

Document history

Author Christine Rennie 2 October 2024

| Client Details | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Contact | Simon Lejeune | |
| Client Name | Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd | |
| Issue | Date | Revision Details |
| A | 02/10/2024 | Initial Draft |
| B | 28/11/2024 | Update |
| C | 25/03/2025 | Final |

Chapter 9.

Cultural Heritage Assessment

Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 9.1 | Statement of Competence | 2 |
| 9.2 | Introduction | 2 |
| 9.3 | Legislation and Planning Policy | 2 |
| 9.4 | Methodology | 4 |
| 9.5 | Consultation | 7 |
| 9.6 | Baseline Condition | 7 |
| | Prehistoric, Roman and Early Medieval Sites (8000 BC – AD 600) | 8 |
| | Medieval Sites (AD 600 – AD 1600) | 8 |
| | Post-medieval and Modern Sites (AD 1600 – 2000) | 8 |
| | Previous Archaeological Assessment | 9 |
| | Vertical Aerial Photographs | 9 |
| | LiDAR | 9 |
| | Field Survey | 9 |
| 9.7 | Potential Issues | 9 |
| | Direct Effects | 9 |
| | Setting Effects | 9 |
| 9.8 | Assessment of Effects | 9 |
| | Assessment of Direct Effects | 9 |
| | Assessment of Effect on Setting | 10 |
| | Cultural heritage sites where HES requested wireframes | 10 |
| 9.9 | Mitigation Measures | 13 |
| | Mitigation of Direct Impacts | 13 |
| | Mitigation of Setting Impacts | 13 |
| 9.10 | Residual Impacts | 13 |
| 9.11 | Conclusions | 13 |

Glossary

| Term | Definition |
|---|--|
| Environmental Impact Assessment | Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is a means of carrying out, in a systematic way, an assessment of the likely significant environmental effects from a development. |
| Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations | The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations) |
| Environmental Impact Assessment Report | A document reporting the findings of the EIA and produced in accordance with the EIA Regulations |
| Proposed Development | The South Kyle II Wind Farm development |
| Proposed Development Area | The area within the “Site boundary” as illustrated on Figures 9.1 and 9.2 within which the Proposed Development will be located |
| The Study Area | A 15km buffer applied to the Proposed Development Area |

List of Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|---|
| CHS | Cultural Heritage Site |
| ClfA | Chartered Institute for Archaeologists |
| HER | Historic Environment Record |
| HES | Historic Environment Scotland |
| IGDL | Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape |
| NLS | National Library of Scotland |
| NRHE | National Record of the Historic Environment |
| OS | Ordnance Survey |
| WoSAS | The West of Scotland Archaeology Service |
| ZTV | Zone of Theoretical Visibility |

9.1 Statement of Competence

- 9.1.1 This Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage Assessment (Chapter) has been prepared by Christine Rennie MA (Hons), PG Dip., MCIfA, FSA Scot, Consultancy Project Manager at GUARD Archaeology Limited in respect of the Proposed Development of South Kyle II Wind Farm near Dalmellington in East Ayrshire. Christine has 10 years of experience in archaeological consultancy during which she has researched and written the cultural heritage chapter for approximately 30 EIA Reports.
- 9.1.2 The assessment was carried out in accordance with the following regulations, standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA), of which GUARD Archaeology Ltd is a Registered Organisation:
 - Code of Conduct (2022)¹;
 - Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services² (2020);
 - Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment³ (2020), and
 - Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment⁴ (2020).

9.2 Introduction

- 9.2.1 The Chapter identifies the cultural heritage baseline within and in the vicinity of the Proposed Development Area and considers the Proposed Development in terms of its potential impact on archaeological and historic environment. It assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the baseline cultural heritage resource, within the context of relevant legislation and planning policy guidelines, and, where appropriate, proposes measures to mitigate any predicted adverse impacts.
- 9.2.2 The cultural heritage assessment encompasses the Proposed Development Area and a 200 m buffer surrounding it, within which the potential direct effects upon all cultural heritage sites were assessed. In addition, the potential indirect effects of the Proposed Development, upon the settings of all designated cultural heritage sites (scheduled monuments, listed buildings, inventory gardens and designed landscapes, and conservation areas) within a 15 km buffer of the Proposed Development Area (the Study Area), were assessed.
- 9.2.3 This Chapter is supported by a Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Sites, which is presented as Technical Appendix 9.1.

9.3 Legislation and Planning Policy

Planning Legislation Context

- 9.3.1 The statutory framework for cultural heritage in Scotland is contained in:
 - the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979⁵ (as amended);
 - the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997⁶ (as amended);

¹ CIFA Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology. 2022. Available online at [Microsoft Word - Code of conduct revOct2022](#)

² CIFA Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services. 2020. Available online at [ClfA-SandG-Archaeological-Advice-by-HER-2020.pdf](#)

³ CIFA Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment. 2020.Available online at [ClfA-SandG-Archaeological-Consultancy-2020.pdf](#)

⁴ CIFA Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. 2020. [ClfA-SandG-DBA-2020.pdf](#)

⁵ The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Available online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>

⁶ Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. Available online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/8/contents>

- the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997⁷ (as amended);
- the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006;
- the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011;⁸ and
- the Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014.

9.3.2 Cultural heritage resources consist of designated and non-designated sites, including individual monuments, related settings and the wider cultural landscape. Sites with statutory designations are defined in Historic Environment Scotland's *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance* (2019)⁹, and comprise:

- Scheduled Monuments;
- Listed Buildings;
- Conservation Areas;
- Marine Protected Areas;
- Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes;
- Historic Battlefields; and
- World Heritage Sites.

National Planning Policy

9.3.3 The implications of the acts noted above on local government planning policy are described within the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) (2023)¹⁰, the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) (2019)¹¹ and its supporting guidance, and Planning Advice Note 2/2011 (2011)¹². NPF4 (Policy 7) and HEPS deal specifically with planning policy in relation to cultural heritage.

Policy 7 (Extracts)

9.3.4 The following elements of Policy 7 are not applicable: (b) demolition of listed buildings, (e) - (g) on conservation areas, (j) battlefields, (k) marine protected areas, (l) World Heritage Sites, (m) buildings at risk, and (n) enabling development.

- *“a) Development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places will be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change. Proposals should also be informed by national policy and guidance on managing change in the historic environment, and information held within Historic Environment Records.*
- *c) Development proposals for the reuse, alteration or extension of a listed building will only be supported where they will preserve its character, special architectural or historic interest and setting. Development proposals*

affecting the setting of a listed building should preserve its character, and its special architectural or historic interest.

- *d) Development proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. Relevant considerations include the:*
 - *i. architectural and historic character of the area;*
 - *ii. existing density, built form and layout; and*
 - *iii. context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.*
- *h) Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:*
 - *i. direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;*
 - *ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided; or*
 - *iii. exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.*
- *i) Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact on important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.*
- *o) Non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible. Where there is potential for non-designated buried archaeological remains to exist below a site, developers will provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource at an early stage so that planning authorities can assess impacts. Historic buildings may also have archaeological significance which is not understood and may require assessment.*

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

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

National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) and the local Historic Environment Record (HER)

9.3.5 Other cultural heritage and archaeological sites, not subject to other designations, are recorded within the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) and the local Historic Environment Record (HER), and many such sites have not yet been identified or recorded. Such undesignated sites are frequently assigned to regional, local or lesser categories of significance. The regional or local importance of such a site is established on the basis of professional judgement, although the criteria for identifying nationally important sites, as outlined in Annex 1 to

⁷ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act. Available online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents>

⁸ Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011). Available online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents>

⁹ Historic Environment Scotland's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019). Available online at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b>

¹⁰ National Planning Framework 4 (2023). Available online at: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2023/02/national-planning-framework-4/documents/national-planning-framework-4-revised-draft/national-planning-framework-4-revised-draft/govscot%3Adocument/national-planning-framework-4.pdf>

¹¹ Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (2019). Available online at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/historic-environment-policy-for-scotland-heps/>

¹² Planning Advice Note 2/2011 (2011). Available online at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/>

Historic Environment Scotland's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019), will often be referred to in making such judgements. Some sites are also, variously, classed as of lesser importance, unknown importance or other importance. Unknown or other importance usually refers to examples where insufficient information exists to assign importance.

Local Planning Policy and Guidelines

- 9.3.6 Local planning policy is set out in the East Ayrshire Local Development Plan (LDP2) (2024)¹³ which includes one policy relating to cultural heritage that is pertinent to this assessment, namely Policy 4.2: *Place and Environment - Historic Environment*.

Other considerations

- 9.3.7 The Proposed Development is located within the local authority area of East Ayrshire Council, which is advised on archaeological and cultural heritage matters by the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS).

9.4 Methodology

Baseline Studies

- 9.4.1 Baseline studies examined all known sites within both the Proposed Development Area and a 200 m buffer zone surrounding it, within which all cultural heritage sites were recorded, researched and the impact of the Proposed Development on those sites assessed. A further 15 km buffer zone (the Study Area) was established, within which all designated cultural heritage sites were recorded, researched and the impact of the Proposed Development on those sites assessed. Study of this surrounding landscape provides the local archaeological and historical context of the Proposed Development and the wider area giving a broader understanding of the historical development of the area and the potential for as-yet-unidentified archaeological remains within that area, as well as assessing the potential impact of the Proposed Development upon the settings of designated sites in the vicinity.
- 9.4.2 The Assessment employed the following methodology:
- GIS Information on designated cultural heritages sites was obtained from HES;
 - GIS Information from the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) was obtained from HES;
 - GIS Information from the local Historic Environment Record was obtained from WoSAS;
 - Relevant aerial photographs were viewed at The National Collection of Aerial Photographs online search resource, and one set of photographs from 1988 was identified as relevant and inspected;
 - Digital versions of the Pre-Ordnance Survey maps, and the first, second and later editions of the Ordnance Survey (OS) maps of the area of interest, held by the National Library of Scotland (NLS), were identified online and examined. Relevant maps range in date from the seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth century;
 - LiDAR images held by the NLS were examined;
 - Relevant Local Development Plans were obtained from the East Ayrshire Council website;

¹³ East Ayrshire Council 2024 Local Development Plan 2. Available online at: <https://www.east-ayrshire.gov.uk/PlanningAndTheEnvironment/development-plans-and-policies/ldp2/ldp2-information.aspx>

¹⁴ As note 9.

- Readily accessible primary and secondary historical sources on the area were consulted for information on its history and past land use, and
- A walkover survey of the Proposed Development Area was carried out.

- 9.4.3 The walk-over survey of the Proposed Development Area was undertaken between 30 May and 2 June 2022 in warm and sunny weather conditions. A Global Positioning System (GPS) was used to record the locations of any features identified; any such features were also recorded by written description and, if appropriate, measured sketches and photographs. Previously recorded cultural heritage sites collated during desk-based research were visited to assess their current condition.

Assessment Methodology

- 9.4.4 The methodology used in the Assessment, including the terminology, was agreed with the then Historic Scotland (now HES).
- 9.4.5 The methodology for the assessment of potential effects has two strands (1) a methodology for assessing the direct effects of the Proposed Development, where those relate to the physical impact of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage features; and (2) a methodology for assessing the indirect effects of the Proposed Development as a result of impact on the setting of statutorily designated cultural heritage features. In both cases, effects can be adverse or beneficial.

Direct Impacts

- 9.4.6 The significance of a direct effect of the Proposed Development is assessed by taking into account the sensitivity of the cultural heritage feature and the magnitude and nature of the impact.
- 9.4.7 The sensitivity of the feature is determined with reference to any designation and, especially for non-designated archaeological remains, by exercising professional judgement informed by criteria, such as those set out in Annex 1 to Historic Environment Scotland's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019)¹⁴ and the HES guidance Managing change in the Historic Environment – Setting (2016)¹⁵ and Managing change in the Historic Environment – Gardens and Designed Landscapes (2020)¹⁶. Other forms of non-designated cultural heritage features can be assigned equivalent levels of importance, with reference, for example, to the criteria for designating Listed Buildings, as outlined in Annex 2 to Historic Environment Scotland's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (2019). Table 9.1 represents a guide used in assigning levels of sensitivity to cultural heritage features.

¹⁵ HES 2016 Managing change in the Historic Environment – Setting. Available online at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>

¹⁶ HES 2020 Managing change in the Historic Environment – Gardens and Designed Landscapes. Available online at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=83214207-c4e7-4f80-af87-a678009820b9>

Table 9.1: Sensitivity and Importance of Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

| Sensitivity | Importance | Feature Examples |
|-------------|----------------------------|---|
| High | International and National | World Heritage Sites; Scheduled Monuments or sites of schedulable quality; A-listed buildings or buildings of equivalent quality; |
| Medium | Regional | B-listed buildings or buildings of equivalent quality; some Conservation Areas; archaeological remains of regional importance |
| Low | Local | C-listed buildings or buildings of equivalent quality; archaeological remains of local importance |
| Lesser | Lesser | Archaeological remains of lesser importance |
| Unknown | Unknown | Archaeological remains of unknown character and importance |

9.4.8 The magnitude of the effect is determined with reference to the scale and type of the potential change to the feature:

Table 9.2: Definitions of Magnitude of Effect

| Magnitude | Definition |
|-----------------------|---|
| Substantial | Total loss of or major alteration to key elements or features of the pre-project conditions, such that the post-project character or composition of the feature would be fundamentally changed. |
| Moderate | Loss of or alteration to key elements or features of the pre-project conditions, such that the post-project character of the feature would be partially changed. |
| Slight | Minor alteration from pre-project conditions. |
| Negligible/ No change | No or slight change to pre-project conditions. |

9.4.9 The significance of direct effects was assessed using the assessment matrix in Table 9.3. The significance of any potential effect on a feature has been assessed as either Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible or None.

9.4.10 Where the direct effect on a feature is classified as Major or Moderate, this is considered a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) as set out in the EIA Regulations. Minor and Negligible effects are not considered LSE.

Table 9.3: Matrix for the Assessment of Significance of Effect

| | | Sensitivity of Feature | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | Lesser/ unknown | Low | Medium | High |
| Magnitude of Effect | Substantial | Minor/ unknown | Minor to Moderate | Moderate to Major | Major |
| | Moderate | Negligible/ unknown | Minor | Moderate | Moderate to Major |
| | Slight | None/ unknown | Negligible | Minor | Minor to Moderate |
| | Negligible/ No change | None/ unknown | None | None | None |

Setting Impacts

- 9.4.11 In the context of the current assessment, potential impacts on the settings of cultural heritage features are primarily visual in nature, although less tangible elements such as function, sensory perceptions, or the historical, artistic, literary and scenic associations of places or landscapes can also contribute to the setting of a cultural heritage feature (HES 2016, 5¹⁷).
- 9.4.12 The assessment of such impacts is based on the importance of a cultural heritage site (as defined in Table 9.1), an analysis of its current surroundings, and an assessment of the extent to which change due to the Proposed Development can be accommodated without detriment to the cultural heritage site. The assessment takes account of a wide variety of elements of setting, including inter-visibility with other sites, buildings or landscape features, key viewpoints to, from and across the cultural heritage site, and potential effects from noise, dust and vibration that may be associated with a development proposal. The HES guidance *Managing change in the Historic Environment - Setting* is used to further define the current setting and to evaluate the potential impact resulting from the Proposed Development.
- 9.4.13 Having defined the current setting and quantified the potential magnitude of the Proposed Development upon the cultural heritage site, the sensitivity and magnitude are, in each case, combined to determine the significance of the effect. The assessment of potential impacts on setting is based on professional judgements concerning the sensitivity, magnitude and significance of the impact in each case. These professional judgements were made in the context of the following structure.
- 9.4.14 The sensitivity of a feature in this context relates to the degree to which change can be accommodated without detrimental impacts on the relationship between the feature and its setting. The sensitivity of each feature subject to assessment is defined as High, Medium, Low or Not sensitive. Unless otherwise justified by specific factors in an individual case, the Sensitivity of each feature was determined as shown on Table 9.4.

¹⁷ HES 2016 Managing change in the Historic Environment – Setting. Available online at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>

Table 9.4: Sensitivity of Cultural Heritage Features to Setting Effects

| Sensitivity | Feature Designation Categories |
|---------------|--|
| High | World Heritage Sites; Scheduled Monuments; A-listed buildings; Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes; some Conservation Areas |
| Medium | B-listed buildings; some Conservation Areas |
| Low | C-listed buildings |
| Not Sensitive | Most cultural heritage features of lesser significance. |

9.4.15 The magnitude of effect arising from the Proposed Development in relation to a given feature and its setting is described as Substantial, Moderate, Slight or Negligible/No change based on Table 9.5 and on professional judgement.

Table 9.5: Definitions of Magnitude of Setting Effect

| Magnitude | Definition |
|----------------------|--|
| Substantial | Major alteration to key elements or features of the pre-project setting, such that the post-project setting of the feature would be fundamentally changed. |
| Moderate | Alteration to key elements or features of the pre-project setting, such that the post-project setting of the feature would be partially changed. |
| Slight | Minor alteration from pre-project setting. |
| Negligible/No change | No or slight change to pre-project setting. |

9.4.16 The significance of any potential effect on the setting of a feature is assessed as major, moderate, minor, negligible or none. The professional judgement of the significance of an effect was made with reference to the following assessment matrix (Table 9.6).

Table 9.6: Matrix for the Assessment of the Significance of Potential Setting Effects

| | | Sensitivity of Feature | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | Not sensitive | Low | Medium | High |
| Magnitude of Effect | Substantial | None | Minor to Moderate | Moderate to Major | Major |
| | Moderate | None | Minor | Moderate | Moderate to Major |
| | Slight | None | Negligible | Minor | Minor to Moderate |
| | Negligible/No change | None | None | None | None |

9.4.17 Where the effect on the relationship of a feature to its setting is classified as Major or Moderate, this is considered to be equivalent to likely significant effects referred to in the EIA Regulations. Minor and Negligible effects are not considered significant.

9.5 Consultation

9.5.1 Scoping opinions were sought from HES and the WoSAS, the archaeological advisors to East Ayrshire Council. Their responses and recommendations are listed in Table 9.7.

Table 9.7: Consultation

| Consultee | Issue | How / where is this addressed |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Historic Environment Scotland | <p>HES asked that ZTV and wireframes be used to determine which cultural heritage assets may be affected by the Proposed Development (letter 22 May 2022).</p> <p>HES requested further consideration of the potential effects upon the settings of the Craigengillan House (CHS 67) and Craigengillan Stables (CHS 68) with assessment of impacts on key</p> | <p>ZTV was produced and was used to eliminate cultural heritage assets with no visibility of the Proposed Development from further assessment (section 9.8.2).</p> <p>Wireframes were used to assess the potential effects upon the settings of:</p> <p>Craigengillan Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (IGDL) (Cultural Heritage Site (CHS) 60);</p> <p>Craigengillan House - ground level - (CHS 67);</p> <p>Craigengillan Stables – ground level - Listed (CHS 68);</p> <p>Dalnean Hill, Farmstead and Field System: Scheduled Monument (CHS 63);</p> <p>Waterside Bing Scheduled Monument (CHS 165);</p> <p>Miners' Villages and Mineral Railways: Scheduled Monument (CHS 173), and</p> <p>Cairn Avel: Scheduled Monument (CHS 360).</p> <p>The results of the setting assessment are at section 9.8.2.</p> <p>At a meeting with Mr Mark Gibson, landowner of Craigengillan Estate, it was agreed that Tom Finnie would take the requested photographs from a room on the second floor of Craigengillan</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | views from the principal rooms of Craigengillan House looking towards the Proposed Development. HES recommended additional visualisations to be produced from the principal rooms at first floor level of the house (letter 18 June 2024). | House which gave the least obstructed view to the Proposed Development Area. |
| The West of Scotland Archaeology Service | <p>WoSAS stated that they had not yet been consulted on this application and advised that the 200 m buffer was too small to properly understand the surrounding area (email 8 June 2022).</p> <p>WoSAS will accept a 1 km buffer (email 9 June 2022).</p> <p>WoSAS further stated that, assuming all known cultural heritage sites are avoided, they are unlikely to require large-scale watching briefs during construction, but may request a walkover survey (pre or post felling) of areas of proposed disturbance and possibly watching briefs on any hilltop or level areas such as terraces or beside burns. (email 8 June 2022).</p> | <p>The 200 m buffer has not been increased as the primary land-use since the mid-eighteenth century within and outwith the Proposed Development has been rough grazing. More recently, commercial woodland planting has taken place within and outwith the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The assessment has found that no known cultural heritage sites will be directly affected by the Proposed Development (section 9.8.1).</p> <p>Mitigation of potential direct effects upon hitherto unrecorded sub-surface remains is discussed at section 9.9.1.</p> |

9.6 Baseline Condition

- 9.6.1 Thirty-four cultural heritage sites and two previous archaeological assessments are recorded within the Proposed Development Area. There are a further 11 cultural heritage sites within 200 m of the Proposed Development Area, none of which would be directly affected by the proposal (Figure 9.1; Technical Appendix 9.1).
- 9.6.2 There are 320 designated cultural heritage sites within the 15 km Study Area. This total comprises 24 scheduled monuments, 14 category A listed buildings, 141 category B listed buildings, 130 category C listed buildings, six conservation areas and four inventory gardens and designed landscapes. Although not designated, one locally important burgh of barony has been included in this total (Figure 9.2; Technical Appendix 10.1).
- 9.6.3 This assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives. Designation data from HES was downloaded on 22 February 2022, and data from NRHE and HER was accessed on the same day. The assessment does not account for any records which may have been amended or added after these dates.

- 9.6.4 In the following assessment, the reference in parenthesis (CHS and number) refers to the cultural heritage sites noted on Figure 9.1 and at Technical Appendix 9.1.
- 9.6.5 The archaeological time periods referred to in the text are taken from the standard date-ranges utilised by the Scottish Archaeological Framework (ScARF).

Prehistoric, Roman and Early Medieval Sites (8000 BC – AD 600)

- 9.6.6 There are four cultural heritage sites of prehistoric date within the Proposed Development Area and a further one within the surrounding 200 m buffer. Six prehistoric Scheduled Monuments are located within the 15 km Study Area.
- 9.6.7 The prehistoric remains within the Proposed Development Area comprise Knockenlee Burn stone setting (CHS 10), Beoch kerb cairn (CHS 11), Dalmellington cairn (CHS 20), Knockskae cairn (CHS 23) and Mossdale cairn (CHS 26), all of which are related to ritual activity.
- 9.6.8 This ritual theme is continued outwith the Proposed Development Area with Lethans Hill standing stones (CHS 35) being located in the 200 m buffer and The King's Cairn Scheduled Monument (CHS 357), Craigengillan Cairn Scheduled Monument (CHS 358), Cairn Avel Scheduled Monument (CHS 360), Holm of Daltallochan Standing Stone Scheduled Monument (CHS 365) and Holm of Daltallochan Stone Circle Scheduled Monument (CHS 366) all within the 15 km Study Area. The sole prehistoric settlement within the Study Area is Knockdon Enclosure Scheduled Monument (CHS 73).
- 9.6.9 There are no known Roman or early Medieval remains within the Proposed Development Area, or within the 200 m and 15 km buffers.

Medieval Sites (AD 600 – AD 1600)

- 9.6.10 There is one cultural heritage site of Medieval date within the Proposed Development Area and two within the 200 m buffer. A further 12 Medieval cultural heritage sites are located within the 15 km Study Area.
- 9.6.11 Within the Proposed Development Area is Trough Burn enclosure, head dyke, sheepfold, and rig and furrow (CHS 28). The rig and furrow cultivation remains may have its origins in the Medieval period.
- 9.6.12 Within the 200 m buffer of the Proposed Development Area are Dame Helen's Castle (CHS 43), a possible motte and bailey earthwork, and an irregular area of rig-and-furrow cultivation (CHS 45).
- 9.6.13 Within the 15 km Study Area are Dalnean Hill, Farmstead and Field System Scheduled Monument (CHS 63), Donald's Isle Scheduled Monument (CHS 70), Loch Doon Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 71 and CHS 72), Laight Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 174), Skeldon Castle (CHS 178), Trabboch Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 192), Auchencloigh Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 194), Auchinleck Castle Scheduled

Monument (CHS 266), Kyle Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 350), Braidenoch Hill Scheduled Monument (CHS 359) and Holm Of Daltallochan Scheduled Monument (CHS 363).

Post-medieval and Modern Sites (AD 1600 – 2000)

- 9.6.14 There are 28 known cultural heritage sites of post-Medieval or modern date within the Proposed Development Area, and a further eight within the surrounding 200 m buffer. Within the 15 km Study Area are 268 designated cultural heritage sites of post-Medieval or modern date.
- 9.6.15 Cartographic and bibliographic sources were used to investigate the history of the Proposed Development Area and to provide detail on the land-use from the seventeenth century onwards.
- 9.6.16 The seventeenth century maps contained little information about the Proposed Development Area, although all noted Dalmellington and Dalmellington Castle (Gordon 1636-52¹⁸; Pont and Blaeu 1654¹⁹; Pont and Blaeu 1662²⁰; Adair 1685²¹).
- 9.6.17 The earliest map to record the area in any detail was Roy's 1747-55 *Military Survey of Scotland*²² which recorded the Proposed Development Area as uncultivated upland. By this time, the Castlemark of Dalmellington (CHS 48) had been established as had settlements at Muck Water (CHS 24) and Parrie Burn (CHS 19).
- 9.6.18 The later eighteenth and earlier nineteenth century maps did not record the land-use within the Proposed Development Area, although both maps recorded Mossdale farmstead (CHS 25), which comprised two structures (Armstrong 1775²³; Thomson and Johnson 1828²⁴).
- 9.6.19 The 1860 Ordnance Survey maps²⁵ demonstrated that the land-use was then upland rough grazing. This land-use is reflected in the numerous sheepfolds recorded within the Proposed Development Area (CHS 2, CHS 3, CHS 4, CHS 5, CHS 6, CHS 7, CHS 8, CHS 13, CHS 14, CHS 15, CHS 16, CHS 21, CHS 30, CHS 31, CHS 32, CHS 33 and CHS 34). Other agricultural remains are Knocklee Burn farmstead (CH 12) and Mossdale enclosure, field system and structure (CHS 25). Also within the Proposed Development Area are Knockenlee Burn quarry (CHS 9) and the linear features Pickhan's Dyke (CHS 18) and Mossdale Burn bank (CHS 27). Within the 200 m buffer, these same maps recorded Meiklehill farmstead (CHS 36), Knocklee Burn quarry (CHS 37), Clawfin farmstead (CHS 38), Pennyvenie No. 4 colliery (CHS 39), Cumnock Burn house (CHS 40), Cumnock Burn structures (CHS 41), Miller's Bank structure (CHS 42) and Kirk Bridge (CHS 44).
- 9.6.20 Subsequent Ordnance Survey maps confirmed that the land-use continued as rough grazing until at least the early 1970s (Ordnance Survey 1910²⁶; Ordnance Survey 1911²⁷; Ordnance Survey 1948²⁸; Ordnance Survey 1958a²⁹; Ordnance Survey 1958b³⁰; Ordnance Survey 1958c³¹).
- 9.6.21 None of the maps consulted recorded Meikle Hill boundary bank (CHS 1), Parrie Burn enclosures (CHS 22) or Trough Burn earthwork bank (CHS 29).

¹⁸ Gordon, R 1636-52 *Cunningham*. Manuscript map.

¹⁹ Pont, T and Blaeu, J 1654 *Carrick*. Amsterdam: Blaeu.

²⁰ Pont, T and Blaeu, J 1662 *Carrick*. Amsterdam: Blaeu.

²¹ Adair, J 1685 *A mape of the west of Scotland containing Clydsdail, Nithsdail, Ranfrew, Shyre of Ayre, & Galloway / authore Jo. Adair*. Manuscript map.

²² Roy, W 1747-55 *Military Survey of Scotland: Lowlands*.

²³ Armstrong, A 1775 *A new map of Ayrshire*.

²⁴ Thomson, J and Johnson, W 1828 *Northern Part of Ayrshire: Southern Part*. Edinburgh: J. Thomson & Co.

²⁵ Ordnance Survey 1860 *Ayrshire Sheet XLVI*. Six-inch 1st edition maps 1843-1882 and Ordnance Survey 1860 *Ayrshire Sheet XLVII*. Six-inch 1st edition maps 1843-1882.

²⁶ Ordnance Survey 1910 *Ayrshire Sheet XLVII.SW*. Six-inch 2nd and later editions National Collection of Aerial photos 1892-1960.

²⁷ Ordnance Survey 1911 *Ayrshire Sheet XLVI.SE*. Six-inch 2nd and later editions 1892-1960.

²⁸ Ordnance Survey 1948 *Ayrshire Sheet XLVI.SE*. Six-inch 2nd and later editions 1892-1960.

²⁹ Ordnance Survey 1958 *NS40NE – A*. 1:10,560 National Grid maps 1944-73.

³⁰ Ordnance Survey 1958 *NS40SE – A*. 1:10,560 National Grid maps 1944-73.

³¹ Ordnance Survey 1958 *NS50NW – A*. 1:10,560 National Grid maps 1944-73.

Previous Archaeological Assessment

- 9.6.22 Two previous assessments of all or part of the Proposed Development Area have been carried out.
- 9.6.23 An archaeological survey (CHS 46) undertaken in 2004 on the site of the then proposed Kyle Wind Farm recorded 97 sites of archaeological significance.
- 9.6.24 A second survey (CHS 47) was carried out in 2008 for the South-West Scotland Renewables Connection Project.

Vertical Aerial Photographs

- 9.6.25 One set of aerial photographs covering the year 1988 was consulted for this assessment³². In addition, satellite imagery from Google Earth covering the period 1985 to 2021 was examined.
- 9.6.26 The aerial photographs recorded the Proposed Development Area as rough pasture with many of the sheepfolds visible on the images.
- 9.6.27 No previously unrecorded cultural heritage sites were noted on any of the aerial photographs or satellite images consulted for this assessment.

LiDAR

- 9.6.28 The LiDAR Digital Terrain Model examined is a raster elevation model at a 0.5 m to 1 m spatial resolution.
- 9.6.29 No previously unrecorded cultural heritage sites were noted on the LiDAR images.

Field Survey

- 9.6.30 A walkover survey of the Proposed Development Area was carried out between 30 May and 2 June 2022 in warm and sunny weather conditions. All cultural heritage sites within the Proposed Development Area were visited, photographed and their condition noted.
- 9.6.31 The terrain over the Proposed Development Area was very rough with thick woodland covering a significant amount of the Proposed Development Area.
- 9.6.32 No previously unrecorded cultural heritage remains were noted during the walkover survey.

9.7 Potential Issues

Direct Effects

- 9.7.1 Potential adverse direct effects on known cultural heritage features can occur within the area of a development where avoidance of such features is not possible. There is also the potential for direct effects on as-yet-undiscovered archaeological remains, which may occur where, for example, sub-surface remains are present but have not yet been identified because they have no visible, above-ground elements.
- 9.7.2 Direct effects on known or as-yet-unidentified cultural heritage features may result from:
- Ground-breaking related to a development, including site establishment and from the excavation and the extraction of stone or other material;
 - Movement of machines over or near to sensitive areas, resulting in the disturbance of elements of a feature, including through the rutting and / or compaction of archaeological deposits.

- 9.7.3 Direct effects on the archaeological resource are typically permanent and irreversible.

Setting Effects

- 9.7.4 Potential indirect effects comprise effects on the setting of designated cultural heritage sites. These include Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Conservation Area and World Heritage Sites. While these potential effects are primarily visual in nature, there are instances where the setting of a cultural heritage feature may be affected even when important views to or from that feature are not affected, for example, where the development affects the curtilage of a listed building but is not visible in important views from or to that building.
- 9.7.5 Potential setting effects include:
- Effects on the inter-relationships between features;
 - Effects on the relationship of a feature to the wider landscape within which it sits;
 - Effects on other significant views from or to features.
- 9.7.6 In addition to effects from a development, effects on setting may result from:
- Changes in views associated with the establishment phase of development;
 - Changes in views resulting from the operation of a development.

9.8 Assessment of Effects

Assessment of Direct Effects

- 9.8.1 The baseline studies identified 35 cultural heritage sites that could potentially be directly impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 9.8.2 The lay-out of the Proposed Development is such that no known cultural heritage sites would be directly impacted during the construction or operational phases.
- 9.8.3 The following assessment of direct effects is based on the methodology outlined in Tables 9.1 to 9.3.

³² National Collection of Aerial Photography. Available online at: <https://ncap.org.uk/>

Table 9.7: Direct Effect Assessment

| Site # | Site Name | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Meikle Hill boundary bank | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 2 | Knipe Hill sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 3 | Peddinnan Burn sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 4 | River Nith sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 5 | River Nith field system and sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 6 | River Nith enclosure | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 7 | Powkelly Burn sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 8 | Knockenlee Burn sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 9 | Knockenlee Burn quarry | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 10 | Knockenlee Burn stone setting | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 11 | Beoch kerb cairn | Low | Negligible/No change | None |
| 12 | Knocklee Burn farmstead | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 13 | Linn Water sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 14 | Linn Water pen | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 15 | Ashbeugh Glen sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 16 | Clawfin farmstead | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 17 | Knockgirran circular sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 18 | Pickan's Dyke boundary bank and ditch | Low | Negligible/No change | None |
| 19 | Parrie Burn structures and enclosure | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 20 | Dalmellington cairn | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 21 | Kirn Bridge enclosure | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 22 | Parrie Burn enclosures | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 23 | Knockskae cairn | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 24 | Muck Water settlement | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 25 | Mossdale enclosure, field system and structure | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 26 | Mossdale cairn | Low | Negligible/No change | None |
| 27 | Mossdale Burn bank | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 28 | Trough Burn enclosure, head dyke, sheepfold, and rig and furrow | Low | Negligible/No change | None |
| 29 | Trough Burn earthwork bank | Low | Negligible/No change | None |

| Site # | Site Name | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 30 | Corbie Craig sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 31 | Mossdale Burn sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 32 | Shiel Burn enclosure complex, sheepfolds | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 33 | Benbrack Burn sheepfold | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 34 | Benbrack Burn sheiling | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |
| 35 | Lethans Hill standing stones | Lesser | Negligible/No change | None |

Assessment of Effect on Setting

- 9.8.4 The baseline assessment established that there are 319 designated cultural heritage sites within 15 km of the Proposed Development Area that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Development. This number comprises 24 Scheduled Monuments, six Conservation Areas, four Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes, 14 Category A Listed Buildings, 141 Category B Listed Buildings, 129 Category C Listed Buildings and one burgh of barony which is of local cultural heritage importance.
- 9.8.5 The ZTV provided by Natural Power Consultants Limited was used to determine which of the designated cultural heritage sites would be unaffected by the proposal. This exercise established that 241 designated cultural heritage sites would have no visibility of the turbines. From the definitions at Table 9.5, the Proposed Development would result in no change to the pre-project settings of these 241 designated cultural heritage sites, resulting in no significant effect upon their settings. These 241 designated cultural heritage sites were eliminated from further assessment.
- 9.8.6 The remaining 78 designated cultural heritage sites were visited and the potential indirect effect upon them was assessed using the Historic Environment Scotland guidance *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Gardens and Designed Landscapes* (2020) and *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* (2020), and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists publications *Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment* (2020) and *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment* (2020). The results of the assessment are at Table 9.8.

Cultural heritage sites where HES requested wireframes

- 9.8.7 HES requested that wireframes be produced for eight cultural heritage sites where the setting could potentially be adversely impacted by the Proposed Development. These are Craigengillan IGD (CHS 60), Dalnean Hill Farmstead and Field System Scheduled Monument (CHS 63), Craigengillan House (CHS 67), Craigengillan Stables (CHS 68), Loch Doon Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 71), Waterside Bing Scheduled Monument (CHS 165), Miners' Villages and Mineral Railways Scheduled Monument (CHS 173) and Cairn Avel Scheduled Monument (CHS 360).
- 9.8.8 The wireframe for Craigengillan IGD (CHS 60) showed that 11 turbines or blade tips would theoretically be visible from the designed landscape. However, the IGD contains mature trees in plantations and belts which would screen visibility to the Proposed Development Area, with the result that the Proposed Development would have a negligible adverse impact upon the setting of the IGD. Consequently, the assessment has found that the Proposed Development would have no significant effect upon the setting of Craigengillan IGD.

- 9.8.9 From Dalnean Hill Farmstead and Field System Scheduled Monument (CHS 63), the wireframe showed that 11 turbine blades within the Proposed development would potentially be visible. Upon visiting the Scheduled Monument, it was apparent that tree cover within the Proposed Development Area would provide some screening, thus lessening the potential impact upon the Scheduled Monument. In addition, the Proposed Development would not affect the ability to understand and appreciate these cultural heritage remains. The assessment has found that the Proposed Development could result in a slight change to the pre-project setting of the cultural heritage remains, resulting in no significant adverse effect upon the setting of Dalnean Hill Farmstead and Field System Scheduled Monument.
- 9.8.10 The wireframe from the category A Listed Craigengillan House (CHS 67) showed that 11 turbine blades would potentially be visible. A meeting with the landowner of Craigengillan Estate which took place in September 2024 determined that the optimum view to the Proposed Development Area was from a second-storey room where visibility towards the Proposed Development Area was less restricted than from any other room in Craigengillan House. Given the difficulty in finding an appropriate interior window which would have relatively unrestricted visibility towards the Proposed Development Area, and that commercial woodland planting intervenes between Craigengillan House and the Proposed Development Area, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would have a significant adverse impact of the setting of this category A Listed Building. At time of writing, the photomontage is not yet available and the assessment may need to be revised once this illustration has been created.
- 9.8.11 The wireframe from category A Listed Craigengillan Stables (CHS 68) also showed that 11 turbines would potentially be visible. Here too, existing commercial woodland planting intervenes between the stables and the Proposed Development Area, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would have a significant adverse impact of the setting of this category A Listed Building.
- 9.8.12 The remaining wireframes requested by HES demonstrated that the turbines would not be visible from Waterside Bing Scheduled Monument (CHS 165) or Miners' Villages and Mineral Railways: Scheduled Monument (CHS 173). From Loch Doon Castle Scheduled Monument (CHS 71), only the tips of four blades would be visible and from Cairn Avel Scheduled Monument (CHS 360), four blades would be visible among the cluster of operational and consented wind farms that include Benbrack, South Kyle I and Enoch Hill I. The Proposed Development would, therefore, have no significant impact upon the settings of these four Scheduled Monuments.

Table 9.8 Setting Impact Assessment

| Site # | Site Name | Site Designation | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|--|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 48 | Castlemerk of Dalmellington | Not designated | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 58 | Craigen Gillan Lodge | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 59 | Craigengillan Bridge | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 60 | Craigengillan Designed Landscape | IGDL | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 61 | Bogton Loch Airfield | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 62 | Doon Bridge on Staiton Road | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 63 | Dalnean Hill, Farmstead and Field System | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 64 | Dalcarnie Bridge | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 67 | Craigengillan House | A Listed | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 68 | Craigengillan Stables | A Listed | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 71 | Loch Doon Castle | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 74 | Munteoch Settlement and Field Systems | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 119 | Longhill | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 163 | Guitreehill Farmstead | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 164 | Waterside Conservation Area | Conservation Area | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 165 | Waterside Bing | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 167 | Waterside Engine House | A Listed | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 173 | Miners' Villages and Mineral Railways | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 195 | Findlayston Farmstead | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |

| Site # | Site Name | Site Designation | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 214 | House Opposite Firbank Gates | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 215 | Firbank | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 216 | 34 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 217 | 44-46 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 218 | 48 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 219 | 56 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 220 | 58 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 221 | 60 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 222 | Ochiltree Parish Church | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 223 | 64 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 224 | 66 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 225 | 68 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 226 | 78 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 227 | 80 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 228 | 86 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 229 | 88 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 230 | 90 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 231 | 92 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 232 | 94-98 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |

| Site # | Site Name | Site Designation | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 233 | 112 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 234 | 114 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 235 | 89 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 236 | 79-87 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 237 | 77 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 238 | 73 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 239 | 71 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 240 | 69 Main Street | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 241 | Ochiltree Primary School | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 242 | 63 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 243 | 53 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 244 | 37-39 Main Street | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 250 | South Lodge Gates and Railings | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 251 | Auchinleck House Gates | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 252 | Auchinleck House Stables | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 253 | Auchinleck House Coachhouse | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 254 | Auchinleck House Water Tower/Dovecot | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 255 | Auchinleck House Ha-ha | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 256 | Auchinleck House | A Listed | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |

| Site # | Site Name | Site Designation | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 268 | Barony Colliery | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 333 | Craigston House | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 334 | Lugar Parish Church | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 335 | Lugar Church Manse | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 336 | 1 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 337 | 2 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 338 | 3 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 339 | 4 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 340 | 5 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 341 | 6 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 342 | 7 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 343 | 8 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 344 | 9 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 345 | 10 Craigston Square | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 346 | Bellow Mill | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 351 | Nith Bridge | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 352 | Old Church and Churchyard | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 353 | Town Hall | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 354 | Martyrs Parish Church | B Listed | Medium | Negligible/ No Change | None |

| Site # | Site Name | Site Designation | Sensitivity | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|--------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 355 | Mossmark of Oldmill | C Listed | Low | Negligible/ No Change | None |
| 360 | Cairn Avel | Scheduled Monument | High | Negligible/ No Change | None |

9.9 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation of Direct Impacts

- 9.9.1 Where possible, any cultural heritage remains should be preserved in-situ through avoidance of direct impacts. Where this is not possible, preservation through record should be achieved.
- 9.9.2 The Assessment has established that the Proposed Development Area has been used as upland rough grazing since at least the mid eighteenth century and that no development is known to have taken place since that time.
- 9.9.3 The Proposed Development would not have a direct impact on any of the known cultural heritage sites. However, prehistoric ritual activity is known in the Proposed Development Area where Beoch kerb cairn (CHS 11), Dalmellington cairn (CHS 20), Knockskae cairn (CHS 23) and Mossdale cairn (CHS 26), and Knockenlee Burn stone setting (CHS 10) are all located.
- 9.9.4 Given presence of these funerary and ritual remains within a mostly undeveloped landscape, the land has some archaeological sensitivity and there is, therefore, potential for the survival of previously unrecorded sub-surface cultural heritage remains within the Proposed Development Area. Consequently, East Ayrshire Council may require that a programme of archaeological evaluation works be carried out in advance of the removal of topsoil and any overburden within the Proposed Development Area. Following consultation with WoSAS, in accordance with NPF4 and PAN 2/2011, where mitigation of direct impacts is required, some or all of the following methods would be used: archaeological survey, building recording, evaluation, excavation, post-excavation analyses and publication.

Mitigation of Setting Impacts

- 9.9.5 No significant adverse impacts upon the settings of designated cultural heritage sites within 15 km of the Proposed Development are anticipated. As a result, it is unlikely that East Ayrshire Council or HES will require any mitigation of indirect impacts that arise from the proposal

9.10 Residual Impacts

- 9.10.1 Should mitigation of potential direct impacts on hitherto unrecorded sub-surface cultural heritage remains be required, no residual impacts on the cultural heritage assets within the Proposed Development Area are anticipated. Following the implementation of mitigation measures.

9.11 Conclusions

- 9.11.1 The Proposed Development would have no direct impacts upon any known cultural heritage sites within the Proposed Development Area.

- 9.11.2 Given the presence of prehistoric remains within the Proposed Development Area and the relatively undisturbed nature of the land, there is some potential for the survival of hitherto unrecorded sub-surface cultural heritage remains within the Proposed Development Area. East Ayrshire Council may, therefore, require a programme of archaeological works to establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains within those areas of the Proposed Development Area that will be subject to ground disturbance.
- 9.11.3 Given that no significant indirect impacts upon the settings of designated cultural heritage sites are anticipated, it is unlikely that East Ayrshire Council or HES will require any mitigation of indirect impacts that arise from the Proposed Development.
- 9.11.4 In conclusion, the Assessment shows that the Proposed Development would have no likely significant impacts on cultural heritage.