

7 Cultural Heritage Assessment

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 The cultural heritage of an area comprises archaeological sites, historic buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs), Inventoried Battlefields and other historic environment features (collectively known as ‘heritage assets’). It also includes features or places which have the capacity to provide information about past human activity, or which have cultural significance due to associations with literary or artistic work, folklore or historic events. The setting of an asset within the wider landscape may contribute to the understanding and appreciation of the asset, and thereby the experience of it and its cultural heritage significance.
- 7.1.2 This Chapter assesses the potential effects of the construction and operation of the proposed Development on heritage assets within the Site and surrounding area. A full description of the proposed development is given in **Chapter 2: Project Description**. The assessment has included consideration of all known designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Site, all nationally significant heritage assets within 10 km of the proposed wind turbines that fall within the Zone of Theoretically Visible model (ZTV), and further nationally significant heritage assets beyond 10 km of the wind turbines identified in consultation with Statutory Consultees or by the assessment as having a setting sensitive to change in the distant landscape (**Figure 7.1** and **7.2**).
- 7.1.3 This assessment has been based on a range of data, including heritage assets recorded by regional and national bodies, readily available secondary sources and the results of a walk over survey of the Site.
- 7.1.4 The historic development of the Site and study area are discussed in the context of the wider region in order to predict the direct impact on any known or potential unknown archaeological remains within the Site and indirect impacts on assets within the Site and study area as appropriate. Measures necessary to safeguard or record any assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development are suggested.
- 7.1.5 For the purposes of this assessment the historic environment and cultural heritage is considered to consist of a variety of historic assets, including the following types of designated assets:
- World Heritage Sites (WHS);
 - Scheduled Monuments (SMs);
 - Listed Buildings (LB);

- Inventoried Battlefields;
- Conservation areas; and
- Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs).

- 7.1.6 These designations are predominantly of national importance, except that Conservation Areas may be of national or regional importance. Only Category A listed buildings are considered to be of national importance. Category B listed buildings are considered of regional importance, and Category C listed buildings of local importance (SNH Handbook, 2018).
- 7.1.7 In addition, the following non-designated assets are also included in the assessment:
- nationally/regionally recorded archaeological sites and finds (Canmore/HER data); and
 - other buildings and structures of historic or architectural importance.
- 7.1.8 This chapter is supported by:
- Technical Appendices 7.1 and 7.2
 - Figures 7.1-7.12 are referenced in the text where relevant.
- 7.1.9 The assessment has been carried out by Beth Gray MA (hons) ACIfA of SLR Consulting Ltd. Relevant codes of practice have been followed.

7.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislation

- 7.2.1 Relevant legislation includes:
- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
 - The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997; and
 - The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011 (this includes amendments to the above).

Policy

- 7.2.2 Relevant planning policy includes:
- National Planning Framework 4 (Scottish Government, 2023);
 - Our Past, Our Future: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (Scottish Government, 2023);
 - Scottish Statutory Instrument No. 101 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017;
 - Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, 2019); and
 - Historic Environment Circular 1, HES 2019.

Guidance

- 7.2.3 A number of relevant pieces of guidance have been published by the national heritage agency, HES, and the professional archaeological body, the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). These publications are:
- Planning Advice Note Planning and Archaeology PAN 2/2011;
 - HES's Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2020);
 - HES's Designation, Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019);
 - Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook (SNH (Naturescot) and HES, 2019)
 - CIfA's Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (CIfA, 2014a), which gives best practice for the execution of desk based assessments; and
 - CIfA's Code of Conduct (CIfA, 2014b).

7.3 Consultation

- 7.3.1 In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the scoping responses and other consultation undertaken as detailed in Table 7.1 below.

Table 7.1: Consultation

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issue Raised	Response/Action
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)(14/10/2022)	Scoping	<p>HES raise concern with a development of this scale at Hill of Fare.</p> <p>Key assets they feel have potential for significant impact include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunhoney (SM44) • Barmekin of Echt (SM57) • Christchurch (SM32) • Midmar (SM100) • Cothill (SM68) • Glassel (SM978) • Midmar Castle (LB16262) • Tyllicairn Castle (LB2959) 	<p>SLR approached HES for further consultation and agreement of viewpoints.</p> <p>The Battle of Corrichie while under review for designation by HES was treated as a hard constraint during the design process.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tilquhillie Castle (LB38) <p>HES also raised that Battle of Corrichie has been requested for designation by a member of the public.</p>	
Aberdeenshire Council Archaeology Service (ACAS) (14/10/2022)	Scoping	ACAS largely agree with the scope set out however, request that a non-designated asset including the remains of two longhouses NJ60SE004 (SLR86) is included for detailed setting assessment and that wider consideration be given to the wider landscape than individual assets.	SLR confirm that SLR86 has been included for detailed setting assessment. Assessment of the wider landscape is highlighted in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
HES (13/01/2023)	Pre-Application	<p>HES raised queries of assessing the internal location of Midmar Castle (LB16262).</p> <p>Discussion regarding visuals occurred and agreed.</p>	<p>Using a 3D modelling software this receptor and other key receptors were investigated with the model and the following viewpoints agreed:</p> <p>Photomontages from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barmekin of Echt (SM57) Sunhoney (SM44) Midmar Castle (LB16262) Cullerie Stone Circle (SM90088) <p>Wirelines from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christchurch Stone Circle (SM32) Tamnagon Stone Circle (SM49) Cothill Symbol Stone (SM68)
HES (30/05/2023)	Pre-Application	HES provided an update on the Battle of Corrichie application for placing it on the Inventory.	SLR confirm receipt of decision by HES that the battlefield would not be placed on the register.
HES (07/08/2023)	Pre-Application	SLR provided HES with an outline of potential enhancement opportunities on assets in the surrounding area that have potential for significant effect. This is outlined in Appendix 7.2.	<p>HES requested sight of photomontages ahead of the application submission which were provided on 14/09/2023.</p> <p>HES welcomed the enhancements to the assets in the area..</p>

			Embedded mitigation through design and reduction of impacts has been outlined in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives .
Torphins Community Council	Gatecheck 1	Requested assessment of Battle of Corrichie and Learney House with additional request of visualisations	The Battle of Corrichie was only assessed for Direct Impact due to the refusal for inclusion on the Inventory of Battlefields by HES. As this asset is classified as a standard HER by ACAS it is considered to be of local importance. As such an assessment of effects through setting change is out of scope. Learney House was assessed in Section 7.6.121 , no impact was found to be significant in EIA terms and no visualisation is required to verify this.

- effects on the setting of designated heritage assets within the study area shown by the ZTV not to be intervisible with the proposed Development, and where there is no identified viewpoint of the heritage assets which contributes to our understanding, appreciation and experience of the same within the ZTV.

Baseline Characterisation

Study Area

7.4.3 There is no guidance from HES which defines a required study area for the archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of wind farms. Professional expertise and experience proposed two study areas:

- the Site and an area buffer zone of 1 km to inform the predictive model of buried archaeology within the Site boundary; and
- a Study Area comprising of land beyond the Site up to 10 km from the proposed turbines, with theoretical intervisibility with the proposed turbines.

Field Survey

7.4.4 A targeted walkover survey was carried out on 09 May 2022. Turbine locations were visited to confirm the presence/absence of unknown archaeological remains and known heritage assets within the site boundary were visited to confirm absence/presence. Ground conditions were wet but weather was dry. All assets recorded on the HER within the site were visited as listed within Technical Appendix 7.1: Site Gazetteer.

7.4.5 Setting assessments were carried out 31 July 2023. Assets that were deemed sensitive to significant effect were visited however, due to private property and no contact from the owners, Category A Listed Building Midmar Castle (LB16262) was not able to be visited.

Sensitivity Criteria

7.4.6 Impacts have the potential to be caused by the Proposed Development where it changes the baseline condition of either the asset itself or its setting.

7.4.7 In accordance with EIA Regulations, this assessment will identify impacts and effects as either direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial, and short-term, long-term or permanent. Direct impacts are those which change the cultural heritage significance of an asset through physical alteration; in this assessment, indirect impacts are those which affect the cultural heritage significance of an asset by causing change within its setting.

7.4 Methodology

Scope of Assessment

Effects Assessed in Full

7.4.1 The following effects have been assessed in full:

- direct effects on all heritage assets within the Site;
- effects on designated cultural heritage assets which are sensitive to change within the study area; and
- effects to assets as agreed with Historic Environment Scotland as set out in consultation within Table 7.1.

Effects Scoped Out

7.4.2 The following have been scoped out:

- effects on the setting of non-designated heritage assets;
- effects on the setting of designated heritage assets more than 10 km from the proposed Development unless identified as being particularly sensitive to change to the distant landscape; and

7.4.8 Direct effects on the cultural heritage significance of an asset will be assessed on the basis of a combination of the cultural heritage significance of the affected asset (where known), the probability of further assets being located within the affected areas and their likely significance, and the magnitude of impact on those assets to be caused by the implementation of the Proposed Development.

7.4.9 Indirect effects on the cultural heritage significance of heritage assets will be identified and assessed with reference to *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (HES, 2020) and the guidance set out in the *EIA Handbook* (2019). Assessment will be carried out in the following stages:

- initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the cultural heritage significance of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of those assets;
- assessment of the magnitude of impact of the proposed Development on the contribution of settings to the significance of assets (by causing change within those settings); and
- prediction of the significance of the effect.

7.4.10 Assessment will be undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects. The magnitude of both beneficial and adverse impact will be assessed according to scale of impact, from high to neutral/none.

Cultural Heritage Significance

7.4.11 The cultural significance of undesignated heritage assets will be assessed by a consideration of their intrinsic, contextual, and associative characteristic as defined in HEPS (2019). In relation to these assets, this assessment will focus upon an assessment of the assets' inherent capability to contribute to our understanding of the past; the character of their structural, decorative and field characteristics as determined from the HER and Canmore records and / or site visits; the contribution of an asset to their class of monument, or the diminution of that class should an asset be lost; how a site relates to people, practices, events, and/or historical or social movements. Assessments of significance recorded within the HER will be taken into account where available.

7.4.12 **Table 7.2** shows the potential levels of cultural heritage significance of an asset related to designation, status and grading, and where non-designated, to a scale of Highest to Negligible importance. This table will act as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provides a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions that could be reached during assessment.

Table 7.2: Cultural Heritage Significance

Heritage significance	Explanation
Highest	Designated assets of international importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Heritage Sites.
High	Designated assets of national importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monuments; • Category A Listed Buildings; and • Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory; • Designated Battlefields.
Medium	Designated assets of regional importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category B Listed Buildings; • Some Conservation Areas; and • Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
Low	Assets of local importance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category C Listed Buildings; • Some Conservation Areas; and • Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
None	Features that do not retain any cultural heritage significance.
Unknown	Assets of indeterminable significance.

Magnitude of Effect

7.4.13 Determining the magnitude of any likely impacts requires consideration of the nature of activities proposed during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

7.4.14 The changes could potentially include direct change (e.g. ground disturbance), and indirect change (e.g. visible change, sound, vibration, traffic movements affecting the setting of the asset). Impacts may be beneficial or adverse, and may be short term, long term or permanent. Magnitude of impact will be assessed with reference to the criteria set out in **Table 7.3**.

Table 7.3: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of impact	Explanatory criteria
High Beneficial	The Proposed Development would considerably enhance the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Medium Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a clearly discernible extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.

Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a minor extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Beneficial	The Proposed Development would enhance to a very minor extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Neutral/None	The Proposed Development would not affect or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude on the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a very minor extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Low Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a minor extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability understand, appreciate and experience it.
Medium Adverse	The Proposed Development would erode to a clearly discernible extent the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
High Adverse	The Proposed Development would considerably erode the cultural significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.

Very Minor	To a barely discernible extent the Proposed Development would introduce change from the baseline that would harm or enhance the cultural significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Negligible	The Proposed Development would not affect or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude, on the cultural significance of the affected asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Neutral/Nil	The Proposed Development would have no effect on the cultural significance of the affected asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.

Significance of Effect

7.4.15 The significance criteria are presented in Table 7.4. Table 7.5 provides a matrix that relates the heritage significance of the asset to the magnitude of impact on its significance (incorporating contribution from setting where relevant), to establish the likely overall significance of effect. This assessment will be undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects, the latter being principally concerned with effects through development within the setting of heritage assets. Those assets which the matrix scores as Moderate will be considered as receiving a significant effect.

Table 7.4: Significance Criteria

Significance	Description
Major	Severe harm or enhancement such as total loss of significance or integrity of the setting, or exceptional improvement by the Proposed Development on the cultural significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset in its setting.
Moderate	Harm or enhancement such as the introduction or removal to the baseline of an element that would affect to a clearly discernible extent the cultural significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.
Minor	To a minor extent the development would introduce change to the baseline that would harm or enhance the cultural significance of the asset and the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it in its setting.

Table 7.5: Significance of Effect

Magnitude of Impact	Heritage Significance (excluding negligible and unknown)			
	Highest	High	Medium	Low
High beneficial	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium beneficial	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor
Low beneficial	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor
Very low beneficial	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Neutral/None	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil
Very low adverse	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Low adverse	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor
Medium adverse	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor
High adverse	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor

7.4.16 Assessment of visual impact has been assisted by a ZTV calculation, prepared principally for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and presented in Figure 7.2. The ZTV calculation methodology is set out in detail in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, but in summary it maps the predicted degree of visibility of the Proposed Development from all points within a study area around the site, as would be seen from an observer's eye level two metres above the ground. The ZTV model presented in Figure 7.2 is based on the maximum height of the blade tips of the Proposed Development. The ZTV model is used to inform the potential impacts on the setting of designated assets within the Study Area.

7.4.17 The ZTV is theoretical because it is based on landform only and does not take into account the screening or filtering effects of vegetation, buildings or other surface features, and in that respect is likely to provide an over-estimate of the actual visibility.

7.4.18 Assets that fall outwith the ZTV are excluded from any further assessment, with the exception of where a view is identified which includes the heritage asset and the proposed turbines, and that view may enable appreciation of the assets' heritage significance.

Mitigation

7.4.19 Where adverse effects on cultural heritage are identified, measures to prevent, reduce, and / or where possible offset these effects, will be proposed. Measures can be broken down into two categories Direct and Indirect Impacts.

7.4.20 Direct Impact mitigations may include:

- the micro-siting of Proposed Development infrastructure away from sensitive locations;
- the fencing off or marking out of heritage assets or features in proximity to construction activity in order avoid disturbance where possible;
- a programme of archaeological work where required, such as an archaeological watching brief during construction activities in or in proximity to areas of particular concern, or excavation and recording where damage is unavoidable; or
- a working protocol to be implemented should unrecorded archaeological features be discovered.

7.4.21 Indirect impact mitigation upon an assts setting may include:

- Alteration to turbine layout;
- Reduction of Turbine Height; or
- Turbine colour.

Residual Effects

7.4.22 A statement of the residual effects has been given following consideration of any further site-specific mitigation measures, where these have been identified.

Cumulative Effects

7.4.23 A cumulative effect is considered to occur when there is a combination of:

- A moderate or above effect on an asset or group of assets due to changes which would be caused by the main development under assessment; and
- an effect on the same asset or groups of assets which would be caused by another development or developments.

7.4.24 Consideration of the other developments will be limited to:

- wind farm planning applications that have been submitted and have a decision pending; and

- wind farm planning applications which have been granted permission but not yet constructed.

7.4.25 Effects from operational wind farms would be included in the baseline. Cumulative effects would be addressed in two stages:

- assess the combined effect of the developments including the Proposed Development; and
- assess the degree to which the Proposed Development contributes to the combined effects from the other wind farm developments.

7.4.26 A cumulative assessment is presented in **Section 7.9**.

Statement of Significance

7.4.27 The cultural heritage assessment concludes with a Statement of Significance summarising the predicted significance of the effects arising from the Proposed Development. Effects that are considered significant in EIA terms are those that are assessed to be moderate or substantial, in accordance with the suggestion contained in current guidance HES and SNH (2019) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, Section C, Page 75.

Limitations to the assessment

7.4.28 The assessment is based on the sources outlined in References and, therefore, shares the same range of limitations in terms of comprehensiveness and completeness of those sources.

7.4.29 Due to restricted access, no site visit took place at Midmar Castle (LB16262) however an assessment was conducted as close as reasonably possible and the photomontage produced from E370361 N805285.

7.5 Baseline

Current Baseline

7.5.1 A full description of the site and environs is given in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives. All heritage assets within the Site and 1 km of this area are shown on **Figure 7.1**. Nationally designated assets within the study areas are shown in relation to the ZTV on **Figure 7.2**.

7.5.2 All recorded non-designated heritage assets within the Site and 1 km of the Site are listed in the gazetteer that is contained within **Technical Appendix 7.1**. Where designated assets are tabulated in this Chapter they are identified by the index number (i.e., Scheduled Monuments) or reference number (i.e. Listed Buildings) under which they are registered by HES, see **Technical Appendix 7.2**.

Nationally Important Designated Heritage Assets

7.5.3 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site, however, there is one Regionally Significant non-designated heritage asset within the Site (NJ60SE0004). Non-designated assets can be found discussed in the below Baseline and in **Technical Appendix 7.1**.

7.5.4 There are 80 heritage assets of national importance within 10 km, consisting of 47 Scheduled Monuments, 26 Category A Listed Buildings, and 7 Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes. There are 45 assets of Regional Importance within 5 km, all being Category B Listed Buildings. As per correspondence with HES and Aberdeenshire Council Archaeology Service (ACAS), it was agreed through a heritage appraisal that the assets to be considered are in Table 7.6.

Table 7.6: Designated Heritage Assets to be assessed in agreement with HES.

Reference	Name	Type	Distance to closest Turbine	Within the ZTV
SM57	Barmekin of Echt, Fort	Scheduled Monument	4.1	Yes
SM12190	Upper Broomhill, hut circles	Scheduled Monument	4.7	Yes
LB16262	Midmar Castle	Listed Building	2.1	Yes
SM100	Midmar Motte	Scheduled Monument	2.5	Yes
SM44	Sunhoney Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	2.5	Yes
SM32	Christchurch Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	2.8	Yes
SM90088	Cullerie Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	8.1	Yes
SM49	Tamnagorn Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	5	Yes
SM6074	New Wester Echt Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	5.9	Yes
SM6076	East Finnercy Stone Circle	Scheduled Monument	6	Yes
GDL00153	Dunecht House	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape	4.9	Yes

GDL00103	Cluny Castle	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape	8.3	Yes
LB3246	Cluny Crichton Castle	Listed Building	1.9	Yes
LB3247/LB3249	Ha Hoose and Raemoir House	Listed Building	2.5	Yes
LB9516	Learney House	Listed Building	3.8	Yes

7.5.5 All other designated assets in the appraisal in **Technical Appendix 7.2** were considered for assessment but were since excluded due to the assets and any important third points falling outwith the ZTV.

Current Baseline

Known Heritage Assets within the Site

Prehistoric and Roman

7.5.6 There are two prehistoric heritage assets within the Site, both areas of potential hut circles (SLR82, SLR115). SLR82 is located in the eastern extent of the Site, approximately 2.5 km east of Turbine 16 on the northeast-facing slope of Meikle Tap. SLR115 is within the north of the Site, approximately 47 m north of Turbine 1 and on the southeast-facing slope of Tornamean and Craigour hills.

7.5.7 There is one further recorded prehistoric heritage asset within 1 km of the Site. A potential hut circle, cairns, and a possible later roundhouse (SLR39) are located approximately 1.3 km northwest of Turbine 4.

7.5.8 There are no Romano-British heritage assets within the Site or 1 km of the Site.

Medieval

7.5.9 There are no recorded medieval heritage assets within the Site or 1 km of the Site.

Post-medieval

7.5.10 There are 49 recorded post-medieval heritage assets recorded within the Site.

7.5.11 Of these assets, 34 are recorded boundary stones¹, mainly identified through historic mapping, and representing the Ward boundaries and parishes of Midmar, Banchory-Ternan and Kincardine O'Neil. The majority of these boundary stones are recorded as being destroyed, however, SLR47 was visited during the Site walkover in August

¹ SLR1, SLR2, SLR3, SLR29, SLR30, SLR32, SLR40, SLR43, SLR44, SLR47, SLR49, SLR50, SLR52, SLR55, SLR62, SLR67, SLR69, SLR70, SLR85, SLR89, SLR91, SLR93, SLR94, SLR99, SLR100, SLR102, SLR106, SLR110, SLR118, SLR119, SLR120.

- 2022 and was identified as still standing but damaged, raising the possibility that others are still standing within the Site.
- 7.5.12 Six cairns² are recorded within the Site, all of these cairns are thought to be boundary markers or markers denoting the tops of hills. There are five assets recorded as buildings within the Site. Of these records, four are noted as remains (SLR34, SLR79, SLR96, SLR104), with one being noted as destroyed (SLR46). SLR79 was located during the August 2022 walkover survey, with two structures being noted to the east of the track.
- 7.5.13 A regionally significant asset (SLR86), identified as the remains of two longhouses and a hexagonal enclosure with other visible walls, is recorded within the north of the Site. It is approximately 0.3 km east of Turbine 1.
- 7.5.14 Further post-medieval assets recorded within the Site include one shieling (SLR116), one record of now destroyed cottages (SLR125), and a farmstead (SLR60).
- 7.5.15 There are a further 70 recorded post-medieval heritage assets outwith the Site. A full list of these assets can be found in **Technical Appendix 7.1**.
- 7.5.16 The majority of these assets are agricultural in nature, comprising 22 farmsteads, four crofts, one distinct enclosure, one set of agricultural cropmarks, an area of rig and furrow, and the site of a cattle market. Areas of industrial exploitation can be seen clustered towards Echt at the east of the Site, including a house with a kiln and two areas of the remains of sand and gravel workings.
- 7.5.17 Domestic structures from this period are also recorded within the HER, with there being nine buildings, four crofts, and two houses. The majority of these structures are clustered at the northeast of the Site near the village of Echt and along the south of the Site.
- 7.5.18 The parish boundaries are identified within the HER record through twelve boundary stones and one cairn. Two chalybeates (healing wells) are recorded, one to the north of the Site and one to the south of the Site, along the Burn of Corrichie and named locally as Queen Mary's Well (SLR78). A stone seat is noted along the Gormack Burn, to the north of the Site (SLR27).
- 7.5.19 The site of the Battle of Corrichie is noted approximately 0.25 km from the Site boundary and may have extended into the site (SLR111). The Battle of Corrichie was fought in 1562, between the forces of the 4th Earl of Huntly and Mary Queen of Scots. It is believed that approximately 120 of the Earl's forces were killed and 100 captured, with the Crown being victorious. The recorded extent of the Battlefield may not reflect the true extent of the battle, as its precise location is unknown.
- Grave mounds (SLR48), believed to be associated with the Battle of Corrichie, are recorded approximately 300 m southeast of the battle site. The site of these recorded mounds was visited during the August 2022 walkover survey, and they were not identified.
- Modern*
- 7.5.20 There are no modern heritage assets within the Site.
- 7.5.21 There are five modern heritage assets recorded within 1 km of the Site. A single shooting (SLR128) butt is recorded approximately 0.5 km north of the Site, it is noted that others may exist in the area.
- 7.5.22 A rifle range (SLR98) is noted approximately 95 m north at the eastern end of the Site. It is associated with a Category C listed building (LB3151). The rifle range may have been used by the Aberdeen Rifle Volunteers, with a marker stone dating to 1860 marking its location.
- 7.5.23 The location of the Second World War Gregness Royal Observer Corps location is noted approximately 900 m to the east of the Site. The location was opened in July 1940.
- 7.5.24 The Mill of Echt (LB3159) is located 1 km to the north of the Site boundary. The asset is a Category B listed building, constructed in the early 19th century as a grain mill. It is currently a domestic property.
- Undated Features or Structures*
- 7.5.25 There are two undated heritage assets recorded within the Site. A record approximately 80 m to the northeast of Turbine 13, states that several piles of stones have been identified throughout the Hill of Fare (SLR97). These stone piles are not thought to be of archaeological interest.
- 7.5.26 A potential burial mound (SLR35) is located approximately 16m to the east of Turbine 10. The asset location was visited during the August 2022 walkover survey and the asset was not located.
- 7.5.27 There is one undated heritage asset recorded within 1 km of the Site, the location of the recovery of a spear made at an unknown date (SLR38). No other associated heritage assets are recorded in the immediate vicinity.
- 7.5.28 During the Walkover Survey in August 2022, three undated potential heritage assets were recorded.

² SLR24, SLR77, SLR84, SLR112, SLR122, SLR126

- 7.5.29 A raised rock feature (SLR301) was identified approximately 40 m south of Turbine 16. The potential asset comprised an area of two flat rocks, with the easternmost flat rock being raised at an angle by two smaller rocks. The potential asset is approximately 2.5 m in length and 1 m in width. The flat rocks are consistent with the natural rock outcrops within the surrounding landscape; however, no other rocks were observed to be raised. Nevertheless, it is likely that the potential asset is a natural feature.
- 7.5.30 A potential area of quarrying (SLR302) was identified 30m to the north of Turbine 15. The area of quarrying appeared to be approximately 1 m in depth, 15 m east to west, and 5 m north to south. The full extent of the asset was unable to be ascertained due to the thick vegetation covering the area.
- 7.5.31 A potential wall or pile of stones (SLR303) was recorded 0.2km west of Turbine 6. The asset is located to the east of the track and is approximately 3 m in length, 0.5m in width, and 0.7m in height. The asset does not appear to correlate with any structures recorded on historic mapping.

Historic Mapping and Historic Land-Use Assessment

- 7.5.32 Assessment of the Historic Land Use Assessment (HLA) map indicates that the land within the proposed Site boundary was primarily used as an area of rough grazing. The entry for this category of land use notes that areas of rough grazing were associated with pre-19th century agriculture and settlement and may contain remains dating back to the prehistoric period. The description states that *"Archaeological landscapes are most likely to survive in this type of modern land use. Nevertheless, there will be extensive areas with little sign of historic use"*.
- 7.5.33 A review of the online historic mapping available from the National Library of Scotland was undertaken. The Hill of Fare and associated hills are first seen on the 1640 Gordon map, however, the hill itself is not named. Hill of Fare is first named on the *Roy Military Survey of Scotland map* from 1747-1755. The Robertson *Topographical and military map of the counties of Aberdeen, Banff and Kincardine* (1822) shows Hill of Fare in detail.
- 7.5.34 Hill of Fare and the surrounding area is first seen in detail on the 1st Edition Six-inch Ordnance Survey Maps of the area (1868, 1869). A number of the heritage assets are noted on these maps, including the supposed location of the Battle of Corrichie (SLR111), Queen Mary's Well (SLR78), and a number of small buildings or enclosures.

- 7.5.35 The area is subsequently seen on later maps including Bacon's Motoring and Cycling Road Map (1910) and Macpherson's Improved Map of Aberdeen, Banff, and Deeside (1936).

- 7.5.36 No further heritage assets were identified through the review of historic mapping.

Aerial Photography

- 7.5.37 The online aerial imagery of NCAP was examined for evidence of archaeological sites. No oblique aerial imagery in the HES archives on Canmore was found. No further archaeological sites were identified.

Discussion of the Site

- 7.5.38 There is evidence of prehistoric domestic activity within the Site due to the presence of hut circles (SLR82, SLR115). Further evidence of prehistoric activity within the Site has not been recorded, however, as evidence of activity from this period is normally identified through earthworks further evidence may be obscured by the heavy vegetation covering the Site. As such, there is a moderate potential for unknown prehistoric heritage assets within the Site.
- 7.5.39 There is no evidence of Romano-British activity within the Site. As such, there is a very low potential for unknown Romano-British heritage assets within the Site.
- 7.5.40 There is no evidence of medieval heritage assets within the Site. As such, there is a very low potential for unknown medieval heritage assets within the Site.
- 7.5.41 There is a high amount of post-medieval activity within the Site and within 1km of the Site. The majority of the assets within the Site are boundary stones, denoting the administrative boundaries that lay through the Site. There are several structures within the Site, the majority of which are most likely agricultural in nature, with Historic Land Use assessment showing that it has been used for rough grazing. The majority of the post-medieval heritage assets within 1 km of the Site are agricultural in nature, with further evidence of domestic settlement and industrial works. In addition, the proximity of the location of the Battle of Corrichie to the Site indicates that there was a concentrated but high level of military activity within the area in the year 1562.
- 7.5.42 As such, there is a moderate to high potential for unrecorded post-medieval heritage assets within the Site, with the possibility for agricultural archaeological remains throughout the Site and archaeological remains associated with the Battle of Corrichie in the vicinity of the recorded battlefield.

Future Baseline

7.5.43 If the Proposed Development was not to proceed, there would likely be no change to the baseline condition of the various heritage assets and features that presently survive within the Site.

Implications of Climate Change

7.5.44 As per 'A Guide to Climate Change Impacts On Scotland's Historic Environment' (October 2019), peat is classed as a cultural heritage resource due to its formation during the Bronze Age as mass deforestation occurred. Due to the anaerobic conditions under which peat is formed, it is often seen as a 'window' onto the palaeo-environment. The presence of peat across the Site, as detailed in **Chapter 10: Hydrology, Geology, & Hydrogeological Assessment**, means there is a potential for environmental or organic deposits to survive. Climate change could affect naturally formed peat deposits leading to the destruction of paleoenvironmental evidence. This might result in the loss of previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets.

7.5.45 Other impacts of climate change on buried remains might result from increased rainfall and fluctuating temperatures, with the sequence and frequency of natural soil saturation and desiccation changing the preservative conditions. This might result in damage or loss of organic artefacts. For upstanding remains, such change has the potential to result in increased water penetration, which may then cause/accelerate erosion/decay of historic fabric.

7.5.46 Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the description of the baseline conditions remains robust for purposes of this assessment, and that it allows for a robust assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage.

7.6 Assessment of Potential Effects

Construction Effects

Embedded Measures

- 7.6.1 Impacts are considered with due regard to embedded mitigation measures.
- 7.6.2 SLR86, a regionally important site within the Proposed Development boundary has been considered for direct impact. To avoid direct effects, a buffer of 0.2 km was embedded into the design.
- 7.6.3 With potential for indirect (operational) effects, as detailed in **Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives**, mitigation through design has been implemented to avoid primary landscape features which contribute to the setting of assets such as SLR86, LB16262 and SM57. Such mitigation has resulted in a turbine deletion,

previously Turbine 1 and the micro siting of turbines to the southern side of Hill of Fare as shown in Figure 3.1.

Potential Effects

- 7.6.4 Taking into account the embedded design mitigation measures, the following effects are predicted.
- 7.6.5 With reference to **Figure 7.1**, the Proposed Development, direct impacts on cultural heritage assets are outlined in **Table 7.7**, below.

Table 7.7: Potential Direct Impacts during Construction

Asset	Infrastructure	Cultural Heritage Significance	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Proposed Mitigation
Battle of Corriche (NJ60SE0001)	Substation, BESS, Construction Compound	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor	N/A
Farmstead (SL79)	Access Track	Low	Very Low Adverse	Very Minor	Fencing Off.
Boundary Stones (SLR44, SLR100, SLR106 and SLR119)	Access Tracks, Turbine 3.	Low	Low adverse	Minor	Photographic record
Farmstead (SLR96)	Access Track	Low	Very Low Adverse	Very Minor	Fencing Off
Sheilings (SLR116)	Crane Hardstanding	Low	Very Low Adverse	Very Minor	Fencing Off
Unknown buried remains	All	Medium	Medium/Major Adverse	Moderate	Possible watching brief

Residual Construction Effects

- 7.6.6 The completion of the archaeological mitigation programme outlined above would offset direct adverse impact upon archaeological remains. Any harm caused to buried remains as a result of ground disturbance during construction would be offset to some degree by the benefits provided through the information gained during the archaeological investigation and reporting process. Any significant impacts identified in relation to buried archaeological remains should be considered in this context.

Operational Effects

Barmekin of Echt (SM57)

Description

7.6.7 The monument, located 3.2 km north-east of the Site, comprises a multi-vallate hillfort (a fort with multiple ramparts and ditches), and is unusual in that it has five entrances. The fort is comprised of five centric ramparts, with at least two phases of rampart construction visible. The earliest works comprise the outermost ramparts, these consist of rubble and earthen banks which stand as high as 2.8 m with an overall width of 150 m (2.03 ha). The two inner ramparts consist of dry stone walling with an original wall thickness of 2.6 m and 3.7 m and encloses an area of 115 m with a remaining height of 0.5 m. The five entrances to the hillfort are along cardinal points, to the North north east, east, south, south west and west south west. Two of the entrances (south and west south west) are blocked due to the later additions of the outer ramparts, which are situated on the steeper sides of Barmekin Hill. It is suggested that the original fort contained five ramparts and that the stone walls built later upon the two innermost ramparts.

7.6.8 A ring-ditch of prehistoric date, around 12 m in diameter, has been identified some 14 m west of the outermost rampart. This could indicate a similar occupation on the hill as with Tap O'Noth (SM63) located 30 km to the north east. A recent drone and lidar survey of Tap O'Noth indicated the presence of 800 hut circles surrounding the hillfort. The presence of the ring ditch in such close proximity to the ramparts may indicate the presence of further habitation on the hill outwith the ramparts of the hill fort. Within the bounds of the ramparts, a 19th century trig point has been erected. The asset appears on Roy's Military Map (Highlands, 1745), as Barmekin, this and the naming of the asset derives from the Scots word referring to a medieval or later defensive enclosure. There is no evidence for a defensive nature of the asset at this period however it does indicate that the level of preservation has influenced the colloquial naming in this case.

Significance

7.6.9 As a scheduled monument, the fort is of high significance due to being protected at national level. The earthwork and archaeological preservation of this asset has the ability to contribute to our ability to understand the sequence of events through time. The composition of the prominent ramparts also have the ability to increase the understanding of construction methods in the late Bronze Age and Iron Age. Whilst the asset is lesser known than that of Tap O'Noth (SM63) it encompasses a larger area and therefore has the potential for the preservation of remains illustrative of habitation.

7.6.10 In addition to the archaeological interest of the Site, setting also contributes to the cultural significance of the asset through providing a topographic and geographical understanding of the earthworks and remains.

Setting

7.6.11 The asset is situated on Barmekin Hill, located 3.2 km to the north east of the Proposed Development. At 275 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD), the asset sits prominently upon Barmekin Hill which is steep sided particularly to the north, west and south, with a gradual slope to the east which is occupied by Upper Broomhall Hut Circles (SM12190), likely part of a contemporary settlement.

7.6.12 The asset overlooks a large plateau of landscape all around (360° field of view), with the distant hills of Corrennie Moor, Pitchie Forest and Millstone Hill bracketing the horizon of the north western landscape (10 km west of the asset). To the north and east of the asset there are significant views over agricultural fields.

7.6.13 In respect to views towards the Site, the Hill of Fare sits within a range of hills 3.2 km to the south of the asset. This range of hills also includes Greymore (393AOD) and Meikle Tap (359AOD). These hills including the Site are all present beyond an intervening flat bottomed valley which includes some watercourses including the Gormack Burn.

7.6.14 With regard to contemporary assets in the landscape, particularly other hillforts, the prominence of Mither Tap in the eastern part of the view towards the Site (Plate 7.1) may indicate that a visual relationship with Mither Tap Fort (SM2114) was important. Mither Tap is described as being a regionally important centre during the late Iron Age and into the Pictish period. The relationship between Barmekin of Echt and Mither Tap was one of a visual nature where the monument would have looked to Mither Tap as a regional centre. These views could also be defensive in nature, as both monuments are described as regional centres and may have been occupied at the same time.



7.6.15

Plate 6.1: Northern Views from the South Western Entrance of Barmekin Hill Fort (SM57)

7.6.16 The asset is situated on top of a bracken and gorse covered Barmekin Hill, it overlooks the crossing of B9119 and B977 at the town of Echt as well the convergence of the A944. Also, located 1.5 km to the north of the monument lies Craigenlow Quarry (23 ha). Located 0.45 km to the monument, is 25kv overhead line which transects from the north of the asset to the west and south between the monument and Hill of Fare.

Contribution of Setting to Significance

7.6.17 Not all aspects of a heritage asset's setting will contribute to its cultural significance. Some aspects will be neutral, others may detract. The following aspects of the setting of Barmekin of Echt, Hillfort are considered to contribute to its cultural significance:

- the earthwork embankments which assist in understanding the archaeological remains of the monument, in their demarcation of spaces;
- Barmekin Hill itself whose slopes elevate the asset and provide for topographic advantage over the adjacent valley floor - affording the asset the ability to monitor localised movement for the possible purposes of defensibility;

- The Hill of Fare, the asset utilises the natural landscape and the channel which it creates. The assets location creates a natural funnel which would assist in the control and defence of the area;
- Surrounding designations, the relatively close proximity of Upper Broomhall (SM12190) and Mither Tap (SM2114) contributes to the significance of the asset in a way that has the potential to increase the understanding of community and landscape control during the late Bronze Age and Iron Age; and
- Coastal plain, the asset has long distance views to the North, East and South looking out to the coastal plains of Aberdeenshire.

7.6.18 The following aspects of the setting of Barmekin of Echt, Fort are considered to detract from its cultural significance:

- Craigenlaw Quarry,
- 25 kV overhead line which runs 450 m adjacent to the asset.

7.6.19 The following aspects of the setting of Barmekin of Echt, Fort are considered to have a neutral effect upon its cultural significance:

- the surrounding agricultural land, including the post-medieval and modern farmsteads, and the minor roads connecting them.

Development Effects

7.6.20 The Proposed Development would introduce 16 turbines upon the summit and crests of the hills that make up the Hill of Fare, notably, Greymore, Blackyduds, Tornamean, Craigrath and the Hill of Fare itself. The closest of these Turbine 16 is situated 4.1 km to the south west of the asset. Analysis of the ZTV and Photomontage suggests that all 16 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset (**Figure 7.2 and 7.5**).

7.6.21 With reference to the section above, a contributing factor to the cultural significance of the asset which has the potential to be impacted upon is the setting of the asset associated with the landscape to its south. The utilisation of the summit of Barmekin Hill holds southern views over the valley floor between the asset and the Site. Hill of Fare creates a natural funnel along the Gormack Burn for those moving in the region. These views are important in understanding the original topographical advantage of the asset and its possible role alongside other hillforts in the control of or monitoring of movement across the landscape, however views of other hillforts would not be blocked. This natural funnel gives the monument clear views of the flat valley floor below between the hills, the outcrop of the northern slopes of Greymore Hill, and the natural southern slopes of Barmekin Hill create a pinch point of control that benefits in the defence of the monument and control of movement in the area. Within these views, all turbines would be visible however, it

is the turbines to the east that have the potential to encroach and distract from the ability to appreciate the relationship of the fort and its natural environs.

- 7.6.22 Through design mitigation, many of the turbines have been placed on the southern slopes of the Hill of Fare to reduce the prominence of the Proposed Development where possible. By locating the turbines on the southern slopes of the hill it has reduced the distraction of the whole development from the asset. Given the nature of the topography, it is unlikely to reduce impact by the Proposed Development completely, and as such certain turbines still have the potential to distract from the relationship between the monument and the landscape which surrounds it. Turbines 1, 2, 7 and 12-16 still stand pronounced which as a result may cause a slight erosion of the ability to appreciate such aspects of the asset's setting that contribute to its cultural significance. However, the Proposed Development would not compromise the overall intelligibility of the asset as a fortified enclosure. Although the ability to experience the relationship between the asset and its defensive nature would potentially be eroded with the introduction of the Proposed Development the proposals would not significantly affect the overall ability to understand or appreciate the contributing factors which contribute to the monuments overall significance. The ability to experience the relationship would still remain however the Proposed Development would introduce a level of distraction to this element.
- 7.6.23 The Proposed Development would result in a comparatively modest level of effect upon one element of setting contributing positively towards an understanding of the asset.
- 7.6.24 A medium adverse magnitude of impact would be anticipated in the worst instance, resulting in an overall Moderate level of effect which is considered Significant in EIA terms. The operation of the Proposed Development would not result in such a high level of impact that it would adversely affect the integrity of the asset's setting. This integrity is preserved in the earthworks and archaeological remains of the asset, the lack of overall impact to an understanding of the topographic advantage held by the asset and the lack of significant infringement to views of contemporary designated assets such as Mither Tap.

Mitigation & Enhancement

- 7.6.25 Alongside the embedded measures which have primarily focussed on reducing the impact upon setting as far as possible which were incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, it is also proposed to install a series of public enhancement measures, refer to **Figure 7.4**.

- 7.6.26 One of these measures would be the installation of an information board adjacent to the eastern entrance of Barmekin of Echt, Hill Fort to raise its profile and enhance public understanding and appreciation. Beyond this, it is also proposed to install a Cultural Heritage Trail in the area. At Barmekin of Echt it is proposed to have signage at the entrance to Upper Mains Farm on the B977 with parking availability and access via a trackway. At present there is little to indicate the presence of the asset to road users or local groups, and those who are aware of it will typically have only a narrow window of opportunity to view and appreciate it. It is envisaged that the entrance to the access track would include space for parking alongside a bespoke signage board that describes the asset in relatable terms, and places it within its broader landscape context.
- 7.6.27 Alongside public access, recent guidance from the Association of Local Government Archaeological Offices (ALGAO), encourages pathways into the archaeological profession. As such, an offsite erosion survey and mitigation strategy is proposed for the asset. This will monitor and mitigate erosion associated with an informal pathway noted to be eroding the southern slopes of the asset on the field visit of 09/05/2022. This will be done utilising local university students and would therefore encourage experience within the profession.
- 7.6.28 It is acknowledged that this strategy would be considered an off-setting measure, and that it would be lower down the mitigation pyramid defined in the EIA Handbook (2019) than e.g., embedded measures, screening etc. It would still serve to off-set the adverse impact identified above to some degree, however, and it would also be consistent with the Scottish Government's ambitions for enhancing public access and appreciation of the historic environment, as set out within Our Past, Our Future (2023).
- 7.6.29 These offsetting measures, in line with mitigation, have been used to reduce and minimise impact on Barmekin of Echt.

Upper Broomhill (SM12190)

- 7.6.30 The monument comprises three hut circles which can be seen on aerial photography and satellite imagery. The hut circles range in size, with the largest being 18 m in diameter with an average wall thickness of 1.5 m and a height of no greater than 0.5 m. The hut circles are located on the northern, more gradual slopes of Barmekin Hill with Barmekin of Echt Hillfort located 0.5 km to the north at the summit. The monument informs a greater understanding of past domestic life and architecture during this time in the form of upstanding remains.

- 7.6.31 As the asset is related directly to the hillfort to the south, it's setting which contributes largely derives from the hillfort itself.
- 7.6.32 Located 4 km north of the proposed development, the asset lies in a landscape of upland heather, with commercial forestry located 0.1 km to the north. Alongside this, the landscape surrounding Barmekin Hill is largely agricultural and post medieval in character. The closest turbine of the Proposed Development, Turbine 16, is located 4 km to the south. It is predicted as per **Figure 7.2** and **7.11** that all 16 of the proposed turbines blades will be visible from the northern most hut circle. The contributing factors to the significance of the asset are that of its ability to enhance the understanding of domestic life during the Iron Age in this region, this would not be impacted from the Proposed Development. However, the ability to appreciate and understand the relationship between Barmekin of Echt and that of the asset may be infringed upon by the turbines appearing above the associated hill fort; the regional centre which is related to that of the monument. As the asset is of the highest significance and the ability to appreciate and understand that of a key contributing factors to the monument's significance would have a clearly discernible effect on this contributing factor to significance, the magnitude of impact would be that of Low resulting in the significance of effect being Minor.
- Midmar Castle (LB16262)**
- 7.6.33 Located 2.2 km north of the Site, constructed between 1570-1575 built by Master Mason George Bell. The monument was originally a six storey battlement tower with a turreted attic tower, it is believed that the occupants of the tower were likely those that previously occupied Midmar Church, Motte (SM100). The tower was later added to in the 17th century, constructing two dormer heads and later an easter tower, two storeys high. The castle is situated within a designed garden consisting of an 18th century sundial (LB16264), walled garden (LB16264), outbuilding (LB16265) and manor house (LB16266).
- 7.6.34 The asset sits on a lower outcrop of Craigshannoch Hill, overlooking the confluence of an unnamed burn to the north west and Gormack burn to the south east. The outcrop of Craigour to the north west and that of Greymore to the east show that the topography screens the castle from approaching parties but allows the castle to see further to the north across the burn to the original Motte (SM100) (0.6 km to the north west). This would have been a strategic defensive placement in the landscape with the Hill of Fare range to the south, enclosing the castle in a natural defensive position. Since it has been heavily altered to be a castle of status rather than that of a defensive nature the castle uses the backdrop of the Hill of Fare and the natural topography as a natural barrier to the edge of the estate.
- 7.6.35 The castle's associations with other designations in the area show a period of use over a significant time period (approximately 300 years). These designations are outlined above.
- 7.6.36 Later reuse has changed the contribution of setting of the asset and how it is appreciated and understood in the landscape, with it's most recent associations, that of the designed landscape being the primary appreciable element of the assets setting currently illustrating its historic and architectural significance. The later alterations and additions of the castle allow for an element of grandeur that was not the primary design intention when it was a defensive feature. For example, the addition of the tree lined drive providing for a designed approach was added around 1892 (OS 2nd Edition). The resulting framing of the castle with the Hill of Fare behind would have been a Victorian design intention, not an original military intention.
- 7.6.37 The asset has gone through a series of alterations, both internally and externally throughout time, with its landscape changing also. From being a strategic point of defence to a feature within a designed landscape. Beyond this the asset is surrounded by agricultural fields and commercial forestry all that have been managed since it's alteration to a Victorian Castle.
- 7.6.38 The Proposed Development is located 2.2 km to the south west of the asset with the closest turbine being Turbine 1. It is predicted that 13 of the 16 turbines would be visible from the asset (**Figure 7.2** and **Figure 7.7**). Due to the Castle currently being occupied, entry was not granted to the project team to achieve internal photography as set out in the limitation of assessment. A 3D digital model was created to assist in the assessment (**Plate 7.2**).



Plate 7.2: 3D model to illustrate potential impact from the Proposed Development upon LB16262

caused by the Proposed Development in the landscape beyond this would be **low adverse** in magnitude resulting in a **Minor significance of effect**.

Midmar, Church, settlement and (Cunningar) motte (SM100)

- 7.6.39 With the asset being that of Category A Listed Building, it is considered to be of the highest significance. It's key contributing factors to that significance are that of its architectural significance and it's historical interest. These relate to multiple periods of use including an original use as a defensive tower house and later as a country manor house. Its surrounding landscape (setting) contributes significantly to an understanding of its use. In relation to the initial use this is provided through an understanding of its defensive location on the outcrop of Craigshannoch. In relation to its later use this is provided through a designed landscape, setting the assets against designed views.
- 7.6.40 Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible from the Castle, the ability to understand and appreciate the relationship between the key contributing factors outlined in 7.7.33-7.7.36 above would be predominantly retained. An understanding of the asset's original defensive function would be unaffected as the topographic positioning of the asset in relation to the adjacent watercourses and hills would be unaffected. The association of the asset to a preceding motte to the north would also be wholly unaffected. Later design intentions setting the asset within a designed landscape would still be discernible with views of the turbines in views to the south being beyond the envelope of the designed landscape. Any distraction

- 7.6.41 The asset comprises the site of the medieval settlement of Midmar. The Cunningar Motte is situated at the western edge of the scheduled area and the old parish church is situated at the eastern edge, with the settlement likely to have existed in the open space between them. The motte comprises a mound of earth, 40 m in diameter and 10m in upstanding height. There is a potential earthen bank around the summit, which may have supported a palisade. At the foot of the motte there is a potential encircling ditch. The motte would have been used as the defensive base for a timber dwelling for a Norman Lord and is thought to have been constructed between the 12th and 13th century. The motte is thought to have been unoccupied by the 16th century, when nearby Midmar Castle (LB16262) (0.6 km to the south west) was constructed and the occupiers of the Motte are believed to have relocated. The church was constructed in the 17th century, on the site of an earlier church building. The church is ruinous and contains family burial enclosures. It was abandoned in 1787.
- 7.6.42 Situated at the base of Torminade Hill, the monument is located at the western head of the valley on a knoll which overlooks the easterly approach. The monument is bracketed by Gormack Burn 0.9 km to the east and Bethlin Burn 2 km to the west. The Hill of Fare range to the south of the asset would have provided a natural defence, with its positioning at the western end of a small valley providing views along the valley to the west, particularly from the motte. However, the main focus of the motte would have been the settlement to its east.
- 7.6.43 The asset is currently situated to the southeast of the B9119 road, which is lined with deciduous trees on either side. The central field is in agricultural use as grazing land, with a field boundary passing directly through the centre of the motte. A telephone wire runs through the south of the scheduled area. A forest or woodland lies to the south and southwest of the scheduled area. A modern farm is located c.70 m north of the asset, on the northern side of the B9119.
- 7.6.44 Based on **Figure 7.2** and **7.12**, it is predicted that 11 of the turbine blades would be visible from the north easterly aspect of the monument. The Proposed Development lies 3.2 km to the south of the asset with the closest turbine being Turbine 1. The monument's significance derives from it's ability to increase our understanding of medieval settlement and society in northeast Scotland. The aspects of setting which contribute to the asset's significance, such as it's easterly defensive views and

historical association with its relationship to LB16262, would not be infringed upon to the point of not being able to understand, appreciate or experience these relationships. It is therefore considered that the magnitude of impact from the Proposed Development be **Very Low**, resulting in a **Very Minor Significance of Effect**.

Recumbent Stone Circles (RCS)

- 7.6.45 A recumbent stone circle is a prehistoric megalithic monument, defined by a horizontal monolith. These monuments have only been identified in two places, with concentrations in Aberdeenshire and in south west Ireland (County Cork and County Kerry). The Scottish recumbent stone circles are believed to date from approximately 3000 BC, ranging from the neolithic period until the bronze age.
- 7.6.46 In both regions, the typical orientation for a recumbent stone circle places the recumbent stone at the southwestern side³. In Scotland, the recumbent stone is set between two upright stones, with these uprights having a tendency to be the tallest in the circle. The height of the stones tapers away from the recumbent, with the smallest stones opposite the recumbent at the north-eastern side⁴.
- 7.6.47 The consistent orientation of the recumbent stone circles insinuates a specific and shared focus. The most commonly accepted reasoning for the orientation is a lunar connection, with the full moon passing low over the recumbent during the midsummer period each year⁵. Furthermore, Ruggles (2005) notes that the recumbents and their flanking upright stones often frame a specific and obvious hill within the wider landscape, suggesting that recumbent stone circles were created to be viewed from the inside out, looking towards the horizon⁶.
- 7.6.48 Some recumbent stone circles share the presence of cup marks, however, these cup marks are not present on all recumbent stone circles and when they are, they are present only on the recumbent stone and its flanking upright stones. Ruggles (2005) suggests that the presence of these cup marks may indicate the rising and setting points of the moon.
- 7.6.49 Whilst the lunar and topographical connections of the recumbent stone circles have been noted, their precise use or function is unknown. Excavations have shown that some recumbent stone circles have been put up around pre-existing features, including funerary pyres⁷.

Sunhoney (SM44)

³ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.

⁴ Ruggles (2005). *Ancient Astronomy: An Encyclopaedia of Cosmologies and Myth*

⁵ Ruggles (2005). *Ancient Astronomy: An Encyclopaedia of Cosmologies and Myth*

⁶ Ruggles (2005). *Ancient Astronomy: An Encyclopaedia of Cosmologies and Myth*

Description

- 7.6.50 The monument, located 2.6 km north-east of the Site, is a recumbent stone circle which forms a series of neolithic monuments within the region of Aberdeenshire. The monument measures 25 m in diameter with twelve erect stone, the recumbent stone sits to the south west of the monument adjacent to the entrance. The two stones flanking (*Flankers*) that of the recumbent are of similar size and shape (2.1 m and 2.2 m tall). The recumbent stone itself, is split into two pieces, which may have been a result of the restoration that is likely to have occurred in the 18th century⁸. Within the recumbent stone and including its broken piece there is a series of cup marks which may or may not predate the stones.

Significance

- 7.6.51 As a scheduled monument the asset is categorised of High significance. The asset's significance derives from the asset's classification of a recumbent stone circle, as well as bearing cup marks. The asset is part of a series of stone circles that are unique to the north east of Scotland and only found elsewhere in south west Ireland. The asset is well preserved and has the ability to considerably enhance the understanding of prehistoric ceremonial practices particularly from the Neolithic.

Setting

- 7.6.52 The asset is situated on a raised knoll above the above the Gormack Burn, the monument overlooks the flood plain of the burn primarily focussing to the west where the ground is flattest. A number of drains on the Ordnance Survey (2017), indicate an area of frequent flooding, this association with water would be typical of Neolithic monuments as seen through a number of cairns, burnt mounds and stone circles.
- 7.6.53 With many recumbent stone circles Sunhoney and others in the area, there is a clear distinction with the monument's axis being north east - south west and aligned to the lunar axis. As previously stated in the opening paragraphs, the stone circle likely tracks lunar events, particularly the midsummer lunar standstill where the moon sweeps between the flanking stones and sits above the recumbent stone. Ruggles theorises that the recumbent stones circles frame a particular hill, in this case it is Blackyduds which is framed (**Plate 7.3**).

⁷ Ruggles (2005). *Ancient Astronomy: An Encyclopaedia of Cosmologies and Myth*

⁸ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.



7.6.54

Plate 7.3: South easterly view from SM44

- 7.6.55 The monument is located 1.8 km east from Christchurch, RCS (SM32), which is aligned almost identically at 233° on their axis of symmetry⁹. Whilst the monuments share visibility of one another, it does not contribute to their significance in the terms that they do not observe the same features of the landscape. However, the close proximity and symmetric alignments do contribute. Contributions of the proximity of other monuments in the area which are recumbent stone circles are unique to the area of north east Scotland.
- 7.6.56 The monument is shrouded in deciduous forestry which lines the monument, but external to this the asset is within agricultural fields, with post medieval farmstead scattered in the landscape. Modern intrusions on the monument in particular are the 25 kv overhead line which runs east to west 20 m north of the asset with the B9119 adjacent to the monument 200 m to the south.

Contribution of Setting to Cultural Significance

- 7.6.57 Not all aspects of a heritage asset's setting will contribute to its cultural significance. Some aspects will be neutral, others may detract. The following aspects of the setting of Sunhoney, Stone Circle are considered to contribute to its cultural significance:

- Gormack Burn
- South West axis and orientation of the midsummer lunar standstill
- Blackyduds Hill within Hill of Fare

7.6.58 The following aspects of the setting of the monument are considered to detract from its cultural significance:

- 25 kV overhead line which runs 450 m adjacent to the asset.

7.6.59 The following aspects of the setting of the asset are considered to have a neutral effect upon its cultural significance:

- the surrounding agricultural land, including the post-medieval and modern farmsteads, and the minor roads connecting them.

Development effects

7.6.60 The Proposed Development would introduce 16 turbines upon the summit and crests of the hills that make up the Hill of Fare itself. The closest of these Turbine 16 is situated 2.4 km to the south west of the asset. Analysis of the ZTV and Photomontage suggests that all 16 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset (Figure 7.2 and Figure 7.6).

7.6.61 With reference to the section above, the primary contributing factor to the cultural significance of the asset which has the potential to be impacted is the relationship the asset holds with Blackyduds, located within the range of Hill of Fare. As it is known that recumbent stones frame particular hills¹⁰, in this case Blackyduds, the ability to appreciate the framing of the hills could be impeded with the presence of Turbines 12 and 13. The ability to appreciate the monument and its relationship to other monuments around it such as Christchurch would not be impeded nor would its relationship to the natural landscape such as Gormack Burn.

7.6.62 A medium adverse magnitude of impact would be anticipated, resulting in an overall Moderate level of effect which is considered Significant in EIA terms. The operation of the Proposed Development would not result in such a high level of impact that it would adversely affect the integrity of the asset's setting. This integrity is preserved in the relationship with other recumbent stone circles in the area, the archaeological context and its relationship with the natural landscape such as Gormack Burn would remain.

Mitigation & Enhancement

⁹ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.

¹⁰ Ruggles (2005). *Ancient Astronomy: An Encyclopedia of Cosmologies and Myth*

- 7.6.63 Alongside the embedded measures which have primarily focussed on diminishing the impact upon setting as far as possible which were incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, it is also proposed to install a series of public enhancement measures, refer to **Figure 7.4**.
- 7.6.64 One of these measures would be the installation of an information board adjacent to the eastern entrance of Sunhoney to raise its profile and enhance public understanding and appreciation. Beyond this, it is also proposed to install a Cultural Heritage Trail in the area. At Sunhoney it is proposed to have signage at the entrance to Sunhoney Farm on the B9119 with parking availability and access via a trackway is also proposed; at present, there is little to indicate the presence of the asset to road users or local groups, and those who are aware of it will typically have only a narrow window of opportunity to view and appreciate it. It is envisaged that the entrance to the access track would include space for parking alongside a bespoke signage board that describes the asset in relatable terms, and places it within its broader landscape context.
- 7.6.65 It is acknowledged that this strategy would be considered an off-setting measure, and that it would be lower down the mitigation pyramid defined in the EIA Handbook (2019) than e.g., embedded measures, screening etc. It would still serve to off-set the adverse impact identified above to some degree, however, and it would also be consistent with the Scottish Government's ambitions for enhancing public access and appreciation of the historic environment, as set out within Our Past, Our Future (2023).
- 7.6.66 These offsetting measures, in line with mitigation, have been used to reduce and minimise impact on Sunhoney stone circle in line with National Planning Framework 4 (2023), paragraph h.
- Christchurch Stone Circle and Standing Stone, Midmar (SM32)**
- 7.6.67 The monument located 2.9 km north of the Site comprises a recumbent stone circle and standing stone. The stone circle comprises of 8 stones still standing, including the recumbent and flankers. Approximately 17 m in diameter with the recumbent stone being 4.5 m long with the flanking stones being 2.5 m in height. The standing stone lies 120 m to the north west of the stone circle. The asset is oriented on a north east south west axis and as previously stated is on the same axis of symmetry as Sunhoney (SM44). The monument has been heavily impacted due to a modern graveyard (1914) which truncates it. Whilst it is believed to be the location of many of the stones which comprise the stone circle it is not confirmed. The standing stone likely relates to the stone circles which we see across Scotland. In many cases, it may predate or was erected at the same time as the rest of the monument.
- 7.6.68 The monument sits on the southern slopes of the hill of the modern farm of Upper Balblair. Similar to Sunhoney (SM44) the asset overlooks the Gormack Burn with the low lying flood plain to the south. It is theorised by Burl¹¹ and Ruggles¹² that the monument's flankers frame the foothill of the Hill of Fare, Torminade, situated 1km to the south of the monument.
- 7.6.69 The asset sits within a modern graveyard that is shrouded in deciduous forestry. With modern farmsteads within the landscape the most prominent modern feature is the 50 kV overhead line running north west - south east to the south of the monument by 0.7 km, as well as the B9119. The closest turbine 2.8 km to the south is Turbine 1, **Figure 7.2** and **7.9** indicates that 14 of the 16 turbine blade tips would be visible from the monument.
- 7.6.70 Due to the asset being largely altered in the 20th century its significance derives largely from its preservation. The relationship between the standing stone and the stone circle contributes to our understanding of the prehistoric ritual landscape of the area with the framing of Torminade equally contributing to its significance. The relationship with Torminade would remain intact with the Hill of Fare forming a backdrop to one of the aspects of its setting which contributes to the significance of the monument.
- 7.6.71 As a scheduled monument the asset is of high significance, it is predicted that the Proposed Development would cause a **low** adverse magnitude of impact and an overall **significance of effect of Minor**. The addition of the Proposed Development would not distract from the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the monument.
- Cullerlie Stone Circle (SM90088)**
- 7.6.72 The monument, located 8.2 km east of the Site, comprises a stone circle, (8 squat boulders 10 m in diameter), with nine ring cairns situated within the circle. Excavation in 1935 found evidence of the ground being levelled before the erection of the stones with a series of burning within the area of the stones, mainly of small piles of willow twigs. It was then that eight small ring cairns were constructed. It is reported that some of the stones were burnt within the cairns. Five of the eight cairns yielded burnt human remains and charcoal. The construction of the cairns is theorised to be linked to the astronomical however the only evidence for this is the

¹¹ Burl, A. (1995) *Astronomical survey, guide book description and photographs*.

¹² Ruggles, C (1981) *Tabulated observations and measurement*.

even number of stones and kerbs. With eight stones erected and 11 or 22 kerb stones (for the largest ring cairn).

- 7.6.73 The monument sits in a largely flat landscape abutted with a mildly undulating landscape on all sides. It overlooks Leuchar Burn and the flat plain it sits within, which is not uncommon for prehistoric assets with funerary ties as similar themes can be seen throughout Great Britain. Similarly, the nature of prehistoric funerary assets is that they often share visibility with one another, in this case East Finnercy, Cairn (SM6076) lies 1.9 km to the west of the asset, a Bronze Age burial cairn. Equally, SM13294 lies 1.7 km to the east, another burial cairn or barrow. The potential intervisibility that is shared between the assets likely contributes to its significance along with its association to the watercourse which it sits alongside.
- 7.6.74 The monument is located in a small parcel of land and owned and cared for by HES. Located 30 m to the south of the monument is Redhill Farm. The farm and the avenue to the asset is lined with planted deciduous forestry. Intermittent commercial forestry also occupies the landscape to the assets west.
- 7.6.75 The Proposed Development is located 8 km to the west of the asset, with the closest turbine being Turbine 16. **Figure 7.2** and **Figure 7.8** predicts that all turbines would be visible from the asset, however, the primary contributors of the assets setting set out above would not be infringed upon. The ability to appreciate the relationship between the asset and it's landscape would remain intact with a minor infringement on the periphery of views to East Finnercy (SM6076). Based on this, the predicted magnitude of impact would be **negligible** resulting in a significance of effect as **Nil**.

Tamnagorn Stone Circle (SM49)

- 7.6.76 Tamnagorn, located 5 km north west of the Site is a recumbent stone circle, dating to approximately 2500BC. A survey of the stone circle was carried out as part of research in 2011¹³. The stone circle is approximately 21 m in diameter, with the recumbent stone and its flankers at the south-south-west and nine other orthostats. Only three orthostats are standing vertically, with the other six lying horizontally. The stone circle encloses a defined ring cairn, which, whilst heavily robbed, appears to measure 15.5 m in diameter, defined by a kerb of boulders. There are at least 12 recorded remaining kerbstones, with a slab approximately 1.7 m in length connecting the ring cairn to the recumbent setting. An inner court is visible through at least four stones in the centre of the circle.

- 7.6.77 As a scheduled monument, Tamnagorn Stone Circle is categorised as High cultural heritage significance. This significance derives from its classification as a recumbent stone circle, a typology limited to the north-east of Scotland and the south-west of Ireland. The asset has the potential to enhance our understanding of late Neolithic society and ceremony, specifically in north-east Scotland. Furthermore, the asset is well preserved and as such the asset has the potential for further buried archaeological remains.
- 7.6.78 The asset is located on the west side of an unnamed hill, at approximately 240 m AOD. The asset sits between two burns, the Stony Burn located c.0.3 km to the north and the Curwich Burn located c.0.25 km to the south, which converge c.0.8 km to the east. This proximity to water is typical of neolithic monuments.
- 7.6.79 The asset's recumbent setting sits at the south-southwest, which is the typical alignment of recumbent stone circles in the north-east of Scotland. The asset's alignment likely has lunar or solar connections, potentially using the recumbent stone circle to frame a lunar standstill event. Whilst most recumbent stone circles use the recumbent setting to frame a specific hill, either in the foreground or on the distant horizons, Welfare (2011)¹⁴ states that Tomnagorn is one of 10 recumbent stone circles where this is not the case.
- 7.6.80 The asset sits within a wider landscape of both prehistoric heritage assets and recumbent stone circles. Christchurch stone circle (SM32) is located c.5km southeast and Sunhoney stone circle (SM44) is located c.6.8 km southeast. As previously stated, Christchurch and Sunhoney both focus on Tominade as a part of their setting, with Tomnagorn having no specific landscape focus. As such, the nearby recumbent stone circles do not have the same landscape focus. Furthermore, the topography of the surrounding landscape likely indicates that the nearby recumbent stone circles were not visible or easily visible from Tomnagorn, indicating that intervisibility was not important to the asset. As such, whilst the asset's placement within a wider landscape of prehistoric heritage asset's provides significance through the potential for spatial analysis, intervisibility between these asset's does not contribute to Tomnagorn's significance.
- 7.6.81 The asset sits within an agricultural field, approximately 0.3 km east of the B993 road. An unnamed post-medieval/modern farm lies between the asset and the B993. The asset is bordered by commercial forestry to the north, with a land boundary and

¹³ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.

¹⁴ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.

sparse deciduous trees immediately to the west. Whilst these aspects of the landscape are not contemporary with the asset, they do not obstruct any key views.

- 7.6.82 Not all aspects of a heritage asset's setting will contribute to its cultural significance. Some aspects will be neutral, others may detract. The following aspects of the setting of Tamnagorn Stone Circle are considered to contribute to its cultural significance:
- Stony Burn and Curwich Burn; and
 - South-south West axis and orientation in regards to the lunar standstills.
- 7.6.83 The following aspects of the setting of the asset are considered to have a neutral effect upon its cultural significance:
- the surrounding agricultural land, including the post-medieval and modern farmstead, and the B993 road.
- 7.6.84 It is anticipated that all 16 of the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset itself. The closest proposed turbine would be proposed Turbine 4, situated c.5 km to the southeast of the asset. Whilst the proposed turbines would be visible from the asset, they would not be visible through the recumbent setting, along the south-southwest axis. As such, the proposed development would not impact the aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance.
- 7.6.85 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **very low adverse**, and as such, the **significance of effect is very Minor**.
- New Wester Echt, stone circle (SM6074)**
- 7.6.86 New Wester Echt is a recumbent stone circle 6 km north east of the Site. It is approximately 20 m in diameter, comprising three visible upstanding stones, a circular crop mark, and a potential outlying standing stone to the east. Whilst the original orientation of the recumbent and total number of stones are no longer visible, a sketch from 1820¹⁵ shows the recumbent stone at the south-west of the circle and seven other stones, including the western flanker. The current upstanding stones comprise the western flanker, however the recumbent is no longer in situ. The stone to the west has an incised cross marked on it, as well as the initials CM.
- 7.6.87 As a scheduled monument, Wester Echt Stone Circle is categorised as being of High cultural heritage significance. This significance derives from its classification as a recumbent stone circle, a typology limited to the north-east of Scotland and the south-west of Ireland. The asset has the potential to enhance our understanding of

late Neolithic or bronze age society and ceremony, specifically in north-east Scotland. Furthermore, the presence of a crop mark denoting the circumference of the asset, indicates a potential for archaeological remains which would further our understanding of the construction and use of the monument.

- 7.6.88 The asset is located at approximately 160 m AOD, on a raised knoll on the northern slope of Barmekin Hill, approximately 1.7 km northeast of its summit. There are no watercourses within close proximity to the stone circle, with Corskie Burn c.1.3 km to the north and Kinnernie Burn c.2 km to the west. The circle would have framed Barmekin Hill to the south west through recumbent as outlined in **paragraphs 7.7.42 onwards**. Craigenlow Quarry sits on the northern slopes 0.7 km to the north west of the asset with a series of post medieval farms in the surrounding landscape.
- 7.6.89 **Figure 7.2** and **Figure 7.10** indicates that 12 of the 16 proposed turbines would be visible with the Proposed Development located 5.9 km to the south west, the closest turbine being Turbine 16. The monument's location on a raised knoll with a framing of Barmekin Hill is a key contributor to the assets significance. As the asset has been largely degraded since it was originally noted in 1820, including the removal of the recumbent stone, it is difficult to appreciate this relationship at present and as such there is a restriction in the experience of the monument. Nonetheless, this relationship remains and the introduction of the Proposed Development behind Barmekin Hill could have the potential to distract from this relationship. It would not however, impact so significantly that the ability to understand, experience or appreciate the relationship which remains.
- 7.6.90 As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development would result in a **Low** magnitude of impact which would result in a **Minor significance of effect**.
- East Finnercy, cairn 330M WNW of (SM6076)**
- 7.6.91 East Finnercy is a prehistoric burial cairn, likely dated to the Bronze Age. It is located 6.1 km east of the Site. The cairn is round in shape and turf-covered, measuring 26.5 m by 22 m in diameter. The asset is approximately 2 m in height. There is a hollowed area in the centre of the cairn, as the result for prior excavation. Neolithic pottery was identified at the base of the cairn, indicating that there may have been a structure from an earlier period on the same site.
- 7.6.92 As a Scheduled Monument, the asset is of high cultural heritage significance. The asset derives its significance from its relatively undisturbed nature, meaning that it has potential for undisturbed deposits. These deposits have the potential to further

¹⁵ HES, (2011). *Great Crowns of Stone- Illustrated Gazetteer*.

our understanding of the dating and construction of the cairn, as well as further our understanding of prehistoric burial cairns in general.

- 7.6.93 The cairn is located at approximately 110 m AOD, on a gentle south facing slope. The asset is located c.1 km east of Gormack Burn, which runs north to south, before turning east after converging with Silverstripe Burn c.2 km south of the asset. The source of Gormack Burn lies within the Hill of Fare range, of which the closest hill, Meikle Tap, is located c.4 km southwest of the asset. Whilst wide and shallow, a valley runs between the asset and Meikle Tap. The setting is typical for a prehistoric burial cairn, often located near water and on higher ground. In addition to acting as a burial place, they are thought to have acted as boundary markers, way markers or focal points within the landscape.
- 7.6.94 The asset is situated within a wider prehistoric landscape, with approximately 94 surviving Bronze Age cairns or barrows within the Strathdon area¹⁶. Spatial analysis of this cairn and other nearby contemporary assets may further our understanding of funerary site locations, structure and nature of society and Bronze Age economy.
- 7.6.95 The asset's current setting comprises agricultural land, with a field boundary running 20 m south of the scheduled area. Braigiewell Farm is located c.0.23 km north of the asset. An unnamed road, which runs north to south between the B9119 and the B9125 is located c.0.3 km east of the asset. Landerberry Road runs c.0.74 km to the southwest of the asset, crossing the Gormack Burn and lined with a mixture of domestic and agricultural buildings. small new build residential development, Finnercy Park, is under construction and located c.0.27 km southeast of the asset, along with several modern domestic buildings. Garlogie Compressor Station is located 0.7 km northeast of the asset. The general wider landscape comprises areas of small, dispersed settlements, farmsteads and industrial buildings.
- 7.6.96 Whilst the cairn sits alone within a group of agricultural fields, it is not as distinctive within the landscape as it may have been upon initial construction. The asset may have been a waymarker when approaching along the Gormack Burn, however, Landerberry Road which crosses and follows the route of the burn, has multiple modern buildings along the northern side of the road, which may obscure the view of the cairn and make it less distinguishable within the landscape.
- 7.6.97 The ZTV indicates that all 16 proposed turbines will be visible from the asset. The closest proposed turbine would be proposed Turbine 16, situated c.6 km southwest of the asset. The asset is situated along the Gormack Burn which is a focal point of the contributing factor to the assets significance, as well as it's potential to

contribute to the understanding of reuse during the Neolithic and Bronze age periods. Based on the understanding of the key contributing factors of the monuments setting it is believed that there would be a minimal impact on the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the monument. As such the predicted magnitude of impact would be **Neutral** which would result in a **Neutral Significance of Effect**.

Cluny Castle (GDL0091) including Cluny Castle (LB2947), Fraser Mausoleum Old Churchyard of Cluny (LB2949), Old Churchyard of Cluny (LB2948)

- 7.6.98 The designed landscape is located 8.9 km north of the Site. It was primarily designed in the late 18th century by the Gordon's of Cluny located on land given by King Robert the Bruce to the Fraser family sometime before 1325. The estate has been passed through the Fraser family and multiple branches of the Gordon family and still remains privately owned by the Linzee Gordon branch. Both the Fraser family and the Gordon family were highly influential, playing key parts in the Jacobite risings and other key parts of Scottish history. Through this connection, the designed landscape has historical interest.
- 7.6.99 Furthermore, the development of the designed landscape has been well documented through cartographic regression. First pictured on General Roy's Military Survey map of 1747-1755, the surrounding landscape and parkland was small and confined to the direct vicinity of the castle. The Old Statistical Account (1796) states that Mr Gordon of Cluny had enclosed about 200 acres of land designed with ditches, walls and belts of planting, 200 acres of formerly barren ground to be forested and 100 acres to form a meadow area on former marshland. The development of the gardens and parkland over time can be seen on Ordnance Survey mapping, with the systems of walks extended and areas replanted over time. This well documented development provides historical interest to the asset.
- 7.6.100 The GDL has architectural interest through the various listed buildings within its boundary. The Castle itself, a Category A Listed Building (LB2949), was originally built as a Z-Plan castle in 1604, with the castle seen today being constructed around the original Z-Plan in 1836-40. The 19th century additions to the castle were designed by John Smith, a renowned architect known for his contribution to the architecture of Aberdeen. The castle is constructed in grey granite and is in the Scottish baronial style and has a neo-perpendicular chapel attached to the northeast corner, constructed in 1870-73.

¹⁶ <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/SM12394>

- 7.6.101 There are two further Category A Listed Buildings within the grounds of the GDL, the Old Churchyard of Cluny (LB2948) and the Fraser Mausoleum (LB2947). These comprise funerary monuments to the southwest of the castle, with interesting architectural features including a domed mausoleum, 4 mortsafes, and simple ashlar neo-greek enclosures.
- 7.6.102 Further listed buildings within the GDL boundary include the B Listed Stableblock (LB2950), South Lodge (LB2954), and Sylvan Cottage (LB2953), as well as the Category C Listed Walled Garden (LB2951).
- 7.6.103 The majority of these buildings, apart from the mausoleum and churchyard, were also designed by John Smith and constructed at the same time as the castle. Their architectural interest derives from their connection to John Smith and their Scottish baronial style.
- 7.6.104 The Cluny Castle Designed Landscape comprises areas of parkland, woodland, and gardens, which have designed approaches and tracks running throughout. The main area of parkland is located to the south of the castle, comprising four park areas divided by beech lined lanes. The policies of Cluny are enclosed by woodland and some commercial forestry. There are extensive gardens surrounding the castle in all directions, which include ornamental ponds as well as fine specimen trees. A high walk, which appears to utilise the natural ridgeline to the east of the castle, offers views to the south over the gardens and the parkland. The setting of the designed landscape includes the appreciation of the relationship of its internal designed components which can be appreciated and understood through observing overall plans of the house, its parkland and the designed landscape.
- 7.6.105 The main approach through the GDL towards the castle is from the south, with the main drive sloping downhill as it heads towards the northwest before the castle comes into view. The main drive offers views into the walled garden, before reaching the castle. There is Scot's pine planted along the eastern end of the drive and planting of oak along the west side of the drive at its northern end. This planting obscures views outwards from the drive, focussing any views to the north towards the castle.
- 7.6.106 A west drive connects the castle and the mausoleum. Whilst the mausoleum was not part of the Cluny Castle estate, it is a borrowed landscape feature, appearing as a temple within the landscape and being a focal point when leaving the castle to the west. The west drive also would have provided views over the Pool of Cluny, a water feature which is now a meadow. There is an eastern drive which is used as access to the walled garden and the stable yard. The drive connected the castle to Tillycairn, which was part of land owned by the Gordons. The drive runs alongside Cluny Burn, which provides a water feature and scenic viewpoint. Historically, there were walking paths and routes, mainly focussed on the Cluny Burn to the east of the castle and the Pool of Cluny to the west. However, these walks have since disappeared and have not been reinstated.
- 7.6.107 The ZTV indicates that all 16 proposed turbines will be visible from parts of the Garden and Designed Landscape. Particularly along the eastern drive. The Proposed Development would not be visible on the western and southern approaches to the castle. Whilst the ZTV indicates that the Proposed Development may be visible along the east approach, this driveway is lined with trees as part of a designed landscape feature, which indicates that long range views to the south are not a key focus of this approach, rather these are likely to funnel the view along an east-west alignment with any long views south glimpsed and not part of a design intention.
- 7.6.108 It is anticipated that the Proposed Development would be visible in long views south from Cluny Castle itself. However, the designed landscape is bordered to the south by a band of trees, which provides a definitive boundary to the designed landscape. This indicates that there is less of a focus on the long-distance views outside of the parkland, with more of a focus on views across and within the designed landscape itself.
- 7.6.109 With the details outlined above, it is predicted that a **very low** adverse magnitude of impact would resulting a **Very Minor significance of effect**.
- Dunecht House (GDL00153), Dunecht House (LB3133), Tower Lodges and Loch of Skene Boathouse, Dunecht House (LB16505)**
- 7.6.110 Dunecht House and its estate was originally owned by the Forbes family, who also owned the barony of Echt. Located 7.3 km north-east of the Site. The original mansion on the site was constructed in 1705. Dunecht House was commissioned by the Forbes family in 1820, in order to replace that original mansion. The architect of the house was John Smith, renowned for his work in Aberdeen, who built the house in Neo Greek Style with Italian additions made in 1859. The house has been occupied by a number of prominent families who have altered the house over the years it has been in use. The designed landscape was established in 1820 by Lord Lindsay and enlarged by G. Bennet Mitchell.
- 7.6.111 The parkland surrounding Dunecht House was established in 1820, and further enlarged in the late 19th and early 20th century. It surrounds Dunecht House on three sides, with drives that sweep through the landscape around many of the undulating hills. Dunecht Loch is located to the southeast of the house, with drives from the house curving towards it. A treelined avenue runs from the house to the north,

connecting it to the walled garden (LB3141). Further groups of trees were located throughout the parkland, with the listing description stating that they framed the loch and the hills beyond the boundary of the GDL. The listing description states that a golf course in the south of the GDL breaks up the visual effect of the parkland. There are major woodland plantations throughout the GDL, with the historical plantations being on Heather Hill in the north and Tillymannoch Wood in the south. These plantations lost trees during a gale in 1953, however, there is recent re-plantation efforts. Trees line the A944 to the north and are thick to the west of the tower lodges. In addition, there are two areas of woodland Garden, one adjacent to the west of the house and one to the south of Dunecht Loch. There is a keyhole cut through the woodland garden to the west of the house, framing views over the Grampian hills. The Loch of Skene is a natural loch, with the water level raised in the 1920s for hydro-electric power. The loch was not originally part of the GDL but was included in the early 1900s when a drive to the east of the house was laid out. Waterton Loch is located to the north of the site and Dunecht Loch is located to the south of the site. There are two large formal gardens adjacent to Dunecht House, to the south and to the west. Whilst some of the original layout has changed, a number of original fountains (LB3134), walls, terraces and balustrades are still extant.

7.6.112 The designed landscape is located on the northern plain of the River Dee. The Corskie Burn runs through the north of the Designed Landscape, entering the Loch of Skene to the east. Dunecht village is located to the northwest of the Designed Landscape. The A944 borders the GDL to the north, the B977 to the west, and there are minor roads running to the east and south. The setting of the Dunecht Garden and Designed Landscape includes the appreciation of the relationship of its internal designed components which can be appreciated and understood through observing overall plans of the house, its parkland and the designed landscape.

7.6.113 The ZTV indicates that all 16 proposed turbines will be visible from parts of the GDL. This includes along parts of the approaches from the east, north and west, as well as from views from Dunecht House itself. The Proposed Development is situated c.2.6 km to the southwest of the GDL, with the closest proposed turbine being Turbine 16, located c.4.8 km to the southwest of the GDL boundary. Whilst the Proposed Development may be visible in views along the east and west approaches, the orientation of these approaches means that the Proposed Development is peripheral. Any key views, including those over the Loch of Skene, Corskie Burn and the parkland to the south, are unlikely to directly feature the Proposed Development

and instead it is anticipated to be a minor distraction when appreciating the points of interest throughout the landscape.

7.6.114 As an inventoried GDL, the asset is of high cultural significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **neutral/None adverse**, and as such, the **significance of effect is Neutral**.

Cluny Crichton Castle (LB3246)

7.6.115 Cluny Crichton Castle, located 2 km south of the Site, is thought to have been constructed in 1666, evidenced by an inset panel above the doorway. The castle was a tower house, 3-storeys in height, shaped in an L plan. The floor plan indicates that each floor would have had three interconnecting rooms and there would have been a spiral staircase in the tower. Some key internal features are still visible, including fireplaces and cupboards. External features are also visible, with two recesses for heraldic panels above the entrance doorway, gun holes protecting the doorway, and small windows. The castle is on the buildings at risk register (Ref: 1563) and is mostly ruinous. The castle has no roof and the southwest corner appears to have been deliberately deconstructed.

7.6.116 The building derives part of its significance from its historical interest. The castle is believed to have been owned and constructed by George Crichton of Cluny, after his marriage to a daughter of Robert Douglas of Tilquhillie. Tilquhillie Castle, the Tilquhillie family seat is located 6.8km to the southeast of the asset. The asset has historic interest as it provides the potential for further understanding of post-medieval land ownership, control and relationships between important families. The asset also derives part of its significance from its architectural interest. Whilst not in good condition and being ruinous, the planform of the castle is still identifiable and key architectural features such as fireplaces, window recesses, and the inset panel. The castle appears to be a good example of a typical 17th century tower house.

7.6.117 The asset's setting contributes to its significance in part. The asset sits on the lower, south facing slopes of the Hill of Fare range of hills. The Burn of Cluny runs to the west of the castle, before turning east approximately 0.7 km south of the castle and running to the east. The Burn of Cluny runs through relatively flat ground, which occupies the north flood plain of the River Dee, which is located c.3.6 km to the south of the asset. This position, above the flood plain provides wide-ranging and long-distance views throughout the surrounding landscape. The presence of gun-holes on either side of the entrance doorway indicates that defence was of particular interest to the occupants of the castle. The occupants of the castle utilised the location on the high ground above the flood plain as a natural defence,

with the ability to use the long-range views to monitor the valley below. The Hill of Fare range is located to the north of the asset and does not form part of the views along the valley.

- 7.6.118 The setting of the asset has changed since its initial construction. The asset is located within agricultural fields, owned and farmed by the post-medieval/modern Cluny Crichton Farm located directly to the north of the asset. This disrupts views to the north from the castle. There is a single track road running c.20 m to the north and c.0.14 km to the west of the asset. This track connects with the A980, which runs c.0.4 km to the south of the asset. The general landscape comprises farmsteads and farmland, with intermittent commercial forestry. The nearest settlement is Banchory, located c.3 km to the southeast of the asset. There is a set of telephone wires which follows the course of the single-track road.
- 7.6.119 The ZTV indicates that 10 proposed turbines would be visible from the asset. The closest proposed turbine, T9, located c.2 km to the northwest. The key views from the asset are to the south, along the flood plain, which it utilises for a defensive position. The proposed development does not feature within these views. Whilst the ZTV indicates that the proposed development would be visible in views to the north, the modern development, comprising Cluny Crichton Farm, acts as a disruption to those views. The modern built environment is a major disruption in views to the north, and as such, the proposed development would be a minor distraction at worst.
- 7.6.120 As a Category B Listed Building, the asset is of medium cultural heritage significance. The magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect is **Negligible**.

The Ha' Hoose (LB3247) and the Raemoir House Hotel (LB3249)

- 7.6.121 The Ha' Hoose (LB3247) is a Category A Listed Building, originally dated to 1715. Located 3.5 km south of the Site. The building is a 2-storey, T-Plan Laird's house, which is a fine example of an early classical country house in rural Aberdeenshire. The house is made out of Hill of Fare red granite rubble, has a studded timber door with an oval fanlight, replacement timber sash and case windows, slate pitched roof, and an armorial panel over the main doorway. The interior of the house is predominantly 20th century in date, with a central hall with a flagstone floor and a timber staircase. The asset's significance partially derives from its architectural interest, as it remains largely unaltered on the exterior and maintains its classical planform, proportions and design. The asset also has historical interest, as its survival is integral to our understanding of the development of the estate.

- 7.6.122 The Raemoir House Hotel (LB3249) was built directly to the southwest of the asset, rather than adapting the already existing building or demolishing it, which is not usual practice. The Ha' Hoose and the Raemoir estate originally belonged to the Hogg Family, before passing to William Innes, a merchant, who built the later house. The Raemoir House Hotel (LB3249) is a Category B listed building, originally designed by renowned architect known for his extensive work in Aberdeen. The building was first constructed in 1817, with additions by John Smith in 1844. Further additions were made by William Kelly in 1927. Kelly was an associate and colleague of Smith, renowned in his own right for his work in Aberdeen. Raemoir House Hotel is a 2-storey building with a basement, designed in a classical mansion house style. The original core of the house has 5 bays and is south facing and is a fine example of an early 19th century classical country house. It maintains its original core, with excellent evidence of its multiple phases of development in the east and west wings. The hotel is also a good example of a structure designed by the eminent architect John Smith and altered by his associate William Kelly.
- 7.6.123 The setting of Raemoir House and the Ha' Hoose are related to one another with their southern aspects a key contributor to their significance. Along with this, their significance is largely derived from their historical and architectural aspects. Situated on the southern foothills of Hill of Fare, namely Craigbeg. Overlooking Bo Burn, 0.5 km to the south of the houses, the elevation of the houses would enhance the ability to look out over to the south of the houses.
- 7.6.124 It is predicted that nine turbines of the proposed development have the potential to be seen from both assets (**Figure 7.2**). The closest of the proposed turbines being 2.4 km to the north of the assets, being Turbine 10. Given that the relationship between the houses constitute their primary setting and that the key contributing factors to significance relate to historical and architectural interest, the addition of the turbines is not predicted to impact significance.
- 7.6.125 As such it is predicted that there would not be any impact on the contributing factors to the significance of the assets. The proposals would have a **Neutral/None** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **Neutral**.
- #### **Learney House, including terraces (LB9516)**
- 7.6.126 Learney House is a Category B Listed Building located 3.9 km north-west of the Site. The asset was originally constructed in the mid-18th century. The original core of the house is an L-Plan 2/3-storey building, which was damaged in a fire in the early 19th century. Some internal panelling, dated to the 18th century, is surviving. John Smith, the renowned architect, reconstructed the building after the fire in 1838. Smith added a number of new internal features to the house. The Learney estate includes

four other Category B listed buildings, a stable block (LB9517) located to the east of the house, a potting shed (LB9518) to the south of the house, and the west and north lodges (LB9520, LB9521). The Category C Listed 'Donkey House' (LB9519), a gazebo, is located to the southwest of the house.

- 7.6.127 The house has architectural interest through the reasonable preservation of the original planform of the house, including some 18th century panelling, as well the clear evidence of remodelling and phasing over time. Learney House also derives its significance from its historic interest, having been remodelled by the renowned architect John Smith, known for his work within Aberdeen. The asset is located within the remains of a 17th to 19th century designed landscape. This designed landscape is a non-designated heritage asset (NJ60SW0036), however, little of the original landscape remains. The house is located at the south base of a ridge, bordered to the north, east, and west by historic coniferous forestry. A formal garden is located to the south of the house, which overlooks agricultural fields.
- 7.6.128 A single track private road forms the drive to the north of the house, connecting the house to the West Lodge. Another single track road is located further to the north, connecting the north lodge to the estate. These tracks are connected to the B993, which runs c.1.3 km to the south and east of Learney House. Key historical approaches towards the house would have been from the north and west lodges, through the historic woodland before arriving at the north of the house. These appear to be the current approaches to the house today.
- 7.6.129 The ZTV indicates that 15 proposed turbines would be visible from the asset. The closest proposed turbine, Turbine 4, is located c.4 km to the southeast of the asset (Figure 7.2). The key contributors to the assets significance derive from its historical and architectural importance with its setting largely focussed to views of the south east. The Proposed Development would potentially infringe upon this view. As the placement of the house was to take in this view as part of design, it is predicted that the asset would have a **very low** adverse magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

Crathes Castle (GDL00119)

- 7.6.130 Crathes Castle is an inventoried GDL, surrounding Crathes Castle, a Category A Listed Building (LB3262). It is located 6.2 km south-east of the Site. Crathes Castle was built in the late 16th Century by the Burnetts of Ley Family, on land gifted to them by King Robert the Bruce in 1323. The Crathes Castle estate was owned by the Burnett family until it was given to the National Trust for Scotland in 1951. Evidence of a garden at Crathes Castle can be found as far back as the 17th century, however,

the first formal garden is believed to have been instated in the 1760s. The parklands surrounding the gardens were created in the late 18th century. By the late 1800s, a series of ornamental gardens had been created surrounding the castle. The final members of the Burnett family to own the Castle, Major General Sir James Burnett and Sybil Burnett, were enthusiastic and well respected gardeners and remodelled, re-designed and maintained the gardens and their work survives today.

- 7.6.131 The GDL forms the key contributor of the setting of Crathes Castle (LB3262), with the key approach being to the south of the castle along a tree lined drive. The approach features a small summit to which the viewer progresses and, once crested, views the castle and its parklands with overarching views to the south. The GDL has been largely altered from its original intent with the addition of a modern GoApe and children's adventure play area. The town of Banchory now lies 200 m to the west of the boundary of the GDL, where previously on the OS 1st edition (1885) it was 1.8 km from the boundary.
- 7.6.132 The Proposed Development lies 6.2 km to the north west of the asset with the closest turbine being Turbine 10. Figure 7.2 illustrates that 15 of the 16 turbine development would be potentially visible. As the proposed development, sits on the periphery of the views which the house appreciates but would not significantly impact the ability to understand, appreciate or experience these views, it is assessed as having a **very low** adverse magnitude of impact on the asset which would result in a **Negligible** significance of effect.

Decommissioning Effects

Embedded Measures

- 7.6.133 The landscape would be reinstated to its original state following decommissioning.

Potential Effects

- 7.6.134 There would be no negative effects upon the setting or significance of any assets within 10 km, as the landscape would be returned to its original state. There would be no direct effects on any assets as there would be no new ground works during this stage.

Residual Post-Operational Effects

- 7.6.135 There would be no residual effects resulting from the decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

7.7 Mitigation

Direct Construction Effects

7.7.1 As outlined in **paragraph 7.6.7**, mitigation as shown in **Table 7.7** is proposed, subject to the agreement with ACAS.

Operational Effects

7.7.2 Design mitigation measures are outlined in the Embedded Measures section.

Enhancement Opportunities

7.7.3 Enhancement measures are proposed for the following assets:

- Barmekin of Echt (SM57)
- Sunhoney, Stone Circle (SM44)
- Upper Broomhill (SM12190)

7.7.4 A program of enhancement measures that are proposed as follows.

Barmekin of Echt (SM57) and Upper Broomhall (SM12190)

7.7.5 Proposed measures include:

- An erosion survey to be carried out on the approaches to the monument and assisted by Archaeology students from local colleges/universities to facilitate pathways into the archaeological profession and to inform the design of the proposed improvements to access.
- Enhancement of appreciation points at the Hill Fort along with the provision of Interpretation Boards to further the understanding and experience of the monument.
- Creation of designated pathways to access monuments and limit foot erosion.
- Provision of increased parking availability to provide more access to appreciate the monument.

Sunhoney, Stone Circle (SM44)

7.7.6 Proposed measures include:

- Enhancement of appreciation points at the edge of the monument along with the provision of Interpretation Boards to further the understanding of the monument.
- Creation of designated pathways to access monuments and limit foot erosion.

Other Potential Measures

- Outreach to local communities in the form of presentation by industry leaders for furthering understanding of the history in the area.

- Excavation and publication of results of a potential longhouse on the site with local groups/Student Summer Schools in conjunction with Local Universities or Colleges. This would be subject to agreement with the local authority.
- Renovation of the currently derelict 18th century lodge house on the Site for visitor shelter and information.

7.7.7 All enhancement/compensatory measures have been created in line with recent ALGAO Guidance (2023). Not all measures are considered to be compensatory and some enhancement into the area is in line with the definitions of Enhancement as set out in BoxC.9.Info.1 of the EIA Handbook. It is considered that the measures set out for the scheduled monuments are considered an enhancement measure due to the lack of access to the monuments including the ability to understand and appreciate their contributors to significance as well as a form of mitigation from the Proposed Development. This shall be implemented under a Cultural Heritage Management Plan as agreed by HES and ACAS as part of a condition of the Proposed Development.

7.8 Assessment of Residual Effects

Direct Effects

7.8.1 As outlined in **paragraph 7.6.7**, mitigation in various forms is proposed in **Table 7.7**. Any residual effects would be in accordance with those outlined in **Table 7.7** however adverse effects would be offset by the positive effect that archaeological recording would have in respect to the wider benefit to the archaeological and local community and preserved through recording in agreement with ACAS.

Operational Effects

7.8.2 Residual Operational effects are summarised in **Table 7.8**.

Decommissioning Effects

7.8.3 As outlined in **paragraph 7.6.110**, decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not result in any adverse effects and thus there would be no decommissioning effects.

7.9 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

7.9.1 Cumulative effects have been considered with regard to any wind farm developments that are:

- consented or the subject of valid but currently undetermined planning or s36 applications); and

- within 15 km of assets of any nationally important assets anticipated to be subject to a Moderate adverse effect (or above) as a result of the Proposed development.

7.9.2 The assessment has considered assets in line with the cumulative assessment. As there are no developments within 15km that are in the planning system no cumulative impact is predicted.

7.10 Summary

7.10.1 This assessment has considered data from a diverse range of sources in order to determine the presence of heritage assets which may be affected by the proposed development. The potential direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the identified assets, mitigation measures for protecting known assets during construction or recording of currently unknown features which could be lost due to groundworks during construction, and the residual effects of the proposed development have also been assessed.

7.10.2 The assessment has considered the potential indirect impacts on the designated heritage assets outlined in **Table 7.8**, which provides a summary of the identified significance of effect upon them.

Table 7.8: Summary of Residual Effects

Asset	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect
Barmekin of Echt (SM57)	Moderate	Enhancement	Planning Condition	Moderate
Sunhoney (SM44)	Moderate	Enhancement	Planning Condition	Moderate
Upper Broomhill (SM12190)	Minor	Enhancement	Planning Condition	Minor
Midmar Castle (LB16262)	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
Christchurch (SM32)	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
New Wester Echt (SM6074)	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
Tamnagorn (SM49)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Cluny Castle (GDL000103)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Midmar Motte (SM100)	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Cluny Crichton Castle (LB3246)	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Learney House (LB9516)	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Crathes Castle (GDL00119)	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Cullerie (SM90088)	Neutral/None	N/A	N/A	Neutral/None
East Finnercy (SM6076)	Neutral/None	N/A	N/A	Neutral/None
Dunecht House (GDL00153)	Neutral/None	N/A	N/A	Neutral/None
Ha Hoose and Raemoir House (LB3247/LB3249)	Neutral/None	N/A	N/A	Neutral/None

7.10.3 Mitigation through design has been embedded as outlined in Chapter 2: Design Evolution and Alternatives and efforts have been taken to ensure that the assets outlined in Table 7.8 have been considered during the design process as well as seeking ongoing advice from HES in regard to mitigating any effects where possible. This has been highlighted in the reduction in number, and relocation of wind turbines. While a Moderate significance of effect has been identified in relation to Barmekin of Echt (SM57) and Sunhoney (SM44), efforts have been taken to ensure that the aforementioned assets have been considered during the design process and

have assisted in ensuring the overall effect of the Proposed Development would not exceed an Adverse Moderate impact.

- 7.10.4 Whilst the impacts might distract from the ability to experience certain aspects of the relationships these assets have with their aforementioned environs, these are contextual characteristics only make up a portion of these assets' significance and as such large elements of their setting would be retained and their integrity would largely be preserved. Therefore, it is considered that with the proposed design mitigation in place, the proposed development will be in line with Policy 7 (h) of NPF4 (2023).