



Chapter 11

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table of Contents

11.1	Introduction	3
11.1.1	Chapter Outline	3
11.2	Legislation and Policy Context	3
11.2.1	Legislation	3
11.2.2	Planning Policy	3
11.2.3	Local Policy	4
11.2.4	Guidance	4
11.2.5	Consultation	4
11.3	Methodology	5
11.3.1	Assessment	5
11.3.2	Study Areas	5
11.3.3	Data Sources	5
11.3.4	Definition of Baseline Conditions	5
11.3.5	Identification of and Evaluation of Key Effects	6
11.3.6	Mitigation Measures and Identification of Residual Effects	6
11.3.7	Impact Assessment Criteria	6
11.4	Baseline Conditions	8
11.4.1	Previous Investigations	8
11.4.2	Geology and Geomorphology	8
11.4.3	Archaeological Background	8
11.4.4	Heritage Assets in the ISA	8
11.4.5	Potential for Undiscovered Heritage Assets within the ISA	9
11.4.6	Heritage Assets in the OSA	9
11.5	Identification and Evaluation of Key Effects	10
11.5.1	Construction Effects	10
11.5.2	Operational Effects	10
11.5.3	Decommissioning Effects	20
11.5.4	Cumulative Effects	20
11.6	Mitigation Measures	21
11.6.1	Mitigation During Construction	21
11.6.2	Mitigation During Operation	21
11.6.3	Residual Effects	21
11.6.4	Summary	21
11.7	References	21

Figures

Figure 11.1:	Heritage Assets within the Inner Study Area (ISA)
Figure 11.2:	Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area (OSA)
Figure 11.3:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 1 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: Ground Floor Entrance) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.4:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: First Floor Dining Room) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.5:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 3 (Earl's Cairn SM449) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.6:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 4 (Thomsonsfeld, Broch SM588) Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.7:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 5 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: Second Floor Lady in Waiting's Room) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.8:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 6 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: Top Floor Kitchen Maid's Room) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.9:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 7 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: Top Floor Corridor) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.10:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 8 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: Tower) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.11:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 9 (Castle of Mey GDL00096, Cat A LB1797: First Floor Drawing Room) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.12:	Castle of Mey Viewpoint Reference
Figure 11.13:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 10 (Castle of Mey GDL00096 Animal Centre) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.14:	Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 11 (Castle of Mey GDL00096 Deer Park) Photomontage and Cumulative Wireline
Figure 11.15:	Cat B Gate Lodge LB 1798 on principal approach, looking north, with woodland shelter belt beyond
Figure 11.16:	Cat A Castle of Mey LB1797, looking south from Braes of Harrow, to east of Harbour Approach, at boundary of GDL
Figure 11.17:	Scenic view of Dunnet Head from IGDL to north of Castle, looking west
Figure 11.18:	Scenic view of Orkney from IGDL walled garden, looking north
Figure 11.19:	North façade of Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797, illustrating arrangement of small, functional windows
Figure 11.20:	Full extent of south-facing window in Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797 dining room, enlarged 1950s
Figure 11.21:	Full extent of view north from Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797 drawing room
Figure 11.22:	Earl's Cairn, Chambered Cairn SM449 looking southwest
Figure 11.23:	Earnay Hillock, Chambered Cairn SM439, looking northeast
Figure 11.24:	Warth Hill Cairn SM503, looking north
Figure 11.25:	Site of Thomsonsfeld Broch SM588, looking west
Figure 11.26:	Freswick Castle LB1799, looking north
Figure 11.27:	Canisbay Parish Church LB1795, looking north
Figure 11.28:	Barrock Free Church LB1887, looking south
Figure 11.29:	CHVP1 and CHVP 11 – Possible Mitigation Planting

Technical Appendices

Technical Appendix 11.3 – Castle of Mey IGDL Description and Designation Map



Chapter 11

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 Chapter Outline

1. This Chapter of the Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development (RED) (hereafter the proposed Development) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report presents an assessment of the effects of the proposed Development on the local historic environment (archaeology and cultural heritage).
2. The objectives of this assessment is 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 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.
3. A heritage asset (or historic 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.
4. Designated assets include:
 - Scheduled Monuments (SM);
 - Listed Buildings (LB), designated at Category (Cat) A, B or C;
 - World Heritage Sites (WHS);
 - Conservation Areas (CA);
 - Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (IGDL);
 - Inventory Historic Battlefields (IHB); and
 - Historic Marine Protected Areas (HMPA).
5. Other assets may also be locally designated through policies in the Local Development Plan.
6. The majority of heritage assets across the UK are not designated. Some undesignated assets are recorded in Historic Environment Records or Sites and Monuments Records (HERs/SMRs) maintained by local authorities and other agencies. However, many heritage assets are currently unrecorded, and the information contained in HERs and SMRs 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 undesignated 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: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)**, and in such cases, it is important to recognise the difference in approach between these two topics. Historic environment assessment addresses effects on the 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.

11.2 Legislation and Policy Context

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

11.2.1 Legislation
9. 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.
10. 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.”
11. The Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014 defines the role of the new public body, Historic Environment Scotland (HES), and the processes for the designation of heritage assets, consents and rights of appeal.

11.2.2 Planning Policy
12. 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”*.
13. 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.”*
14. 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”.*

15. 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).

16. ‘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.

11.2.3 Local Policy

17. The Highland Council (THC) adopted the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP) in April 2012. Within the HWLDP Policy 57 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage is of relevance to this Chapter.

18. This policy in part states;

“All development proposals will be assessed taking into account the level of importance and type of heritage features, the form and scale of the development, and any impact on the feature and its setting”

“Council also intends to adopt the Supplementary Guidance on the Highland Historic Environment Strategy. The main principles of this guidance will ensure that:

- *Future developments take account of the historic environment and that they are of a design and quality to enhance the historic environment bringing both economic and social benefits;*
- *It sets a proactive, consistent approach to the protection of the historic environment.”*

19. In August 2018 THC adopted the Caithness and Sutherland Local Development Plan (CSLDP) to be used in conjunction with the HWLDP. The CSLDP sets out a number of Key Outcomes, of relevance to this Chapter is the Key Outcome for environment and heritage;

“High quality places where the outstanding environment and natural, built and cultural heritage is celebrated and valued assets are safeguarded”

11.2.4 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; the circumstances under which developers can be required to provide further information, in the form of a field evaluation, to allow planning authorities to reach a decision; and measures that can be taken to mitigate adverse impacts.

21. 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.

22. 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’, of which the guidance note on ‘Setting’ (Historic Scotland, 2016) is relevant to this assessment.

23. 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). The Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work (2012) has also been followed.

11.2.5 Consultation

24. Consultee scoping responses and other consultation carried out during the archaeology and cultural heritage assessment are summarised in **Table 11.1: Summary of issues identified from consultations**.

Table 11.1. Summary of issues identified from consultations

Consultee	Consultation Response Summary	Action Taken
Historic Environment Scotland Scoping Response, 24 August 2020	<p><i>We consider that there is the potential for significant cumulative effects on the setting of the designated assets identified below. We therefore request that appropriate cumulative assessments and visualisations are provided in any EIA Report produced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Castle of Mey (LB 1797) & associated garden & designed landscape (GDL 00096)</i> • <i>Earl’s Cairn, chambered cairn N of Hollandmake, Inkstack (SM449)</i> • <i>Thomson’sfield, Broch 780m SW of Brabstermire (SM588)</i> 	<p>Cumulative effects are assessed in Section 11.5.4</p> <p>See Section 11.5.2.1 and Visualisations - Figure 11.3 (CHVP1), Figure 11.4 (CHVP2), Figure 11.7 (CHVP5), Figure 11.8 (CHVP6), Figure 11.9 (CHVP7), Figure 11.10 (CHVP8), Figure 11.11 (CHVP9), Figure 11.12 (Castle of Mey VP Reference), Figure 11.13 (CHVP10) (Castle of Mey Animal Centre) and Figure 11.14 (CHVP11) (Castle of Mey Deer Park).</p> <p>See Section 11.5.2.2 and Visualisation – Figure 11.5 (CHVP3).</p> <p>See Section 11.5.2.2 and Visualisation – Figure 11.6 (CHVP4).</p>
Historic Environment Scotland Scoping Response, 24 August 2020	<p>HES advise that ‘all nationally important assets, including scheduled monuments, up to at least 10km from the proposed development should be appraised for potential impacts on their settings. However, we do not generally recommend the use of a specific radius to identify assets for inclusion or exclusion in assessments as there is the potential for assets to be missed. As stated above, we would generally recommend the use of an appropriately detailed ZTV to identify assets which may potentially receive impacts to their settings in the first instance.</p>	<p>See Section 11.3.2 for an outline to the approach to the assessment, in line with HES scoping comments. The project Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (see Figure 11.2) has been used to identify any ‘assets that may be affected’.</p>
The Highland Council Scoping Response, March 2019	<p><i>The assessment will include a walkover survey of the development area (including any land required for associated infrastructure).</i></p>	<p>Walkover surveys were undertaken in both the inner and outer study areas as detailed in Section 11.3.3.</p>
The Highland Council Scoping Response, March 2019	<p><i>The assessment will consider the potential direct impacts of the development to cultural heritage as well as indirect impacts.</i></p>	<p>An assessment of potential construction phase effects is presented in Section 11.5.1.</p>
The Highland Council Scoping Response, March 2019	<p><i>The indirect impact assessment must include a study of cumulative impacts. Where indirect impacts are predicted, these will be illustrated using photomontages.</i></p>	<p>An assessment of potential operation phase effects is presented in Section 11.5.2. Photomontages and wireline visualisations are presented as Figures 11.3-14</p>
The Highland Council Scoping Response, March 2019	<p><i>Where impacts are unavoidable, HET expect proposed methods to mitigate this impact to be discussed in detail, including both physical (i.e. re-design) and where appropriate, compensatory/off-setting.</i></p>	<p>Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 11.6</p>

Consultee	Consultation Response Summary	Action Taken
The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (Archaeology)	<i>The information presented in the scoping request will adequately address the impact assessment for this proposal. The methodology is acceptable. However, although direct impacts to known assets will be scoped out, the assessment will need to consider the potential for unrecorded or buried features and deposits to be present that may be impacted. Where impacts are unavoidable, HET expect proposed methods to mitigate this impact to be discussed in detail.</i>	For completeness, direct impact assessment has been carried out (Section 11.5.1) The potential for undiscovered heritage assets to be present within the ISA is discussed in Section 11.4.5 . Mitigation measures are discussed at Section 11.6 .
Historic Environment Scotland [29 January 2021]	<i>Given that the Drawing Room is a principal room within the category A listed building we require a visualisation produced from this room to demonstrate the impacts from this central and key location within the castle.</i>	See visualisation Figure 11.11 (CHVP9)
Historic Environment Scotland [29 January 2021]	<i>We would continue to recommend that, in the first instance, the monument is visited and photographs taken to illustrate its setting and important lines of sight.</i>	Earl's Carin was visited in May 2021 to aid the assessment. See visualisation Figure 11.5 (CHVP3)
Historic Environment Scotland [29 January 2021]	<i>HES would be happy to attend a meeting to discuss potential options to mitigate the potential effects on the setting of the Castle of Mey and its garden and designed landscape. We consider that it would be useful if The Highland Council and Energy Consents Unit are also invited to attend any meeting proposed.</i>	A mitigation proposal was submitted to HES on 10 August 2021. The proposed mitigation included a planting belt, comprising native species, along the southern boundary of the Castle of Mey's IGDL. The purpose of this mitigation would be to screen the IGDL and principal rooms from the modernising visual effects of the proposed Development. HES did not support the proposed mitigation as: "Planting a new belt of trees along the southern boundary of the designed landscape would alter the historic design of planting and would block designed and intended views, carefully channelled and framed by historic planting". This is discussed further in Section 11.6.3.2: Residual Operational Effects.

11.3 Methodology

11.3.1 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, 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.

11.3.2 Study Areas

27. The Inner Study Area (ISA) corresponds to the application boundary. Within this area, all heritage assets are assessed for construction and operational effects.
28. The Outer Study Area (OSA) is defined by the ZTV 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, so as to ensure that all significant effects are recognised:
- Up to 5 km from proposed turbines: Conservation Areas, Category B and C Listed Buildings, and any undesignated asset of local importance which has a wider landscape setting that contributes substantially to its cultural significance.
 - Up to 10 km from proposed turbines: all assets of national importance: Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Historic Battlefields and undesignated assets of potentially national importance.
 - Beyond 10 km from proposed turbines: any asset of national importance where long-distance views from or towards the asset are thought to be particularly sensitive, in the opinion of the assessor or consultees.

11.3.3 Data Sources

29. 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) and The Highland Council's Standards for Archaeological Work (March 2012). The following sources of information were referred to:
- designation data downloaded from the Historic Environment Scotland website on 28 April 2020;
 - the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), including the Canmore database and associated photographs, prints/drawings and manuscripts held by HES;
 - The Highland Council Historic Environment Record (HER) digital data received 24 August 2020;
 - 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;
 - statistical accounts;
 - relevant online resources (including; Pastmap, SCARF); and
 - readily available published sources and unpublished archaeological reports.
30. A targeted walkover survey of the ISA was carried out on 27 October 2020 guided by modern mapping and a handheld Global Positioning System (GPS). The purpose of this walkover was to assess the presence/absence, character, extent and condition of known assets and to identify any previously unrecorded assets. Heritage assets considered to be likely to be affected by operational effects in the ISA and OSA were visited on 26 and 28 October 2020.

11.3.4 Definition of Baseline Conditions

11.3.4.1 Known Heritage Assets

31. Designated assets in both the ISA and OSA which have been previously recorded on the NRHE are labelled with the reference number assigned by HES (prefixed SM for Scheduled Monuments, LB for Listed Buildings, IGDL for Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and PiC for Properties in Care); undesignated assets are labelled with The Highland Council HER reference number (prefixed with MHG).
32. Assets within the ISA are listed in **Technical Appendix 11.1: Assessment of Heritage Assets within the ISA** and shown in **Figure 11.1**.
33. Assets within the OSA that meet the appraisal criteria for detailed settings assessment are described in **Section 11.4.6** heritage assets in the outer study area, listed in **Technical Appendix 11.2: Assessment of Heritage Assets within the OSA** and shown in **Figure 11.2**.

11.3.4.2 Potential for Unknown Heritage Assets within 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: Archaeological**

potential, 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.

11.3.5 Identification of and Evaluation of Key Effects

37. 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 will 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 from construction to decommissioning but they are only likely to lead to significant effects during the prolonged operational life of the development; and
- **Indirect impacts** describe secondary processes, triggered by the 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.

38. 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 or activities associated with a development, or for the development as a whole.

39. 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 on the internet. Where this initial appraisal has identified the potential for a significant effect, the asset has been visited to define baseline conditions and identify key

viewpoints. Visualisations have been prepared to illustrate changes to key views, where potentially significant effects have been identified (Figures 11.3 to 11.14).

40. Photomontage visualisations have been produced as representative of the likely impacts of the proposed Development on the Castle of Mey Barrogill Castle IGDL (GDL00096, Cat A LB1797) & its Lodge (Cat B LB1798). CHVP1 (Figure 11.3) is centrally-placed, illustrating the anticipated view from ground-level on exit from the Castle's main south-facing entrance. CHVP2 (Figure 11.4) is offset, from the first floor dining room, illustrating the anticipated view from the principal entertaining room with the largest windows on the southern façade. Further photomontages are presented at the request of HES through consultation to illustrate the anticipated view from the first floor drawing room (CHVP9, Figure 11.11), which is between CHVPs 1 and 2, from the second floor lady in waiting's room (CHVP5, Figure 11.7), the third (top) floor kitchen maid's room (CHVP6, Figure 11.8) and corridor (CHVP7, Figure 11.9), and from the roof, on top of the south eastern tower (CHVP8, Figure 11.10). CHVP10 (Figure 11.13) and CHVP11 (Figure 11.14) are photomontages produced to demonstrate the likely visibility of the proposed Development from the Animal Centre and the Deer Park, each viewpoints within the IGDL.
41. CHVP3 (Figure 11.5) illustrates the anticipated view of the proposed Development from Scheduled Monument Earl's Cairn (SM449), aligned with the axis of the central chamber. CHVP4 (Figure 11.6) illustrates the anticipated view of the proposed Development from Scheduled Monument Thomsonsfield Broch (SM588).
42. The photomontages have been produced by the Landscape and Visual team, the methodology for preparing the photomontage is described in **Technical Appendix 7.1: LVIA Method**.

11.3.6 Mitigation Measures and Identification of Residual Effects

43. For both direct impacts and potential impacts on cultural significance resulting from change in setting, 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.
44. 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).

11.3.7 Impact Assessment Criteria

11.3.7.1 Heritage Importance, Cultural Significance and Sensitivity

45. 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.
46. 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 undesignated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (Table 11.3: Criteria for assessing the importance of heritage assets). Assets of national importance and international importance are assigned a 'High' and 'Very High' level respectively. Scheduled Monuments, IGDL, Inventory Historic Battlefields and Historic Marine Protected Areas are, by definition, of national importance.
47. 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.
48. 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	World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal international importance
High	Category A Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, IGDL, Inventory Historic Battlefields, Historic Marine Protected Areas and undesignated assets of national importance
Medium	Category B Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, and undesignated assets of regional importance
Low	Category C Listed Buildings and undesignated assets of local importance

50. 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.

51. 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 2016, 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.

11.3.7.2 Assessment of the Magnitude of Impacts on Cultural Significance

52. The magnitude of an impact is a measure of the degree to which the cultural significance of a heritage asset would 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).

53. Magnitude is assessed as '**High**'/'**Medium**'/'**Low**'/'**Negligible**', and either '**Adverse**' or '**Beneficial**', or '**No Impact**', using the criteria in **Table 11.4: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impacts on heritage assets** 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 11.6.5**, 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.

11.3.7.3 Assessment of the Significance of Effects

55. 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: Criteria for assessing the significance of effects on heritage assets** 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

57. 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**'.

11.3.7.4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

58. Cumulative effects can occur when other existing or proposed (typically windfarm) 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.

59. Other existing or proposed windfarm developments are included in the cumulative assessment where they also lie within 5 km of the asset, or within 30 km in cases where an asset's wider landscape setting is judged to be exceptionally sensitive. 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 Baseline Conditions

11.4.1 Previous Investigations

60. The OSA has been the subject of previous archaeological investigations, including a number in the direct vicinity of the ISA and relevant to this assessment, as follows (listed with HER reference, prefixed EHG):
- EHG3158: DBA and walkover survey, Inner Sound, Canisbay (July 2011);
 - EHG1224: DBA and walkover survey, Proposed Scoolary Windfarm, Caithness (June 2004);
 - EHG4805: DBA and walkover survey, Gills Bay 132KV (June 2016);
 - EHG4527: DBA and walkover survey, Proposed Lyth Windfarm (Feb 2013);
 - EHG4438: DBA, Proposed Lochend Windfarm (July 2013); and
 - EHG722: DBA and walkover survey, Anemometer mast sites (May 2002).
61. Of these previous investigations, the survey area for EHG1224 (SUAT Ltd, June 2004) included a large proportion of the ISA for the current assessment. In addition to the known heritage assets recorded by the HER and identified by this assessment, the DBA for the previous assessment (i.e. review of historic maps and aerial photos) identified 18 further assets within the ISA for the current assessment comprising buildings, sheepfolds, wells, an enclosure, quarries, a possible boundary stone, and areas of rig and furrow historical agricultural earthworks. In addition, the walkover survey for the previous assessment identified one additional heritage asset within the ISA, another former quarry, probably for a modern access track.
62. The results of these surveys, along with the further studies carried out for this report, provide a thorough understanding of the archaeological and historical assets which survive upstanding within the study areas.

11.4.2 Geology and Geomorphology

63. According to the British Geological Survey data (<https://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html> accessed 20 October 2020), bedrock geology within the ISA comprises Middle Old Red Sandstone (undifferentiated) – conglomerate, sandstone, siltstone and mudstone. Superficial geology within the ISA largely comprises predominantly peat on the lower slopes; on the high point in the centre of the Site an area of till is recorded; and on both the eastern and western Site boundaries there are areas of Alluvium – clay, silt, sand and gravel, associated with Link Burn (west) and Gill Burn (east).
64. The Phillips Mains Mire Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), an area of Class 1 Peatland, is in the northeast area of the Site. Peat began forming in the early Neolithic period, but did not reach its maximum extent until much later (Davidson & Henshall, 1991).

11.4.3 Archaeological Background

11.4.3.1 Prehistoric Periods

65. Within the 10 km area surrounding the ISA (the OSA), evidence of prehistoric activity comprises approximately 27 scheduled monuments. These features date from the Neolithic through to the late Iron Age and includes ritual and funerary cairns and standing stones, a burnt mound, a promontory fort and brochs. The majority of these assets are located on the coast or along watercourses or on raised positions overlooking watercourses. Given the proximity of the Site to the coast, a number of the heritage assets identified in the OSA are located on the Island of Stroma.
66. The earliest heritage assets within the OSA are funerary cairns and standing stones. Such funerary and ritual monuments typically date from the Neolithic to Early Bronze Age. The absence of associated Neolithic settlement remains probably reflects the priorities of past research, or the fact that such assets were made of less substantial materials, most probably timber and turf.
67. Dating to the Iron Age there are 14 scheduled brochs in the OSA. These are amongst the most prominent archaeological sites in Caithness and comprise large cylindrical drystone towers surviving up to 12 m high. Although the exact function of brochs remains under debate they are often considered to be defended farmsteads with the size of the structures providing evidence of social cohesion.

11.4.3.2 Medieval to Modern Periods

68. The early medieval period in Caithness is dominated by the Norse incursions into the area in the 9th century and their subsequent control of the area from the 10th century to early 13th century. A presence in the surrounding area is recorded in

the Orkneyinga Saga. Placename evidence suggests that settlements surrounding the ISA are derived from old Norse (Hollandmey is the 'high land of Mey' i.e. the hill above Mey, Brabuster is a typical farm/settlement name with the placename element bister/buster = Norse Bolstadr, and Skarfskerry, Skirza and Freswick are all of Norse origin).

69. Within the OSA, located on the coast 7 km east of the ISA, lies the remains of Freswick Links Viking Settlement (SM2535). Due to the overlap of the OSA with a significant length of coastline, there are further HER records for three Norse ship burials, two at the Ness of Huna and one at Kirk O'Tang, each c. 2 km north of the ISA. 6km south of the ISA is the Ring of Castlehill (SM576), a circular Norse or Norman fort.
70. There are the remains of one medieval period castle within the OSA. Bucholly Castle (SM620) dates to the 15th century. Further medieval remains are located 3.5 km south east of the ISA at Kirkstones settlement (SM4636), where the excavation of which (in 1866) showed signs of habitation in the Medieval period or later. Structures are still visible that are dissimilar to those of known shielings. 1.6 km south east of Kirkstones is Green Hill of Clayton (SM4593), a settlement complex that is reminiscent of Kirkstones.
71. There are the remains of two post- medieval period castles within the OSA. Castle of Mey/Barrogill Castle (Cat A LB1797) and Keiss Castle (SM623) both date to the late 16th century.
72. According to the Scottish Urban Archaeological Trust (SUAT) 2004 visit to the National Archives of Scotland (NAS, Mey Papers GD96), 'Hollandmey' is mentioned in 1573 (NAS, GD96/135), 'Brabustermuir' in 1604 (NAS, GD96/316) and 'Scularie' in 1614 (NAS, GD96, 376).
73. From the medieval period through to the early modern period the archaeological record for this area of Caithness is dominated by agricultural remains consisting of small farmsteads, crofts, sheep folds and sheilings, enclosures, lodges, long houses and field systems. These assets are generally post-medieval though some may have their origins in the medieval period. This area of Caithness was subject to the Highland Clearances in the 19th century when the small farmsteads and crofts were cleared to enable large-scale sheep farming. In addition, there are the remains of industry including grain mills, water mills/dams and smithies.
74. A large concentration of known heritage assets occurs along the coast to the west, north and east of the ISA. These are not considered further in the assessment of archaeological potential as the ISA is of a distinct landscape character and land use.
75. The character of the ISA comprises largely flat open moorland, some of which has been drained in the later historic periods and today, the Site contains sections of Coniferous Woodland Plantation and is located within an area of carbon-rich soils.

11.4.4 Heritage Assets in the ISA

11.4.4.1 Designated Heritage Assets

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

11.4.4.2 Undesignated Heritage Assets

77. There are 15 undesignated assets recorded by NRHE/HER within the ISA as listed in **Technical Appendix 11.1** and shown in **Figure 11.1**. These include four of shielings or possible shielings, four sheepfolds, six farmsteads or possible farmsteads and one possible broch.
78. The survey for EHG1224 (SUAT, June 2004) identified 19no. further heritage assets within the ISA for the current assessment from first edition OS mapping, historical aerial photography, and walkover survey. These assets, comprising three wells, six quarries, an enclosure, a re-erected/modern boundary stone and seven areas of rig and furrow (no longer extant) are of **'Negligible'** importance. As a significant effect is not possible on an asset of **'Negligible'** importance, these are not considered further in the assessment.
79. The historic map review for the proposed Development identified ten further heritage assets within the ISA. These assets, comprising three wells, six quarries, and one trackway are of **'Negligible'** importance. As a significant effect is not possible on an asset of **'Negligible'** importance, these are not considered further in the assessment.

11.4.5 Potential for Undiscovered Heritage Assets within the ISA

80. the previous survey and the survey of the ISA for the current proposed Development are likely to have identified and recorded any upstanding cultural heritage assets. It is therefore considered that there is 'Low' potential for further upstanding cultural heritage assets unrecorded within the ISA, however, it is acknowledged that as much of the Site remains densely afforested, the walkover survey was limited to clearings and areas that were easily accessible. It is therefore possible that upstanding archaeological remains may survive within more densely planted and less accessible areas of the plantation.

81. In general, the Site is of 'Low' archaeological potential due to its low-lying and waterlogged nature. There is evidence of activity primarily in the later historic period when drainage was implemented within the ISA. The potential for previously unrecorded assets varies within the ISA:

- It is considered that in the area immediately surrounding the broch (MHG640), there is 'Medium' potential for associated assets to survive as subsurface remains. However, it is acknowledged that the broch has never been investigated through excavation and may represent later activity.
- The remainder of the ISA is considered to have 'Low' archaeological potential, although it is acknowledged that in areas of deep peat, there is potential for previously unrecorded assets to survive below-ground and obscured by the masking effect of peat cover.

11.4.6 Heritage Assets in the OSA

82. Assets within the OSA that meet the appraisal criteria for detailed settings assessment are listed in full in **Technical Appendix 11.2** and shown in **Figure 11.2**.

11.4.6.1 World Heritage Sites

83. There are no WHS in the OSA. (The Flow Country is on the tentative list for World Heritage Site status, although for ecological rather than cultural reasons. Firm proposals for a boundary and any buffers have yet to be reached.)

11.4.6.2 Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes

84. There is one IGDL within 25km of the Site: Castle of Mey (formerly known as Barrogill Castle) (GDL 00096). The Castle's associated garden & designed landscape contained two listed buildings, Category A Castle of Mey (LB 1797) and Category B Lodge (LB 1798). The Castle was constructed in 1566-72 in a LC16 Z-plan layout comprising a main three-story and attic block with SE projecting five-story square tower wing and NW square stair tower. Various subsequent 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th century additions comprise the current Castle of Mey (LB 1797). The designed landscape (GDL 00096) of parkland, woodland, formal gardens and walled gardens was probably established between 1750 - 1875, probably c.1820, with replanting and improvements in 1928 and post-1952. The IGDL, the listed buildings within it, and their relationships are considered as a single entity for detailed assessment. Castle of Mey IGDL is located 1.8 km north of the ISA. In accordance with the criteria in **Table 11.3**, IGDLs are of 'High' importance.

11.4.6.3 Scheduled Monuments

85. There are 39 scheduled monuments (SM) within 10 km of the proposed wind turbines (see **Figure 11.2**). A full list of SMs is provided in **Technical Appendix 11.2**). None of the SMs within the OSA are Properties in Care. The majority of SMs date to the prehistoric period with the record being dominated by cairns (ten) and brochs (14no.). Further prehistoric SMs include a fort, a burnt mound and a standing stone. The remainder of the SMs comprise, in chronological order, a Norse coastal settlement, two castles, three churches, a windmill, two later historic deserted settlements, and two 20th century military batteries. Scheduled monuments, in accordance with the criteria in **Table 11.3**, are considered to be of 'High' cultural heritage importance.

86. Following appraisal, based on sensitivity to visual change within the setting of each scheduled monument and the potential for the proposed Development to affect cultural significance, four scheduled monuments have been considered for detailed assessment. The scheduled monuments include three cairns and one broch. See **Table 11.7** and **Figure 11.2**. The appraisal process is outlined below (see also **Technical Appendix 11.2**).

87. Ten of the scheduled monuments are outside or only slightly in the ZTV, all of which are located on the coastline to the north, east or west of the ISA. There are no views from, or across them (including those from the sea) which would result in their cultural significance being affected by the proposed Development. These are therefore excluded from further assessment.

88. As presented in Consultation **Table 11.1**, HES requested detailed impact assessments on two scheduled monuments in the OSA: Earl's Cairn, chambered cairn N of Hollandmake, Inkstack (SM 449) and Thomsonsfield, Broch 780 m SW of Brabstermire (SM588). Assessment of these assets is presented in **Sections 11.5.2.1** and **11.5.2.2**.

89. There are a further seven cairns which lie within the ZTV, two of which have been considered for detailed assessment following appraisal: Warth Hill cairn, 2 km north of Freswick (SM503); and Earney Hillock chambered cairn, 720 m northeast of Granton Mains, Bowermadden (SM439). Appraisal has confirmed that the cultural significance of all other SM cairns within the OSA/ZTV would not be affected by the proposed Development. Those cairns that are prominent features are located at such a distance that their prominence would not be affected by the proposed Development. The contribution to these assets' significance made by their settings does not include the Site and these are therefore excluded from further assessment.

90. There are a further ten brochs which lie within the ZTV, none of which have been considered for detailed assessment following appraisal. All the other SM brochs within the OSA/ZTV are prominent features that are located at such a distance that their prominence would not be affected by the proposed Development. For those brochs preserved as below-ground remains only, appreciation of their setting would not be affected by the presence of distant turbines in the flat landscape. Where brochs occur in a group, such as Whitegate (SM13621), Keiss (SMSM13623), and Kirk Tofts (SM560), group value and intervisibility would remain unaffected by the proposed Development. The contribution to these assets' significance made by their settings does not include the Site and these are therefore excluded from further assessment.

- The remainder of the SMs excluded from further assessment following appraisal comprise assets with a localised setting (e.g. the site of a church, two deserted medieval villages, a burnt mound, and the remains of two castles (located directly on the coast) whose cultural significance would remain unaffected by the proposed Development;

- a 20th century military battery with a focus on the sea and no relationship with the proposed Development providing contribution to cultural significance;

- prominent features (a windmill) located at such a distance from the Site that the prominence of the asset would remain unaffected by the proposed Development;

- a recumbent standing stone which is not a prominent asset whose cultural significance would remain unaffected; and

- an earthwork fort comprising ditches and a low mound, not a prominent asset whose cultural significance would remain unaffected.

91. A number of the assets in the OSA are located on the Island of Stroma, from where it is not considered that the heritage assets derive any significance from, or hold a relationship with, the Site. Similarly, a number of the assets in the OSA are located directly on the coastline to the north, west and east of the Site and draw significance from association with the sea rather than the inland area of the Site.

Table 11.6. Scheduled Monuments considered for detailed assessment

Reference	Name	Location in relation to the Site	NGR
SM588	Thomsonfield, broch 780 m southwest of Brabstermire	1.6 km east of the ISA	332853, 969933
SM503	Warth Hill, cairn 2000 m north of Freswick	5.6 km east of the ISA	337163, 969883
SM449	Earl's Cairn, chambered cairn north of Hollandmake, Inkstack	1.6 km west of the ISA	326293, 969737
SM439	Earney Hillock, chambered cairn 720 m northeast of Granton Mains, Bowermadden	5.8 km south west of the ISA	323307, 964726

11.4.6.4 Listed Buildings

93. There are five Category A Listed Buildings located within 10 km of the Site (two of which are located within 5 km), and there are six Category B Listed Buildings and one Category C Listed Building located within 5 km of the Site. None of the listed buildings within the OSA are Properties in Care. Category A Listed Buildings, in accordance with the criteria in Table 11.3, are considered to be of 'High' cultural heritage importance and Category B Listed Buildings are considered to be of 'Medium' importance.

94. An appraisal of Category A Listed Buildings located within the ZTV and beyond 10 km was carried out. None of these assets are associated with designed views, vistas or landscapes, are appreciated from an immediate/local setting, and are not therefore considered sensitive to change within their settings from long distances. In addition is one lighthouse at Noss Head, whereby its prominent siting and long-distance views towards it contribute to its significance, these views are from the North Sea and would remain unaffected by the proposed Development. No heritage assets beyond 10 km of the Site have therefore been identified as requiring detailed assessment.

95. Following appraisal, based on proximity/sensitivity to visual change within the setting of each listed building and the potential for the proposed Development to affect cultural significance, three Category A and three Category B Listed Buildings have been considered for detailed assessment (see Table 11.7).

Table 11.7. Listed buildings considered for detailed assessment

Reference	Name	Category	Location in relation to the Site	NGR
LB1799	Freswick Castle	A	6.5 km east of the ISA	337801, 967142
LB1795	Canisbay Parish Church	A	3.0 km northeast of the ISA	334349, 972853
LB1797	Castle Of Mey	A	1.6 km north of the ISA	329032, 973889
LB1807	West Canisbay (3x buildings)	B	2.6 km north east of the ISA	334258, 971872
LB1887	Barrock Free Church	B	2.2 km west of the ISA	325692, 971215
LB1798	Lodge, Castle Of Mey	B	1.5 km north of the ISA	328957, 973703

97. The remaining listed buildings are excluded from detailed assessment as appraisal has concluded that:

- Category A listed Dunnet Parish Church is located in a local townscape setting at sufficient distance from the Site that its prominence/dominance would remain unaffected by the proposed Development;
- Category A listed Keiss Harbour architectural and historical significance is not contributed to by the Site; and
- Category B listed buildings Ham Mill (LB1891) and Rattar House (LB1892), located 4.4 km and 3.2 km from the proposed Development respectively, are considered to have localised settings with no historical or current relationship to the Site; and
- Category C listed Lodge, Barrock House is located in a wooded setting and the group value with other associated listed buildings would remain unaffected by the proposed Development.

11.4.6.5 Inventory Battlefields

98. There are no Inventory Battlefields within the OSA.

11.4.6.6 Conservation Areas

99. There are no Inventory Battlefields within the OSA.

11.5 Identification and Evaluation of Key Effects

11.5.1 Construction Effects

100. Likely construction effects upon known heritage assets could result from topsoil stripping and excavation associated with wind turbines, access tracks, site compounds, substations, cable trenches and other infrastructure within the construction footprint. There is also a risk of accidental damage to heritage assets outside the construction footprint from uncontrolled plant movement.

11.5.1.1 Predicted Construction Effects

101. Direct construction effects are anticipated upon one known cultural heritage asset (Table 11.8: Predicted construction effects upon known heritage assets). The full assessment of heritage assets in the ISA is presented as Technical Appendix 11.1.

Table 11.8. Predicted construction effects upon known heritage assets

NRHE / HER Ref	Name	Anticipated Impact	Importance	Magnitude of impact	Significance of Effect
MHG56458	Farmstead – Crackersfield (site of)	Laydown area	'Low'	'High Adverse'	'Minor Adverse'

103. There is potential for previously unrecorded assets to survive below-ground and obscured by the masking effect of peat cover. Peat potentially seals an undisturbed early Neolithic ground surface with archaeological potential. Effect significance cannot be meaningfully assessed for unknown assets, as neither the sensitivity of the receptor nor the magnitude of the effect can be known. Consequently, only the likelihood of construction effects is considered.

104. Potential archaeological remains may be sealed beneath peat wherever it occurs within the Site. The potential for buried land surfaces remains to be evaluated.

105. It is considered that there is one area of increased potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets to survive within the ISA, in the area immediately surrounding the broch (MHG640) there is 'Medium' potential for associated assets to survive as subsurface remains. In the remainder of the ISA there is 'Low' potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets to be affected by construction work. A direct construction impact on unknown heritage assets in the ISA is possible, although unlikely. Any effect resulting from such an impact is unlikely to be of greater than 'Minor' significance.

11.5.2 Operational Effects

106. 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).

11.5.2.1 Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes

Castle of Mey (Barrogill Castle) (GDL00096), Castle of Mey (Cat A LB1797) & Lodge (Cat B LB1798)

107. The Castle's associated garden & designed landscape contains two listed buildings, Category A Castle of Mey (LB1797) and Category B Lodge (LB1798). These assets are considered as a group, with the IGDL providing the surroundings in which the Castle is experienced. The layout of the IGDL is presented at Figure 11.2 and a photo of the southern façade (main entrance) of the Castle is included in Figure 11.12. Figures 11.3 – 11.19 illustrate general views of and from the Castle, its gardens, and associated buildings.

Description of the Group of Assets

108. The Castle dates from 1566-72, constructed by George, 4th Earl of Caithness. It is understood that the 16th century Castle was sited at this location as the Earls of Caithness owned this land, with no evidence that its location was chosen specifically to take advantage of particular views. The designed landscape providing the setting to the Castle is not original to the 16th century building, it is a 19th century aesthetic, reflecting evolving fashions. The 1747-52 Roy Highlands Map shows the Castle with an enclosed garden to its south. The Lodge was not constructed at this time.
109. The main Castle block comprises a three-storey + attic /three-bay block with gun loops in the south elevation, a coped end and ridge stacks with slate roofs. With the main block, the Z-plan is completed by a five-storey square tower at the southeast, with angle bartizans and gun loops, crenelated, with modern glazing; and a northwest stair tower. In 1819, William Burn (architect) raised and crenelated parts of the original Castle, and added a Baronial porch, a two-storey projection at the south elevation, with a round-headed entrance under a crenelated wallhead. The Gate Lodge (LB 1798) was also added in the early 19th century (single-storey with canted west gable; harled rubble with ashlar margins; centre entrance in three-bay north elevation; pair centre ridge corniced stacks; slate roof.) After a period of neglect the Castle was restored in the second half of the 20th century by HM the Queen Mother, works which removed a number of the early 19th century alterations and in c. 1954, added a crenelated, two-storey, wide single-bay dining room wing with angle bartizans at the western main gable.
110. The designed landscape of parkland, woodland, formal gardens and walled gardens was established between 1750 – 1875, probably c.1820, with replanting and improvements in 1928 and post-1952. The layout from this period is shown on the 1st Edition OS map of 1873. Comparison of this with the 2nd Edition OS map of 1910 and the present design shows the landscape to have remained substantially the same since then. In summary, the designed landscape includes 40.5 ha of parkland, 4.7 ha of woodland, and 1.08 ha of formal garden which includes 0.5 ha of walled gardens. There are two walled gardens adjacent to the Castle of Mey. The east walled garden is enclosed on the north and east sides, and the west walled garden, thought to be the older of the two although the exact date of the walls is uncertain, is enclosed on all four sides.
111. The designed landscape extends south to the Lodge, west to the edge of the walled garden and the woodlands flanking the west drive, and east to Barrogill Mains Farm. The stable/garage block, unlisted, lies to the north east of the Castle. Crenelated walls flank the entrance to the courtyard on the south front of the Castle, and cannons stand on the adjacent lawns, relics of the Napoleonic wars. To the north, a road links the Castle with a road running west to the pier at Harrow, approximately 1 km to the west of the Castle. Between the Castle and the stable-block to the north is an area of grassland which is important to the setting of the Castle from the Harbour approach. The mill-lade runs through this area, past the Home Farm and the stables, to flow into the sea due north of the Castle. It has been dammed in two places since 1952 and the two resulting ponds are separated by a race. To the south, a road runs due south from the Lodge flanked by a beech/hawthorn hedge and a stone dyke to the A836. To the south of the Castle there is a driveway and woodland belts, mainly comprising sycamore and ash, enclosed by fencing. Formal lawns lead up to the south front of the Castle. Crenelated walls, in a similar style to the Castle additions of the 1950s, flank the entrance to this area from the main drive. Cannons stand on the lawns. The west drive approaches the Castle through the woodland. They are indicated on the 1st Edition OS map of 1873. Reference to the 1st & 2nd Edition OS maps indicates pathways through the woodlands. In 1928, Castle of Mey was purchased by Captain Imbert-Terry who was responsible for the replanting of the shelter woodlands. Beyond the woodland to the south the Parkland is situated, enclosed on the southern boundary by a road linking the Lodge with Barrogill Mains Farm. North of this road is the Animal Centre, which although included in the IGDL boundary is not mentioned in the List Description as it is a very recent construction. This road also encloses the Parkland to the south of the east drive. A shelterbelt has been established along the northern edge of the A836, but this is not part of the Castle of Mey property.
112. The Castle and policies were for sale when the Queen Mother first saw them during her visit to Caithness in 1952. Her Majesty purchased the Castle and revived its original name of the Castle of Mey. When Her Majesty bought the Castle, it was in a dilapidated condition and threatened with demolition. Her Majesty initiated many improvements to the Castle and gardens, which were designed to have been at their best for the Queen Mother's visits in August and October.

Analysis of Cultural Significance

113. The cultural significance of the group of assets is multi-faceted and nested. The Inventory description of the IGDL ¹ (**Technical Appendix: 11.3: Castle of Mey IGDL Description and Designation Map**) grades the historical, architectural and scenic characteristics of the designed landscape as 'outstanding' with only 'some' interest in the artistic, horticultural and nature conservation characteristics. According to the Inventory, the Castle of Mey has outstanding historical value due to its

¹ <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/GDL00096>

associations with the Earls of Caithness and its more recent association with Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother. Outstanding architectural value reflects the fact that the designed landscape provides the setting for the Category A Listed Castle. Outstanding scenic value derives from what the Inventory description describes as the 'magnificent position' of the castle close to the shore of the Pentland Firth, creating 'magnificent views' from the castle, west towards Dunnet Head and across the Pentland Firth to Orkney. Views of the Castle and its woodland, particularly from the east, are also judged to be 'Significant'.

114. The cultural significance of the Category A Listed Castle reflects the same three main components as the IGDL (architectural, historical and scenic). The significance of the Castle (and the justification for its designation) is primarily derived from the architectural interest and intrinsic value of the Castle's fabric. It holds information relating to 16th century construction methods and societal structure with further interest derived from the later alterations which are representative of the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th centuries and the changing architectural fashions and needs of the Castle's occupants. Contextually, the Castle is dramatically sited and orientated such that views of the Pentland Firth contribute greatly to the modern aesthetic of the property. The curtilage of the Castle was manipulated in the 19th century to enhance the building's architecture, by guiding how visitors approach and appreciate the building. Associative historical value has already been described above, deriving from the past owners of the castle and their contribution to its development.

Contribution of Setting to Significance

Views towards the Castle from Outside its Grounds

115. Views of the Castle from the wider landscape are few and the IGDL description notes "*The flat nature of the landscape limits views of the policies which are enclosed within the woodlands to the south and the policy walls to the north*". Significant views of the Castle and its woodlands are cited in the IGDL description, as seen from the A836 and other minor roads between it and the coast, particularly from the east. The site visit carried out for this assessment noted that the Castle is prominently visible in a coastal setting from the east at distances of less than 1 km, but that the grandeur of the Castle and its complex architecture with multiple towers and chimneys can be readily appreciated when outside its own grounds only from Harrow pier and the Braes of Harrow approaching the Castle from the west along the coast, at a distance of less than 1 km.
116. Views of the Castle from the Pentland Firth are not considered significant. As discussed above, the Castle is not a prominent feature in the landscape beyond its grounds, therefore it is unlikely to be viewed prominently from the Pentland Firth, and it was certainly not designed to be so. The Castle's architecture would not be appreciated from the sea, a distance of over 500 m away, and was evidently not designed to be viewed from a boat, particularly given the well-known hazardous currents.

Approaches to the Castle

117. Access to the Castle can be gained on four approaches: from the south, from the south east, from the north and from the north east. Of these, the approach from the south was the main drive historically intended to be used by guests to the Castle, and that from the south east was the secondary approach. The approach from the north is the modern access for tourists, and the access from the north east is a private approach through the Castle's Home Farm.
118. Along the principal (historical) approach from the south, it is difficult to gain a view of the Castle which is shielded by the flanking shelter belts to the southeast and southwest. Moreover, the approach has been designed to guide the visitor sequentially via the Gate Lodge (LB 1798), through the woodland belts (**Figure 11.15**), turning through east and northwards again to 'reveal' an opened-up view of the Castle's southern façade on emergence from the woodland. This view is considered significant, as a manipulated element of the designed landscape.



Figure 11.15. Cat B Gate Lodge LB 1798 on principal approach, looking north, with woodland shelter belt beyond

119. The secondary route from the southeast, via Barrogill Mains Farm, is the mirror image of the main guests' approach that approaches through the south eastern woodland to join up with the main approach on the driveway in front of the Castle for a similar 'reveal' of its southern façade.
120. Today, visitors approach the Castle from the north ('the Harbour Approach') where, from the public car park, the Castle appears imposing due to the view upslope. The approach from Home Farm offers a similar view of the Castle.



Figure 11.16. Cat A Castle of Mey LB1797, looking south from Braes of Harrow, to east of Harbour Approach, at boundary of IGDL00096 Views from Within the Grounds (Inventory Garden Designed Landscape)

121. As discussed above, views of the Castle from the wider landscape are few, and it is best appreciated from within its IDGL grounds. From the area of grassland to the north the Castle is an imposing structure as viewed up the slope (Figure 11.16). The Castle is flanked by the walled gardens and backdropped by woodlands with no view beyond. The northern façade of the Castle is best appreciated from within the IGDL to the north.
122. From the Castle looking north there are the expansive views described as 'magnificent' in the List description over open pasture fields to the Pentland Firth and Orkney beyond. To the west the profile of Dunnet Head, the northerly point of mainland Scotland, is visible beyond fields (Figure 11.17), to the east are further views of pasture and isolated farms beyond two dammed ponds.



Figure 11.17. Scenic view of Dunnet Head from IGDL00096 to north of Castle, looking west

123. A view of the Castle's western façade is available from the west walled garden. There is an elevated viewing platform in its southeast corner, designed to overlook the walled garden but which also affords views north and northwest beyond the Castle curtilage to Dunnet Head, the Pentland Firth and Orkney (**Figure 11.18**), as described above. There is no view southwards from the walled garden and its elevated viewing platform due to the presence of the woodland blocks.



Figure 11.18. Scenic view of Orkney from IGDL00096 walled garden, looking north

124. The view towards the south from the Castle's porch is a sheltered, channelled view between two woodland blocks of the curving driveway of the principal approach, around a manicured lawn in the foreground, with the glimpsed Parkland containing three clusters of sycamore and ash in the middle distance. Due to the land rising to the south, the three clusters of trees are positioned on the horizon with nothing visible beyond (see photomontage visualisations **Figures 11.3 – 11.11**).

Views from within the Castle

125. Views from within the Castle at ground level are as described from within the IGDL (see above paragraphs 122-5), however, from the upper floors more becomes visible beyond the IGDL boundary; a landscape comprising open fields, scattered farms and few trees to the south with coastal and sea views to the north.
126. The public rooms of the Castle are on the first floor of the main block with service rooms below and two floors of bedrooms above (including those in the south eastern tower). The view is most expansive from the roof of the south eastern tower, although views southwards from here are partially obscured by a cap house with views to the north interrupted by chimney stacks. It is not considered that the 16th century Castle was situated to afford views in any particular direction, with windows primarily present to let in light (**Figures 11.19-21**). It is similarly not believed that the Earls of Caithness scaled the south eastern tower in order to appreciate the view.
127. The public rooms on the first floor comprise four interconnected rooms which each occupy the full width of the main block. Starting at the west end, there is the Dining Room which has windows facing west and south. The triple south-facing window is the largest in the Castle and was inserted in the 1950s (**Figure 11.20**); two smaller west-facing windows overlook the walled garden. A door from the Dining Room connects to the Drawing Room which has single windows facing north (**Figure 11.21**)

and south. Large double doors connect to the Equerries Room which has a single north-facing window. Finally, at the east end, is the Library with windows facing north and east. There has some enlargement of windows, most notably in the Dining Room, but none is designed to facilitate the appreciation of views from the Castle and the arrangement of furniture does nothing to encourage this.



Figure 11.19. North façade of Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797, illustrating arrangement of small, functional windows



Figure 11.20. Full extent of south-facing window in Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797 dining room, enlarged 1950s



Figure 11.21. Full extent of view north from Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797 drawing room

Relationship with the proposed Development

128. The proposed Development would be located to the south of this group of assets, with the nearest turbine, Turbine 7, located 3.8 km south-southeast of the Castle of Mey (LB1797) and 3.6 km south-southeast of the Parkland (the southern boundary of IGDL00096) and the Lodge (LB1798). The impact assessment considers views of, across and from the Castle and its gardens, and has identified that some part of the proposed Development would be visible from each of the porch, the lawn, the Parkland and the Animal Centre, all of which are located to the south of the Castle. Partial views would also be afforded from within any of the south-facing rooms within the Castle, and the whole of the proposed development would be visible from the roof of the south eastern tower (described in detail in the following paragraphs). The locations of seven viewpoints inside and outside the Castle that have been illustrated with photomontages are shown on a photograph of the south elevation of the Castle (**Figure 11.12**).
129. A photomontage looking south from the porch of the main entrance to the Castle (CHVP1, **Figure 11.3**) demonstrates that the tips of all ten turbines would be visible to varying degrees from the porch and lawn to the south of the Castle, within the view channelled by the woodland blocks of the IGDL and partially obscured by both the landform and vegetation. Movement of the turbine blades is likely to make them more visible than they appear in the photomontages. The turbines would also be slightly more prominent when viewed from the open Parkland on the southern boundary of the IGDL and from the Animal Centre (CHVP10 and 11, **Figures 11.13 and 11.14**).
130. Predicted views towards the proposed Development from public rooms on the first floor of the Castle are illustrated by photomontages from the Drawing Room (CHVP9, **Figure 11.11**) and the Dining Room from where ten turbines are potentially visible (CHVP2, **Figure 11.4**) albeit partially obscured by the woodland planting in the castle grounds. Screening of the ten turbines by the landform is slightly reduced at first floor relative to ground level but trees within the Castle grounds still screen the turbines to a considerable degree. Comparison of the view from these two rooms illustrates how the precise viewpoint affects the degree of screening by the woodland in the foreground. It should be noted that the view from the Drawing Room window was taken without leaf cover on the trees and with the window sash raised as the glass was too dirty for photography; this maximises the visibility of the turbines in the visualisation but does not reflect the typical experience of a person standing in the Drawing Room.
131. From the private chambers in the upper storeys of the Castle, the ten turbines would be more visible as screening by both landform and vegetation is reduced to some degree. From the second floor, illustrated by a view from the Lady in Waiting's Room (CHVP5, **Figure 11.7**), trees in the woodland blocks are still high enough to screen turbines, which are therefore only visible through the gap between the two blocks. Two viewpoints on the 3rd (top) floor (CHVP6 and 7, **Figures 11.8 and 11.9**) illustrate how the precise viewpoint affects which turbines would be visible in the gap between the woodland blocks; Turbines 5 – 10 from the centrally placed corridor view ((CHVP7, **Figure 11.9**) but only Turbines 7 – 10 from the more western Kitchen Maid's Room (CHVP6, **Figure 11.8**). It is only from the roof of the tower (CHVP8, **Figure 11.10**) that the entire proposed Development wind turbines would become visible above the top of the trees in the view looking south. It is not anticipated that the ground-mounted solar array or control compound would be visible from this distance in any of these views.
132. The predicted extent and nature of visual change in the setting of the Castle and its grounds, as summarised in the preceding paragraphs, should be understood in the context of those aspects of setting that would not be changed by the operation of the proposed Development.
133. No views of the Castle have been identified where it is anticipated the proposed Development would be seen in combination with the Castle. The turbines would be behind a visitor on the landward approaches to the castle and, from the limited viewpoints to the north, there would be no visibility due to screening either by woodland or the landform. This includes viewpoints within the IGDL to the north of the Castle, from Harrow pier and from the Braes of Harrow. The absence of combined views reflects the fact that the land falls away towards the sea (north) from the Castle with the mature woodland to the south of the Castle forming the skyline in views looking south.
134. A visitor's experience of the Castle from within its grounds would be unchanged with no visibility of the proposed Development in views of the Castle. There would also be no visibility from the walled garden or from the open area to the north of the castle, including the visitor centre. Views out from the Castle and its grounds to the west, north and east would be unchanged, leaving the important scenic views to Dunnet Head and Orkney unaffected by the proposed Development.

Anticipated Impact on Cultural Significance

135. The seven visualisations discussed above demonstrate that, whilst visible, the turbines would not be a prominent or significantly distracting feature when viewed from the IGDL or LB Castle of Mey, except when seen from the roof of the south eastern tower (CHVP8, **Figure 11.10**).
136. There would be no change in any of the views cited in the IGDL List Description as contributing to the significance of the group of heritage assets (see above). Where there would be views of the proposed Development from the Castle southwards, these views contribute less to the cultural significance of the asset than those looking northwards either from the Castle, or of the Castle. Where turbines would be introduced into the view, they would not obscure or interfere with any intended intervisibility with any natural or historical focal point. At present, from elevated positions, the view towards the proposed Development is of open arable fields which do not contribute to the cultural significance of the Castle of Mey. Nevertheless, this view southwards is a guided and historically manipulated view, particularly from a central position at ground level on exit via the Castle's porch, in which the proposed Development would introduce a degree of change.
137. It is considered that the driveway along which the view of the proposed Development would be channelled was primarily designed to guide the view of visitor's northwards towards the Castle on arrival. (Indeed, views to the south are not cited in the List Description for the IGDL nor the LB as of significance). The way that the carriage drives were designed to function and 'reveal' the Castle on approach would remain understandable, appreciated and unchanged. Further significant views that would remain unchanged include the dramatic natural views to the north and northwest; the detailed and manicured artistic layout of the walled garden to the west of the Castle as viewed from the intended elevated viewing platform, as well as from within the Castle itself; and any intervisibility between built or designed elements within the grounds of the IGDL would remain similarly unaffected.
138. The cultural significance of the Gate Lodge (Cat B LB1798), its part in the sequential reveal of the Castle's southern façade, and the (non-intervisible) relationship with the Castle would be maintained and unaffected.
139. No views towards the Castle from where its architecture and grandeur can be appreciated would be affected by the proposed Development in any direction on land. Due to the land dropping down towards the sea to the north, along with existing screening from woodland blocks and the Castle itself, there would be no views of the proposed Development backdropping the Castle when viewed from the north, nor would there be any view of the proposed Development from Harrow pier or the Braes of Harrow.
140. Where both the Castle and the proposed Development would be visible in conjunction from positions out at sea, such views are considered not to be relevant as the Castle was not designed to be viewed from the Pentland Firth.
141. CHVP2 (**Figure 11.4**) and CHVP9 (**Figure 11.11**) present the anticipated views of the proposed Development from the dining room and drawing room and illustrate the predicted impact upon views from the two public rooms that face south, including the largest window (installed by HM Queen Mother to let more light in). Views southwards from the private chambers, although original fabric of the Castle, were not a specific design aesthetic of the 16th century main block.
142. The 'focus' of the designed view to the south from the Castle and the Parkland comprising three clusters of trees would remain evident in the middle ground of any view in which turbines would be introduced, despite their presence in the background. The introduction of turbines in this view would not dominate the vista, but they would be incongruous. The movement of the blades would introduce a kinetic element that was not present previously.
143. All multi-faceted and nested elements of the cultural significance of the Castle and its designed landscape have been considered with regards to the contribution overall that setting makes to the cultural significance. In summary, the proposed Development would represent a change within a designed view that would diminish the contribution made to the significance of the Castle. A change in the view southwards, which is not the primary aesthetic of the Castle and its 19th century designed garden and the significance of which should not be overstated, is considered to result in an 'Adverse' impact of 'Negligible' magnitude resulting in an effect of 'Negligible significance' on the Castle of Mey (IGDL00096, Cat A LB1797), which is 'Not Significant'.

11.5.2.2 Scheduled Monuments

Earl's Cairn, Chambered Cairn north of Hollandmake, Inkstack (SM449)

144. Earl's Cairn, chambered cairn (SM449) is the remains of a prehistoric round cairn of the Orkney-Cromarty type dating to the Neolithic period. The cairn has been disturbed by historical robbing and ploughing and all that now remains of it is a turf-covered mound 10-14 m in diameter by 1.6 m high although the original cairn perimeter can still be traced as a slight stony shelf, 20 m in diameter. Within the mound are three transverse slabs, part of the chamber, and six earthfast stones, obviously part of the chamber, but not in situ. No trace of exposed upright stones nor drystone-walling, reported present in 1911, remain. Boulders have been dumped around the fringe of the cairn.



Figure 11.22. Earl's Cairn, Chambered Cairn SM449 during photography for photomontage Figure 11.5, looking southwest

145. The cultural significance of this cairn derives primarily from the intrinsic archaeological interest, further excavation of the physical remains would allow interpretation of information regarding funerary practices in the Neolithic to Early Bronze Age. Contextually, the siting in the landscape and relative position with other monuments provide insights 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.
146. Earl's Cairn is prominently positioned in an arable field (currently sown grasses), on the top of a low, gentle rise. Due to the relative flatness of the landscape there are panoramic views from the cairn in most directions. The immediate landscape comprises fields enclosed by post-and-wire fences or low dry stone/Caithness flagstone walls, a quarry, and modern farm buildings. Beyond the immediate vicinity Loch Heilen is visible to the southwest and the four wind turbines of the operational Lochend Windfarm are prominent features to the southeast. There are striking long range views over lower ground, southwest to Morven and Scaraben, northwest to Dunnet Head and north across the Pentland Firth to Orkney. The intervening landscape drops down in elevation slightly between the cairn and the proposed Development, before rising again in the centre

of the Site. Views in this direction (east) are screened by a planted belt of trees along the eastern side of the field which blocks views from the cairn over the subdued landform. The Lochend Windfarm turbines rise above this belt of trees.

147. Earl's Cairn is one of a group of chambered cairns in north east Caithness which appear to have been located to serve a community settled on the well-drained soils of the area (Davidson & Henshall, 1991). It is likely that the cairn would have been placed to be intervisible with contemporary settlement and other prominent monuments. That said, there are no known Neolithic settlements in the vicinity of this cairn, nor can any other contemporary monuments been seen from it; as a result these aspects of setting make no contribution to significance of the cairn. When the cairn was newly built and at full height, it would have been a prominent feature in the landscape but most of the structure has been lost to stone robbing and it is now only possible to appreciate the presence of the cairn in its hilltop site at close range (i.e. within the field that it is located).
148. Caithness cairns in general follow the usual trend amongst Scottish chambered cairns in orientation of the chamber's long axis facing the southeast quadrant of the compass (Davidson & Henshall, 1991), although there is a wide variety exhibited. Earl's Cairn is orientated west-northwest to east southeast, with the entrance at the east-southeast end. It has been suggested that the orientation of chambered cairns is no more than a "broad preference" (Henshall and Ritchie, 2001, 119) and this archaeological research has, to date, been unable to determine whether the orientation of the main axis of Orkney-Cromarty type cairns contributes to their significance or not. The Earl's Cairn chamber is not aligned with any evident focal point (neither natural nor man-made) in the near or far distance that the orientation of the chamber has evidently been constructed to respect. The orientation of the chamber and passage cannot now be readily appreciated on the site due to infilling of the chamber and the view east-southeast along the known alignment of the passage is currently obstructed by trees only 100 m to the east of the cairn.
149. The proposed Development is located to the east of this asset, with proposed Turbine 1 located 2.1 km east-northeast and Turbine 4 located 2.9 km southeast. The location of the proposed Development over 2 km away would not affect the prominence of the cairn, which would remain readily discernible within its immediate setting (the only area in which it can be appreciated).
150. The photomontage (CHVP3, Figure 11.5), which has been aligned with the axis of the chamber and passage, demonstrates that on exit from the chamber, all ten turbines of the proposed Development would be visible adjacent to the installed Lochend Windfarm turbines. The proposed solar array or control compound would not be visible. It is not certain that the orientation of the chamber towards the east-southeast was significant, and if it was, the meaning has been lost as there is no evident feature on this alignment with which intervisibility was obviously intended. The proposed Development would therefore introduce a change in the view, but not prevent an understanding of the hilltop siting and appreciation of, or ability to speculate regarding, the orientation of this cairn.
151. The general presence of the proposed Development would constitute a material change the setting of the Earl's Cairn but there is no reason to interpret this change as an adverse impact on the significance of the cairn. It would continue to be experienced in a 21st century rural agricultural landscape that contains buildings and a working quarry in much closer proximity. None of these modern landscape features materially detract from our ability to appreciate the hilltop location chosen for the cairn and to speculate how it might have related to other unknown contemporary features in the landscape.

152. All aspects of the significance of the cairn and its setting considered, the proposed Development would have 'No Impact' on the cultural significance of Earl's Cairn (SM449) resulting in **no effect significance** which is 'Not Significant'.

Earney Hillock, Chambered Cairn 72 m northeast of Granton Mains, Bowermadden (SM439)

153. Earney Hillock (SM439) comprises the grassed-over remains of a possible chambered (the presence of a chamber is uncertain) long cairn of the Neolithic period (regarded as doubtful by Davidson & Henshall, 1991, 47). It is situated at 62 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in cultivated land at the edge of an extensive boggy area. The upstanding remains of the cairn consist of an overgrown mound approximately 34 m northwest to southeast and 18 m transversely, standing 1 m to 1.7 m in height. There are four visible orthostats (upright slabs) showing proud of the turf, all apparently broken. Three of the orthostats are clustered together about 9 m from the south eastern end of the monument. The northernmost of the three is 1 m long and 0.1 m thick, aligned north-northwest to south-southeast while the southernmost is 1.6 m long and 0.2 m thick, aligned west-northwest to east-southeast, and both project 0.3 m. Between them is the barely visible tip of the third stone. The fourth orthostat is 11 m to the northwest of the northern-most stone of the group of three and is 0.6 m long, 0.25 m thick and projects by 0.4 m.



Figure 11.23. Earney Hillock, Chambered Cairn SM439, looking northeast

154. The cultural significance of this cairn derives primarily from the intrinsic archaeological interest, which, if this is indeed a cairn, holds information regarding funerary practices in the Neolithic. 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. Earney Hillock therefore holds the potential to contribute to this research.
155. Earney Hillock is prominently visible in a pasture field alongside a road, a landmark in an otherwise generally featureless setting. There are panoramic views comprising a similar view in all directions of rough pasture, sporadic fencelines and hedges and isolated modern farms. The landscape rises very gently to the north east and there are very distant hills visible on the horizon to the south west.
156. The long axis of the earthwork remains is orientated northwest to southeast, however without formal investigation the orientation of any chamber (if indeed there is one) is currently uncertain.
157. The proposed Development would be located to the northeast of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine T4, would be located at a distance of 6.5 km. The proposed solar array would not be visible. The location of the proposed Development at this distance would appear relatively very small and would not affect the prominence of the cairn, which would remain readily discernible. The proposed Development does not exhibit a current or historical relevant relationship with the cairn. The wider landscape setting would remain essentially unchanged despite the presence of the proposed turbines within a small part of the panorama, and these would not affect the potential to understand and appreciate this asset in its wider landscape setting.

158. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of Earney Hillock (SM439) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

Warth Hill, Cairn 2000 m north of Freswick (SM503)

159. Warth Hill Cairn (SM503), is the remains of a cairn on the summit of Warth Hill (c.125 m OD) measuring 19 m in diameter and 2 m high. The cairn, possibly reused as a beacon, was excavated in 1870, and contained two cists (stone lined burial chambers) containing human remains. Today, the hollowed centre is partly filled with debris and there is no trace of the cists. The west and north edges of the cairn are mutilated by modern ditches.



Figure 11.24. Warth Hill Cairn SM503, looking north

160. The cultural significance of this cairn derives primarily from the intrinsic archaeological interest, excavation of the physical remains should any be preserved would allow interpretation of information regarding funerary practices in the Early Bronze Age. The cairn has likely been constructed on the summit of Warth Hill in the otherwise generally relatively flat landscape as a landmark and is prominently viewed from all directions. Summit cairns are generally located where they would be visible to the communities who constructed them from their contemporary settlements and surrounding area and contextually it is this intervisibility that is of most relevance to the contribution that setting makes to its cultural significance.
161. The summit position on Warth Hill, at 124 m AOD is a relative vantage point in the otherwise flat landscape and therefore affords long panoramic views in all directions. The hill itself and the immediate landscape comprises heather moorland. To the east the North Sea is prominently visible, and also visible to the north is the Pentland Firth with the Island of Stroma and Orkney beyond. The turbines of Stroupster Windfarm are visible to the south west, with prominent hills on the horizon beyond. To the north west the profile of Dunnet Head is clearly visible. Although in a prominent position, the cairn itself is not

discernible from the proposed Development. The cairn is particularly prominent from the lower, coastal ground to the east, and it is here that contemporary settlement is likely to have been located.

162. The proposed Development would be located to the west of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine 10, would be located approximately 6.6 km away. The proposed solar array would not be visible. The proposed turbines would be a sufficient distance from this asset not to affect its continued presence as a landmark feature. The wider landscape setting would remain essentially open moorland despite the presence of the proposed turbines.

163. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of Warth Hill Cairn (SM503) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

Thomsonsfield, Broch 780 m SW of Brabstermire (SM588)

164. Thomsonsfield Broch (SM588) is the remains of a probable broch partially excavated before 1910 at which time parts of a circular wall were uncovered. Nothing is visible now except a low, grassy mound. The mound measures c.35 m north to south by 21 m transversely and 0.9 m high. It extended westwards into the adjacent field but has been ploughed out.



Figure 11.25. Site of Thomsonsfield Broch SM588, looking west

165. The primary value of brochs is the intrinsic archaeological interest in their fabric as a potential data source on the architecture, defensive, domestic life and the social motives behind the construction of such massive structures during the Iron Age. The nature of these structures suggests that defence was a priority, although symbols of power and the avoidance of conflict is also a potentially significant factor. The contextual value of brochs therefore comes from their relationship with the surrounding landscape, as prominently visible monuments. Brochs are commonly sited on mounds with views over the surrounding area;

along valleys or over the coastal plain. Brochs are also often located close to areas of cultivatable land suggesting that agriculture was also of importance to the Broch dwellers.

166. Thomsonsfield Broch is located midway on a slope with a southeast aspect within heather moorland. Open views are available including the turbines of Stroupster Windfarm to the south east, the North Sea is visible in the distance to the east, and Orkney is visible beyond the Pentland Firth to the north. The broch site is not overlooking land to the west, and it is unlikely that the Site formed part of the land its inhabitants cultivated. Due to topography, the proposed Development would not be visible to the west of the broch site, a view which at present contains a modern house and steel communications tower.

167. The proposed Development would be located to the west of this asset, with the nearest turbine, Turbine 10, located approximately 2.3 km away. The wireline visualisation (**Figure 11.6**) generated for the proposed Development to aid this assessment demonstrates that all ten turbines would be visible from the site of the broch, however due to intervening topography in some cases only the blades would be visible. The proposed solar array or control compound would not be visible. Although historically an intentionally prominent monument, the subsurface remains are no longer prominent, and hardly recognisable as a heritage asset. The contribution that setting makes to the significance of this asset relates to the understanding the defensive properties of the topographic position and the presence of cultivatable land.

168. The ability to understand and appreciate the location of the broch in the wider topographic setting would be unaffected, the defensive properties of long distance views would remain, as would the relationship with the surrounding cultivatable land. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of Thomsonsfield Broch (SM588) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

11.5.2.3 Listed Buildings

Freswick Castle (Cat A LB1799)

169. Freswick Castle (LB1799) is a Category A listed building. The building is a mansion house of three storeys of late 17th century date, substantially re-cast in the 18th century. The building is of architectural and historical interest.



Figure 11.26. Freswick Castle LB1799, looking north

170. It is prominently positioned on the North Sea coast and otherwise surrounded by pasture, beyond which lies moorland including a prominent view of Warth Hill to the north west and Stroupster Windfarm to the west-southwest. The mansion house therefore has views over the surrounding landscape, however it is considered that the relationship with the sea, and the local views of its immediately surrounding farm land which provide the contextual contribution to cultural significance regarding the building's siting and domestic function.
171. The proposed Development would be visible to the west-northwest of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine 9, is located 7.8 km to the west-northwest. At this distance, the proposed Development would not challenge the prominence of Freswick Castle. There is no significant evident relationship with views towards the proposed Development that would be affected. The relationship of the house with the seascape and surrounding farmland that contribute to its cultural significance would not be affected. It is considered that the proposed Development would have **'No impact'** on the cultural significance of Freswick Castle (LB1799) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

Canisbay Parish Church (Cat A LB1795)

172. Canisbay Parish Church (St. Drostan's Church of Scotland) (LB1795) is a Category A listed building, a listing that includes the burial ground. The burial ground is walled and includes fine quality, 17th – 20th century tomb stones of historical interest. A Medieval church, it was rebuilt in the 17th century, with extensive renovations and alterations in the 19th century. Cruciform plan with two storey saddle-backed tower at western gable, the church's fabric is of architectural and historical interest.



Figure 11.27. Canisbay Parish Church LB1795, looking north

173. The local views of its parish provide the contextual contribution to cultural significance of the church, which is otherwise located by itself. A prominent local landmark within a wide and open parish context with sporadically located buildings in enclosed pasture, the church is also used as a landmark for sailors in the Pentland Firth. The cultural significance of the church is further contributed to by its associations with the historical inhabitants of the Castle of Mey, the Earls of Caithness and HM the Queen Mother, and also the Prince of Wales who have each worshipped at Canisbay Parish Church.
174. The proposed Development would be visible to the southwest of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine 10, is located 4.5 km away. At this distance, the proposed Development would not challenge the prominence of the church. The Site is located within the parish of Canisbay and historically therefore inhabitants of the shielings and crofts on the Site may have worshipped at the church. It is not considered that the proposed Development would significantly impact the ability to understand the parish layout and inter-relation of historical contemporary structures within it. The proposed Development would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of Canisbay Parish Church (LB1795) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

Barrock Free Church (Cat B LB1887)

175. Dunnet Free Church, Gate Piers and Enclosure Wall, Barrock (LB1795) is a Category B listed building. Built in 1844, the fabric and architecture are of intrinsic interest and that it was built by communal effort is of historical interest. The building is no longer in ecclesiastical use. Unadorned, although with no spire or tower, the church is monumental in scale and a prominent local landmark.



Figure 11.28. Barrock Free Church LB1887, looking south

176. Located on the top of a slight rise, in a roadside setting with open views of enclosed pasture in the immediate vicinity and the Pentland Firth and the Island of Stroma beyond. Local views of surrounding isolated farms and houses of Barrock provide the contextual contribution to cultural significance of the former church.
177. The proposed Development would be visible to the southeast of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine 1, is located 2.9 km away. At this distance, the proposed Development would not compete with the local dominance of the building. It is not considered that the proposed Development would significantly impact the ability to understand history of the former church nor appreciate its architecture. The proposed Development would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of Barrock Free Church (LB1795) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

West Canisbay (Cat B LB1807)

178. West Canisbay (LB1807) is a Category B listed building, late 18th/early 19th century, two-storey three-bay house with flanking single storey, two-bay wings, all south-facing. (No photograph is included as the site is on private property).
179. The house is located in gardens and surrounded by enclosed pasture and isolated farms. Due to topography, views south from the property are blocked by the landform. The building is listed for its architectural interest and is appreciated at short range in a local context.
180. The ZTV indicates that the proposed Development would be partially visible to the south west of this asset. The nearest turbine, Turbine 10, is located 4 km away. The southerly aspect is a feature of facing the sun for warmth and it is considered that views of turbines over the horizon would not affect the cultural significance of this asset. The proposed Development

would have **'No Impact'** on the cultural significance of West Canisbay (LB1807) resulting in **no effect significance** which is **'Not Significant'**.

11.5.3 Decommissioning Effects

181. The Applicant is seeking consent for the proposed Development in perpetuity so there would be no decommissioning. Should there be a failure of any renewable energy technology beyond economic repair or if the technology comes to the end of its viable operating life, the Applicant would replace the appropriate renewable energy infrastructure with a similar model of the same dimensions and appearance. Such operations would be similar to construction and similar mitigation would be applied. Therefore, it is considered that the construction and operational effects assessed above represent a worst case scenario.

11.5.4 Cumulative Effects

182. The cumulative effects of the proposed Development with the developments of the three consented, in planning or scoping stage, or at appeal windfarm developments within a 20 km Study Area (as described in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** and shown in **Table 11.9** below) have been considered. Existing windfarms form part of the baseline of this assessment and are therefore not included as cumulative developments.

Table 11.9: Cumulative developments within 20 km study area

Cumulative windfarm development	Number of wind turbines	Height to blade tip	Distance and direction to the proposed Development	Planning status
Cogle Moss	12	99.5 m	11 km to the north	Consented
Camster 2	11	126.5 m	18 km to the north	Application
Slickly	11	149.9 m	2.5 km to the north west	Application

183. 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 impacts on previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets.
184. 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 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.
185. 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.
186. In terms of operational effects upon the setting of heritage assets in the OSA, no effects of **'Minor'** or greater significance have been identified, thus no cumulative impacts are predicted for known cultural heritage assets from any combination of developments.

11.6 Mitigation Measures

11.6.1 Mitigation During Construction

187. A direct effect upon one known heritage asset of 'Low' importance has been identified (HER MHG56458: Farmstead – Crackersfield (site of)) resulting in a 'Minor Adverse' effect.
188. It is considered that there is one area of increased potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets to survive within the ISA, in the area immediately surrounding the broch (MHG640) there is 'Medium' potential for associated assets to survive as subsurface remains. However, the nearest proposed construction groundworks to broch MHG640 are 350 m away (crane pads for both of Turbines 6 and 9).
189. The need for of any mitigation works would be agreed with The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (THCHET). If necessary, the programme and scope of mitigation would be specified in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which would be agreed with the HCHET in advance of the works

11.6.2 Mitigation During Operation

190. 'No Significant' operational effects are predicted on the setting of cultural heritage assets from the operation of the proposed Development. No mitigation is recommended.

11.6.3 Residual Effects

11.6.3.1 Residual Construction Effects

191. Following implementation of a programme of mitigation agreed with the HCHET in advance of the works, no residual effects are anticipated upon known and/or potential heritage assets within the ISA.

11.6.3.2 Residual Operational Effects

192. There would be 'No Significant' operational effects on cultural heritage assets during the operation of the proposed Development.
193. As no mitigation for the visibility of the proposed Development from the Castle of Mey (Barrogill Castle) (GDL00096, Cat A LB1797) could be agreed with HES, the residual effect on its setting would be of 'Negligible Adverse' significance, and therefore 'Not Significant'.
194. A planting belt comprising native species had been suggested along the southern boundary of the Castle of Mey IGDL GDL00096 to offer an element of screening of the proposed Development from ground level within the IGDL (for example CHVP11) and from the Castle of Mey Cat A LB1797 Ground Floor Entrance (CHVP1). The planting belt would also likely reduce visibility from the principal rooms of the Castle (CHVP2 & CHVP9).
195. HES did not support the proposal as: "Planting a new belt of trees along the southern boundary of the designed landscape would alter the historic design of planting and would block designed and intended views, carefully channelled and framed by historic planting".
196. Should the proposed planting belt be established, it would lie roughly 210m south of the Castle's porch, 3.5km north of the nearest proposed turbines, and would be expected to stand to a mature height of c.6 m. **Figure 11.29** has been produced to illustrate where the proposed planting belt would stand after 5, 10 and 15 years.
197. The planting belt would not screen any of the proposed turbines from the upper floors or roof of the castle due to the relative height of these vantage points. The assessment in this chapter considers that the views from the smaller functional windows of the upper private bedroom chambers contribute less to significance of the castle and grounds. It is anticipated that the modernising effect of turbines in the views south from the IGDL at ground level, and from the ground and first floor rooms (including the principal entertaining dining and drawing rooms) would be minimised or eliminated entirely. Whilst the introduction of a planting belt into the views south would represent a visual change, the introduction of trees would be appropriate and in character with the existing planting within the IGDL which contributes to the significance of the Castle.

11.6.4 Summary

198. Potential effects of the proposed Development upon cultural heritage assets resulting from its construction, operation, and cumulative effects have been considered.
199. A direct effect upon one known heritage asset of 'Low' importance has been identified (HER MHG56458: Farmstead – Crackersfield (site of)) resulting in a 'Minor Adverse' effect. It is considered that there is potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets to survive within the ISA. Following implementation of a programme of mitigation agreed with the HCHET in advance of the works, no residual effects are anticipated upon known and/or potential heritage assets within the ISA.
200. Potential operational effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets in the surrounding area have been considered. The effect on cultural significance resulting from change in setting is considered to be of 'Negligible Adverse' significance for the Castle of Mey (Barrogill Castle) (GDL00096, Cat A LB1797).
201. The potential for cumulative effects has been considered. No cumulative effects have been identified.

11.7 References

DBA and walkover survey, Proposed Scoolary Wind Farm, Caithness: SUAT: June 2004

Geology of Britain: British Geological Survey. Available at:
<https://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html>

Listing, scheduling and designations: Historic Environment Scotland. Available at:
<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/listing-scheduling-and-designations/>

Past Map: Historic Environment Scotland. Available at: <https://pastmap.org.uk/>

Standards for Archaeological Work: The Highland Council: 2012

The Chambered Cairns of Caithness, An Inventory of the Structures and their Contents: J.L. Davidson and A.S. Henshall: Edinburgh University Press: 1991

**Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development
Project Team**

ScottishPower Renewables
320 St Vincent Street
Glasgow
G2 5AD

T +44 (0)141 614 0451

Hollandmeyred@ScottishPower.com

