# Chapter 11

## Archaeology and Cultural Heritage



SCOTTISHPOWER RENEWABLES

# Table of contents

### Figures



### Technical Appendices



# Chapter 11
# Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

## 11.1 Executive summary

1. This EIA Chapter has assessed the direct impacts from the construction of the proposed development and the indirect impact upon heritage assets from its operation within their setting. The assessment has been compiled with reference to all relevant planning policy and guidance documents of Historic Environment Scotland and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. SLR has consulted with the statutory consultees in order to agree the methodology employed by the assessment and for them to identify specific assets of particular concern to them. The methodology and study areas employed by the assessment have been formulated as a result of this consultation.

2. A baseline and targeted walk over survey was undertaken in order to assess direct impacts on all heritage assets within the application area. Indirect impacts upon a heritage asset have been assessed for assets of regional or national importance within 10 km of the nearest proposed turbine; selected heritage assets of national importance over 10 km from the proposed turbines where a change to that part of the landscape which is visible in long-distance views from the asset has the potential to impact upon the asset's setting. A visit to heritage assets outside the application area was made where is it was beneficial to assessing indirect impacts upon their setting.

3. The Site is predominantly covered by commercial forestry. The baseline concluded that much of the archaeological resource found within the Site is associated with a post-medieval agricultural landscape, in correspondence with historical sources. The proposed Development would have a direct impact on two post medieval trackways (**SLR31** and **SLR32**). The proposed Development is likely to improve access to Allan's cairn, a converters grave marker situated on the Southern Upland Way through improved access and signage. The assessment found indirect impacts from the operation of the proposed Development, which would include Very Slight adverse significance of effect, a Very Slight beneficial effect, with an overall Neutral effect on Allan's Cairn. All other assessments were concluded to have Nil effect.

## 11.2 Introduction

4. The cultural heritage of an area comprises archaeological sites, historic buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs), Registered 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.

5. 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 3: Description of the proposed Development**. 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 wind turbines, 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 to the distant landscape **(Figure 11.1 and 11.2).**

6. 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. The historic development of the Site and study areas 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 areas as appropriate. Measures necessary to safeguard or record any assets potentially affected by the proposed Development are suggested.

8. 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).

9. These designations are 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, 2017).

10. In addition, the following non-designated assets are also included in the assessment:

- nationally/regionally recorded archaeological sites and finds; and
- other buildings and structures of historic or architectural importance.

11. This assessment has been undertaken by SLR Consulting Ltd, which is a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA).

12. This Chapter is supported by:

- **Technical Appendices 11.1** and **11.2**
- **Figures 11.1-11.2** are referenced in the text where relevant.

# 11.3 Approach to assessment and methods

### 11.3.1 Legislation, policy and guidance

13. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the following principal relevant legislation:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997;
- The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011; and
- Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), 2014.

14. The Scottish Government and HES have issued a number of statements of policy with respect to dealing with the historic environment in the planning system:

- Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017;
- Historic Environment Circular 1 May 2016a;
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland May 2019a; and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.

15. Three relevant pieces of guidance have been published by HES, in conjunction with Scottish National Heritage (SNH[1]), and by the professional archaeological body the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. These publications are:

- Historic Environment Scotland guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting 2016b;
- Scottish National Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland 2018; and
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment 2014.

### 11.3.2 Study areas

16. This assessment employs the following study areas:

- Inner Study Area: land within the Application Boundary of the proposed Development; and
- Outer Study Area: land within 10 km of the proposed locations of the wind turbines.

17. Historic Environment Data in the Inner Study Area and land within 1 km of it are presented to identify enough cultural heritage data to inform a predictive model of the probability for potential buried archaeological remains to exist within the Inner Study Area, but not previously identified, which might be directly affected by construction there.

18. It should be noted that the land within the application boundary (Inner Study Area) was reduced following the commencement of the assessment, but the 1 km buffer from the original application boundary (which is used to inform the predictive model) was not altered.

19. The Outer Study Area is employed to take account of possible setting impacts on heritage assets of regional and national importance. All designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets of regional or national importance within the Outer Study Area are considered and assessed with reference to potential indirect impacts.

### 11.3.3 Effects assessed in full

20. The following effects have been assessed in full:

- direct effects on all heritage assets within the Inner Study Area;
- effects on the setting of designated heritage assets and selected non-designated heritage assets of national importance within the Inner and Outer Study Areas; and
- effects on the setting of selected designated assets of national importance nearby the Outer Study Area where long distance views towards the turbines may form part of the setting which contributes to the asset's cultural significance; or additional sites at a greater distance as agreed through consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES).

### 11.3.4 Effects scoped out

21. The following have been scoped out:

- effects on the setting of heritage assets more than 10 km from the proposed Development unless identified as being particularly sensitive to change to the distant landscape; and
- effects on the setting of 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 our understanding, appreciation and experience of the same within the ZTV.

### 11.3.5 Data sources

#### Desk study

22. The baseline conditions have been characterised from the following sources:

- data held on non-designated sites in the Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC) Historic Environment Records (HER);
- data held on non-designated sites in East Ayrshire Council (EAC), held by West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS);
- data held on non-designated sites in the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE, 'Canmore');

[1] SNH changed name on 24 August 2020 to NatureScot.

- historic mapping on-line at the National Library of Scotland;
- aerial imagery held by the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) and HES;
- data of the Historic Land-use Assessment, produced by HES
- schedules, listings and inventories of designated assets held by HES; and
- appropriate published archaeological and historical works.

**Previous archaeological work - Arcus archaeological desk-based assessment (2013)**

23. In November 2013, Arcus Consulting produced a desk-based assessment for a previous proposal on the same land with an additional parcel of land to the north. Arcus carried out a walkover survey in September and November 2013. All historic sites identified by the work were identified using online sources, Historic Environment Data provided by local councils, aerial photography or cartographic sources.

**Field survey**

24. Details of the field survey can be found in **Technical Appendix 11.1: Field Survey.**

### 11.3.6 Consultation

25. In undertaking the assessment, consideration has been given to the scoping responses and other consultation undertaken as detailed in **Table 11.1**.

Table 11.1: Consultation with stakeholders

| Consultee and Date | Scoping/ Other Consultation | Issue Raised | Response/Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Historic Environment Scotland (23rd of April 2020)** | Pre-Application Response | Suggested a wider methodology study area of 20 km. A more detailed ZTV was requested. Request any formal scope be submitted to Energy Consents (ECU). Request specific Assets be included;<br>• *Dumfries House* (Category A listed building, LB14413, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL149)<br>• *Drumlanrig Castle* (Category A listed building, LB3886, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL143)<br>• *Sanquhar Town Hall* (Category A listed building, LB40540)<br>• *Durisdeer Church* (Category A listed building, LB3856)<br>• *Tinwald House* (Category A listed building, LB17238)<br>• *Kemps Castle, Fort 320m SW of Euchan Bridge* (Scheduled Monument, Index no.656)<br>• *Chrichton Peel & Sanquhar Castle* (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 687)<br>• *Ryehill, Motte* (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 708)<br>• *Druidhill Burn, Motte* (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 691)<br>• *Ballaggan, Motte* (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 704)<br>• *Grennan Hill, Fort 250m S Of* (Scheduled Monument, Index no.6285)<br>• *Tynron Doon, Fort* (Scheduled Monument, Index no.663) | We have added the assets listed by HES in column 3 to our assessments. |
| **Historic Environment** | Response to SLR Drawings | Asked for ZTV on specific Heritage Assets: | This was provided to HES. |

| Consultee and Date | Scoping/ Other Consultation | Issue Raised | Response/Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Scotland (18th of May 2020)** | | • Dumfries House (Category A listed building, LB14413, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL149);<br>• Drumlanrig Castle (Category A listed building, LB3886, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL143);<br>• Sanquhar Town Hall (Category A listed building, LB40540);<br>• Durisdeer Church (Category A listed building, LB3856); and<br>• Tinwald House (Category A listed building, LB17238) | |
| **Historic Environment Scotland (4th of June 2020)** | Final Consultation | Agreed the Assets that lie outwith the ZTV can be scoped out with attention therefore being required with respect to the following assets:<br>• Drumlanrig Castle (Category A listed building, LB3886, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL143)<br>• Sanquhar Town Hall (Category A listed building, LB40540)<br>• Durisdeer Church (Category A listed building, LB3856<br>• Kemps Castle, Fort 320m SW of Euchan Bridge (Scheduled Monument, Index no.656)<br>• Chrichton Peel & Sanquhar Castle (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 687)<br>• Ryehill, Motte (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 708)<br>• Druidhill Burn, Motte (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 691)<br>• Ballaggan, Motte (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 704)<br>• Grennan Hill, Fort 250m S Of (Scheduled Monument, Index no.6285)<br>• Tynron Doon, Fort (Scheduled Monument, Index no.663<br>Visualisations are requested from the following assets:<br>• *Drumlanrig Castle (Category A listed building, LB3886, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL143)*<br>• *Sanquhar Town Hall (Category A listed building, LB40540)*<br>• *Durisdeer Church (Category A listed building, LB3856)* | These are addressed within the Chapter in Section 11.5 |
| **Dumfries and Galloway Council's Archaeological Officer (26th of May 2020)** | Scoping Letter Response | DGC recommend assessment of indirect effects that nationally significant sites (Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Designed Landscapes, A-listed buildings and unscheduled sites considered by the local authority to be of national significance) out to 10 km should be assessed where they fall within the ZTV, as well as regionally significant Non-Inventory | Addressed in the Chapter. No non-inventory Designed landscapes have been included in the assessment as none would be adversely affected by the proposed |

| Consultee and Date | Scoping/ Other Consultation | Issue Raised | Response/Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Designed Landscapes and Archaeologically Sensitive Areas for which there are specific Council historic environment policies.<br><br>Regionally significant historic assets out to 5 km should also be assessed in cases such as burial cairns, hillforts and commemorative monuments where their landscape setting is one of their key characteristics. Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes should also be included alongside RSAs as regional designations with respect to the LVIA assessment, in addition to Inventory Designed landscapes.<br><br>On the information available it is advised that indirect effects on the following assets must be included in any assessment:<br><br>• Designated monument at Sanquhar Castle (HS ref SM687).<br>• Undesignated monuments at Allan's Cairn (MDG24), St Connel's Church (MDG75)<br><br>After preliminary assessment a finalised list of illustrations for inclusion in an EIA should be agreed with the Council Archaeologist. | Development. These are addressed in Section 11.5. |
| **West of Scotland Archaeological Service on Behalf of East Ayrshire Council** | Scoping Letter Response | No response | |

### 11.3.7 Approach to assessment of effects

26. Impacts may be caused by the proposed Development where it changes the baseline condition of either the asset itself or its setting.

27. In accordance with EIA Regulations, the assessment identifies 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 heritage significance of an asset through physical alteration; for the purposes of this assessment indirect impacts are those which affect the heritage significance of an asset by causing change within its setting.

28. Direct effects on the heritage significance of an asset have been assessed on the basis of a combination of the 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.

29. Indirect effects on the heritage significance of heritage assets have been identified and assessed with reference to Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2016b) and the guidance set out in SNH and HES (2018). Assessment has been carried out in the following stages:

- initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the 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.

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

### 11.3.8 Heritage significance

31. The cultural significance of undesignated heritage assets was assessed by a consideration of their intrinsic, contextual, and associative characteristic as defined in Annex 1 of HES (2019b). In relation to these assets, this assessment focussed 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 were taken into account where available.

32. **Table 11.2** shows the potential levels of 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 acts as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provides a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions reached by this assessment.

Table 11.2: Heritage Significance

| Heritage Significance | Explanation |
|---|---|
| Highest | Sites of national or international importance, including:<br>• World Heritage Sites;<br>• Scheduled Monuments;<br>• Category A Listed Buildings;<br>• Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory;<br>• Designated Battlefields; and<br>• Non-designated assets of equivalent significance. |
| High | Site of regional importance, including:<br>• Category B Listed Buildings;<br>• Some Conservation Areas;<br>• Non-designated assets of equivalent significance. |
| Medium | Sites of local importance, including:<br>• Category C Listed Buildings;<br>• Some Conservation Areas; and<br>• Non-designated assets of equivalent significance. |
| Low | Sites of minor importance or with little of the asset remaining to justify a higher importance. |
| Negligible | Negligible or no heritage significance |
| Unknown | Further information is required to assess the significance of these assets. |

### 11.3.9 Magnitude of impact

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

34. The changes could potentially include direct change (e.g. ground disturbance), and indirect change (e.g. visible change, noise, 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 has been assessed with reference to the criteria set out in **Table 11.3.**

Table 11.3: Magnitude of impact

| Magnitude of Impact | Explanatory Criteria |
|---|---|
| High Beneficial | The proposed Development would considerably enhance the heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. |
| High Adverse | The proposed Development would considerably erode the heritage significance of the affected asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it. |

### 11.3.10 Significance of effect

35. The significance of effect is presented in **Table 11.4.** This 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 is undertaken separately for direct effects and indirect effects, the latter being principally concerned with effects on setting.

Table 11.4: Significance of effect

| Magnitude of Impact | Heritage Significance (excluding negligible and unknown) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Highest | High | Medium | Low |
| High beneficial | Substantial | Substantial | Moderate | Slight |
| Medium beneficial | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Very slight |
| Low beneficial | Moderate | Slight | Very slight | Very slight |
| Very low beneficial | Slight | Very slight | Negligible | Negligible |
| Neutral/None | Neutral/Nil | Neutral/Nil | Neutral/Nil | Neutral/Nil |
| Very low adverse | Slight | Very slight | Negligible | Negligible |
| Low adverse | Moderate | Slight | Very slight | Very slight |
| Medium adverse | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Very slight |
| High adverse | Substantial | Substantial | Moderate | Slight |

### 11.3.11 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis

36. Assessment of visual impact has been assisted by a ZTV calculation, prepared principally for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and presented in **Figure 11.2**. The ZTV calculation methodology is set out in detail in **Chapter 7: 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 11.2** 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 Outer Study Area.

37. 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.

38. 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 wind turbines, and that view may enable appreciation of the assets' heritage significance.

### 11.3.12 Potential cumulative effects

39. A cumulative assessment is presented in paragraph 164. Cumulative effects are assessed with regard to assets that have been assessed as receiving an above negligible impact from the proposed Development. The other contributor developments are considered to be other wind energy developments within 5 km or 10 km of the affected heritage asset, depending on the heritage significance of the asset, that have been given planning consent, have an active planning application or are undergoing a planning appeal. Operational windfarms are considered as part of the baseline assessment.

### 11.3.13 Mitigation

40. A statement of the proposed mitigation of the identified impacts follows the assessment. The main approach to mitigation is through design: avoidance of direct impacts on heritage assets has been a consideration throughout the design process, and post consent this would continue, e.g. through micrositing. Direct impacts may also be mitigated through a program of archaeological works. Screening to avoid impacts on the setting of assets is rarely feasible for wind turbines, but has been considered where other effects from other infrastructure may be mitigated in this way.

### 11.3.14 Residual effects

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

### 11.3.15 Statement of significance

42. 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 (2018) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook, Section C, Page 75.

### 11.3.16 Limitations to the assessment

43. The assessment is based on the sources outlined in **Section 11.3.5** and, therefore, shares the same range of limitations in terms of comprehensiveness and completeness of those sources. The densely afforested nature/dense brash cover of much of the Site has meant that not all of the proposed infrastructure or recorded heritage assets within these areas could be reached during the Site visit. This does not affect the validity of the findings, as assessment has generated sufficient records of known heritage assets from the surrounding study area, for a robust assessment to be made of the potential for unknown assets to occur within the Site. Due to the Covid-19 movement restrictions not all designated Heritage assets could be visited due to prohibited access by landowners.

## 11.4 Baseline conditions

### 11.4.1 Introduction

44. The current landscape character of the proposed Development and its immediate vicinity consists of commercial conifer plantation. The closest town is Sanquhar which lies along the A76, 6 km to the east of the proposed Development application boundary, the closest property within Sanquhar lying 9.6 km from turbine 1. A full description of the proposed Development and environs is given in **Chapter 1: Introduction**, **Chapter 2: Site Description and Design Evolution** and **Chapter 3: Description of the proposed Development**.

### 11.4.2 Designated heritage assets

45. There are no World Heritage Sites, Inventoried Battlefields, or Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscapes, within the Outer Study Area.

46. There are no designated heritage assets within the Inner Study Area.

47. There are six Category A Listed Buildings of national importance within the Outer Study Area, as well as 33 Category B Listed Buildings of regional importance. Assets of regional importance have only been assessed out to 5 km from the proposed development. These are listed in **Table 11.5.**

48. Within the Outer Study Area there are four scheduled monuments of national importance, listed in **Table 11.5.** In response to consultation with HES, additional designated heritage assets beyond 10 km outside the Outer Study Area and up to 15 km from the proposed turbine locations have also been considered for assessment, because the location and nature of the assets indicates that long distance views may contribute to the heritage significance of the monument. As such, an additional six scheduled monuments, three category A Listed Buildings and an Inventoried Garden and Design Landscapes are assessed, presented in **Table 11.5.** Assets that have been considered in correspondence with HES are outlined in Consultation.

Table 11.5: Designated Heritage Assets within the Outer Study Area

| Designation | Type | Index Number | Within ZTV | Distance to Nearest Proposed Turbines (km) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Craigengillan, cairn** | Scheduled Monument | SM2238 | Yes | 8.2 |
| **Stroanfreggan Craig, Fort** | Scheduled Monument | SM1095 | Yes | 9.1 |
| **Kemps Castle, fort** | Scheduled Monument | SM656 | Yes | 9.1 |
| **Stroanfreggan Bridge, Cairn** | Scheduled Monument | SM1043 | Yes | 9.4 |
| **Sanquhar Town Hall** | Listed Building Category A | LB40540 | Yes | 9.9 |
| **Craigdarroch House** | Listed Building Category A | LB10340 | No | 8.7 |
| **Glenluiart House** | Listed Building Category A | LB10307 | No | 9.9 |
| **Moniaive Village Kilneiss House** | Listed Building Category A | LB10298 | No | 10.2 |

49. Some additional heritage assets were identified by statutory consultees, who requested that they were included in the assessment. These assets are identified in **Table 11.6.**

Table 11.6: Additional assets requested for assessment by Statutory Consultees.

| Designation | Type | Index Number | Within ZTV | Distance to closest Turbine (km) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Chrichton Peel & Sanquhar Castle** | Scheduled Monument | SM687 | Yes | 10.4 |
| **Ryehill Motte** | Scheduled Monument | SM708 | Yes | 11 |
| **Grennan Hill, Fort** | Scheduled Monument | SM6285 | Yes | 12 |
| **Drumlanrig Castle** | Listed Building/ Inventoried Garden and Design Landscape | LB3886/ GDL143 | Yes | 12.2 |
| **Durisdeer Church** | Listed Building | LB3856 | Yes | 19 |
| **Allan's Cairn** | Regionally/ Locally Important Site to DGC | MDG24 | Yes | 0.3 |
| **Kirkconnel Church** | Regionally Important Site to DGC | MDG75 | Yes | 8.2 |
| **Druidhill Burn, Motte** | Scheduled Monument | SM691 | No | 10.2 |
| **Tynron Doon, Fort** | Scheduled Monument | SM663 | No | 12 |
| **Ballagan Motte** | Scheduled Monument | SM704 | No | 12.7 |

| Designation | Type | Index Number | Within ZTV | Distance to closest Turbine (km) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Moniaive Village Kilneiss House** | Listed Building | LB10298 | No | 10.2 |

50. Assets that fall outwith the ZTV are excluded from any further assessment.

### 11.4.3 Non-designated assets of regional or national significance in the Outer Study Area

51. Non-designated heritage assets are assessed for any potential to be of regional or national significance, following the criteria detailed in paragraph 30. The heritage significance of these assets has been assessed with reference to the data supplied by Dumfries and Galloway's Archaeological Officer and HES in order to determine the relevance of long-distance views to appreciating their significance. The heritage significance of each non-designated asset is provided in the gazetteer of sites (**Appendix 11.2**).

52. Following the selection process, there is one heritage asset that will be assessed; Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**), which has been assessed to be of local / regional importance as per DGC data classification.

### 11.4.4 Known heritage assets within the Inner Study Area

53. The locations of the heritage assets are provided in **Figure 11.1.** The locations of gazetteer sites are detailed in **Figure 11.1.**

#### Prehistoric periods

54. There are two possible prehistoric findspots within the Inner Study Area, both identified as barbed arrowheads in the area surrounding Polskeoch (**SLR22 & SLR28**), in addition there is a possible Cairnfield (**SLR37**) and a flint arrowhead (**SLR36**),

55. Up to 1 km beyond the Inner Study Area there is one prehistoric site that lies within the area of Polskeoch, an unidentified flint of prehistoric date (**SLR41**). There are a further three assets that lie at Dalwhat Water, 1.6 km to the south of the proposed Development, identified as prehistoric cairns of Regional Importance as per data supplied by Dumfries and Galloway HER.

56. Additionally, there are two cairns that are also classed as undated but can be associated with the Prehistoric period (**SLR129**, **SLR115**).

#### Roman and Medieval periods

57. There are no known Roman or Medieval assets within the Inner Study Area or within 1 km of it.

#### Post-Medieval

58. There are six sites within the Inner Study Area which date to the post-medieval period. The majority of the these are agricultural features associated with use of the land prior to its current use for forestry. They include sheepfolds - two in the northern parcel of land at Euchanhead and one in the south beside Shinnelhead Farm (**SLR8, SLR26, SLR29**), enclosure to the north in Euchanhead (**SLR9**), and two trackways, one to the north at Littledodd Hill and in the south on Wether Hill (**SLR23, SLR24**). In addition, a commemorative cairn, known as Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**) is located 1.8 km to the south of Polskeoch. Situated on Wether Hill, the cairn is situated on the conjunction between the three county parishes; Dumfries, Kirkcudbright and Ayr. The cairn is in memorial of George Alan and Margaret Gracie who were shot by Dragoons during the 17th century; a more detailed assessment of this feature can be found below.

59. Within a 1 km buffer of the Inner Study Area there are a total of 62 sites. Within these there are sheepfolds (**SLR47-89**), trackways, (SLR90-92), farmsteads (**SLR93, 95-101**). There are an additional 35 Farmsteads (**SLR126-128, 131, 110, 116-120, 123, 124**), six Drove Roads, (**SLR105, SLR107, SLR109, SLR111, SLR122, SLR123**). Although undated, features of these may be reasonably attributed to the post-medieval period.

#### Modern 20th Century

60. There are no modern heritage assets within the Inner Study Area or within 1 km of the proposed Development. The Striding Arches, an artistic piece created by Andy Goldsworthy, is located in the southern part of the Site, but not recorded in the HER. Assessment of this piece has therefore been included in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual**.

61. An undated but probably modern Beacon Stance (SLR104) is located to the east of the proposed Development at Cruffel Hill.

**Undated**

62. Within the Inner Study Area there are 23 undated sites. These are: 21 Sheepfolds (**SLR1-7, SLR10-21, SLR25, SLR30, SLR33, SLR34**). two Drove Roads (**SLR31, SLR32**), and one cropmark group, (**SLR35**).

63. Within the 1 km study area from the proposed Development, there are 28 undated sites. Within these undated sites there are 35 Farmsteads (**SLR17, 126-128, 131, 110, 116-120, 123, 124**) and six Drove Roads, (**SLR105, SLR107, SLR109, SLR111, SLR122, SLR123**). Although undated, features of these types may be reasonably attributed to the post-medieval period. Two Cairns are also classed as undated but can be associated with Prehistoric period (**SLR129, SLR115**). A beacon stance (**SLR104**) that could be associated with the modern period. There is also a findspot of a Brass pot, (**SLR113**), which remains undated.

### 11.4.5 Historic mapping

64. A review of online historic mapping from the National Map Library of Scotland was undertaken.

65. The earliest map of a sufficiently large scale of the area of the proposed Development is Roy's Military Survey of Scotland (Roy 1747-1755). The Inner Study Area is depicted with hills such as Lorg Hill and Craig Lellan. The first reference to the site name of Euchanhead is depicted by the river running east west through the site labelled as Yochan Head and Yochan Water. Also, on Roy's map there is a depiction of a small settlement labelled Pitskeach, it is reasonable to assume this is the same settlement know later as Polskeoch. The farm of Shinalhead is also depicted, known today as Shinnelhead.

66. Euchanhead is referenced on Arrowsmith (1807) and is referenced as such on all historic and current Ordnance Survey (OS) maps.

67. Polskeoch is shown on Crawford, W (1804) map of 'Dumfries-shire', it also shows the river of 'Euchan Head'. It is also the first map indicating the presence of Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**) which was erected in 1857, this may indicate the presence of a previous cairn of an earlier date.

68. The first edition of the Ordnance Survey maps shows the Inner Study Area as utilised for pasture. The sheepfolds and enclosures of the HER are shown (**SLR1-3, 6--15, 17-21**). It also depicts Allan's Cairn adjacent to the pathway now known as the Southern Upland Way. Euchanhead enclosure is also depicted on the map, showing a name variation from Crawford.

69. The Second Edition Ordnance Survey map shows no cultural heritage variation.

### 11.4.6 Aerial photography

70. Aerial imagery available from the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) and Canmore was reviewed. There was no oblique aerial imagery of the Inner Study Area available from Canmore.

71. NCAP holds four vertical images of a sortie flown on the 10 June 1988, covering the southern parcel of land in the south of the proposed Development at a scale 1:24,000 (Sortie: ASS/62388 of Planning & Mapping Limited). The area of plantation within the southern parcel is small in 1988 with half of the land unforested. Due to the scale of the vertical imagery smaller features such as Sheepfolds cannot be identified.

72. NCAP holds three vertical images of a sortie flown on the 10 June 1988, covering the northern parcel of land within the north of the proposed Development at a scale 1:24,000 (Sortie: ASS/62188 of Planning & Mapping Limited). The area of plantation within the northern parcel is smaller in 1988 with half of the land unforested with a mix of moorland. Due to the scale of the vertical imagery, smaller features such as Sheepfolds cannot be identified.

### 11.4.7 Discussion

73. Prehistoric activity is scarce in the area. Within the Inner Study Area, there are two find spots (**SLR22, SLR28**) that lie near Polskeoch: both are barbed flints commonly used in the Neolithic period when the first agricultural communities were developing. No further prehistoric heritage assets were identified within 1 km of the proposed Development boundary.

74. There are no recorded HER monuments dating to the Roman period. The nearest Roman scheduled monuments to the proposed Development are (**SM13711**) in Drumlanrig castle, and Durisdeer Roman Fort, (**SM670**) which lie over 10 km to the south east.

75. There are no recorded medieval assets within the Inner Study Area, or 1 km of the proposed Development.

76. Post medieval activity within the Inner Study Area is associated with agricultural settlement and activity including farmstead, agricultural buildings, trackways and enclosures boundaries (**SLR8, SLR26, SLR29, SLR9, SLR23, SLR2, SLR27**).

77. There are no 20th Century or modern heritage assets identified by the baseline.

### 11.4.8 Potential for unknown heritage assets

78. The potential for unknown remains within the Inner Study Area have been assessed using a predictive model of historic environment from the Historic Environment Record within the Inner Study Area and 1 km from the proposed Development Site boundary.

79. The potential for unknown remains of the prehistoric period is low. Much of the lower ground of the proposed Development has been significantly affected by forestry and agriculture. Despite the presence of a prehistoric findspot there is little evidence to suggest that there would be unknown prehistoric sites.

80. The potential for unknown remains of the Roman Period is very low. There is no known activity within 1 km of the proposed Development, though the Site is located between the two Roman frontiers of the Antonine Wall and Hadrian's Wall. Similarly, there are no known heritage assets of the local population of the Roman period within 1 km of the proposed Development. The closest known designated assets are over 10 km to the south east at Drumlanrig Roman fort (**SM13711**).

81. The potential for unknown medieval remains is low. There is no evidence for medieval heritage assets within the Inner Study Area, and they are scarce in its immediate surroundings of 1 km.

82. The potential for unknown remains of the post-medieval period is high, due to the number of assets associated with post-medieval farming activity within the Inner Study Area. The areas where known Heritage assets are located, such as Euchanhead farmstead as well as near the house of Polskeoch, are likely to be of higher potential for unknown remains. The southern portion of the Site is moderate to high potential due to there being less farming activity.

## 11.5 Assessment of effects

83. It is considered that the proposed Development has potential to cause direct impacts on below ground archaeology within the Site during construction through physical disturbance / destruction, and potential indirect impacts on designated assets which are sensitive to change, and which could be affected by change within their setting in the construction and operational phases.

84. Indirect impacts could potentially occur during the operational stage and are characterised as an alteration of any aspect of the landscape setting of a heritage asset which contributes to its significance. Although these assets have individual levels of importance, the proposed Development would affect the heritage significance of the asset by forming change within their settings.

### 11.5.1 Potential construction effects

85. Direct impacts would be caused where ground works which form part of the construction phase of the proposed Development would physically disturb or destroy any heritage assets. Actions which have the potential to cause impacts in this way include:

- excavation of turbine and met mast bases, substation foundations, crane hard standings, borrow pits and cable trenches;
- forestry operations associated with the proposed Development, particularly where these entail stump and root removal; and
- construction and upgrading of access tracks, working compounds and laydown areas.

86. Where significant ground disturbance would take place, these activities would remove or harm any heritage assets within the area of ground disturbance. This damage would be irreversible and permanent. The cables are proposed to run alongside the access track or in places under the track. As the precise routes of the cables are not yet known (in terms of which side of the track they would be installed along particular track sections, or which sections would lie within the track), the assessment has assumed the route to cause the greatest impact. However, due to the uncertainty it is not conclusive of the level of impact.

87. Two assets have been identified as receiving direct impact from the proposed Development. These are two trackways (**SLR31** and **SLR32**) which have been identified as of negligible importance with a low adverse impact and resulting in a slight magnitude effect from the proposed infrastructure, this is due to only a minimal impact on the wider asset with the track cutting only a small section of the wider assets. The predicted significance of effect is Slight adverse**.**

88. Groundworks could also affect currently-unknown heritage assets. The baseline data suggest that the heritage significance of such assets is likely to be no greater than low. The magnitude of impact on such assets could be up to high in cases of complete destruction. Assuming a heritage significance of low or lower and high adverse impact, the unmitigated significance of effect would be Slight adverse or lower.

### 11.5.2 Embedded measures for direct impacts

89. Mitigation in relation to most heritage assets has been embedded into the design of the proposed infrastructure and has therefore avoided or reduced the risk of direct impacts wherever possible. This mitigation has taken the form of design alterations intended to avoid siting turbines and associated infrastructure on known heritage assets.

### 11.5.3 Proposed mitigation of direct impacts

90. Appropriate mitigation undertaken during construction would be in the form of:

- fencing off and avoidance of known heritage assets in close proximity to the proposed Development that could otherwise be accidentally damaged during the construction works such as Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**);
- a watching brief on elements of the ground works that have the potential to have direct impacts on unrecorded buried archaeology; and
- should any known or unknown heritage assets have the need to be removed or compromised then a programme of archaeological works will need to be agreed with Dumfries and Galloway Council's Archaeological officer (DGAS) or West of Scotland Archaeological (WoSAS) on behalf of East Ayrshire Council.

91. The precise scope of the mitigation works would be negotiated with DGAS or EAC and the agreed mitigation programme would be documented in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation.

### 11.5.4 Residual direct effects

92. The completion of the archaeological mitigation programme outlined in Section 11.5.3 would minimise the loss of the archaeological resource that could occur as a result of the construction of the proposed Development. Any harm caused to buried remains would be balanced by the gain in knowledge resulting from investigation and reporting. No EIA significant residual direct effects are anticipated from the construction of the proposed Development.

### 11.5.5 Potential operational effects within the Inner Study Area

93. There are no regionally or nationally designated heritage assets identified within the Inner Study Area. Effects on Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**), located within the Inner Study Area, are assessed because the asset is considered a regionally important site that lies within the Inner Study Area, and an impact assessment has been carried out paragraph 154.

### 11.5.6 Potential operational effects within the Outer Study Area and beyond

94. Designated heritage assets within the Outer Study Area and beyond which require impact assessment have been identified in paragraph 48 and **Tables 11.5** and **11.6**. **Table 11.5** shows assets within the Outer Study Area, and **Table 11.6** assets which lie beyond the Outer Study Area but for which assessments have been requested by stakeholders.

#### Indirect impacts on prehistoric assets

***Craigengillan and Stroanfreggan Cairns and Stroanfreggan Craig Fort***

95. The probably contemporary prehistoric Craigengillan Cairn (**SM2238**) and Stroanfreggan Cairn (**SM1043**) lie 3 km apart overlooking the Water of Ken and adjacent routeway in the vicinity of its confluences with the Craigengillan and

Stroanfreggan Burns respectively. The earliest recorded activity in the area is represented by knapped flint dating to the early Mesolithic period.

96. The Craigengillan Cairn lies 800 m north west of the Stroanfreggan Archaeological Sensitive Area (ASA). It is likely that visibility in views from, of, and between the assets was an important factor in their siting in relation to the topography. However, their topographical locations differ: the Craigengillan Cairn lies on the western side of the valley of the Water of Ken, c. 70 m higher than the river, while the Stroanfreggan Cairn lies in the valley bottom in an area of relatively flat, probably marshy ground indicated by its name (Culmark Moss), where the Ken Water meets the Stroanfreggan Burn. Within this area the Water of Ken is crossed by the B729 on Smittons Bridge; this road may be taken to follow an ancient routeway in territory such as this where the strong topography offers limited alternative courses for routeways.

97. The importance of the location in antiquity is reinforced by the location of the Iron Age fort, Stroanfreggan Craig Fort (**SM1095**) which would have controlled the river crossing and marshland.

98. Extensive plantations now cover the upland areas which are thought to have been largely used for open upland grazing before the 20th century.

99. The assets are individually assessed in the remainder of this sub-section.

*Craigengillan, Cairn (**SM2238**)*

100. This circular kerbed cairn is located on the southern slopes of Craigengillan Hill, on a north east south west running ridge overlooking the Water of Ken valley to the east. At the base of the cairn, the kerb comprises large rounded boulders, contrasting with the angular stone fragments of the eroded mound of the cairn. Two walls have been erected to form a sheep shelter on top of the cairn.

101. Views from the cairn to the north and west are blocked by the topography, and the primary original intended views from the cairn are likely to have been down to the south-east into the valley of the Water of Ken and its adjacent routeway, and south-south-east towards Stroanfreggan Cairn, though Craigengillan cairn is now situated within commercial forestry preventing medium or longer-distance views. The view of the cairn westwards from the valley is also likely to have been a consideration in its siting. The asset lies 1 km to the North East of the Craigengillan Burn, with the cairn overlooking the confluence of Craigengillan Burn and the Ken Water to the south southwest. Long and mid-range views to the north and west are obscured by topography. Craigengillan Cairn lies 800 m to the north west of the Archaeological Sensitive Area (ASA) of Stroanfreggan, described as being a multiperiod area dating as early as Mesolithic period. It includes the Stroanfreggan Cairn (**SM1043**), potentially contemporaneous with Craigengillan Cairn, approximately 3 km to the south east. Craigengillan Cairn is currently situated within commercial forestry preventing distance views of the surrounding landscape.

102. The nearest turbine (turbine 15) of the proposed Development lies 8 km north east of the cairn and the ZTV of the proposed Development suggests that parts of ten of the proposed turbines would theoretically be visible from the cairn, of which eight would be the full turbine and two would be of blade tips only. The cairn's location in the landscape indicates that it was intended to look over the valley to the south southeast and be viewed from this part valley, overlooking the valley of the Water of Ken and its confluence with Craigengillan Burn. Modelling of the topography indicates there may have been intervisibility between Craigengillan and Stroanfreggan cairns.

103. The proposed Development and valley of the Ken Water are screened from view by the existing forestry. The magnitude of impact from the proposed turbines would therefore be None and the significance of effect would be Nil. Should the trees be felled, theoretically 13 of the proposed turbines would be visible in the backdrop to the valley of the Ken Water to the north east, therefor any additional effects caused by the turbines would only be temporary due to replanting. The turbines would be in the periphery of the view across the valley of the Ken Water which contributes to our understanding and appreciation of the heritage asset.

104. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the cairn.

*Stroanfreggan Craig, Cairn (**SM1043**)*

105. Stroanfreggan Cairn, situated at the edge of a bank on low-lying ground, is a large circular cairn. Its sides were formed by four large slabs the joints between are smaller stones bonded with clay. Excavation of the cairn produced a plano-convex flint

knife dating the cairn to early Bronze Age. The perimeter of the cairn has been marked by large boulders of which only three remain, while the beds from which others have been removed are distinct. The site has been heavily robbed in Antiquity.

106. The cairn is located on the lower slopes of a hill at the southern edge of the ASA, very close to the confluence of Stroanfreggan Burn and the Water of Ken and the river crossing. The intended visibility of the monument is probably here provided by proximity to the routeway, compared with the elevated location of Craigengillan Cairn. The setting is focused on the valley bottom and the river confluence and crossing, though a view of Craigengillan Cairn would also have been important and Carroch Lane situated 100 m to the south, south west, as well as the confluence of Stroanfreggan Burn and the Water of Ken, lying approximately 300 m to the south west. As above, Craigengillan Cairn (**SM2238**) is theoretically visible from Stroanfreggan Cairn, the two sites being potentially contemporaneous.

107. The current setting of the cairn is one of rough grazing of an upland moorland. The cairn lies 270 m to the south of the road B729 and 500 m from the farm of Stroanfreggan to the north east. The site lies 800 m to the east of the settlement of Smittons and 79 m to the east of the Southern Upland Way. The site is situated adjacent to an unnamed road, on the edge of commercial forestry. The nearest turbine of the proposed Development (turbine 15), lies 9.5 km from the heritage asset. The Zone of Theoretical visibility of the proposed Development predicts that three blade tips of turbines would theoretically be visible, but no turbine hubs.

108. The proposed Development would form a very minor element of the distant landscape above the hills to the north of the asset. The principal elements of the cairn's setting are the valley of Ken Water and Stroanfreggan Burn. There is also some potential for further contemporaneous sites in the ASA to the north. The view of the blade tips would not intrude upon the key aspects of the asset's setting which contributes to our understanding or appreciation of the monument.

109. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the cairn.

*Stroanfreggan Craig, Fort (**SM1095**)*

110. Stroanfreggan Craig is an Iron Age fort visible today as double concentric stone walls forming a defensive structure around its perimeter, with a steep entrance to the south of the fort. The tumbled southern wall of the fort appears to continue along the cliff edge away to the east of the main monument; however, this is possibly a later dyke. It is located within the ASA of Stroanfreggan.

111. The fort is situated on the lower slopes of Stroanfreggan Craig overlooking the Water of Ken and Culmark Moss to the south west. An unnamed burn lies 19 m to the south east of the fort. The fort overlooked and guarded the river confluence, routeway and crossing. These features are the key aspects of its setting, though visibility of the earlier monuments would also be relevant, Stroanfreggan Cairn (**SM1043**) lies 700 m to the south east of the fort, of the early Bronze Age, therefore predating the fort.

112. The current setting of the fort is one of upland moorland, overlooking the valley of the Ken Water with 20$^{th}$ century plantation trees on the opposing side of the valley. The fort lies 200 m to the east of the fork of the road B729 and an unnamed road. The fort lies 400 m to the east of Smittons hamlet and 400 m to the west of the Southern Upland Way which intersects the Stroanfreggan ASA. The ZTV of the proposed Development predicts that eight turbines would theoretically be visible from the asset, of which six would be of turbine hubs and two would be of blade tips only.

113. The proposed Development lies outside the primary setting of the fort and creates a minor element in the distant landscape to the north east of the asset. The proposed Development lies 9 km from the closest turbine (turbine 15). It would not impact upon the key aspects of the assets setting that contribute to our appreciation and understanding of the monument.

114. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the fort.

*Grennan Hill, Fort (**SM6285**)*

115. Grennan Hill Fort is an Iron Age asset located on a rocky knoll in a commanding position at the end of the sloping ridge south of Grennan Hill, some 12 km from the nearest proposed turbine. The sub-rectangular enclosed area measures 46 m east-west by 24 m north-south and is bounded by a deep ditch on the north and west sides and a 5 m high vertical rock face and steep natural slopes on the east and south sides respectively. The ditch has a counterscarp bank and internal rampart on the

west side only. On the steep south slope there is a level terrace. The entrance lies on the north east side; a slight hollow way leads off from the entrance. Two near-circular 5 m diameter levelled areas in the undulating interior may be hut platforms.

116. The Fort will have controlled the valley of Scaur Water and this is the key aspect of its setting. The hillfort is located at an elevation of 190 m AOD, providing views to the north and south along the valley to the river. The hillfort is positioned on a plateau to the south of Grennan Hill. The site lies 200 m above Scaur Water and 1.18 km from Tynron Doon Hill Fort, (**SM663**), a potential contemporary site lies 1.2 km to the west and also occupies a knoll overlooking valleys.

117. The modern setting of the hillfort has changed since its inception. It is currently lying within pastural fields overlooking Scaur Water; the asset is surrounded by deciduous forestry to the west with agricultural pastural fields to the east, and the monument overlooks an unnamed minor road that follows Scaur Water. A modern field boundary lies to the immediate north east of the site. Fardingallan Farm lies 600 m to the east. The village of Penpont lies 2 km to the south east of the monument and the residential property of Craignee Cottage lies 240 m to the west of the monument.

118. The ZTV indicates that three blade tips and no hubs would theoretically be visible; as the closest turbine (turbine 18) would be 12 km away to the north west and the potential for visibility is limited, if the blade tips were to be visible they would appear in views from the fort as a minor element in the distant landscape.

119. The proposed Development would create a minor element in the distant landscape and would not affect the key aspects of the intended original setting of the monument.

120. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the fort.

### Indirect effects on assets at Sanquhar

121. The town of Sanquhar lies to the immediate east of the River Nith overlooking the valley of the river. Sanquhar has a long history dating as far back as the Neolithic. The town lies on the historic route of the A76 which lies to the east of the River Nith. It was of sufficient importance for a tollbooth to be constructed in 1735. The Ordnance Survey map of 1922 shows, speculatively, that the A76 was a Roman road. During the medieval period the area of Sanquhar attracted several fortified residences, possibly originating in pre-Norman times: Ryehill Motte, Kemps Castle and Sanquhar Castle. They all occupy naturally defensive positions, being situated on knolls controlling the routeway of the A76. In the medieval and post medieval period the town of Sanquhar went through expansion and development. The expansion of the town can be seen through the variance of Roy's map 1745 and the OS map of 1900. Roy's map indicates that settlement activity was limited to the high street in comparison to the Ordnance Survey map where the town expands to the north and south of the town with the addition of the railway. From being a small town, the town is considered a Royal Burgh in the late medieval period and is now recognised as an Area of Archaeological Sensitivity.

#### *Kemps Castle, Fort (SM656)*

122. Kemps Castle lies 8 m to the north of Euchan Water, 900 m to the south west of the town of Sanquhar and 160 m to the north west of the hamlet of Ulzieside. It is situated at the east end of a long narrow flat-topped promontory overlooking the confluence of Euchan Water and the River Nith. The knoll provides strong natural defences on all sides except the west, where the approach along the knoll is blocked by a broad ditch with an internal rampart and a second internal ditch with upcast mounds within that. The entrances through these defences are at their southern ends.

123. Kemps Castle was previously thought to be an Iron Age Hillfort; however, after a visit in 1954, the Ordnance Survey reported that the site was more likely to be a medieval motte castle and thus possibly linked to the later medieval stronghold of Sanquhar Castle (**SM687**).

124. The asset lies 1.1 km from the medieval castle of Sanquhar (**SM687**) which could be a potentially contemporaneous medieval settlement with the potential links to Kemps Castle. The site lies 1.3 km from the A76, a historic route. The A76 can be dated back to the 17th Century if not earlier. The monument is currently surrounded by areas of deciduous trees surrounded by grassland, close to the farm at Elzieside with a farm track to the south of the monument. The operational Whiteside Hill Windfarm is visible from Kemps Castle.

125. Kemps Castle fort lies 9.1 km to the east of turbine 1 of the proposed Development. Seven of the proposed 21 turbines would be theoretically visible from the monument (**Figure 11.2**). They would appear as a minor part of the landscape in the distance views to the west the backdrop of the skyline, given the distance of the turbines to the monument.

126. The proposed Development would create a minor element in the distant landscape to the west of the asset, and would not impact upon the key aspects of the assets setting which contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the monument which are that of the Euchan Burn and the River Nith lying to the south east.

127. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the castle.

***Sanquhar Castle / Crichton Peel (SM687)***

128. Sanquhar Castle, probably of the thirteenth century, occupies a prominent position with natural defences on all sides except the east, where it has been isolated by a ditch which has been almost obliterated on the south east. To the north east of the castle is a prominent counterscarp mound. The earliest cartographic record of Sanquhar Castle is on Pont's map of 1654 (Nithia Vicecomitatus). By the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey of 1843, the castle is depicted as ruins, with an additional tower depicted on the map as Wallace Tower added in the 14th century. By the 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map of the 20th Century the Wallace Tower was depicted as Crichton Peel after the Crichton Family purchasing the castle in the Mid-17th century.

129. The castle is situated to the south east of Sanquhar town overlooking the River Nith at the confluence with the Euchanwater, with the current A76 to the east. A road in the position of the A76 is also shown on Pont's map, attesting to the route's antiquity. The asset lies 1.1 km to the east of Kemps Castle (**SM656**) a possible motte overlooking Euchan Water, and 1 km to the north west of Ryehill Motte (**SM708**) also in the Nith Valley. The castle at Sanquhar superseded the motte at Ryehill. The approach to the castle is from the north east with the castle situated above the Nith with views directed down the valley to the south and along the valley to the south east. Views to the north of the castle would have encompassed the medieval town of Sanquhar, with views to the north west along the river valley.

130. The castle has been heavily robbed since its abandonment and has been enclosed with a metal fence to prevent entrance due to dangerous stonework. The Southern Upland Way passes through the scheduled area creating an area of erosion on the footpath. The castle lies 20 m from residential housing with the Conservation Area of Sanquhar 100 m to the north east of the castle. The scheduled area of the castle includes the Castle Mains Farm that appears on the OS 1st edition maps (1899). The castle lies 300 m to the north west of the modern farm of Newark with a sewage works lying 350 m to the west of the asset. A modern railway of the Glasgow and South Western Railway runs 380 m to the north east of the asset, with the A76 running perpendicular to the monument.. From the castle, the windfarms of Hare Hill and Whiteside Hill are visible in the backdrop of the skyline. The ZTV of the proposed Development predicts that five turbines would be visible. The castle lies 10 km to the east of the closest proposed turbine (turbine 1).

Plate 1: View from Sanquhar Castle towards the proposed Development.

131. The proposed Development would create a minor element in the distant landscape to the west of the asset; and would not impact upon the key aspects of the asset's setting. The proposed Development would also not impact on the understanding and appreciation of the monument and its surrounding setting due to the setting of the monument being directed to the River Nith and the surrounding valley to the north and south.

132. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the castle.

***Ryehill, Motte (SM708)***

133. Ryehill Motte dates to the late 12th century. The motte is situated on the edge of terrace slopes overlooking the flood plain of the River Nith. The Motte is 15 m high with natural slopes on the west side and elsewhere the slopes are up to 3 m high. The sub-oval level top measuring 20 m running north west-south east by 17 m shows evidence of rig cultivation which will post date the motte. There is a small quantity of stone visible around the edge of the summit area and surface quarrying has disfigured the north side. Ryehill Motte first appears on Pont's map of 1654 (Nithia Vicecomitatus). By the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey of 1896, it is depicted as a moat as well as a castle that lies on the edge of the route now known as the A76. It is unclear which feature the map depicts as Ryehill Motte. The motte is characteristically situated on a natural terrace overlooking the River Nith and the route of the A76. Similar to Sanquhar Castle (**SM687**) and Kemps Castle (**SM656**), the Motte appears to be in control of the trade route of the A76 and the valley of the River Nith.

134. The current setting of the Motte is that of pastoral fields with deciduous trees to the immediate north west. Telephone poles surround the asset 60 m to the north east and 200 m to the south west. The site is situated 185 m to the south of the A76, and 200 m from the Sanquhar to Dumfries Railway line. The Motte lies 100 m away from Ryehill Farm. The Motte lies 1.1 km to the south of the town of Sanquhar. Lying 6 km to the west are the windfarms of Whiteside Hill, Sanquhar and Harehill. From the ZTV, five turbine blades will be visible however given the site lies 11 km away from the closest turbine (turbine 1) it is unlikely to be seen due to long distance views. However, should the proposed Development be visible it would appear as a minor element in the background of Whiteside Hill windfarm.

135. The proposed Development creates a minor element in the distant landscape to the north west of the asset; and would not impact upon the key aspects of the assets setting. The proposed Development would also not impact on the understanding and appreciation of the monument and its surrounding setting due to the intended setting of the monument being directed to the River Nith and the surrounding valley. With the focus of the asset on the main route of the A76 to the east the proposed Development would fall into the backdrop behind the windfarms of Whiteside Hill and Sanquhar.

136. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the castle.

***Sanquhar Tollbooth/Town House (LB40540)***

137. Sanquhar Town house was designed by Robert Adam and built in 1734, on the site of an earlier tollbooth, using stone from Sanquhar Castle (**SM687**). The house is situated in the middle of the high street of Sanquhar facing south east down the high street, making it a focal point of the town. The circumstances indicate a patron of high social status. The roof includes a prominent cupola, but there is no view out from it. Previously referred to as a tollbooth, the town house was constructed on the remains of the previous tollbooth, the town house is likely situated in the town square overlooking a previous wool market. The town house is situated in the conservation area and ASA of Sanquhar. The primary setting of the town house is the town of Sanquhar; views out from the town into the surrounding countryside are limited to occasional glimpses.

138. The town house currently is used as a museum for the town of Sanquhar. The town is situated on the A76, a primary route of Dumfries and Galloway. Many of the listed buildings in Sanquhar high street also contribute to the town houses setting as contemporaneous sites, though many of them have modern shop fronts in line with the modern setting of the buildings. Due to the surrounding townscape visibility of the proposed Development would be limited. The ZTV indicates that five hubs and four blade tips would theoretically be visible, the asset being 10 km to the east of the closest turbine location (turbine 1).

139. The proposed Development would create a minor element in the distant landscape to the west of the asset, and would not impact upon the key aspects of the assets original intended setting.

140. It is predicted that the operation of the proposed Development would form a magnitude of impact of None, and a significance of effect of Nil on the heritage significance of the asset.

**Indirect effects on other assets**

***Drumlanrig Castle (LB3886 and GDL00143)***

*Drumlanrig Castle (**LB3886**)*

141. Drumlanrig Castle (**LB3886**) was built in the mid-17th century by the 1st Duke of Queensbury William Douglas. The grand mansion stands upon a terraced platform among the woods of upper Nithsdale, its four-square turreted profile and pink-coloured sandstone contrasting with the greenery of its surroundings. Completed in about 1690, Drumlanrig became the home of James Douglas, 2nd Duke of Queensberry, known as the 'Union Duke' because of his role in the Treaty of Union of 1707. The architect was almost certainly James Smith, who had been a mason at Holyrood house under Sir William Bruce and Robert Mylne. His other notable works are Canongate Kirk in Edinburgh and Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian. At the succession of the Buccleuch's, restoration was carried out in the Castle in 1810. During restoration the Designed Landscape was installed, (**GDL00143**). In the 20th Century, the castle was used as a Military hospital in the First World War.

142. The original setting of the castle was within the castle's designed landscape (**GDL00143**), mainly enclosed by woodland. There is a main drive on the approach to the castle however this was added as part of the redesign of the landscape prior to the turn of the 19th century. The redesign of the landscape extended the landscape to the east and added the addition of the main avenue of approach to the castle, which curved to the east over the River Nith. Further additions such as further foresting, terracing and embankments were also carried out altering the setting from it's original. From Crawford's plan of Drumlanrig in 1709, there have since been further alterations such as gardens, deforestation and additional buildings to the main drive to the north of the castle. It is unclear when these additions took place, but they are present on the Ordnance Survey of the early 1900's therefore it can be assumed it was during the redesign of the castle and its landscape.

143. The setting of Drumlanrig Castle remains largely unaltered from the 20th Century when the Castle was a temporary military hospital; there has since been the addition of parking to the pavilion and a ticket booth along the main avenue of the designed landscape on the approach to the castle. Modern fittings to the buildings such as security and telephone cabling have been added. The resurfacing of the drive and road networks are an addition to the appreciation of the site. The ZTV indicates that the proposed Development would theoretically not be visible from the Castle, but would be from the wider designed landscape, assessed below.

144. With evidence from the ZTV, the proposed Development would not be visible from Drumlanrig Castle. The magnitude of impact would be None and the significance of effect would be Nil. The castle forms a key element in the wider designed landscape, which is discussed next.

*Drumlanrig Castle GDL (**GDL00143**)*

145. When the Castle and its lands fell to the 3rd Duke of Buccleuch he began the redesign of the formal gardens and designed landscape. Walter Francis, the 5th Duke of Buccleuch, who succeeded in 1819, spent the next 65 years restoring the Castle and improving the grounds. Between 1812 and 1840, William Atkinson, William Elliot, Edward Blore, William Burn, William S. Gilpin and Sir Charles Barry were all asked to produce designs for these improvements. During this period, Drumlanrig was made into one of the foremost designed landscapes in the country. Most of the huge parterres were removed before World War II and, by the end of the war, much of the woodland around Drumlanrig needed to be replanted. This great work was done by Walter, 8th Duke, (1935- 1973) who was an expert forester and greatly influenced current forestry techniques.

146. The current setting of Drumlanrig Designed landscape has not changed significantly since the redesign of the grounds in the 19th Century, aside from the addition of parking to the pavilion and a ticket booth along the main avenue of the of the designed landscape on the approach to the castle. Throughout the designed landscape there is the modern addition of telegraph poles.

147. From the ZTV, the proposed Development would not be visible from the main aspects of the designed landscapes such as the integral drives which contribute to its understanding, a number of blade tips have the potential to be visible throughout the grounds. The ZTV indicates that theoretical visibility of the proposed Development would be limited to a maximum of 11 blade tips in views from areas of plantation or pastural fields. The areas of plantation or pastural fields do not contribute greatly to the significance of the designed landscape, or the ability to appreciate it. The closest turbine to the designation is 12 km to the north west (turbine 18), should the proposed development be visible from the asset it would appear in the distant landscape and would not infringe on the Designed Landscape's setting.

Plate 2: View facing the proposed Development from within Drumlanrig (GDL00143)

148. The partial screening of the proposed Development by the landform would combine with that from the deciduous and conifer plantations within the designed landscape resulting in no visibility of the proposed Development.

149. The magnitude of the impact would be None and the significance of effect Nil.

*Durisdeer Parish Church (**LB3856**)*

150. Durisdeer Parish church is an ecclesiastical building currently still in use. Durisdeer is Parish Church of 1699 with potentially more ancient origins, dedicated to St Cuthbert. The church was renovated in the mid-19th century. The church is situated within the conservation area of Durisdeer. The church is situated 80 m to south east from Carron Water. On Roy's Military (1755) map Durisdeer is depicted as Diodier Kirk, this may indicate that the church was once bigger as the footprint on the

map extends beyond the current footprint of the church today. The primary setting of the church is the village where its parishioners lived and the surrounding land in which they worked. It is situated overlooking the main approach to the town.

151. The church is immediately surrounded to the north, west and south west by deciduous forestry with the village green directly to the east of the church. There is a tarmacked car park to the main entrance/exit of the church with a cluster of houses surrounding the village green directly in front of the church. The village green is lined with tall hedgerows screening views of the wider landscape. The ZTV indicates that two hubs and six blades would theoretically be visible from the church, however as the proposed Development lies to the north west of the church which is currently shrouded in deciduous forestry showing there would be no turbines visible. As per the consultation outlined in **Table 11.1** with HES, a photomontage was not produced in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact** from the village green on the exiting of the church as there is the same theoretical predicted visibility as from the church location; however the due to the hedgerows and the building of Hope Cottage (**LB3859**) obstructing further views the proposed Development would not be visible.

Plate 3: Views facing towards the proposed Development from the Village Green in front of Durisdeer Church (**LB3856**)

152. This asset is of the highest heritage significance, but the magnitude of impact is predicted to be None, resulting in a significance of effect of Nil.

*St Connel's Church (**MDG75**)*

153. St Connel's Church is a ruin of a medieval church recorded in the local HER. Excavation of the church revealed a rectangular building 19.8 m x 5.4 m with rough dressed masonry standing to a maximum height of 1.3 m. The walls, although covered, appear to be 1.0 m thick. The entrance, which has steps leading down into the church, was on the south side, 4.0 m from the west end. A low wall divided the chancel from the nave. A few dressed stones were observed in the churchyard wall, but no interlaced cross-shafts were noted. No gravestones earlier than the 18$^{th}$ century were noted. St Connel's church is situated 2.6 km from the town of Kirkconnel,

154. The current setting of the ruins of St Connel's Church lies in pastural fields, the site's enclosing field boundary and the nearby Kirkland farm 200 m to the north west. St Connel's church also lies 20 m from a sheepfold servicing Kirkland farm. The church is situated within the confluence of Churn Burn and Glenaylmer Burn lies 130 m to the south, as well as Stell Sike and Glenaylmer Burn that lies 200 m to the south west. The church lies at the base of Kirkland Hill and overlooks the valley of the River Nith and the town of Kirkconnel. The ZTV indicates that 12 turbines including hubs would theoretically be visible; however, given that the proposed Development is 9 km from the closest turbine the proposed Development would appear as a minor element in a wide view of the landscape.

155. Due to the extent of the setting and the monument's distance from the proposed Development, and that the proposed Development would create a minor and distant element in the wider landscape, it is predicted that the impact on this asset of medium heritage significance would be None and that the significance of effect would be Nil.

*Allan's Cairn (**MDG24/ SLR27**)*

156. Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**) is a non-designated commemorative cairn of medium/ high heritage significance. Following the methodology outlined in Paragraph 30, the asset is considered to be of local rather than regional importance, and therefor of medium heritage significance.

157. The asset is a pillar dedicated to George Allan and Margaret Gracie, said to have been shot by dragoons as they fled from Whig's Hole during the 17th century and buried at the site, possibly with an earlier marker cairn. The current cairn was erected in 1857, located on the burial site, which is on the boundary of three parishes of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright and Ayr, and the story is detailed on the asset. It is located on the ridge of High Countam in former open moorland, achieving maximum visibility of the asset from the immediately surrounding area and provides long distance views to the east. Long distance views in other directions would have been obstructed by local topography.

158. The current setting of the cairn is the modern forestry plantation of Euchanhead, lying directly on the Southern Upland Way with views of the blade tips of the Whiteside Hill Windfarm over the tree-tops 1 km away to the north east. The cairn lies in a small clearing in the forest with very limited views of the surrounding landscape.

159. Following construction of the proposed Development the cairn would lie on the eastern edge of the southern group of turbines with the closest turbine (turbine 15) being 170 m to the south east. The ZTV, incorporating the new forestry screening (see **Technical Appendix 3.2: Forestry** for details of the restocking plan)**,** indicates that all 21 turbines would be visible where the asset is situated.

Plate 4: Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**) facing turbine 15 of the proposed Development

160. The current setting greatly hinders the appreciation of the asset due to the screening, by forestry, of the original wide-ranging views which determined its siting. The proposed replacement of the conifer plantations with open ground surrounding the monument would improve its visibility and therefore the setting contributing to the significance of the monument. The proposed Development creating open views from the cairn, by which returning the monument to its original setting, would introduce of the visibility of all 21 turbines which have the potential to encroach on the setting of the monument. The turbines will not significantly impact on the appreciation or understanding of the monument. Although present in views to the north, west and south they do not interrupt distant views to the east.

161. It is predicted that the magnitude of impact from the turbines would be low adverse on this asset of medium significance which would result in the significance of effect being Very Slight Adverse.

162. As part of the proposed Development there would be increased access and signage boards to the monument to provide information on the heritage of the area. This as well as the forestry mitigation detailed in **Technical Appendix 3.2: Forestry**, would provide more access as well as promoting public understanding and appreciation of the monument. As indicated in **Table 11.3** this would result in a magnitude of impact of low beneficial and the significance of effect would be Very Slight Beneficial.

163. When the two effects are considered together the overall effect of the proposed Development would be Neutral.

### Embedded measures for indirect effects

164. As part of the design process, the location of turbines and other infrastructure have been adjusted where possible to reduce the potential for impacts on nearby heritage assets such as Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**).

### Proposed mitigation for indirect effects

165. For assets outside the Inner Study Area mitigating indirect impact is limited, particularly as the open nature of the historic landscape over much of the region has now mostly been altered to forestry, and most forms of screening, such as tree planting, might also impact negatively on the understanding and appreciation of heritage assets within their setting. Therefore, no heritage-specific mitigation is proposed. The only mitigation that should be noted is that of Allan's Cairn (**SLR27**) where the installation of signage boards and improved access, will be incorporated into the proposed Development.

### Residual indirect effects

166. The significance of indirect operational effects through change in the setting for the heritage assets in the study areas are nil or in one case neutral. The residual effects of the operation of the proposed development incorporating embedded measures would be Nil, except for Allan's Cairn which would be Neutral.

### Cumulative indirect effects

167. The baseline conditions for assessment have included existing windfarms.

168. Cumulative effects have been considered with regard to any windfarm developments that are:

- consented or are in the planning process either as an original submission or in appeal;
- within 5 km of heritage assets of regional importance; and
- within 10 km for heritage assets of national importance that are predicted to receive an above negligible effect from the proposed Development.

169. The proposed Development would not form any significant effects in EIA terms, and would therefore not contribute to any cumulative effects.

## 11.6 Summary and statement of significance

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

171. The area of the proposed Development is significantly covered by commercial forestry. The baseline concluded that much of the archaeological resource found within the proposed Development associated with a post-medieval agricultural landscape.

172. The construction of the proposed Development would cause direct impacts on two post medieval trackways (**SLR31** and **SLR32**), and potentially on unknown assets. The residual effects incorporating mitigation are predicted to be less than Slight Adverse, and not significant in EIA terms.

173. Operation is predicted to have a Nil or Slight Adverse effect overall on the significance of the heritage assets which have been assessed.

174. These effects are within the lowest level of effects identified within the SNH and HES EIA Handbook 2018 (Appendix 1, Figure 1). There are no predicted significant effects in EIA terms on heritage assets resulting from the construction or operation of the proposed Development. In respect to SPP paragraph 145, the assessment concludes that there would be no EIA significant adverse effect on the integrity of the setting of scheduled monuments.

# 11.7 References

**Legislation**

- 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.

**Policy**

- Scottish Planning Policy NPF3 (2014), especially Valuing the Historic Environment paragraphs 135-151;
- Statutory Instrument No 101 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017;
- Historic Environment Circular 1 May 2016-;
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland May 2019; and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and archaeology.

**Guidance**

- Historic Environment Scotland guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting 2016b;
- Scottish National Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland 2018; and
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment 2014.

**Sources**

- Historic Environment Scotland Designation pages for site descriptions and history;
  - Drumlanrig Castle (Category A listed building, LB3886, and Inventory Designed Landscape, GDL143);
  - Sanquhar Town Hall (Category A listed building, LB40540);
  - Durisdeer Church (Category A listed building, LB3856;
  - Kemps Castle, Fort 320m SW of Euchan Bridge (Scheduled Monument, Index no.656);
  - Chrichton Peel & Sanquhar Castle (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 687);
  - Ryehill, Motte (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 708); and
  - Grennan Hill, Fort 250m S Of (Scheduled Monument, Index no.6285).

Cartographic sources

| Map | Date | Sheet/Title | Scale |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Timothy Pont** | 1654 | Nithia Vicecomitatus: The Shirifdome of Nidis-dail | |
| **William Crawford** | 1709 | A plan of ye garden & plantation of Drumlangrig [sic] in Scotland, the seat of his Grace the Duke of Queensburry | |
| **Roy's Military Map** | 1752 | Lowlands | |
| **William Crawford** | 1768 | Plan of farms belonging to the Duke of Beccleuch | 1 inch to 1 mile |
| **William Crawford** | 1828 | Atlas of Scotland | 1 Inch to 1 mile |
| **Ordnance Survey** | 1860 | Dumfriesshire, Sheet XX | Six Inch |
| **Ordnance Survey** | 1896 | Sanquhar (15) | One Inch |
| **Ordnance Survey** | 1900 | Dumfriesshire XX. NW & NE | Six Inch |
| **Ordnance Survey** | 1923 | 3rd Edition | One inch |

**ScottishPower Renewables**
**9th Floor**
320 St Vincent Street
Glasgow
G2 5AD

T +44 (0)141 614 0451

euchanheadrenewables@scottishpower.com

SCOTTISHPOWER
RENEWABLES