ceardaich	Platforms; Building; Bloomery	Post-medieval	Low
59303	Skipness River	Sheepfold	Post-medieval	Low
59104	Gleann Bhaile na h-Uamha	Sheepfold	Post-medieval	Low
58849	Eas a' Chromain	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
58757	Skipness River	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
59240	Strath nan Coileach	Shieling	Post-medieval	Low
14906	Meall Down	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
14905	Eas a' Chromain	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
14896	Strath nan Coileach	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
14877	Glenskible	Shieling-huts	Post-medieval	Low
14897	Strath nan Coileach	Shieling-huts; Banks; Enclosures; Rig; Trackway; Cultivation Remains	Post-medieval	Low
58848	Allt na Gamhna	Stone	Undated	Uncertain

11.5.6 Potential for Undiscovered Heritage Assets within the ISA

80. With the exception of the area of moorland between the two forestry areas, the ISA is almost exclusively characterised by deep ploughed forestry, meaning any archaeological remains either below or above ground are unlikely to have survived.

81. The following heritage asset locations were visited during the walkover survey carried out on 1st of September 2021:

- WoSAS 59303, a non-designated sheepfold of Low importance located 5 m from a proposed access trackway;
- WoSAS 4436, a non-designated cup marked stone of High importance located within an area of proposed peat restoration; and
- WoSAS 58757, a non-designated cup and ring marking of High importance located within an area of proposed peat restoration.

82. Following a thorough search of the wider area surrounding the heritage assets above, none were noted during the walkover survey. The assets are all located within areas of deeply ploughed, felled forestry and are unlikely to have survived as extant or below ground features.

11.5.6.1 Corranbuie Forestry Area

83. The Corranbuie forestry area of the ISA is dominated by hills, the highest of which is Cruach an t-Sorchain which lies at 343 m AOD at the south of the area. Undulating topography characterises the areas in between the hills with low lying areas of just 10 m AOD present at the north east along the shore of Loch Fyne. The archaeology within this part of the ISA as recorded on WoSAS HER relates to the post-medieval period. Of the 24 known assets present, 20 are located at the north east lying at or below 200 m AOD and generally situated on the gentler gradients close to Loch Fyne, highlighting the suitability of this area for settlement and pastoral exploitation. The remaining four assets are a sheepfold, a shieling, a croft and an enclosure, all of which sit between 240 m and 250 m AOD and are typical of post-medieval livestock management structures found in upland landscapes. The structures and platforms which comprise the heritage assets in the Corranbuie forestry area of the ISA demonstrate upland grazing and livestock management practices in the post-medieval period.

84. The undulating landscape and occasional steep slopes which characterise the central and western extent of the Corranbuie forestry area of the ISA is likely to have made it unsuitable for settlement. The majority of the Corranbuie forestry area can therefore be considered to be of Negligible archaeological potential, whilst the area at the north east roughly between the hill of Cnoc Glas and Cnoc a Mhor-fìhr can be considered as being of Low archaeological potential for further evidence of post-medieval pastoral activity. Any such remains are commonly found in landscapes such as this and can be considered as being of Low importance.
85. The western reaches of the area of open moorland between Corranbuie and Skipness is characterised by terrain which gently slopes to the east from 330 m AOD culminating in the highest peak in the area, Cruach Doire Leithe, which sits at 377 m AOD. At the east, there are steeper inclines going west from 310 m AOD to the peak of Cruach Doire Leithe. Despite the gentler western slopes of this area and the presence of fresh water lochans in the area, no known heritage assets are recorded in this area. It is likely the upland nature of the area made it less attractive for settlement when compared to the lower lying north-eastern area of the Corranbuie forestry area and the south-eastern extents of the Skipness forestry area, both of which had easy access to Loch Fyne. The area can therefore be considered as being of Negligible archaeological potential.

11.5.6.2 Skipness Forestry Area

86. The Skipness forestry area of the ISA is similar in character to Corranbuie, with hills dominating the area, the highest of which is Cruach na Machrach which sits at 346 m AOD. Undulating topography characterises the areas in between the hills with low lying areas present at the south east of this part of the ISA at the shoreline of Loch Fyne.
87. The archaeology of this part of the ISA as recorded on WoSAS HER shows human activity in the area dating to the prehistoric period. The prehistoric assets lie at varying heights AOD, from between 130 m AOD and 150 m AOD at the south-west, 170 m AOD at the east and 230 m AOD in roughly the centre of the Study Area. The variation in height perhaps reflects the less than prosaic nature of cup marked and cup and ring marked stones, with areas of suitable stone likely to have been sought out across the landscape.
88. The post-medieval assets within the Skipness forestry area relate to upland pasture, agricultural and industrial practices. Like the assets in the Corranbuie forestry area, the assets are mostly situated below 200 m AOD. However, the pattern of settlement differs from the Corranbuie forestry area in that the assets are more evenly distributed across the landscape instead of being focussed in the area of Loch Fyne. Six of the assets are located at the east, between 60 m and 190 m AOD. Of these, there are three platforms situated in steep inclines, suggesting the hillside was dug into in order to provide a flat area for use. A farmstead and a bloomery are also situated on steep inclines whilst another platform dug into the hillside close to the three platforms had a building and bloomery built on it.
89. In the central eastern area, a sheepfold is present at 230 m AOD, whilst the central western area has six shielings and a sheepfold lie at between 120 m and 190 m AOD. At the south-west a shieling is present at 150 m AOD and a larger settlement comprising shielings, banks, enclosures, a rig, trackways and cultivation remains is present at 100 m AOD. The upland assets are typical of pastoral practices of the post-medieval period, with sheepfolds and shielings commonly found in such areas. The more established settlement at the south-west unsurprisingly sits at a lower level of 100 m AOD. This area of the Skipness forestry area benefits from the Skipness River skirting its south western extents, making it more suitable for settlement when compared to the smaller burns which characterise the central and western areas of the Corranbuie forestry area. This idea is supported by the fact that the majority of heritage assets present within the 2 km OSA are also focussed on the environs of the Skipness River.
90. The Skipness forestry area can be considered to be of Low archaeological potential for remains of all periods. Post-medieval settlement appears to be focussed in areas where there is access to a water source, with the assets at the east close to Loch Fyne and the assets at the west largely focussed along the Skipness River. Whilst the prehistoric remains are less predictably distributed, they appear to be broadly focussed in the central part of this area of the ISA.

11.5.6.3 Importance of Potential Archaeological Remains

91. In both the Corranbuie and Skipness forestry areas, any previously unrecorded prehistoric remains, if present, are likely to have been truncated by forestry activities although could potentially have survived as below ground features. Given the upland nature of the majority of the landscape, the potential for settlement dating to this period is considered to be Low. Upstanding earthwork prehistoric remains could be presumed to be of High importance if they survive in good condition, damaged prehistoric earthworks or below ground remains are more likely to be of, at most, Medium importance.

92. Any previously unrecorded remains of medieval or earlier date, if present within either area of the ISA, would be presumed to be of at least Medium importance for their evidential value as the physical evidence of previously unknown activity would contribute to the Regional Archaeological Research Framework for Argyll.
93. In both areas of the ISA, there is a Low potential for previously unrecorded remains associated with post-medieval upland grazing and settlement to exist along water courses. There is also a Low potential for previously unrecorded assets relating to livestock management to exist within the upland forested areas in both parts of the ISA.
94. Below ground and earthwork remains of post-medieval date (most likely field boundaries, abandoned shielings or farmsteads) would be presumed to be of only Low importance for their evidential value which contributes to a sense of place.

11.5.7 Heritage Assets in the OSA

95. There are no Inventory Battlefields, Conservation Areas or World Heritage Sites within the OSA.

11.5.7.1 Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes

96. There are three Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDL) within the 20km OSA, one of which, Stonefield Castle Hotel (GDL00350) lies within 10 km of the ISA. GDLs derive cultural significance through designed views and vistas, inter-relationships between heritage assets therein, as well as potentially long-range views towards historic or natural features located outwith the defined landscape boundary. In accordance with the criteria in **Table 11.3**, GDLs are of high importance.
97. The two GDL located beyond the 10 km OSA lie outwith the ZTV for the proposed Development and are excluded from detailed assessment. In the case of Stonefield Castle Hotel (GDL00350), appraisal (presented in full in **Technical Appendix 11.1**), has identified a single viewpoint on the isthmus with Barmore Island as the only location from which a view of the proposed Development would be afforded. This view is not considered fundamental to the cultural significance of Stonefield Castle and it is also therefore excluded from detailed assessment.

11.5.7.2 Scheduled Monuments

98. There are four Scheduled Monuments (SMs) within 5 km of the ISA comprising a prehistoric enclosure, two prehistoric chambered cairns and a medieval castle/chapel. There are a further 12 SMs within the 5 – 20 km OSA comprising four prehistoric duns, a prehistoric fort, a prehistoric cairn, a prehistoric standing stone, a medieval chapel, two medieval castles, a medieval burgh and a post-medieval settlement. In accordance with the criteria in **Table 11.3**, SMs are of high importance.
99. All of these sites derive cultural significance from their intrinsic value as they contain buried archaeological remains that would provide information about the date of construction and the uses of the monument in each case. The settlement sites have further evidential value as they provide physical evidence of the former settlement patterns in this area. The religious, ritual and funerary sites have associative value for their connection with past peoples.
100. In terms of contextual value, prehistoric funerary monuments and forts, and Medieval castles were likely intentionally placed in the landscape to be prominently visible in their immediate vicinity. Long range views are likely to contribute to the significance of the defensive sites, and possibly to some of the religious, ritual and funerary sites as well as to the settlement sites (in particular intervisibility with contemporary sites of the previous two categories).
101. Following appraisal (presented in full in **Technical Appendix 11.1**), six SMs are considered for potential effects resulting from change in their setting:
- Cnoc na Sgratha (SM3281), a cairn located 1.5 km south-west of the ISA southernmost point, the SM comprises a cairn measuring 7.5 m in diameter by 1 m in height with the remains of a cist approximately in its centre.
 - Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225) a medieval chapel and castle located 1.5 km south east of the southernmost point of the ISA.
 - Glenreasdell Mains (SM3281), a chambered cairn located 3.3 km west of the of the southernmost point of the ISA.
 - Caisteal Aoidhe (SM3523) a prehistoric domestic and defensive fort located 4 km north east of the northernmost point of the ISA, beyond the Sound of Bute/Loch Fyne.
 - Lochranza Castle (SM90206), a medieval castle located on the Isle of Arran approximately 8.8 km south east of the southernmost point of the ISA.
 - Dun Skeig (SM2491) a prehistoric dun comprising a hill fort and promontory fort located 12.2 km south west of the ISA.

11.5.7.3 Listed Buildings

102. There are 15 Cat A LBs within the 20 km OSA, none of which lie within 10 km of the ISA. 14 Cat A LBs lie outwith the ZTV for the proposed Development and have been excluded from detailed assessment. No effect upon the cultural significance of Cour House Saddell (LB18360) is predicted as this is derived from its intrinsic value and contribution made by setting comprises its immediate vicinity only. The LB has been excluded from detailed assessment.
103. There is one Cat B LB within the 5 km OSA: Skipness Parish Church (LB18406), which is excluded from detailed assessment as it lies outwith the ZTV. Of the Cat B LBs within the 10 km OSA, three were identified as having a wider landscape setting that contributes to their significance. Of these, Castle Ascog (LB12082) has been excluded from detailed assessment as whilst the visibility of the proposed turbines from the LB may be possible over a long distance, these views do not contribute to its cultural significance. Tarbert Church of Scotland (LB12029) and Stonefield Castle Hotel (LB18262), have been excluded from detailed assessment as they lie outwith the ZTV. The remaining 10 Cat B LBs within the 10 km OSA are not considered to have a wider landscape setting which contributes to their cultural significance.
104. Following appraisal (presented in full in **Technical Appendix 11.1**), no Listed Buildings have been identified as requiring detailed assessment.

11.5.7.4 Non-designated Heritage Assets

105. There are 50 Non-designated WoSAS HER records within the ISA. 24 of the WoSAS HER records are located in the northern Corranbuie forestry area and 26 are in the southern Skipness forestry area.
106. WoSAS maintains a Non-Statutory Register (NSR) of heritage assets of regional or National Importance, which are possible candidates for scheduling. Two categories of such assets are defined by WoSAS: 'C' denotes assets 'almost certainly of National Importance' and 'V' denotes assets 'probably of National Importance'. Both categories are considered to be of High importance for this assessment.
- within the OSA (2 km from the proposed turbines) there are 90 non-designated HER heritage assets of which WoSAS considers one to be of probable National Importance and two to be of almost certain National Importance.
 - within the OSA (2 - 5 km from the proposed turbines) there are 168 non-designated heritage assets of which WoSAS considers 13 to be of almost certain National Importance and three to be of probable National Importance.
 - within the OSA (5 - 10 km from the proposed turbines) there are 369 non-designated heritage assets of which WoSAS considers 16 to be of almost certain National Importance and seven to be of probable National Importance.
107. Following appraisal (presented in full in **Technical Appendix 11.1**), two non-designated heritage assets are considered for potential effects resulting from change in their setting:
- Saint Brendan's Church of Scotland (WoSAS Pin 4375), a post-medieval church located 1.1 km south of the ISA.
 - Skipness House (WoSAS Pin 4374), a country house located 1.3 km south east of the ISA.
108. Neither of these heritage assets are considered of either certain or probable National Importance on WoSAS NSR.

11.6 Identification and Evaluation of Effects

11.6.1 Construction Impacts

109. Potential construction effects could result from topsoil stripping and excavation associated with wind turbines, ground-mounted solar arrays, access tracks, site compounds, substations, cable trenches and other infrastructure within the area where most development is proposed (Corranbuie forestry area), or the groundworks for the proposed access track (Skipness forestry area). There is also a potential risk of accidental damage to heritage assets outside the construction footprint from uncontrolled plant movement.
110. The assessment of potential setting effects upon heritage assets in the OSA as a result of the construction stage of the proposed Development, through the introduction of cranes etc to the landscape, is the same as those assessed under 'operational effects', although construction effects would be temporary in nature.

11.6.1.1 Predicted Construction Effects

111. The assessment has identified that no direct construction effects are anticipated upon any known cultural heritage assets within the ISA, from the proposed Development.
112. Three heritage assets recorded in the ISA were identified as being in close enough proximity to the proposed Development infrastructure that accidental damage is considered possible in principle:
- WoSAS 59303, a non-designated sheepfold of Low importance is located 5m from a proposed access trackway;
 - WoSAS 4436, a non-designated cup marked stone is located within an area of proposed peat restoration; and
 - WoSAS 58758, a non-designated cup and ring marking is located within an area of proposed peat restoration.
113. The walkover survey confirmed that none of these features have survived, likely as a result of deep ploughing activities associated with the plantation of the forestry. No direct impacts, direct or accidental, as a result of the proposed Development are therefore predicted.
114. Across the ISA as a whole there is a considered Negligible - Low archaeological potential for hitherto unknown remains. Direct construction impacts on previously unknown heritage assets in the site boundary are therefore possible, only at depth, beneath the impact level of previous extensive deep ploughing by forestry activities. Effect significance cannot be meaningfully assessed for unknown heritage assets, as neither the cultural significance of the asset nor the magnitude of the effect can be known. Consequently, only the likelihood of construction effects is considered. Based on the assessment of known heritage assets in the vicinity, any effect resulting from an impact upon archaeological remains discovered during the construction-phase is unlikely to be of greater than Minor Adverse Significance.
115. There are no heritage assets in the ISA or OSA that are likely to be temporarily impacted by dust and noise as a result of construction of the proposed Development due to intervening distance, and through measures that will be introduced in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (see **Technical Appendix 3.1 of Chapter 3**). The proposed ground mounted solar arrays at the south east of the Skipness forestry area is located within an area where six cup marked stones are recorded as being present. None of these features were visible at the time of the walkover survey and they have likely been removed following the deep ploughing of the area for forestry. As these heritage assets can no longer be appreciated in the landscape it is unclear how setting would once have contributed to their significance, and it is therefore considered the proposed Development cannot impact upon any contribution made by setting to the records of these heritage assets.
116. The assessment of potential setting impacts upon heritage assets in the OSA as a result of the construction stage of the proposed Development, through the introduction of cranes etc into the landscape, is the same as those assessed under 'operational impacts', although construction impacts would be temporary in nature.

11.6.2 Operational Effects

117. Effects on heritage assets are defined as impacts to cultural significance resulting from change in setting that would typically result from changes to views from, across or towards heritage assets (i.e. visual effects) or from any perceived sensory change (such as noise, or dust during construction).
118. Stages of assessment for potential operational effects are presented as follows:
- description of the (group of) asset(s) and relevant historical background;
 - analysis of cultural significance;
 - contribution of setting to significance (including, as appropriate: views towards the monument, approaches, views within/through the designated area, and views from the monument);
 - relationship with the proposed Development (site); and
 - anticipated impact on cultural significance.

11.6.2.1 Scheduled Monuments

11.6.2.1.1 Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225)

Description of the Group of Assets and Relevant Historical Background

119. Skipness Castle is a major medieval fortress with views over the Kilbrannan Sound to Arran. It is one of many medieval castles in Argyll and is comparable with broadly contemporary sites such as Castle Sween, Dunstaffnage Castle and Rothesay Castle. It is comprised of a high curtain wall that encloses two earlier structures: the hall-house, adjacent to the north curtain wall, and chapel, adjacent to the south curtain wall. Three rectangular towers are located at the west curtain wall, the north east corner and the south east corner. The east range was partially demolished and reconstructed as a three-storey tower house with parapet walk in the north east corner. Entrance is gained through the gatehouse in the west section of the south curtain wall. Much has been altered and demolished, leaving the curtain walls, towers, hall-house and tower house.
120. The first castle was built by the MacSweens around 1247. By the mid thirteenth century the MacSweens had control of huge swathes of territory which stretched from Loch Awe in the north to Loch Fyne in the south. Norway's control over Argyll was lost with the defeat of Haakon IV at the Battle of Largs (1263) and his successor, King Magnus, was compelled to agree to the Treaty of Perth (1266) in which the domain was ceded to Scotland. Thereafter the MacSweens, who had supported the defeated Hakon, were driven out of Kintyre. By the 1290s Skipness was owned by Clan MacDonald. It was held by the MacDonald Lords of the Isles until 1495 when James IV placed it in keeping of his Comptroller, Sir Duncan Forestane from whom it passed in 1502 to Earl of Argyll. Subsequently it was the seat of Campbell, Captains of Skipness until c.1750 when it was replaced by a mansion nearby and converted into a steading. Skipness estate was acquired from the Campbells in 1845 by William Fraser.
121. Virtually all of the walling masonry throughout all stages of construction is random rubble, which consists almost entirely of variably foliated greenish-grey metasedimentary rock (BGS, 2015). The same metasedimentary rock has been used in all stages of construction, indicating the stone was being sourced locally for building throughout the early 13th century until the late 16th century. Relatively large, tabular blocks of the local bedrock have been used to form lintels for doors and windows, and smaller blocks have been used to form archways. This stone is the same as the stone forming most of the walling. Most of the decorative stone in Skipness Castle is medium-grained pink sandstone. The closest outcrop of Permian sandstone to Skipness castle is at the Cock of Arran. A small proportion of the sandstone blocks in Skipness Castle are white sandstone. The white sandstone in Skipness Castle is likely to have been sourced from Permian or Triassic strata on Arran, possibly near to the site where the pink sandstone was extracted.
122. The site was first occupied in the first half of the 13th century, when a basic two storey hall-house and chapel were constructed, enclosed by an earth and timber rampart. About the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries the castle was enlarged and strengthened by the erection of a high rubble curtain wall with parapet walk, within which the hall-house and chapel were incorporated. Within the courtyard, ranges of buildings stood against the south wall, and the north section of the east wall. Entrances leading into the courtyard are located in the north and south walls. The main entrance was from the sea, which was defended by a gatetower with a portcullis.
123. The original chapel of St Columba within the castle was secularised and it was replaced by Kilbrannan Chapel, 330 m south-east, around the same time as the castle was reconstructed, in the late 13th or early 14th century. The dedication is to St Brendan. It consists of a single rectangular chamber, measuring 25 m x 8 m by 8.2 m over walls varying from 1.14 m to 1.37

m thick, of coursed rubble masonry with red Arran sandstone dressings at the doors, windows, quoins and skews. It is lit by narrow splayed lancet windows in the nave and chancel and a larger, Y-traceried window at the east end. It was entered through two doors in the south wall (one now blocked) and one in the north wall. Within the chapel and surrounding graveyard is a significant group of five, late medieval, recumbent tombstones. Kilbrannan Chapel, dedicated to St Brendan, is clearly of medieval date, but the name 'Kilbrannan' and the presence of early burials suggest there is a longer tradition of worship and burial at this site; there may have been an earlier chapel here. The building appears to have remained in use until at least 1692 and was probably abandoned for worship some time in the 18th century, perhaps as a consequence of the erection of a church at Claonaig. In the modern period however, the chapel came back into use as the local church. The use of the graveyard for burials has given it strong associations with the local community; it is still in use as a burial ground today.

124. Towards the beginning of the 16th century, the northernmost part of the east range of the castle's courtyard buildings was heightened by three upper storeys, and the upper portion of the adjacent section of the east curtain wall was rebuilt and provided with an embattled parapet walk. Re-using the two-storey hall-house that dated from the early MacDonald era, they built the Tower House that still dominates the site. The transformation to a tower house was completed later in the 16th century by the reconstruction of the upper portion of the tower, and the removal of the remainder of the east courtyard range to leave the tower free-standing on its south side. The tower house with cap houses and a corbelled parapet is oblong with an angle tower, comprising three storeys, a basement (vaulted in 16th century) and an attic. Slit windows (some enlarged in 16th century) are present in the elevations. The tower house encloses a single chamber in each floor.
125. The castle was abandoned about the end of the 17th century. Late in the following century it was converted into a farm steading by the removal of the early courtyard buildings, except the tower house, and the erection of lean-to sheds and offices against both sides of the curtain wall. These farm buildings were removed in 1898, and steps taken to preserve all that remained of the castle. The castle and chapel survive to almost full height. In the 1970s, the roof of the tower and the cap house were re-slatted, with work to consolidate the rest of the monument commencing at this time and continuing until 1995.
126. As a scheduled monument, the castle and chapel are of High (National) importance.

Analysis of Cultural Significance

127. The medieval castle and associated chapel survive in excellent condition. Skipness Castle is the product of a long and complex development sequence and it has excellent potential to add to understanding of major changes in architectural form in Scottish castles between the 13th and 16th centuries. It is highly likely that archaeological deposits associated with the monument's earlier phases, construction, use and abandonment survive within and around the upstanding remains.
128. Skipness Castle was the administrative centre of a considerable barony, one of the great medieval lordships of Kintyre. The asset has potential to inform our understanding of the nature of lordship and wider medieval society. The asset also has potential to enhance our understanding of medieval castles and the daily lives of the people who occupied them, as well as medieval warfare and specific historical events.
129. Kilbrannan chapel is particularly well preserved. It survives to wall-head height throughout and much of the architectural dressed stonework of the doors and windows is still in place. It has seen little change or disturbance and retains much of its original form. The surrounding graveyard has excellent potential for the survival of important archaeological remains of medieval and post-Reformation date and, possibly, the remains of an earlier church. Such evidence has the potential to enhance understanding of burial practices over a long period and scientific analysis of the skeletal remains could reveal evidence for health, diet, illness, cause of death and, possibly, the occupational activities of people directly associated with the castle.

Contribution of Setting to Significance

130. Skipness Castle sits on an artificially extended natural gravel terrace - one of a series of raised beach deposits. The castle is situated on gently sloping ground around 10 m above sea level, overlooking Kilbrannan Sound, the entrance to Loch Fyne, and the Isle of Arran.
131. Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel do not feature prominently in long range views from the sea when approached via ferry from Lochranza, Isle of Arran, becoming most apparent at a range of approximately 3.5 km to their south west on the approach to Claonaig. From this range the setting of the two structures within an area of agricultural land dominated by the peaks of Cnoc nan Gabhar, Cnoc na Meine and Cnoc na Sgratha to the north is well highlighted, with these hills forming the primary visual focus when viewing this area from the sea.

-
132. On the western approach from Claonaig along the B8001, Skipness Castle is largely screened from view by woodland and the local topography, only coming into view upon arrival to the modern car park in its immediate environs. Kilbrannan Chapel is more readily visible, coming into view from a range of approximately 2.5 km when approached from the west; the chapel may have been placed in this location in order for it to be the first structure seen when approaching from this direction, highlighting its importance to the local area.
133. When experiencing Skipness Castle in its immediate environs, its commanding position is emphasised. Situated on open ground, it takes advantage of a natural gravel terrace, which was artificially enhanced and extended. From the exterior of the castle at the south and east, there are wide views to the south, south-west and east out to sea, a reminder of the castle's strategic location and the importance of control of the sea during the medieval period. Its location provided beaches where the warships of the MacSweens, the builders of the original hall-house, could be launched and monitored from a vantage point. From inside the castle superstructure, the imposing nature of the architecture becomes apparent, with views out to Kilbrannan Sound possible through its southern entrance, further emphasising the castle's relationship with the sea.
134. Upon leaving the castle from its southern entrance, the local context in which it functions is clearly emphasised. Clear views of Kilbrannan Chapel located to the south-east are afforded from both the south and east of the castle, with these views emphasising the key relationship between the two structures as centres of secular power and religious life, physically separate but intrinsically connected (albeit not originally, as the first chapel was initially located within the castle walls). The local setting of the castle and chapel within a strip of agricultural land, first experienced when viewed from the ferry crossing from Lochranza, is brought into focus by the south-easterly views from the exterior of Skipness Castle. The agricultural land, currently used for pasture, is bound by forestry to the north and west and by set-aside, rough ground to the east, creating a partial sense of enclosure which serves to heighten the importance of this local setting. The relationship between the two structures within this landscape contributes to how both are understood and appreciated as a group. The agricultural setting demonstrates that the castle was the administrative centre of a productive estate rather than as a fortress during this time. This local agricultural landscape is also likely to reflect, largely unchanged, that which would have existed during the medieval period, further highlighting the importance of this setting, and the contribution it makes to the significance of the castle and chapel.
135. From the south-east of Skipness Castle, a track leading to Kilbrannan Chapel is followed; the open views of the sea along this route further emphasise its important relationship with the castle whilst the views and experience of the local agricultural land help form an impression of how the inhabitants of the area would have engaged with the productive landscape and also experienced the approach to the chapel from the castle or from the nearby village of Skipness. On approach to the west, the ruined chapel is silhouetted above the skyline.
136. Kilbrannan Chapel is considerably larger than other examples of medieval chapels in Kintyre and its position, separate but clearly associated with the castle, adds to its interest and significance. The chapel is situated in an agricultural field approximately 300 m south-east of Skipness Castle. From the chapel, there are aesthetic open views to the south across Kilbrannan Sound towards the Isle of Arran, from where the sandstone used for the chapel's door dressings, windows, quoins and skews was sourced. Views towards the village of Skipness, approximately 800 m to the west are possible from the south of the chapel, whilst views north-west are dominated by Skipness Castle. To the north, views are largely of local agricultural land, with views to the east obscured by an area overgrown by gorse and bushes. The immediate environs of the chapel contribute to how it is understood and appreciated as a place of medieval and later worship as well as an important place for burying the deceased, an activity which continues into the present day. The architectural style of the chapel itself along with its construction material can be readily appreciated whilst inside and immediately outside the chapel, whilst experiencing the graveyard allows for an appreciation of the development of gravestone and memorial styles from the medieval to modern period. The immediate environs of the chapel and graveyard therefore allow the visitor to understand and appreciate its long history as an important religious centre and place used for interring the dead.
137. Short range views from the chapel are also instructive in how it functions in the local landscape. From the southern gate of the chapel, views back towards Skipness Castle as well as along the shore towards the village of Skipness, approximately 800 m to the west are possible. Whilst further emphasising the relationship between the chapel and the castle and the dynamic between secular and religious power, the ability to see Skipness village to the west from the chapel highlights the relationship the two structures would have had with the local settlement. These views therefore enhance the visitor's ability to understand and appreciate the chapel and castle as places that would have been important to local settlements and highlights the link between them.
-

138. Views and experience of the sea from the chapel also make an aesthetic and aural contribution to its setting, allowing the visitor to form an impression of how the chapel would have been experienced in the medieval and later periods.
139. Views of Skipness Castle dominate when walking back towards it from Kilbrannan Chapel along the track running parallel to the shoreline, with the castle appearing as the dominant feature, backdropped by forestry and hills to the north. As the track turns north-east leading up to the castle, its imposing nature becomes more apparent as the visitor comes into closer proximity to it. In closer views, the castle is silhouetted above the skyline.

Relationship with the proposed Development

140. The proposed Development would be located to the north of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel, with the nearest turbine located approximately 2.5 km north of Skipness Castle and 2.9 km north west of Kilbrannan Chapel. The assessment considers views of and from the castle and chapel in their local context as well as views to them from Kilbrannan Sound and on the western approach along the B8001 from Claonaig. The assessment has identified that the proposed Development would be visible from Kilbrannan Sound on the Lochranza to Claonaig ferry, from the path leading towards Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel and from Kilbrannan Chapel itself. Two viewpoints from Kilbrannan Chapel and the path leading towards Skipness Castle have been illustrated with photomontages (**Figures 11.3** and **11.4** respectively) and a viewpoint from Kilbrannan Sound illustrated with a wireline visualisation (**Figure 11.5**).
141. The wireline visualisation from Kilbrannan Sound, approximately 4.8km south-west of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (CHVP 20, **Figure 11.5**) demonstrates that all 13 of the proposed turbines would be fully visible from this point.
142. A photomontage from just south of the southern gate of Kilbrannan Chapel (CHVP 15, **Figure 11.3**) demonstrates that the tips of Turbines 3, 5, 13 and 14 would be visible to varying degrees from this location. The tips of Turbines 13 and 14 would be screened somewhat from view by forestry with trees to the north of the chapel partially screening Turbine 3.
143. A photomontage from the path leading towards Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel (CHVP16, **Figure 11.4**) is similar to **Figure 11.3** with the hubs of Turbines 10 and 5 visible and the tips of Turbines 3, 13 and 14 visible to varying degrees from this location and along the north-west running section of the track from Kilbrannan Chapel. The tips of Turbine 3 would be slightly more visible from this location compared to the location of **Figure 11.3**. The turbines would become less visible on the approach to the castle along the north-east running section of the track due to screening by the existing mature woodland behind the castle. Upon arrival at the castle and in its immediate environs, the turbines would be screened by woodland and by the structure itself.

Anticipated Impact on Cultural Significance

144. The three visualisations described above demonstrate that the proposed turbines would cause a visual change within the setting of Kilbrannan Chapel and Skipness castle when viewed from both long and short range. From CHVP 20 (**Figure 11.5**) the castle and chapel do not feature prominently in the landscape when viewed from Kilbrannan Sound; from this range, the structures are dominated by the peaks of Cnoc nan Gabhar, Cnoc na Meine and Cnoc na Sgratha to the north and are not readily discernible in the landscape. The agricultural land in which the castle and chapel are situated is more readily visible and the local landscape in which the structures function is evident and understood. Whilst the proposed turbines would introduce a visual change to views towards the castle and chapel from Kilbrannan Sound, it is considered that long range views towards the structures from here do not make an important contribution to their cultural significance, with the structures dominated by the natural landscape to the north.
145. The proposed Development would not impact upon views of Skipness Castle or Kilbrannan Chapel on the western approach from Claonaig on the B8001. Skipness Castle is screened from view along this road, only becoming apparent upon arriving. Kilbrannan Chapel is more visible, coming into view from a range of approximately 2.5 km. However, any views of the proposed turbines are likely to be at most peripheral in nature and would not distract from the appreciation of Kilbrannan Chapel afforded from this approach.
146. The visual change caused by the proposed wind turbines would introduce an element of distraction when viewing Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel as shown in CHVP 15 (**Figure 11.3**). The visual relationship between the two structures is important to understanding and appreciating them as centres of secular and religious power. However, the turbine tips, would be relatively peripheral if viewing Skipness Castle from when viewed from the southern gate of Kilbrannan Chapel. Turbines 14 and 13, which would appear above Skipness Castle if viewed from this location, would be largely, although not completely, screened from view by forestry, mitigating the level of visual distraction of the relationship between the two structures. Views

of the village of Skipness to the west would be fully retained, allowing for a continued appreciation of the relationship between the chapel, castle and local settlement.

147. Some views of Kilbrannan Chapel itself from CHVP 15 (**Figure 11.3**) would experience change and a level of visual distraction as a result of the tips of the proposed turbines appearing directly over the structure, against the skyline. However, long range views to the north from the chapel do not contribute substantially to its significance, with the experience of the chapel's immediate environs more informative in appreciating it as a place of medieval worship and a place to bury the dead. Approaching the southern gate of the chapel from CHVP 15 (**Figure 11.3**) would also result in the turbines being at least partially screened from view by the chapel itself. The experience of being within the chapel and its graveyard would not be significantly altered as a result of the proposed turbines, allowing for a continued understanding and appreciation of the chapel. The important visual and aural experience of the immediately adjacent sea, to the south of the chapel, would remain unchanged.
148. Views of Skipness Castle from the natural gravel terrace, as illustrated by CHVP 16 (**Figure 11.4**), would also experience a low level of change and visual distraction. From this location on the track leading back to the castle from Kilbrannan Chapel, the tips of Turbines 5 and 3 would be the most obvious visual distraction, with the tips of Turbines 14 and 13 relatively well screened by forestry. From this location, and along all of the north west running section of track leading from Kilbrannan Chapel, the castle is the dominant feature, appearing as the primary visual focus in the landscape, silhouetted against the sky from some positions. From the south of the castle, Turbine 5 would appear over the castle itself, introducing a degree of visual distraction to views of the castle from the north west running track but not fundamentally challenging the castle as the dominant feature in the landscape. The level of visual distraction resulting from the tips of Turbine 5 is likely to lessen as the visitor comes into closer proximity to the castle, either from the north east running section of track leading to it or from the agricultural land to the south east of the castle; the dominance of the castle and imposing nature of the architecture becomes more readily appreciable when approached from these areas with screening from the woodland behind the castle likely to mitigate the visual change and distraction caused by the turbines.
149. The setting of Skipness Chapel and Kilbrannan Chapel is multi-faceted, with the visual relationship between the castle and chapel, their setting within the local agricultural landscape and their relationship with the village of Skipness and Kilbrannan Sound all important in how they are understood and appreciated. In the case of the view of Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel (CHVP 15 **Figure 11.3**), it is considered that the proposed Development would cause a visual change but would not meaningfully alter the ability to understand and appreciate the relationship between the two structures whilst the view of Skipness village from this location to the west would remain unaltered. The ability to experience Kilbrannan Chapel's immediate environs and graveyard would also remain unaffected by the proposed Development. In views of Skipness Castle from the north west running track from Kilbrannan Chapel (CHVP 16, **Figure 11.4**), it is considered the proposed Development would introduce a level of visual change which would result in the turbine tips appearing over the castle to varying degrees along the hill line which forms part of the backdrop to the castle. Further, the turbine tips would represent a modern inclusion into the setting of the castle in which, due to a lack of extensive and more recent development, it is possible to experience an operating agricultural landscape in which the castle would originally have stood, albeit there are a modest number of more-recent stone buildings existing within these views currently. Despite this, however, the tips of the proposed turbines would not fundamentally challenge the dominance of the castle within the landscape and would not materially alter how the castle is understood and appreciated in this capacity. Whilst the proposed Development would constitute a modern inclusion within the operational agricultural landscape in which the castle is set, and thus lead to a level of visual distraction, it would not fundamentally change the understanding and appreciation of the relationship between the castle and this key local setting which would remain clearly discernible to the visitor.
150. Views of Skipness Castle from Kilbrannan Chapel and the north-west running section of track leading to it form one facet of the setting of the structures. Whilst this facet would undergo visual change as a result of the proposed Development as shown in CHVP 16, Figure 11.4, these north-western views of the castle from these points are not in themselves considered to be fundamental to understanding the castle and its relationship with the chapel. These viewpoints represent only one aspect of how the two structures are experienced and how they are understood and appreciated. The architectural and archaeological interest which forms the intrinsic cultural significance of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel will remain unchanged by the proposed Development; as such, the visitor would be able to appreciate the form and fabric of the structures and how this defines them as medieval monuments. Other key informative views would also be retained; south-eastern views of the chapel from the castle, for example, which takes in Kilbrannan Sound and the local agricultural land in which the castle and chapel are set would remain unchanged. This view is key in understanding the castle's strategic location in relation to Kilbrannan Sound as well as understanding the productive landscape in which both the buildings were

constructed. This key relationship between the castle and chapel and the sea, and the associated visual and aural experience, would be retained.

151. It is considered that the proposed Development would have a **Low Adverse impact** on the cultural significance of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225), an asset of High (National) importance, resulting in an effect of **Minor** adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.1.2 Lochranza Castle, Arran (SM90206)

152. Lochranza Castle is an L-plan fortified tower house situated on a promontory in Lochranza, on the northern part of the Isle of Arran.
153. The current 16th century tower-house form is typical L-shaped plan. In the main it is three storeys and an attic in height, with the south wing two storeys higher. The original castle was a late 13th early 14th century oblong hall-house of two main storeys having a small square tower projecting from its SW corner. The early features at Lochranza which led researchers to propose the existence of the hall-house are a blocked doorway on the north-east wall and a number of long arrow-slits and several narrow windows with wide splayed jambs and wide internal openings. Much of this early work remains, but its present appearance derives mainly from a thorough reconstruction carried out in the late 16th century when the upper works were renewed and heightened and crenelated and the interior remodelled, with the principal entrance being moved to the middle of the south-west wall so that it would be overlooked by the wing that formed the foot on the L-plan. It was possibly erected by a member of the Stewart family of Menteith (J Dunbar 1973); it was occupied in 1614 by troops of James VI, and later that century by Cromwell's forces. Lochranza Castle is now ruinous.
154. As a scheduled monument, the castle is of High (National) importance.
155. Hall-houses are comparatively rare, the majority having been destroyed or, as in the case of Lochranza, incorporated into later buildings. They comprise small, compact buildings characteristically used by the lesser nobility whose finances could not extend to the construction of larger castles. In many ways they are the forerunner of tower-houses but they were never designed to reach the height of towers, and the principal accommodation was normally arranged on two floors, the lower being used for storage, while the upper floor contained the lord's hall.
156. As well as its inherent fabric and archaeological potential, the castle derives its cultural significance from its setting on a promontory leading into Loch Ranza; anchorage could have been controlled from this location with views across Kilbrannan Sound towards the mainland possible. Its position in this location also allows for a striking aesthetic view of the castle when approached from Kilbrannan Sound from where it is backdropped by Torr Nead an Eoin and Glen Chalmadale. The castle would have been an important centre of secular power in the local area, and its position on a promontory further enhances its dominance, making it a focal point in the landscape. The castle is broadly contemporary with Skipness Castle (SM13225) on the other side of the Kilbrannan Sound and intervisibility between the two castles forms part of the setting of each.
157. On the south-eastern approach on the ferry from Claonaig, Lochranza Castle comes into view at a range of approximately 3 km; as the castle becomes more visible, its striking setting within Loch Ranza with the hill of Torr Nead an Eoin forming its southern backdrop becomes apparent. On the approach to the castle from the south on the A841, the castle appears prominently, silhouetted against the hills on the mainland north of Kilbrannan Sound. From the ground level outside the castle views across Kilbrannan Sound to the north, and north west are possible although are partially obscured by anchored yachts in the vicinity of the castle and within Loch Ranza. To the west views are of the village of Lochranza, with views to the east of the western slopes of Creag Ghlas. To the south are striking views of Torr Nead an Eoin and Glen Chalmadale.
158. A photomontage visualisation (CHVP 17, **Figure 11.10**) demonstrates that all 13 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the northern exterior of Lochranza Castle, with the nearest turbine located 10 km to the north. The entrance to the castle was locked at the time of the site visit, meaning it was not possible to gain views over Kilbrannan Sound from any elevated positions. Wireline visualisations from mid-level (CHVP 18, **Figure 11.11**) and from the level of the southern tower of the castle (CHVP 19, **Figure 11.12**) have been produced and show the same number of turbines would be visible from these levels. Comparison of the three visualisations demonstrate that there is no discernible difference in the visibility of the proposed Development from ground level, or from the two positions at elevations within the castle.
159. Whilst all 13 of the proposed turbines would be visible in north-facing views from ground, mid and upper levels of Lochranza Castle, they are located at such a distance that they would cause a relatively peripheral distraction to understanding and

appreciating the castle's relationship with Kilbrannan Sound and the mainland to the north. Skipness Castle (SM13225), on the other side of Kilbrannan Sound, is almost indiscernible from the northern exterior of Lochranza Castle, dominated as it is by the hills to its north. As such, the proposed turbines would not actively affect the visitor's ability to understand and appreciate the relationship between the two castles. Views of Skipness Castle do not therefore make an important contribution to the cultural significance of Lochranza Castle although the connection between the two as contemporary structures adds wider context to Lochranza Castle's historical narrative. The proposed turbines would also be visible on the southern approach to the castle from the A841. However, from this approach, they would appear to the east of the castle and be relatively peripheral to views of the castle which would retain its prominence. The impressive southern views of the castle on the approach from Claonaig would not change.

160. Whilst the proposed Development would cause a visual change to the setting of Lochranza Castle, this change would not affect how it is understood and appreciated as a structure intended to dominate this northern area of the Isle of Arran and to control the anchorage in Loch Ranza and Kilbrannan Sound. Views of Skipness Castle are too difficult to discern to make a meaningful contribution to the cultural significance of Lochranza Castle. It is therefore considered the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Lochranza Castle (SM90206), resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.1.3 Cnoc na Sgratha, Cairn (SM3651)

161. This overgrown cairn measures 7.5 m in diameter by 1.0 m in greatest height; a few large boulders near the perimeter on the east and south may belong to an original kerb. There are the remains of a cist (a stone-lined burial chamber), oriented east north east to west-south west, approximately in the centre. It measures 1.1 m x 0.6 m x 0.6 m. Apart from the western end-slab, and a small adjacent slab, the stones of the cist have been dislodged or disturbed, and the floor is covered by debris. It is clear, however, that the cist stood above ground, the walls only being bedded a little way into the subsoil. Above, and immediately west of the cist, the end of a large flat slab protrudes from a pile of earth and stone thrown up when the cist was initially opened, while another flat slab, 1.0 m x 0.4 m x 0.1 m lies just outside the east end of the cist. Probably these are fragments of the original cap-stone.
162. As a scheduled monument, the cairn is of High (National) Importance.
163. The cultural significance of this cairn derives primarily from the intrinsic archaeological interest, which holds information regarding funerary practices in the Bronze Age. Contextually, the siting in the landscape and relative position (with contemporary monuments) allows research into the societies that built them, in terms of where contemporary settlement may have been located and whether related features in the landscape were significant. Prehistoric cairns are often located in elevated positions overlooking the community that built them; as such outward views from the cairn to areas of possible nearby settlement contribute to its contextual cultural significance.
164. The cairn is not readily discernible in the landscape when approached from the east, with the dense vegetation in the area obscuring any long-range views towards it. Views from the cairn to the north and west are limited to the slopes of Cnoc an t-Suidhe and Cnoc na h-Eireige. To the south, striking long range views across Kilbrannan Sound towards the Isle of Arran are possible. To the east, views are restricted by commercial forestry, currently preventing any views towards the village of Skipness or the southern extent of the Skipness River that may originally have been afforded. To the north east are medium range views towards the Skipness River valley; only the upper most slopes of the valley are discernible, with the river and its banks not visible due to topography.
165. A wireline visualisation (CHVP 11, **Figure 11.8**) demonstrates that seven of the proposed turbines would be visible in north east facing views from the cairn, with the nearest turbine located approximately 3 km to the north east. Whilst the turbines would appear over the Skipness River valley to the north east, views towards this valley do not significantly contribute to the cultural significance of the cairn. Views of the valley looking in this direction are limited almost exclusively to the upper slopes leading to the river, making it difficult to appreciate the valley as a landscape feature. The steep slopes of the valley leading to the Skipness River and limited amount of land at its banks also make it unsuitable for settlement and as such make it unlikely that the cairn was constructed by populations living along this area of the Skipness River. It is therefore unlikely that the cairn was constructed with the intention of having deliberate views towards this north-eastern area. The striking, dominant views to the south over Kilbrannan Sound are still possible, whilst views south east and south west towards low lying land suitable for settlement would historically have been possible prior to the plantation of commercial forestry. These southern views from the cairn can therefore be seen as contributing to the significance of the cairn as they connect the cairn to the wider landscape and communities that were likely to have constructed it.

166. Whilst the proposed Development would cause a visual change to the north-east facing views from the cairn, it is not considered that these views are significant to understanding and appreciating it as a monument connected to the local communities and wider landscape. It is therefore considered that the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Cnoc na Sgratha, Cairn (SM3651), resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.1.4 Glenreasdell Mains, Chambered Cairn (SM3281)

167. Glenreasdell Mains chambered cairn is located immediately east of the B8001 approximately 3.3 km west of the southernmost point of the application boundary. The monument comprises a chambered cairn of Neolithic date, dating probably from the third millennium BC. It survives as a grass-grown mound of earth and stones measuring 20 m by 19 m and standing to a maximum height of 1.2 m on the south west side and 0.5 m on the north east. It is irregular in plan but would likely originally have been trapezoidal or oblong. Two roofless burial chambers constructed of large stone slabs are visible near the centre of the cairn. The cairn stands at 45 m above sea level on a slight knoll within a cultivated field.

168. The cairn derives its cultural significance primarily from its archaeological potential which could enhance understanding of the construction, form and development sequence of chambered cairns in Argyll and further afield. Chambered cairns are Neolithic in origin, dating most commonly from the third and fourth millennia BC. Excavation elsewhere suggests that they were used over a lengthy period and housed the remains of multiple individuals. Cairns like this were often adapted over time and could form a focus for burial in later periods. Buried deposits associated with cairns have the potential to enhance understanding of the practice and significance of burial and commemorating the dead at specific periods in prehistory as well as provide insight into the society during the prehistoric period. Contextually, the cairn derives its cultural significance from its location on a knoll within a fertile valley rich in prehistoric monuments such as cup-marked stones and cists.

169. As a scheduled monument, the cairn is of High (National) Importance.

170. The cairn does not feature prominently in views driving north and south along the B8001, coming into view only when within its immediate vicinity. From the cairn, the dominant views are to the west towards the valley along the Claonaig Water. A number of cists are located in the vicinity of the valley, with the nearest located approximately 500 m to the west. The cists are not visible in west facing views from the cairn. Views from the cairn to the north, east and south are largely of the local topography. The cairn is almost indiscernible in views east to it from the area of the cists near the Claonaig Water approximately 500 m to the west, although it is likely it was more prominent during the prehistoric period. The fertile ground around the Claonaig Water is likely to have been the area from which the cairn was intended to be viewed, with reciprocal views back to this area from the cairn also important in understanding the cairn's importance to the local community.

171. The cairn lies outside the ZTV, meaning views from the cairn would not be altered by the proposed Development. Any turbines which may be visible from the valley along the Claonaig Water are unlikely to affect how the asset is understood and appreciated. As shown on wireline visualisation (CHVP 22, **Figure 11.9**) the proposed turbines, the nearest of which, Turbine 14, is located 3.6 km away to the east, fall outwith the landscape in which the cairn was intended to function in. Whilst introducing a visual change, visibility of the proposed Development would not alter how the key local relationship between the cairn and the valley along the Claonaig Water. The cists which are recorded in this area are not visible on the ground, meaning any visual relationship between them and the cairn has been lost. Whilst it would likely have been more prominent in the prehistoric period, the cairn is difficult to discern in east facing views looking from the vicinity of the cists around the Claonaig Water, coming into view more readily at a range of approximately 150 m in an area outwith the ZTV. The views towards the valley along the Claonaig Water would be retained, with the ability to understand and appreciate the cairn in its important local setting unlikely to be significantly altered as a result of the proposed Development.

172. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Glenreasdell Mains, chambered cairn (SM3281), resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.1.5 Caisteal Aoidhe, Fort, Ardmarnock (SM3523)

173. A vitrified dun and annexe occupy a tidal island off the east shore of Loch Fyne; the rocky shingle-covered spit between the island and the shore may have been partly improved and heightened to assist access, and there are some large carefully-placed boulders near the landward end. That a fire consumed the timber-laced dun is evidenced by large lumps of vitrified material that have rolled from the dun wall on to the spit. The dun measures c.11 m in diameter within a wall c.3.5 m thick, but only on the south do stretches of both inner and outer facing-stones survive. Vitrification has been most intense on the north and south-west, where large quantities of fused core material are visible. On the north-east the rubble of the wall still stands

to a height of at least 3 m above ground level outside the dun. Fallen debris has obscured the position of the entrance. The annexe, which is situated on the north, measures about 12 m by 8 m and has been defended by a timber-laced wall probably as much as 1.2m in thickness. A stretch of outer facing-stones about 1.7 m beyond and 2 m below the vitrified material further emphasises the impressive nature of the original wall-construction. There are only slight traces of the wall on the south-east flank, where it occupied a rocky crest line, and the entrance to the annexe may have been at this point.

174. As a scheduled monument, the fort is of High (National) Importance.
175. The cultural significance of the fort lies primarily in its intrinsic value, with the potential through archaeological excavation to reveal information on the building construction methods, the life of the inhabitants and may provide information on whether the dun was intentionally or accidentally destroyed by fire. Contextually, the dun derives its cultural significance from its position on a small islet on the eastern side of Loch Fyne, with views out and over the loch important to how it is understood and appreciated. The dun likely exploited the loch for resources and administered control over the waters in the vicinity. Its intentional siting is clearly a predominantly defensive one.
176. The islet on which the fort is situated is visible when crossing Loch Fyne on the Tarbert to Portavadie ferry, allowing for an appreciation of how it may have appeared from the loch when in use and how it functioned within the seascape. The islet is largely screened from view by the topography on its south western approach on land, coming into view from a range of approximately 300 m. From the fort there are clear views of Loch Fyne and Kintyre to the west, south-west and south with partial views of the loch to the north-west. To the east and north east there are views of the Bagh Buic bay located approximately 400m away. The position of the fort would likely have allowed for monitoring of Loch Fyne and allowed for the control of anchorage at the nearby bay. It is likely the fort was visible on the southern approach from the loch, highlighting its defensive position and place in the landscape and the importance of its relationship with the loch.
177. A photomontage visualisation (CHVP 24, **Figure 11.15**) shows that 12 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the fort, with the nearest turbine, Turbine 11, located approximately 8.7 km to the south west. The proposed turbines would introduce a visual change in south-facing views, with the turbine blade tips screened to varying degrees by topography. However, the distance at which the proposed turbines are located is such that they would appear as a relatively peripheral feature when looking south from the fort. Their location nearly 9 km south of the fort is outwith where the fort was intended to dominate and control and as such would not alter the ability to understand and appreciate the fort as a place of local power intended to control the nearby anchorage at Bagh Bay and monitor Loch Fyne. Views of the distant hills across to Kintyre, whilst aesthetically pleasing, do not contribute significantly to the setting of the fort or enhance the ability to understand its function. Views of the fort from the nearby ferry crossing from Tarbert to Portavadie as well as views of the fort on the approach from the south of Loch Fyne would be retained and allow for a continued appreciation of the defensive position of the fort.
178. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Caisteal Aoidhe, fort, Ardmarnock (SM3523), resulting in resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.1.6 Dun Skeig, duns and fort (SM2491)

179. Three successive structures may be distinguished on the summit of Dun Skeig. The first (I) is a fort measuring c. 113 m by 36.5 m within a single stone wall; the second, an oval dun within a vitrified wall (II) which partly overlies the south-west end of the fort; and the third, a well-preserved dun (III) whose wall contains pieces of vitrified material presumably taken from the ruins of II. The fort wall, which originally enclosed the whole of the summit, has been very severely robbed. In the south-east it survives as a low stony bank, 3.0 m wide, in which one outer facing stone is visible, while further north its course is marked by two separate stretches of outer face. On the south-west and west, the wall appears as a crest-line, but on the north it is represented by a band of debris from which numerous outer facing stones protrude. This is in such contrast to the other parts of the wall, it may be a later rebuilding of this section as an outwork to the adjacent dun. The principal entrance to the fort was probably to the west of this dun, where the crest-line marking the side of the wall is interrupted by a track. No internal buildings were found. The larger dun (II) consists of an oval enclosure, 26 m x 18.5 m, within a stone wall, the core of which has been completely vitrified. This now appears as a bank of debris, varying from 2.4 m - 6.1 m thick. No facing stones are visible, so that the original width of the wall is uncertain. The north half of the interior is occupied by a scarp 3.4 m high, but it is not certain whether this is natural or artificial. The rest of the interior is level and featureless. No entrance is visible. The smaller dun (III) measures 14.6 m x 12.8 m within a wall 3.0 m - 4.6 m thick, standing 1.8 m high internally. It has a well-defined entrance in the north east, with door-checks and traces of a bar-hole in the north wall. No other mural features, such as cells or galleries, can be seen. A small area of rock, bearing three plain cup marks, lies c.2.1 m outside the wall of II, on its north-north east arc. Differential preservation led investigators from the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical

Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS, now part of HES) to speculate that the north-east end of the fort had been rebuilt as an outwork to the dun crowning this end of the summit. The investigators also observed pieces of vitrified stone incorporated into the wall of the dun, which is thus thought to be more recent than the vitrified dun on the south-west end of the summit.

180. As a scheduled monument, the dun is of High (National) Importance.
181. The cultural significance of the dun lies primarily in its intrinsic value, with the potential through archaeological excavation to reveal information on the building construction methods, the phasing of the duns, and information on whether they were intentionally or accidentally destroyed by fire. Contextually, the dun derives its cultural significance from its prominent situation on the elongated summit of Dun Skeig, a prominent position overlooking the mouth of West Loch Tarbert to the north-east and the Sound of Gigha to the west and south-west. Its intentional siting is clearly a predominantly defensive one.
182. The dun appears as a prominent landmark on the south-western approach from the A83 and is an imposing feature on the approach by foot from the east. At the summit of Dun Skeig, there are commanding views north-east up West Loch Tarbert, with clear, open views of the local agricultural land to the east and south. To the west and south west are striking long range views of the Sound of Gigha and the Isle of Gigha approximately 9.5 km away. Views to the north are largely of an area of commercial forestry. The situation of the dun suggests it was intended to be a prominent landscape feature and centre of local power, designed to control the local area and monitor maritime traffic on West Loch Tarbert. In the wider area, along the banks of West Loch Tarbert are two scheduled dun sites: Dun a Choin Duibh (SM2421), Eilean Àraich Mhòir (SM3183) and the unscheduled Dun Mor (WoSAS 43531). These sites provide examples of similar, possibly contemporary sites in the wider landscape. These sites are not discernible in the landscape when looking north east up East Loch Tarbert, meaning any visual relationship which may have existed between them and Dun Skeig has been lost.
183. A wireline visualisation (CHVP 23, **Figure 11.14**) from the north of the Isle of Gigha approximately 9.2 km away demonstrates that all 13 of the proposed turbines would be visible from this location with the blade tips obscured to varying degrees by the topography. The nearest proposed turbine would be located approximately 22 km to the north east. Whilst the proposed Development, in conjunction with other consented, proposed and operational renewable energy developments, would cause a visual change to long range views towards Dun Skeig from the Sound of Gigha, the distance at which they are located means the hill on which the dun is positioned would remain the dominant landscape feature when viewed from this point. The dun would therefore remain to be understood and appreciated as a feature intended to dominate its local area as well as a landmark intended to be visible from the Sound of Gigha. The proposed Development and other consented, proposed and operational renewable energy developments would become less apparent on the westerly approach to the dun from the sea, becoming increasingly screened by the topography and further mitigating their impact on the long-range west facing views of the dun.
184. A photomontage visualisation (CHVP 25, **Figure 11.13**) demonstrates that all 13 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the summit of Dun Skeig, with the blade tips obscured to varying degrees by the topography and commercial forestry to the north. The nearest proposed turbine, Turbine 1, would be located approximately 8.8 km to the north east. The proposed Development would introduce further visual change, along with other consented, proposed and operational renewable energy developments to north west, north and north east facing views from Dun Skeig. However, the distance at which the turbines are located, approximately 8.8 km to the north east, are outwith the area the dun was intended to control and dominate. It is therefore considered that the proposed turbines would not impact the ability to understand and appreciate the dun as a place of local power intended to control the nearby arable land and monitor movements on West Loch Tarbert. The key north east view up West Loch Tarbert would experience relatively minor change, with the wind turbines likely to appear only peripherally to the east from this viewpoint. There would be no change to any visual relationship the dun may have had with the three other duns along West Loch Fyne as intervisibility with these monuments has been lost and does not make any contribution to the cultural significance of Dun Skeig any longer, therefore it is not anticipated that the proposed Development could affect this historical contribution. Views of the local arable land to the north and north east, whilst experiencing long-distance visual change as a result of the proposed Development, would be largely retained along with the ability to understand and appreciate the local area which the dun was intended to dominate and control. The striking views over the Sound of Gigha and to the Isle of Gigha to the west and south-west would be retained.
185. It is considered that the proposed Development would have a **Negligible Adverse impact** on the cultural significance of Dun Skeig Dun Skeig, duns and fort (SM2491), an asset of High (National) Importance, resulting in an effect of **Negligible Adverse significance** which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.2 Non-designated heritage assets

11.6.2.2.1 Skipness House (WoSAS 4374)

186. The Old Mansion House/Country House was designed by architect John Honeyman and built 1867 and as depicted on the 1st edition of the Ordnance Survey (OS) 6-inch map. Parts of this original house were demolished in 1881, though certain sections remain having been incorporated into the present building. The present building is one to two storeys, comprising four structures arranged around a courtyard and main house with M-shaped gables. An incomplete wooden extension to the north of the house was noted during the site visit.
187. As a non-designated heritage asset, Skipness House is of Low (Local) Importance.
188. The current building is of limited interest. The cultural significance lies primarily in its intrinsic value, incorporating the remains of an earlier country house, and the associative interest of the construction, location, history and development of this original Mansion/Country House. The owner of Skipness House also own Skipness Castle, and much of the form of the present castle mound is a result of 19th century landscaping associated with Skipness House and its policies. There is therefore some group value between the two structures. Contextually, the house derives its cultural significance from its immediate setting, set in front of woodland with Skipness Castle 90 m to the north east, with views of Kilbrannan Chapel approximately 360 m ESE. The house represents a 19th century addition to a medieval landscape, evidenced by the castle and chapel, and is positioned such that these structures feature in views from it.
189. The main approach to Skipness House from the west is through a gateway comprising four piers with a lodge located immediately to the north (WoSAS 4373). Passing through the gates, the road runs south-east and is flanked by woodland on each side. Skipness House is not visible from this western approach and only comes into view upon arrival into the modern car park immediately to its north. From the house, there are striking views to the south and south-east taking in Kilbrannan Sound and the Isle of Arran. Kilbrannan Chapel located 360 m east-south east is visible along with the local agricultural land in which it is set, with Skipness Castle dominating views to the north east. The woodland backdrop to the house and its relationship with Skipness Castle can be appreciated when viewing it from Kilbrannan Chapel and from the north west track running parallel to the shore.
190. A wireline visualisation (CHVP 14, **Figure 11.6**) demonstrates that four of the proposed turbines would theoretically be visible in north-facing views from Skipness House with the nearest turbine, Turbine 5, located 3.2 km to the NNW. Views of the turbines from the house itself would, however, be screened from view by the woodland at the north of the house. The turbines would also likely be visible when viewing the house from Kilbrannan Chapel and from the north-west running track leading to the chapel. The turbines would, however, appear relatively peripheral, situated as they are further to the east of the house itself. Views to the house, highlighting its setting in front of a wooded area in close proximity to Skipness Castle would still be readily appreciable despite the presence of the proposed turbines. The striking views from the house to the south and south-east would be retained along with views of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel along with the ability to understand and appreciate the house as a part of the evolution of the landscape through time.
191. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Skipness House (WoSAS 4374), resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.2.2 Skipness, Saint Brendan's Church of Scotland (WoSAS 4375)

192. Saint Brendan's Church is located at the north-east of the village of Skipness approximately 1.1 km south of the southernmost point of the application boundary. The church dated 1896 was originally a Mission Church designed by Bertram Vaughan Johnson. It is built in the plain gothic revival style, of coursed rubble with a gabled porch with pointed arch. The interior is simple with open timber ceilings.
193. As a non-designated heritage asset, the church is of Low (Local) Importance.
194. The church derives its cultural significance primarily from its architectural style as an example of a gothic revival church and its history as a Mission Church. Association with its architect is also of interest, and the church is of value as a focal point of the local community. Contextually, there is group value with the memorials inside the church (notably, those of the Graham family of Skipness) and a war memorial in the grounds of the church.
195. The church is situated at the end of a row of houses at the north-east of the village of Skipness. As the height of the church is broadly comparable to the houses, it does not assume a prominent position within this part of the village and is not readily

discernible as a church until coming within a range of approximately 70m on the southern approach to it. When approached from the north, the church is the first building which comes into view after crossing the Skipness River. From the church, the dominant view is to the south, taking in the nearby houses with partial views of the Kilbrannan Sound and the Isle of Arran. Looking north and north-west from the memorial within the church grounds, the church is backdropped by woodland.

196. A wireline visualisation (CHVP 13, **Figure 11.7**) demonstrates that the tips of one of the proposed turbines would be visible in north facing views from Saint Brendan's Church. The turbine would, however, likely be at least partially screened from view by the extensive woodland which is present to the north of the church. Whilst it is possible the turbine would be visible from the southern approach to the church, this view is not significant in understanding and appreciating the church as a focal point of the local community. Its unassuming stature suggests it was not intended to dominate the village or the area to the north. Views to the south from the church would be retained, allowing the visitor to appreciate the church in its local setting, whilst views of the church as the first building seen on the northern approach would also be retained.
197. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **no impact** on the cultural significance of Saint Brendan's Church of Scotland (WoSAS 4375), resulting in **no effect** of adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

11.6.2.3 Cumulative Effects

198. The cumulative effects of the proposed Development with the developments of other consented, or at appeal, renewable energy developments (as described in **Chapter 7**) have been considered. Existing windfarms form part of the baseline of this assessment and are therefore not included as cumulative developments.
199. In terms of direct effects, due to the nature of previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets likely to be found in the ISA, it is considered that there is no potential for cumulative construction effects on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets. Any effects will be contained within the ISA, and none will be further directly impacted by any other developments outside this area.
200. Cumulative operational effects can occur when the contribution made to the cultural significance of a heritage asset is directly altered by the proposed Development in combination with other proposed windfarms. The assessment of effects uses the same methodology applied in considering the likely effects of the proposed Development alone. All analysis of asset significance and the contribution made by setting remains unchanged. All that is altered is the nature of visual change predicted for the one or more scenarios under consideration.
201. Cumulative operational effects are considered in cases where an effect of minor or greater significance has been predicted on the setting of an historic asset as a result of the proposed Development. The purpose of this threshold is to ensure that the assessment remains proportionate and focused on those cases where there is potential for an EIA-significant effect to arise.
202. In terms of operational impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets in the study area through development within their setting, an effect of **Minor Adverse significance** which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms, is predicted upon one scheduled monument, Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225). No cumulative schemes are located within parts of the landscape that are also considered to contribute to the monument's significance to increase the impact magnitude concluded following assessment of the proposed Development in isolation.
203. No increased cumulative impacts are therefore predicted for known cultural heritage assets from any combination of developments.

11.6.3 Mitigation Measures

11.6.3.1 Mitigation During Construction

204. No direct impacts upon any known archaeological remains have been identified. No areas requiring protection from accidental damage by fencing during construction have been identified.
205. Given the negligible-low potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains to be preserved, the need for any mitigation works will be agreed with WoSAS. If necessary, the programme and scope of mitigation will be specified in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which will be agreed with WoSAS in advance of the works.

11.6.3.2 Mitigation During Operation

206. An effect of **Minor** adverse significance which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms as a result of the operation of the proposed Development is predicted within the setting of one scheduled monument, Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225). The impact magnitude has been minimised as far as reasonably possible through measures embedded in the design of the proposed Development. There are no further effective site-specific mitigation measures that could be practically implemented, and no further mitigation is recommended.

11.6.3.3 Mitigation embedded in the design

207. To mitigate the proposed Development's operational effects as far as practicable, multiple mitigation measures have been embedded within its design stages. High importance was given to the potential effects the proposed Development could have on Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel, which eventually led to a reduction in the height of the proposed turbines as well as siting those turbines to reduce any potential impacts on Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel. In addition, one turbine, Turbine 10 was removed in its entirety and the location of Turbine 5 was moved further north in order to further mitigate the impact these turbines would have had on the cultural significance of Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel through causing changes to their setting under the original design. Additional information regarding the design of the proposed Development presented within **Chapter 3**.

11.6.4 Residual Effects

208. Potential effects of the proposed Development upon heritage assets resulting from its construction, operation and cumulative effects have been considered.

11.6.4.1 Residual Construction Effects

209. No direct impacts upon any known heritage assets within the ISA are anticipated during construction and no construction-phase effects upon the setting of heritage assets have been identified.

210. Any effect resulting from an impact upon archaeological remains discovered during construction-phase is unlikely to be of greater than Minor Effect of adverse Significance. Following implementation of a programme of mitigation agreed with WoSAS in advance of the works, **no residual effects** are anticipated upon any hitherto unknown potential heritage assets that may be preserved within the ISA.

11.6.4.2 Residual Operational Effects

211. An effect of **Minor Adverse significance** which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms as a result of the operation of the proposed Development is predicted within the setting of one scheduled monument, Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225). Visibility of the proposed Development from the scheduled monument, Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel (SM13225) has already been minimised through design. The residual effect would be an effect of **Minor Adverse significance** which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.
212. No increased cumulative impacts are predicted for known cultural heritage assets from any combination of developments.

11.7 Summary of Effects

213. This Chapter has assessed potential direct impacts from the construction of the proposed Development and the potential impact upon heritage assets from its operation within their setting. The assessment has been compiled with reference to all relevant planning policy and guidance documents of Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists. These effects are summarised in **Table 11.8**.

Table 11.8: Summary of Effects

Effect	Phase	Assessment consequence	Effect significance
Direct archaeological impact upon known heritage assets within ISA	Construction	None	Not Significant
Direct archaeological impact upon hitherto unknown potential heritage assets within ISA (negligible – low overall archaeological potential)	Construction	No greater than Minor, Permanent, Adverse	Not Significant
Setting effects upon heritage assets within the ISA	Construction	None	Not Significant
Setting effects upon Skipness Castle and Kilbrannan Chapel SM13225	Construction	Minor, Temporary, Adverse	Not Significant
	Operation	Minor, Long-Term, Adverse	Not Significant
Setting effects upon Dun Skeig Duns and Fort SM2491	Operation	Negligible, Long-Term, Adverse	Not Significant
Cumulative effects	Operation	No increased cumulative effects identified	Not Significant

11.8 References

BGS (Everett, PA, Gillespie, MR & Tracey EA), 2015, *Provenance of building stones in four 'galley castles' in Argyll*, Minerals and Waste Programme Commissioned Report OR/15/053

British Geological Survey, 2021, *Geology of Britain*- available at :
<https://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html>
(Date Accessed: 14/08/2021)

Canmore Website, 2021, available at: <https://canmore.org.uk/>
(Date Accessed: 14/08/2021)

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2020a) '*Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*'

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2020b) '*Standard and guidance for desk-based assessment*'

Historic Environment Scotland, 2021, *Exploring Scotland's Historic Environment*, available at: <https://pastmap.org.uk/>
(Date Accessed: 14/08/2021)

Historic Environment Scotland, 2021, *Listing, Scheduling and Designations*, available at:
<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/listing-scheduling-and-designations/>
(Date Accessed: 14/08/2021)

National Library of Scotland, 2021, *Ordnance Survey Maps*, available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/>
(Date Accessed: 14/08/2021)

ScottishPower Renewables

320 St Vincent Street
Glasgow
G2 5AD

T +44 (0)141 614 0451

EarraghailRenewableEnergyDevelopment@scottishpower.com

