

10. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

10.1 Introduction

- 10.1.1 This Additional Information chapter constitutes an update to Chapter 10 (Cultural Heritage) of the Breezy Hill Energy Project Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which was submitted in May 2025. The Cultural Heritage team at SLR Consulting was formally engaged on 23 October 2025 and has assumed responsibility for cultural heritage matters from the previously appointed consultants.
- 10.1.2 Any information provided within this report supersedes that provided within Chapter 10 of the May 2025 EIA report. The assessments undertaken within this report follow SLR's standard Cultural Heritage methodology. Due to time constraints, the methodology outlined within this report has been informally agreed with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and the methodology has been successfully used for several prior submissions.
- 10.1.3 This Chapter presents the assessment of the likely significant effects (as per the 'Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations') on archaeology and cultural heritage receptors arising from the Breezy Hill Energy Project ('the Proposed Development') during construction, operation and decommissioning.
- 10.1.4 The 'cultural heritage' of an area comprises archaeological sites, historic buildings, Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs), Inventoried Battlefields and other historic environment features.
- 10.1.5 The cultural heritage impact assessment identifies cultural heritage assets that may be subject to significant effects, both within the footprint of the infrastructure of the Proposed Development and within a surrounding radius of 10 km; establishes the potential for currently unknown archaeological assets to survive buried within the site; assesses the predicted effects on these assets; and proposes a programme of mitigation where appropriate. It will consider direct effects (such as physical disturbance or effects through setting change), indirect effects (such as might result from dewatering), and cumulative effects (where assets affected by the Proposed Development are also likely to be affected by other development proposals of a similar nature). The proposed approach to the assessment of effects on cultural heritage is set out below.
- 10.1.6 The objectives of this chapter are to:
- Describe the assessment methodology and significance criteria used in completing the updated impact assessment;
 - Update the baseline presented within the May 2025 EIA report using data established from desk studies, targeted surveys and feedback obtained during consultation with statutory consultees;
 - Describe the potential effects of the Proposed Development, including direct (physical), direct (setting), indirect, and cumulative effects;
 - assess the residual effects remaining following the implementation of mitigation measures; and



- reach a conclusion on the likely significant effects based on the information gathered and the analysis and assessments undertaken.
- 10.1.7 The chapter then highlights any further measures recommended to prevent, minimise, reduce, or offset any environmental effects.
- 10.1.8 The assessment has been carried out by Erin Ashby, MSc ACIfA, Senior Heritage Consultant, of SLR Consulting Ltd. The chapter has been reviewed and approved by Beth Gray, MA (Hons) MCIfA, Principal Heritage Consultant.
- 10.1.9 The chapter is supported by:
- **Technical Appendix 10.1:** Gazetteer of Heritage Assets within 1 km of Proposed Development.
 - **Technical Appendix 10.2:** Cultural Heritage Appraisal.
- 10.1.10 **Figures 10.1 – 10.7** are referenced in the text where relevant.

10.2 Scope and Consultation

Scope of the Assessment

- 10.2.1 This chapter takes an appropriate and topic-specific approach to assessment of the Proposed Development within the parameters identified in **Revised Chapter 2: Proposed Development Description**. As outlined in the aforementioned chapter, turbines T2 and T13 have been relocated from the May 2025 EIA layout. This chapter provides a worst-case assessment for Archaeology and Cultural Heritage and presents sufficient information for consultees and the decision makers to comment on and determine the application within the parameters of the Proposed Development.

Post-Application Consultation

- 10.2.2 **Table 10-1** outlines any consultation from the relevant statutory consultees that has been received post-submission of the May 2025 EIA report.

Table 10-1: Post-application Consultation

Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
Historic Environment Scotland – 5 th June 2025	<p><u>Consultation Response to EIA Report Submission</u></p> <p>Historic Environment Scotland (HES) objects to the application due to insufficient information provided within the EIA chapter. They were unable to reach a view on the potential impacts of the development, including any mitigation measures which may be required to reduce significant effects.</p> <p><u>Scoping</u></p> <p>HES notes concern regarding the level of information provided in the Scoping report (4th June 2022). They were unable to identify specific assets for inclusion at the scoping stage and noted that the number</p>	<p><u>Letter to HES from GUARD Archaeology Ltd, dated 15th July 2025</u></p> <p>GUARD Archaeology responded to HES's comments on the submitted EIA Chapter. Their response is summarised below.</p> <p>With regards to HES' concerns about the methodology, GUARD states that their method is outlined in paragraphs 10.5.3 to 10.5.18 and on Tables 10.2 to 10.6. They note that their methodology had been agreed</p>



Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
	<p>and location of visualisations within the LVIA chapter were insufficient to allow for a full assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>EIA Submission</u></p> <p>HES had significant concerns about how the assessment of impacts was undertaken within the EIA report. They would have expected to see a structured approach presented for the assessment of any impacts from the Proposed Development, detailing construction, operational and cumulative effects on assets within HES' interests.</p> <p>HES note that there is no structured assessment or supporting narrative provided to substantiate the outcomes presented in either Table 10.8 of the EIA report or paragraph 10.7.3 of the EIA report. As a result, it was difficult for HES to understand how these conclusions were reached. In addition, it is unclear what the outcomes within these reflect or if they relate to Construction, Operation or Cumulative impacts from the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>Visualisations</u></p> <p>HES note that no cultural heritage visualisations were provided with the submission. They note that the visualisations within the Landscape and Visual chapter were not sufficient to assess potential impacts on cultural heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>HES note that the applicant states within the 'Environmental Measures Embedded into the Development Proposals' Paragraph 10.7.23, that 'primary mitigation' ensured that no known cultural heritage sites would be directly affected during construction and de-commissioning of the Proposed Development. They note that this primarily relates to direct/indirect physical impacts. At this stage, insufficient information has been provided, and HES are unable to confirm if there is a further requirement for design mitigation to avoid, reduce or offset setting impacts on cultural heritage assets.</p>	<p>with Historic Scotland, the predecessor to HES.</p> <p>They state that a ZTV was used to assess the 29 heritage assets identified as being within HES' remit, to understand which assets were outwith the zone of visibility. They note that this is a standard method used in the industry. They omitted 14 cultural heritage assets from the assessment due to being located outwith visibility of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>For the remaining 15 assets, all were visited by GUARD and assessed in accordance with the outlined methodology and HES guidance. GUARD found that in all cases, intervening buildings and or woodland would screen visibility of the proposed turbines. They note that they were willing to individually outline each site, its setting and the intervening landscape features if deemed necessary.</p> <p>GUARD note that they did not include visualisations as they had not assessed any instances of a significant adverse impact on the setting of any heritage assets within the remit of HES. They note that the Proposed Development would not result in an adverse effect upon the setting of any designated cultural heritage assets included in the assessment.</p> <p>GUARD notes that due to the above, they did not deem it necessary to provide the results of the settings assessment to HES.</p> <p>GUARD accept that they omitted to state that the findings of the direct impact assessment and setting assessment relate to all stages of the Proposed Development, namely Construction, Operation and De-Commissioning.</p> <p>They note that they did not assess potential cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development as they did not</p>



Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
		identify any potential significant impacts.
HES 28 th July 2025	<p><u>Letter in response to GUARD correspondence dated 15th July 2025</u></p> <p>HES note that the provided Figure 10.3 (attached to the letter dated 15th July 2025) was not previously provided or referenced with the EIA submission. They note that the 15th of July letter and Figure 10.3 have introduced additional confusion.</p> <p><u>HES' Comments</u></p> <p>HES note that there is a discrepancy between the site boundary presented on Figure 10.3 and that submitted as part of the EIA report by other topics. They request that any further figures have continuity with the EIA submission and that they are provided with an updated figure with the correct boundary and site access.</p> <p>HES note that a ZTV has been provided along with Figure 10.3. This ZTV is for a 26-turbine scheme and has an unclear blade tip height. As such, it does not appear to use the correct 20-turbine layout that has been submitted. They request that this be resolved.</p> <p>They note that Dalmellington Iron Works (SM4345) is both scoped out of assessment within the 15th of July letter and scoped in for assessment within the submitted EIA chapter. HES note that it is unclear whether this asset is scoped in or scoped out and requests clarification.</p> <p>HES note an error in referencing table numbering between the EIA report and the 15th of July letter.</p> <p>HES do not recognise planting and screening with trees as an appropriate form of mitigation for impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets.</p> <p>HES note that the statement 'the direct impact assessment and setting assessment relate to all stages of the Proposed Development, namely Construction, Operation and De-Commissioning' (15th July letter) is confusing. They note that it is unclear how the conclusions in Table 10.7 and Table 10.8 can relate to the whole life cycle of the development. They outline an example, with reference to Paragraph 10.7.2 of the EIA report. HES request that assessments of impacts for both construction and operation phases be separated.</p> <p><u>HES' Advice</u></p>	<p>This Additional Information chapter is provided in response to HES's comments from the 28th of July 2025. The chapter provides updated information in order to provide sufficient information to support HES's decision.</p> <p>Updated figures have been provided, along with appropriate visualisations.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, the scope of assessment was identified during an informal phone call with HES on 27th of October 2025.</p>



Consultee	Consultation Response	Applicant Action
	<p>HES would expect any EIA to contain a structured assessment with a supporting narrative and visualisations, to substantiate the outcomes. The assessment should be presented within the EIA, as a public record, to ensure that the relevant people have sufficient information in order to reach a view on potential impacts.</p> <p>HES request that the applicant review their Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting guidance and should follow the three-step process to assessing impacts.</p> <p>HES maintain their objection to the application, as insufficient information has been provided and they are unable to reach a view on the potential impacts.</p>	

Assets within the Site

- 10.2.3 Cultural heritage assets within the Site boundary have been assessed in order to determine any direct and indirect impacts.

Assets outwith the Site

- 10.2.4 All nationally significant designated assets within 10 km of the proposed turbines have been considered for potential impacts on their setting and have been subjected to a Cultural Heritage Appraisal (**Technical Appendix 10.2**). In line with scoping advice received from East Ayrshire Council, all Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes within 10 km of the proposed turbine locations have been considered for potential impacts upon their setting and subjected to a Cultural Heritage Appraisal (**Technical Appendix 10.2**). A full list of assets scoped in for assessment can be found in **Table 10-8**.

Assets Scoped Out of Assessment

- 10.2.5 Except for designated heritage assets scoped in for detailed assessment for the potential for significant effects on their setting (**Table 10-8**), designated heritage assets within 10 km of the proposed turbines that do not fall within the ZTV and designated heritage assets that are outwith the 10 km study area have been scoped out of further assessment due to having no potential for impacts upon their setting.

10.3 Legislation, Guidance and Policy

Legislation

- 10.3.1 The following 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 Statutory Instrument No. 101 The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

Policy

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

- National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4; 2023);
- Onshore Wind Policy Statement (2022);
- Historic Environment Scotland: Designation Policy and Selection guidance (2020);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS; 2019); and
- East Ayrshire Local Development Plan 2 (2024) – Policies HE1, HE2, HE3, HE4, and HE5.

Guidance

10.3.3 Relevant Guidance and Technical Standards Comprise

- Our Past, Our Future: The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (2023);
- Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (2020);
- A Guide to Climate Change Impact: On Scotland's Historic Environment (2019);
- NatureScot 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 (2019);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (2014, updated 2020); and
- Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.

10.4 Approach and Methodology

10.4.1 The assessment methodology adhered to for the purposes of preparing this Revised EIA Report is detailed below.

Study Area¹

10.4.2 The following study areas are proposed on the grounds of professional experience:

- A 1 km radius to ascertain potential for unknown buried remains was applied to the Site boundary (**Figure 10.1**); and

¹ There is no guidance defining what the extent of an appropriate 'study area' should be for the archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of wind farms. Any given study area will therefore represent an exercise in professional judgement, refined to point of agreement between stakeholders during consultation.



- To assess the impact on the settings of heritage assets, a 10 km Study Area was defined around the turbines, as these are the most visually prominent elements of the Proposed Development due to their scale (**Figure 10.2**).

Information and Data Sources

10.4.3 **Table 10-2** sets out the main data sources used within this report.

Table 10-2: Main Data Sources Used in the Production of this Report.

Subject	Source	Location
Designated heritage assets (except conservation areas)	HES	HES digital data download
Conservation areas	East Ayrshire Council (Conservation Area Appraisals) and HES (Shapefile Data)	HES digital data download
Non-designated heritage assets	HES Database – Trove	Digital data supplied as download
Non-designated heritage assets	Historic Environment Record (HER) data held by the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS)	Digital data supplied as download
Historic maps	National Library of Scotland	Online
Aerial photography	HES	HES database Canmore and National Collection of Aerial Photograph (NCAP) (online)
Historic Land-Use Assessment (HLA)	HES	On-line
Historic Environment	Unpublished reports	Various
	Published synthetic works	Various
	Previous EIA Report Submission	Energy Consents Unit (ECU)
Condition of recorded heritage assets within the site	Field inspection	Inspected by GUARD Archaeology between the 26 th and 30 th of August 2024, with further walkover surveys on the 15 th of October 2024 and between the 1 st and 2 nd of April 2025.

Assessment Methodology

- 10.4.4 The Proposed Development has the potential to result in effects upon the cultural significance of heritage assets where it changes their baseline condition and/or their setting.
- 10.4.5 In accordance with the EIA Regulations and the EIA Handbook², this assessment has identified any development impacts as either direct or indirect, adverse, or

² Scottish Natural Heritage and HES (2018).



beneficial, and short-term, long-term, or permanent. The definition of impact is described below:

- Direct (physical) impacts: occur where the physical fabric of the asset is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as a direct result of the Proposed Development. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- Indirect (physical) impacts: occur where the fabric of an asset, or buried archaeological remains, is removed or damaged, or where it is preserved or conserved, as an indirect result of the proposal (such as might result from dewatering), even though the asset may lie some distance from the proposal. Such impacts are most likely to occur during the construction phase and are most likely to be permanent.
- Direct (Setting) impacts: result from the proposal causing change within the setting of a heritage asset that affects its cultural significance or the way in which it is understood, appreciated, and experienced. Such impacts are generally, but not exclusively, visual, occurring directly as a result of the appearance of the proposal in the surroundings of the asset. Setting impacts may also relate to other senses or factors, such as noise, odour or emissions, or historical relationships that do not relate entirely to intervisibility, such as historic patterns of land-use and related historic features. Such impacts may occur at any stage of a proposal's lifespan and may be permanent, reversible, or temporary.
- Cumulative impacts: can relate to the physical fabric or setting of assets. They may arise as a result of impact interactions, either of different impacts of the proposal itself, or additive impacts resulting from incremental changes caused by the proposal together with other projects already in the planning system or allocated in a Local Development Plan.

10.4.6 Direct impacts upon the cultural significance of heritage assets have taken into account the level of their cultural significance (where known) and the magnitude (extent) of the identified impacts.

10.4.7 Impacts on cultural heritage assets will be identified and assessed with reference to the guidance set out by NatureScot and HES (2019). Assessment will be carried out in the following stages:

- initial consideration of intervisibility and other factors leading to the identification of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the cultural significance of potentially affected assets;
- assessment of the contribution of setting to the cultural significance of those assets;
- assessment of the extent to which change to any contributing aspects of the settings of those assets, as a result of the Proposed Development, would impact their cultural significance (magnitude of impact); and
- determination of the significance of any identified effects.



10.4.8 Assessment on the impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets will be carried out following the three-stage approach outlined in Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2020):

- Stage 1: identify the historic assets that might be affected by the Proposed Development;
- Stage 2: define and analyse the setting by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the historic asset or place is understood, appreciated and experienced; and
- Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes on the setting, and the extent to which any negative impacts can be mitigated.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

10.4.9 The settings assessment has been assisted by a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) calculation, presented in **Figure 10.2**. A ZTV calculation maps the predicted degree of visibility of a Proposed Development from all points within a proportionate, defined study area around the site, as would be seen from an average observer's eye level (two metres above ground level). The ZTV model presented in **Figure 10.2** is based upon the maximum level of theoretical visibility, i.e. the maximum height of the turbine blade tips. As bare-earth topographical data was used, the ZTV assumes the worst-case scenario, with no screening such as vegetation or buildings. For further information on the ZTV methodology, refer to **Revised Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**.

Cultural Heritage Significance

10.4.10 The categories of cultural significance to be referred to are presented in **Table 10-3**, which will act as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provide a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions drawn.

10.4.11 The cultural significance categories take into account factors such as: designation, status, and grading. For non-designated assets, consideration has been given to their inherent heritage interests, intrinsic, contextual, and associative characteristics as defined in HES's Designation Policy and Selection Guidance³. In relation to these assets, the assessment focuses 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 informed by the Historic Environment Record (HER) and Trove records and/or site visit observations; the contribution of an asset to their class of monument, or the diminution of that class should an asset be lost; and how a site relates to people, practices, events, and/or historical or social movements. Assessments of the cultural significance of specific

³ HES (2019c)



assets, where recorded within the HER, have been taken into account where appropriate.

Table 10-3: Cultural Heritage Significance

Cultural Heritage Significance	Criteria
Highest	Sites of international importance, including: World Heritage sites.
High	Sites of National importance, including: Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Gardens and Designed Landscapes included on the national inventory; Designated Battlefields Conservation areas containing nationally important buildings; and Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
Medium	Sites of Regional/Local importance, including: Category B and C Listed Buildings; Conservation Areas containing buildings that contribute significantly to its character; and Non-designated assets of equivalent significance.
Low	Assets of Local importance. Heritage assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations or with little of the asset remaining to justify a higher importance.
Negligible	Assets that are of very little or no heritage interest. Heritage assets where the ability to interpret their archaeological context has been removed/eroded.
Unknown	Further information is required to assess the significance of these assets.

10.4.12 In addition to identifying the cultural significance of a heritage asset, it is essential, where changes to setting are being assessed, to understand the contribution that setting makes towards the cultural significance of an asset. Elements of setting may make a positive, neutral, or negative contribution to the cultural significance of an asset. Thus, in determining the nature and level of impact upon an asset and their setting by the development, the contribution that setting makes to an asset's cultural significance and thus its sensitivity to changes to its setting need to be considered.

10.4.13 This approach recognises the importance of avoiding significant adverse effects on the setting of an asset in the context of the contribution that setting makes to the understanding, appreciation, and experience of an asset. It recognises that setting may be key in characterising, understanding, and appreciating some, but not necessarily all, assets. Indeed, assets of high or highest cultural significance do not necessarily have high sensitivity to changes to their settings.

10.4.14 An asset's relative sensitivity to alterations to its setting refers to its capacity to retain its ability to contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the past in the face of changes to its setting. The ability of an asset's setting to contribute to an



understanding, appreciation and experience of it and its cultural significance also has a bearing on the sensitivity of that asset to changes to its setting.

10.4.15 While certain cultural heritage assets of high or highest cultural heritage significance are likely to be sensitive to direct impacts, not all will have a similar sensitivity to impacts on their setting; this would be true where setting does not appreciably contribute to their cultural significance. HES' guidance on setting makes clear that the level of effect may relate to *"the ability of the setting of an asset to absorb new development without eroding its key characteristics"*⁴. Assets with very high or high relative sensitivity to setting impacts may be vulnerable to any changes that impact their settings and even slight changes may erode their key characteristics or the ability of their settings to contribute to the understanding, appreciation, or experience of them. Assets where relative sensitivity to changes to their setting is lower may be able to accommodate greater changes to their settings without key characteristics being eroded.

10.4.16 The key criteria used for establishing an assets relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is detailed in **Table 10-4**. This table has been developed based on SLR's professional judgement and experience of assessing setting impacts. It has been developed in line with relevant policy and guidance throughout this chapter.

Table 10-4: Sensitivity of Setting

Relative Sensitivity	Explanatory Criteria
Very High	An asset, the setting of which is crucial to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it, should be regarded as having very high sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant where setting, or elements of, make a crucial and essential direct contribution to significance.
High	An asset, the setting of which is major to an understanding, appreciation, and experience of it, should be regarded as having high sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant where setting, or elements of, contribute substantially to their cultural significance.
Medium	An asset, the setting of which makes a moderate contribution to the understanding, appreciation, and experience of it, should be regarded as having medium sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset for which setting makes a contribution to significance but whereby its value is derived equally from its other characteristics.
Low	An asset, the setting of which makes some contribution to the understanding, appreciation, and experience of it, should be regarded as having low sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset where its significance is derived mainly from other characteristics.
Negligible	An asset where setting makes a minimal contribution to the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset and it should be thought of having a negligible sensitivity to changes to its setting.

10.4.17 The determination of an assets relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is first and foremost reliant upon the determination of its setting and how setting aligns with other key characteristics which contribute to cultural significance. While cultural significance is defined by the criteria set out in **Table 10-3**, the sensitivity of setting

⁴ HES (2020)



criteria for each asset will be defined using professional judgement and, where appropriate, by a site visit conducted by the assessor. The resulting sensitivity of setting will then be defined and referenced within the assessment for use in applying professional judgement to determine whether the resulting effects are in line with policy.

Magnitude of Impact

- 10.4.18 Determining the magnitude of any likely impacts includes consideration of the nature of the activities proposed during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.
- 10.4.19 Changes could potentially include ground disturbance and changes to setting. The latter might include visual change, as well as noise, vibration, smell, dust, traffic movements etc. Impacts may be beneficial or adverse, and may be short term, long term or permanent.
- 10.4.20 Where adverse impacts on cultural heritage assets are possible, the magnitude of impact can be reduced through measures to prevent, reduce and/or, where possible, offset these effects.
- 10.4.21 Taking into account all embedded mitigation measures (**Section 10.6**), the magnitude of any impact has been assessed using professional judgement, with reference to the criteria set out in **Table 10-5**.

Table 10-5: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Explanatory Criteria
High Beneficial	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is considerably enhanced.
Medium Beneficial	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is enhanced to a clearly discernible extent.
Low Beneficial	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is enhanced to a minor extent.
Very Low Beneficial	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is enhanced to a very minor extent.
Neutral/None	The Proposed Development would not impact the cultural heritage significance of the heritage asset, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience it.
Very Low Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is eroded to a very minor extent. This level of impact would not be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.



Magnitude of Impact	Explanatory Criteria
Low Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is eroded to a minor extent. This level of impact would rarely be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.
Medium Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, is eroded to a clearly discernible extent. This level of impact might be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.
High Adverse	Changes to the elements of the fabric or the setting of the cultural heritage asset that contribute to its cultural significance, such that this cultural significance, or the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset, would be considerably eroded. This level of impact would probably be considered to affect the integrity of the asset's setting.

10.4.22 **Table 10-6** provides a matrix that relates the cultural significance of the asset to the magnitude of impact on its cultural significance, to produce an overall anticipated level of effect (significance of effect).

Table 10-6: Significance of Effect

Magnitude of Impact	Cultural Significance (Excluding Unknown)				
	Highest	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High Beneficial	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor
Medium Beneficial	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible
Low Beneficial	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor	Negligible
Very Low Beneficial	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Neutral/None	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil	Neutral/Nil
Very Low Adverse	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Low Adverse	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Very Minor	Negligible
Medium Adverse	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor	Negligible
High Adverse	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Very Minor



Cumulative Effect

- 10.4.23 Cumulative effects have been assessed in line with the guidance provided in the EIA Handbook⁵. A cumulative effect is considered to occur when there is a combination of:
- an impact on an asset or group of assets due to changes resulting from the Proposed Development; and
 - an impact on the same asset or group of assets resulting from other wind farm developments (consented or proposed, but not operational) within the surrounding landscape.
- 10.4.24 Assets with a minor or higher significance of effect resulting from the Proposed Development in isolation have been considered for cumulative assessment, as these assets are most likely to be susceptible to significant cumulative effects.
- 10.4.25 In accordance with the methodology agreed upon at Scoping, only wind farm developments have been considered for cumulative impacts. Consideration of other developments has been limited to:
- wind farm planning applications within 15km of an asset with an impact of minor or higher that have been submitted and have a decision pending; and
 - wind farm planning applications within 15km of an asset with an impact of minor or higher that have been granted permission but not yet constructed.
- 10.4.26 Wind farms that were under construction when the assessment was undertaken are considered as part of the baseline environment for operational impact assessments. Any effect resulting from operational wind farms has been considered as part of the baseline effect assessment.
- 10.4.27 A study area of 15km from each assessed asset was chosen based on professional judgement, allowing the assessment to encompass both the Proposed Development and any other developments within the surrounding landscape deemed to have the potential for cumulative effects.
- 10.4.28 Cumulative effect has been considered in two stages:
- assessment of the combined effect of the developments, including the Proposed Development; and
 - assessment of the extent to which the Proposed Development contributes to the combined effect.

⁵ Scottish Natural Heritage and HES (2019).



- 10.4.29 The developments included for cumulative assessment are accurate as of November 2025.

Significance and Integrity

Significance

- 10.4.30 Once the anticipated effects of the Proposed Development upon cultural heritage assets are defined, professional judgement is used to determine whether those effects would be either 'Significant' or 'Not Significant' for the purposes of EIA. As part of this determination process, regard was given to any relevant guidance.
- 10.4.31 With reference to the matrix presented in **Table 10-6**:
- any effects identified as 'major' would most probably be considered 'Significant;'
 - any effects identified as 'moderate' might also be considered 'Significant,' although professional judgement may determine otherwise on the basis of the associated site-/asset-specific detail; and
 - any effects identified as 'minor' or less are unlikely to be considered 'Significant,' though again, professional judgement has been exercised.
- 10.4.32 A clear statement has been made in relation to all affected assets as to whether the identified effects upon them are considered to be 'Significant' or 'Not Significant' for purposes of EIA.

Integrity

- 10.4.33 Policy 7h) of NPF4⁶ states that development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where; *“significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided.”* In addition, Policy 7i) of NPF4 states that *“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”.*
- 10.4.34 A significant effect in EIA terms does not necessarily equate to a significant impact upon the integrity of an asset's setting. Where EIA significant effects are found, a detailed assessment of adverse impacts upon the integrity of the setting is made. Whilst non-significant effects are unlikely to significantly impact the integrity of the setting, the reverse is not always true. That is, the assessment of an effect as being significant in EIA terms does not necessarily mean that the adverse effect on the setting of the asset will significantly impact its integrity. Changes to factors of setting that contribute to cultural significance, such that the understanding, appreciation and experience of an asset are not adequately retained will have a significant

⁶ Scottish Government (2023)



adverse impact on the integrity of its setting⁷. This is most likely to occur where the sensitivity of setting as set out in **Table 10-5** is High or Very High.

Mitigation

10.4.35 Suitable measures for minimising effects through ground disturbance might include:

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

10.4.36 Suitable measures for mitigating any setting effects might include:

- alteration of the proposed turbine layout; and/or
- reduction of proposed turbine heights.

10.4.37 A statement of any embedded mitigation measures proposed to be implemented in response to identified cultural heritage impacts is provided, with the impact predictions taking these into account. The main approach to mitigating both direct and indirect impacts has been through design. Avoidance of direct impacts on heritage assets has been a consideration throughout the design process. Where avoidance is not possible, further mitigation is proposed as a condition to consent.

10.4.38 In relation to direct physical impacts, embedded mitigation measures including adjustments to turbine numbers, layout and height, have been considered and incorporated as part of the design process (see **Revised Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives**).

10.4.39 Further proposed mitigation measures, not referenced above, such as archaeological fieldwork undertaken as a condition to consent or other post-consent measures associated with public benefits, are proposed in **Section 10.7**.

Residual Effects

10.4.40 Residual effects are the resulting effects after consideration of proposed mitigation measures. A statement of the residual effects of the Proposed Development has

⁷ As defined and agreed in the Hill of Fare Wind Farm Cultural Heritage Statement of Agreed Matters (July 2025). DPEA Reference: WIN-110-4



been provided, taking into account any site-specific mitigation measures which could be implemented as a condition to consent.

Limitations of Assessment

- 10.4.41 The assessment is based on the sources outlined in both **Table 10-2** and **References**, and, therefore, shares the same range of limitations in terms of comprehensiveness and completeness of those sources.
- 10.4.42 Due to time constraints, only selected assets were there was a potential for significant effect was visited. This includes Craigengillan Estate (GDL00111) and Dumfries House (GDL00149). All other assessments were carried out using publicly available data.

10.5 Baseline Conditions

Introduction

- 10.5.1 A full description of the site and environs is given in **Revised Chapter 2: Proposed Development Description**. All heritage assets within the 1 km study area are shown in **Figure 10.1**. Designated assets within the 10 km study area are shown in relation to the ZTV in **Figure 10.2**.
- 10.5.2 All recorded designated and non-designated heritage assets within 1km site boundary are listed in the gazetteer that is contained within **Technical Appendix 10.1**. Where designated assets are tabulated in this chapter, they are identified by the index number (i.e. Scheduled Monuments) or reference number (i.e. Listed Buildings) under which they are registered by HES.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.5.3 Within 10 km of the proposed turbine locations, there are 15 Scheduled Monuments, ten category A Listed Buildings, and three Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes. There are nine Category A Listed Buildings and two Conservation Areas within 5 km of the proposed turbine locations.
- 10.5.4 Within 1 km of the site boundary, there are five Listed Buildings: three Category B and two Category C. In addition, there are two Scheduled Monuments and one Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape within 1 km of the Site boundary. These assets are noted in **Technical Appendix 10.1**.

Archaeological Baseline

Prehistoric Context

- 10.5.5 There are no recorded prehistoric heritage assets within the Site boundary; however, there are five assets of a prehistoric date within 1km of the Site boundary.
- 10.5.6 SLR94 is a recorded findspot of a Neolithic stone axe, found c.1.1 km northwest of T1. The findspot is recorded in isolation, with no other prehistoric assets recorded within its vicinity.



- 10.5.7 SLR111 records the site of a kerbed cairn, which contained up to three cists. The cairn is located c.0.6 km northwest of the construction access track and c.5.2 km southeast of T18.
- 10.5.8 SLR8 records the location of a potential ring cairn, tentatively dated as later Neolithic or early Bronze Age. The asset is recorded c.0.37 km north of the construction access track and 3.5 km southeast of T18.
- 10.5.9 SLR82 records the location of a potential barrow, recorded as having been 'ploughed down' prior to a 1982 field survey. The asset is recorded 0.8 km south of the construction access track and 5.1 km south of T18. A potential crannog (SLR83) is recorded c.0.67 km west of SLR82. The crannog is located within Bogton Loch, c.1 km southeast of the access track and 5.3 km south of T18.

Romano-British Context

- 10.5.10 The HER records the location of two potential Roman assets within 1 km of the site, both potential roads.
- 10.5.11 SLR53 is recorded c.2.5 km south of T18 and runs northwest to southeast, crossing the construction access track c.1 km north of the A713. The road is recorded as a 'Roman Road' on the 1st Edition 6-Inch Ordnance Survey (OS) Map, dated to 1860 (Ayrshire Sheet XLVI). This OS map is the only evidence we have dating the asset as Roman, and as the map was produced some 1800 years after Roman occupation in the area, it is unclear where this information came from originally.
- 10.5.12 A second potential Roman road (SLR116) is located c0.6 km north of T1, running roughly west-southwest to northeast. The asset may have been part of a road which ran from Wiston to Patna; however, historic surveys seem unsure of its Roman dating. Surveys both in 1974 and 1980 determined that the potential road followed the line of a 17th-century hollow-way and that it had no characteristics of a Roman road.

Medieval Context

- 10.5.13 There are no heritage assets of a medieval date recorded within the Site boundary; however, there is a singular asset recorded with a medieval date within 1km of the Site boundary. SLR97 is recorded c.1.4 km southwest of T17. The asset comprises agricultural remains (namely, rig and furrow and enclosures) as well as evidence of quarry scoops. A survey in 1974 reported at least seven scooped and recessed terraced hut bases, as well as a sherd of medieval pottery from an area beside a hollow-way.
- 10.5.14 Additionally, there are a further four assets recorded as being of medieval to post-medieval dating within 1km of the Site boundary. SLR95 is located c.0.7 km to the north of T1, and comprises an area of rig and furrow with a potential set of turf huts.
- 10.5.15 SLR5 is recorded c.0.6 km south of the access track and c.3.8 km southeast of T18. The asset comprises remains relating to multi-period agricultural use of the land. The earliest remains appear to be reminiscent of nearby fermtouns, a medieval lowland farming settlement that would have worked cooperatively on unenclosed



fields. There is evidence that a nearby stream was altered into a canal, and a mill was constructed. Eventually, the mill and the surrounding agricultural land were amalgamated into a farm complex, which was in use until at least the 1800s.

- 10.5.16 SLR49 is located c.0.5 km northwest of SLR5, c.0.5 km south of the access track and c.3.5 km southeast of T18. The asset comprises the remains of a small pre-improvement farmstead, containing some structures, a kiln, fields divided by lynchets, and small areas of rig cultivation. A 1989 study determined that the farmstead was likely abandoned before the 1850s; however, the 1st Edition 6-Inch OS Map (1860) does record a single structure within the location of the farmstead.
- 10.5.17 Dalnean Hill, farmstead and field system (SM4390) is an agricultural settlement dated to the medieval to post-medieval period, located on Dalnean Hill. The asset is located c.0.9 km southwest of the access track and 5.2 km southwest of T18.

Post-medieval Context

- 10.5.18 There are five recorded post-medieval heritage assets within the Site boundary.
- 10.5.19 SLR77 is recorded c.0.3 km southwest of T3 and comprises a small area of rig and furrow, potentially associated with the Auchingee farmstead (SLR15), located c.0.17 km to its northwest. The rig and furrow is surrounded by an area of commercial forestry, but the rig itself appears to be preserved. The area was observed during the site visit by GUARD, noting that the area of rig was aligned roughly north-northeast to south-southwest, and was contained within an earth bank.
- 10.5.20 SLR56 comprises the remains of Greenhill Farmstead, located c.0.8 km northeast of T7. A farmstead or settlement is depicted on Roy's map (1747-1755) and is shown on the 1st Edition OS map as a roofed longhouse, well, garden enclosure, small rectangular enclosure and three open-ended fields. The asset is shown as being 'in ruins' on the 1957 OS Map. The asset was visited during a 2004 survey, where the remains of a two-compartment building were identified, with associated field boundaries, and was again identified during the GUARD site visit.
- 10.5.21 SLR29 comprises a settlement named Knockgilderon. The settlement is first depicted on Roy's map, along with an area of cultivation, and its expansion can be seen over subsequent OS maps. A 2004 survey identified the remains of the farmstead, namely a building with three compartments, as well as a dry stone boundary extending north-south from the northeast corner. The GUARD survey did not identify any upstanding remains. Aerial photography shows the three-compartmented building being extant in 2011; however, it had been removed by 2016. The extent of the settlement at its largest is shown in **Figure 10.1**, demonstrating that it crosses the access track between T6 and T5 and crosses the location of T5.
- 10.5.22 SLR61 comprises a record of an enclosure, identified on Ordnance Survey mapping (1859) as Knockreach. A settlement of Knockbetch, presumably the same settlement despite the difference in spelling, is seen on Roy's map, in the same



- position, and is named but not shown on available OS Mapping. The asset was not found during the GUARD survey, as the area has been used for quarrying activities.
- 10.5.23 An enclosure (SLR117) is recorded on the 1894 OS map, c.0.5 km northeast of T13. The enclosure is south of Rankinston farmstead (SLR13), and as such, the enclosure is potentially associated with the farmstead.
- 10.5.24 There are post-medieval assets recorded within 1 km of the Site boundary. All assets are listed within **Technical Appendix 10.1**.
- 10.5.25 There are five designated post-medieval assets within 1 km of the Site boundary. SLR84 (LB1084) and SLR84 (LB122) are both Category C Listed bridges. SLR84 allows Ayr Road (A713) to cross Cumnock Burn, and SLR85 allows Broomknowe, a road at the northern boundary of Dalmellington, to cross Cumnock Burn. Both bridges are located c.0.65 km west of the access track. SLR21 (**LB1087**) is a category B Listed Bridge, located c.1km southeast of the access track, and carries the driveway of Craigengillan House. SLR22 (**LB1086**) comprises the gate lodge at the entrance to Craigengillan Estate, and is a Category B Listed Building.
- 10.5.26 The fifth designated post-medieval asset is the Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape of Craigengillan (**GDL00111**), located c.0.3 km south of the Access track and c.4.7 km south of T18. Craigengillan Estate has existed since the 16th century; however, the designed landscape was first created in the late 18th and early 19th century.
- 10.5.27 The area surrounding the site, most significantly to the south, has a long history of coal mining. For example, there is evidence of the sinking of a coal pit near Dalmellington in 1755, which was financed by the inhabitants of Dalmellington in the hope that they could meet local coal supply needs⁸. The Dalmellington Iron Company opened their Iron Works in 1848, increasing coal and ironstone extraction in the area. The Dalmellington Iron Works (**SM4345**) are located c.3.2 km southwest of T18.
- 10.5.28 There are ten coal mines recorded on the HER within 1 km of the Site boundary⁹, all concentrated to the south of the turbine locations and to the north of Dalmellington. Further industrial assets related to the mining include an egg-end boiler (SLR4) and the record of three railways (SLR40, SLR48, and SLR70) used for transporting coal. There are two records of houses/structures relating to the housing of colliers and those working within the mining industry. Craigmark Cottages (SLR105) records the location of a series of roofed structures, presumably Miners' cottages, located c.0.2 km south of the access track and 3.5 km south of T18. The cottages are no longer extant and are not seen on the 1957 1:25,000 OS maps, despite being present on the 1948 Six Inch OS map. SLR50 records the site

⁸ Whatley (1983)

⁹ SLR16, SLR17, SLR86, SLR87, SLR88, SLR89, SLR90, SLR91, SLR93, SLR112.



of a similar set of structures, labelled on historic mapping as Collier's Row, located c.0.7 km south of the access track. These cottages are no longer extant.

- 10.5.29 There are 11 recorded post-medieval farmsteads within 1 km of the Site boundary. Whilst the majority of the aforementioned industrial records from the post-medieval period are located to the south of the turbine locations and in the vicinity of the access track, the records of farmsteads are present in two separate clusters.
- 10.5.30 Six records of farmsteads are located in proximity to the southern access track, to the north of Dalmellington¹⁰. All recorded farmsteads appear to be no longer in use; however, they demonstrate the agricultural land use of the area during the post-medieval period.
- 10.5.31 Five records of farmsteads are recorded within proximity to the proposed Turbine locations. SLR11 is recorded c.1 km southeast of T8, SLR79 is recorded c.0.85 km east of T1, SLR15 is recorded 0.46 km southwest of T3, and SLR14 is recorded c.1 km west of T3. All four assets are no longer in use as farmsteads. The fifth farmstead, SLR13, is recorded c.1.1 km southeast of T9, is named Rankinston and appears to still be extant and in use today.
- 10.5.32 In addition to the post-medieval assets found within 1km of the Site, there are four recorded post-medieval to modern dated assets. Rankinston (or Broomhill) coal mine (SLR7) is recorded c.1.8 km west of T3. SLR1 records the site of a colliery, located c.0.7 km south of the access track. SLR23 records the location of the village of Burnton, c.0.7 km east of the access track, which was a small farmstead in the post-medieval period before developing into a mining village in the early 1900s. SLR114, located within the northwest of Dalmellington, records the location of a building that was in use as a cottage hospital during the late 1800s. A drill hall stood on the site during the First World War, before being demolished and replaced by a cadet hut.

Modern Context

- 10.5.33 There are no recorded modern assets within the Site boundary; however, there are 17 recorded modern assets within 1km of the site. SLR10 is located c.1.3 km northeast of T1 and comprises the location of Greenhill Colliery.
- 10.5.34 Apart from SLR10, all modern assets are recorded to the south of the turbine locations, in the vicinity of the access track. From this grouping, the closest modern asset to the turbine locations is SLR65, a record of a square structure that has since been destroyed by coal mining activities, located c.2.3 km southeast of T18.
- 10.5.35 A further four collieries/coal mines are recorded within 1 km of the access track¹¹, demonstrating the continued use of the land for industrial exploitation during the early and mid-1900s. The last coal mine to start work within the general area of Dalmellington opened in 1953, and the last coal pit closed in 1978. The modern period saw the development of housing for those working in the coal mines and

¹⁰ SLR6, SLR28, SLR31, SLR32, SLR33, SLR39.

¹¹ SLR2, SLR18, SLR19, SLR47.



adjacent infrastructure. The village of Burnton developed c. 0.65 km east of the access track, with the construction of a series of miners' cottages¹². Furthermore, Dalmellington expanded to the northeast, with further housing being built (SLR98, SLR102).

- 10.5.36 Further assets recorded include a First World War hospital (SLR107), a bridge (SLR109), a tennis court (SLR110), and an engine house associated with the collieries (SLR3). SLR38 records the location of a First World War Airfield, designated as a Scheduled Monument (**SM13693**). The airfield was part of the Loch Doon Gunnery School, constructed between 1916 and 1917.

Undated Heritage Assets

- 10.5.37 There are eight undated heritage assets recorded within the Site boundary.
- 10.5.38 SLR115 records the location of an enclosure, recorded on the 1897 Ordnance Survey Map. The asset is located c.0.2 km northeast of T19, and is currently located within commercial forestry. No evidence of the asset was found during the GUARD survey.
- 10.5.39 SLR58 records the location of a rectangular enclosure, c.0.45 km southwest of T7 and directly east of a track. SLR59 comprises a record of a fodder store, c.90 m south of T4. SLR76 records the location of a potential enclosure, c.0.32 km northwest of T3. No upstanding remains of these assets were identified during GUARD's site visit.
- 10.5.40 SLR57 records the location of a pen, located c.0.35 km west of T7, and SLR55 records the location of a circular enclosure, located c.0.6 km northeast of T7. No upstanding remains related to either asset were identified during the GUARD walkover survey.
- 10.5.41 SLR54 records the location of an enclosure, located c.0.2 km northeast of T5. Whilst the asset has been avoided by the surrounding forestry plantation, GUARD found no upstanding remains present during their walkover survey.
- 10.5.42 SLR116 records the location of a stone footbridge, identified from the 1859 OS map, c.0.28 km northeast of T13 and crossing the Hawford Burn.
- 10.5.43 There are 42 undated heritage assets located within 1 km of the Proposed Development. All recorded undated heritage assets are listed within **Technical Appendix 10.1** and are shown on **Figure 10.1**.
- 10.5.44 The majority of these assets are agricultural in nature, comprising records of pens, enclosures, farmsteads, field clearance cairns, sheepfolds, and fodder stores. An unroofed building (SLR9) is likely also agricultural in nature. The assets are indicative of the post-medieval farming practices within the landscape surrounding the Site; however, they may also represent earlier farming practices. The assets

¹² SLR99, SLR100, SLR101. SLR103.



certainly show that prior to the intensive mining, the main land use of the area was agricultural.

- 10.5.45 The industrial activity of the post-medieval and modern period is also reflected in the undated assets, comprising evidence of Ironstone mining (SLR63), possible mine shafts (SLR43, SLR44, SLR45), industrial spoil tips (SLR35), and an area of quarrying (SLR71).
- 10.5.46 There are two recorded undated bridges within 1km of the Site. SLR20 is a Category B Listed Building (**LB1113**), carrying the B741 over the River Doon c.0.68 km southwest of the access track. SLR92 records the location of a road along the access road to the Chalmerston Mines, c.0.5 km north of the access track.
- 10.5.47 A cairn (SLR78) is recorded c.0.34 km northwest of T3; however, the description of the asset notes a series of mostly turf mounds with some stone inclusions. Potentially, these are field banks associated with the nearby settlement of Auchingee (SLR15).
- 10.5.48 A curling pond (SLR46) is recorded along the northern bank of Bogton Loch, c.0.87km southeast of the access track. A potential 'fox park' (SLR9) is located c.0.8km west of the access track. The location of the Runnin Dog Inn (SLR24) is recorded c.0.35km east of the access track. A 'mound' (SLR52) is recorded c.0.13km west of the access track, with no further description as to its nature. An area of experimental plantation (SLR51) is recorded within the bounds of Bogton Loch Airfield (SM13693).
- 10.5.49 A potential stone setting (SLR72) is recorded c.0.78 km northwest of the access track and comprises a curvilinear mound with a central notch, with a set of stone alignments aligned with the notch.
- 10.5.50 SLR41 and SLR42 record the locations of either end of a diverted watercourse, c.1 km south of T18.

Historic Mapping, Historic Land Use Assessment, Aerial Photographs, and LiDAR

- 10.5.51 The area of the site is first visible on Gordon's Cuninghame Map (dated 1636-52). There are no recorded settlements or evidence of land use within the area of the Site, with it shown as a series of hills.
- 10.5.52 The site is first seen in detail on Thomson's 1828 map "Northern Part of Ayrshire. Southern Part. Bottom right section". The settlement of 'Auchengie' is recorded close to the site, likely corresponding with Auchingee Hill Farmstead (SLR15). A wooden bridge is also recorded within the vicinity of the site, but it is not clear whether this asset is within the site boundary.
- 10.5.53 Roy's 1747-1755 map shows several small settlements located within and directly adjacent to the Site. The farmsteads of Auchingee (SLR15), Knock Guldron (SLR29), Greenhill (SLR56), and Knock Retch (SLR61) are shown with associated areas of rig cultivation, demonstrating the agricultural use of the land during the mid-1700s.



- 10.5.54 Baillie's Map (1774) does not show the site in detail; however, it does show an area of bog within the general area of the site, which indicates a lack of cultivation.
- 10.5.55 The 1860 6 Inch OS Mapping shows both Knockgulderon (SLR29) and Greenhill (SLR56) farmsteads within the site. The settlement or farmstead of Knock Retch (SLR61) is named, but no associated structures are shown, and as such, it can be assumed that it was no longer extant at this time. The land around SLR26 appears to be improved land, but not necessarily enclosed, whereas SLR56 is shown to have an enclosed area to its north. The general use of the land within the site appears to be pastoral, with scattered sheep rees and hay stores and an absence of enclosed fields.
- 10.5.56 By 1897, the OS Map shows both Knockgulderon (SLR29) and Greenhill (SLR56) as having expanded and both now having larger areas of enclosed land associated with them. In addition, several land boundaries are recorded crossing the hills. Whilst the land still appears to have been used pastorally, likely as rough grazing, the land ownership appears to be more formalised.
- 10.5.57 The 1911 6-Inch OS Map shows little change in the landscape of the Site; however, the enclosure system associated with Knockgulderon (SLR29) appears more complex than those shown on earlier maps.
- 10.5.58 The 1948 OS Map again shows little change within the site, with the land use appearing to continue to be pastoral in nature. However, by 1957, there were more noticeable changes within the Site. Whilst the landscape appears to still be pastoral in nature, Greenhill farmstead (SLR56) is noted as being 'in ruins'. Knockgulderon (SLR29) has a singular roofed building, shown as being T-shaped, and the enclosure system surrounding it has been reduced.
- 10.5.59 Aerial photography from 1985, sourced from Google Earth, shows the site as being forested, seemingly commercial forestry based on the plantation pattern. Aerial photography from 2011 onwards shows the development of the surrounding landscape for mining, with areas of clearance of forestry. The online aerial imagery of NCAP was examined for evidence of archaeological sites, and publicly available LiDAR data for the site was analysed. No further archaeological sites were identified.
- 10.5.60 Historic Land Use Assessment (HLA) data does not show any historic land use recorded. The modern land use is recorded as a mixture of rough grazing and plantation, which is shown on the aforementioned historic mapping and aerial photography.

Prior Archaeological Investigations

- 10.5.61 In addition to the walkover survey carried out by GUARD Archaeology, a further eight archaeological investigations, ranging from excavations to desk-based assessments, have been carried out within the Site boundary. These investigations¹³ identified several features, all outlined in the baseline above, and

¹³ WoSAS References: 102, 728, 962, 3192, 4064, 4298, 4394, and 7477



no further sites of archaeological interest were identified within the Proposed Development.

Discussion of the Site

- 10.5.62 There is evidence of some degree of prehistoric activity in the vicinity of the site, both through the potential crannog (SLR83) and several funerary and ritualistic assets, in the form of cairns and barrows. Apart from SLR94, a record of a handaxe to the north of the Site, all prehistoric assets are recorded to the south of the turbine locations, in the vicinity of the access track. Whilst there is some potential for further prehistoric remains to be found within the Site, these would likely be concentrated within the area of the access track and the other prehistoric assets. However, this area of the site has been extensively mined and developed with mining infrastructure (e.g., site tracks), and as such, the ground has been disturbed. The survival of such remains is unlikely, and thus there is a very low potential for as-yet unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets within the site boundary.
- 10.5.63 There are two records of potential Roman roads within 1 km of the Proposed Development; however, there is uncertainty over whether either road is definitively Roman in date. The southernmost road (SLR53) crosses the access track, and there is the potential for associated find spots and unrecorded assets to surround the roads if they in fact date to the Roman period. As noted, the area surrounding the access track has been subject to heavy development, from opencast mining and associated infrastructure. Whilst there is some potential for surviving Roman assets, this potential is very low due to the degree of impact that the mining activity has had on the landscape.
- 10.5.64 Whilst there are no medieval heritage assets recorded within the Site, the medieval assets recorded within 1 km of the Site boundary demonstrate that the surrounding landscape would have primarily been used for agricultural purposes during this period. The preserved remains of multiple fermtouns provide an understanding of the land organisation, with small communities working collective plots of land for both agricultural and pastoral reasons. Whilst there is no evidence of medieval agricultural practices within the site itself, the land was likely used similarly to outwith the site. As such, there is some potential for medieval remains, most likely agricultural in nature, within the site boundary. However, as noted, the access track passes through a heavily mined area, and the northern area of the site, in the vicinity of the proposed turbines, is comprised of commercial forestry. The roots of commercial forestry, as well as its associated drainage systems, have a high potential for disruption of archaeological stratigraphy. As such, heritage assets with higher sensitivity to this type of disruption, such as earthworks, field boundaries, or the remains of buildings, are unlikely to have survived to a noticeable extent under these conditions. As such, the potential for unrecorded medieval heritage assets within the site is very low.
- 10.5.65 The post-medieval assets recorded within the study area largely comprise mining assets and agricultural assets. Agricultural assets are found throughout the study area and appear to be well recorded through historic mapping. However, the mining assets are mainly concentrated to the south of the Proposed Development, in the vicinity of the access track. No mining assets are recorded within the vicinity of the



proposed turbines. Due to the continued industrial exploitation of the landscape surrounding the access tracks, it is unlikely that further remains of an industrial mining or agricultural nature to be present in this area.

- 10.5.66 However, whilst the area surrounding the proposed turbines has been subject to commercial forestry plantation since the 1980s, there are areas of the forestry that have avoided post-medieval remains (e.g., SLR77). Whilst in the majority of the site it is unlikely that there would be substantial surviving post-medieval agricultural remains, especially those that would be particularly susceptible to damage by tree roots, such as cultivation remains, there is moderate potential for the survival of post-medieval remains in the form of wall footings, land boundaries or other structures which may have been avoided during plantation.
- 10.5.67 There is no evidence for modern activity within the site, with the majority of modern assets recorded within 1 km of the site comprising mining remains and those related to the First and Second World Wars. These remains are well recorded and, as such, are unlikely to extend into the site. There is therefore a negligible potential for modern heritage assets to be unrecorded within the site.

Future Baseline

- 10.5.68 If the Proposed Development were not to proceed, there would be no change to the baseline condition of the site, and it would continue to be used for commercial forestry.
- 10.5.69 As per the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO's) Guidance for Peatland Restoration and the Historic Environment in Scotland¹⁴, peat is classed as a cultural heritage resource due to its unique ability to preserve organic and inorganic archaeological remains. Formed after the ice-age, the peatlands provide a waterlogged and anaerobic environment, which leads to a much slower rate of decay for archaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains compared to other soil types¹⁵.
- 10.5.70** Where there is peat presence across the site, as detailed in **Chapter 8: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat**, there is a potential for environmental or organic deposits to survive. Climate change could affect naturally formed peat deposits, leading to the destruction of paleoenvironmental evidence. This might result in the loss of previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets.
- 10.5.71** Other impacts of climate change on buried remains might result from increased rainfall and fluctuating temperatures, with the sequence and frequency of natural soil saturation and desiccation changing the preservative conditions. This might result in damage or loss of organic artefacts. For upstanding remains, such change

¹⁴ Mann (2022).

¹⁵ Gearey, et al. (2010)



has the potential to result in increased water penetration, which may then cause/accelerate erosion/decay of historic fabric.

10.6 Assessment of Effects

Construction Effects

Embedded Measures

- 10.6.1 The layout of the Proposed Development is based on the extent of heritage assets outlined within the May 2025 EIA Report. The May 2025 EIA Report included embedded measures to avoid direct physical impacts on those assets. This Additional Information has identified that, in some cases, the extent of these assets goes beyond what was presented within the May 2025 EIA Report, and as such, the submitted design no longer avoids direct physical impacts on all known heritage assets within the Site boundary.

Direct Construction Impacts

- 10.6.2 Direct impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets as a result of construction activity are considered to be minimal at most and temporary in nature. The worst-case scenario for settings impacts, comprising the completed Proposed Development, is considered under Potential Operational Effects.
- 10.6.3 Direct (physical) impacts would comprise any groundworks or other ground disturbance undertaken as part of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Specific activities which have the potential to cause impacts through the construction phase of the Proposed Development include the excavation of wind turbine foundations, substation compounds, crane hardstandings, borrow pits, cable trenches, and any areas of cut and fill. This will also include the construction and maintenance of access tracks, laydown areas and working compounds.
- 10.6.4 Where ground disturbance takes place, these activities would remove, truncate or change any heritage assets located within the area of ground disturbance. Damage to heritage assets caused in this way would be permanent and irreversible.

Known Remains

- 10.6.5 Within the Site boundary, there are 14 recorded heritage assets. Of the assets recorded within the Site boundary, the following eight assets are offset from any area of proposed infrastructure and their 100 m micro-siting allowance, and as such would not be located in the vicinity of any ground-breaking works:
- SLR54 – Pen (Sheepfold);
 - SLR55 – Circular Enclosure;
 - SLR56 – Greenhill Farmstead;
 - SLR57 – Pen;
 - SLR76 – Enclosure;
 - SLR77 – Rig and Furrow;



- SLR116 – Stone Foot Bridge; and
 - SLR117 – Enclosure.
- 10.6.6 As the assets outlined above are sufficiently offset from any areas of infrastructure, and their 100 m micro-siting allowance, they would not be subject to any impact from the Proposed Development. Thus, there would be a nil significance of effect.
- 10.6.7 Furthermore, SLR61 comprises the location of Knockreoch Farmstead, which is located within an area that has been used for quarrying activities and has been removed in its entirety. As such, whilst the asset is recorded c.9 m south of the access track, as the remains have been removed, there would be no impact and as such a nil significance of effect.
- 10.6.8 SLR29, the location of Knockgulderon Farmstead, covers a large area which comprises the location of T5 and an area of access track between T5 and T6. Whilst upstanding remains of the farmstead were not identified during the walkover survey, there may still be remains of the farmstead and the surrounding enclosures within the heavily forested areas. The remains of SLR29 would be of local importance and are likely to be compromised by the forestry, and as such, are of low heritage significance. As the impacts on SLR29 would be limited to partial removal from the construction of T5 and any ground-breaking works associated with the access track, this would be considered to erode the asset's cultural significance to a minor extent and thus cause a low adverse magnitude of impact. This would result in a very minor significance of effect, which would be considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.
- 10.6.9 SLR53 comprises the location of a potential Roman road, which crosses the access track near its southern terminus. An existing track already cuts through the asset, and it lies in close proximity to extensive mining remains, which would indicate the level of preservation of the road has been compromised. Furthermore, it is uncertain as to whether the asset dates to the Roman period due to the lack of supporting evidence. Due to the above factors, the asset can be said to be between low cultural heritage significance, depending on the asset's preservation and the true dating of the asset. The impact on the asset would be limited to ground-breaking works associated with minor access track widening, if needed, and as such, there would be a very low adverse magnitude of impact on the asset. As such, the significance of effect would be considered to be negligible, which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.
- 10.6.10 SLR58 comprises the location of an undated enclosure, which was not located during the GUARD walkover survey. Whilst there appear to be no upstanding remains, there is some potential for the footings of the enclosure to survive below ground. As the asset is at best of local importance and would most likely be poorly preserved. Therefore it is considered to be of low cultural heritage significance. The asset is situated c.10m to the east of the access track and outwith any area of proposed works; however, the 100 m micro-siting allowance may mean that the infrastructure for T7 and T8 would impact the asset. In the event of the asset's full



removal, this would result in a high adverse magnitude of impact and thus a minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

- 10.6.11 SLR59 comprises the potential remains of an undated fodder store, located c.65 m southeast of T4. The asset was not located during the GUARD walkover survey. As the asset is at best of local importance and would most likely be poorly preserved. Therefore, it is considered to be of low cultural heritage significance. Whilst located outwith the area of proposed works, the asset is located within the 100 m microsite buffer of T4 and as such may be subject to direct physical impacts as a result of construction works. In the event of the asset's full removal, this would result in a high adverse magnitude of impact and thus a minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.
- 10.6.12 SLR115 comprises the site of an undated enclosure. Whilst there appear to be no upstanding remains, there is some potential for the footings of the enclosure to survive below ground. As the asset is, at best, of local importance and would most likely be poorly preserved due to its placement within an area of commercial forestry, it is of low cultural heritage significance. Whilst located outwith the area of proposed works, the asset is located within the 100 m microsite buffer of the track in the vicinity of T20, and as such may be subject to direct physical impacts as a result of construction works. In the event of the asset's full removal, this would result in a high adverse magnitude of impact and thus a minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

Unknown Remains

- 10.6.13 As outlined in **Section 10.5**, the potential for unrecorded remains within the Site is of very low to moderate across all time periods. The majority of the Site has been subject to development, either through mining activity, mining-related infrastructure, or commercial forestry. These intrusive activities have high potential to have truncated any unrecorded archaeological remains. However, there may be some preservation of assets; most likely post-medieval agricultural assets in the form of field boundaries or enclosures, within the commercial forestry surrounding the turbines. These assets are likely to be of local importance and of low preservation from activities relating to forestry, and as such are considered to be of low cultural heritage significance. There is the potential for their full removal as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development, which comprises a high adverse



magnitude of impact. This would result in a minor significance of effect, which is considered **Not Significant** in EIA Terms.

10.6.14 A summary of potential direct physical impacts from construction activities is presented in .

Table 10-7: Potential Direct Construction Impacts

Asset	Infrastructure	Cultural Heritage Significance	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Is the Effect Significant In EIA Terms?
SLR29 – Knockgulderson Farmstead	T5 and Access Track	Low	Low Adverse	Very Minor	No
SLR53 – Potential Roman Road	Access Track	Low to Medium	Very Low Adverse	Negligible	No
SLR58 – Enclosure	Access Track	Low	High Adverse	Minor	No
SLR59 – Fodder Store	T4	Low	High Adverse	Minor	No
SLR115 – Enclosure	Access Track	Low	High Adverse	Minor	No
Potential Unrecorded Remains	All Infrastructure	Low	High Adverse	Minor	No

Operational Effects

10.6.15 Impacts during the operation of the Proposed Development will relate to changes within the setting of cultural heritage assets. In order to identify assets with the potential for direct impacts upon their setting, an appraisal exercise was undertaken. The results of this exercise are provided within **Technical Appendix 10.2**.

10.6.16 The assets scoped in for further assessment within this chapter are listed in **Table 10-8**. All assets listed within **Table 10-8** were assessed in detail for potential operational effects on their setting.

Table 10-8: Assets Scoped in for Further Assessment

Designation Reference	Designation Title	Type of Asset
SM5393	Auchencloigh Castle	Scheduled Monument
GDL00111	Craigengillan	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
GDL00149	Dumfries House	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
LB96	The Temple, in Policies of Dumfries House	Category A Listed Building



Auchencloigh Castle (SM5393)

- 10.6.17 The asset comprises the remains of a medieval tower house or castle. The castle is mostly ruinous, with fragmentary remains comprising several sections of lime-bonded whinstone rubble walling. The asset appears to have been rectangular, 12 m by 10.5 m, with walls measuring approximately 1.4 m in thickness. The height of the castle is unknown, with the surviving walls up to 1.5 m in height. A later sheepfold was built into the southwestern side of the castle, likely indicating robbing of the original castle stone.
- 10.6.18 The asset derives its cultural significance in part from its intrinsic characteristics, namely its archaeological value. As there is limited available information about the owners and usage of the castle, archaeological investigation has the potential to further our understanding of the castle's date, its construction, and potentially its inhabitants. In addition, it has the potential to add to our understanding of medieval domestic architecture, social organisation and domestic occupation.
- 10.6.19 The asset also derives its cultural significance from its setting. The asset is located c.0.1 km west of Burnton Burn, which runs south to north. The castle was likely placed in proximity to the burn to provide a source of water for its inhabitants, as well as to provide water for any surrounding agricultural land. The surrounding landscape appears to be suitable for agricultural purposes, evidenced by the numerous farmsteads surrounding it, and the inhabitants of the castle would likely have utilised the land for their own agricultural requirements.
- 10.6.20 The asset sits at approximately 200 m AOD, with the ground sloping upwards to the south, reaching 330 m AOD at Green Hill, c.3 km to the south. The hills to the south of the castle allow for an element of natural defence, protecting the asset from the south and shielding the inhabitants from any approach from this direction.
- 10.6.21 The asset's position at the base of south-facing hills focuses views towards the north. Whilst at ground level the landscape is undulating and might restrict longer distance views, it can be anticipated that as a tower house, the height of any upper storeys would allow for views northwards. These views would be towards the larger watercourse of Burnock Water, c.1.5 km to the west, which runs south to north, as well as further north to Ochiltree and the meeting of Lugar Water and Burnock Water. The watercourses and their area of meeting at Ochiltree were likely of importance as a routeway through the landscape. By having visibility in this direction, the inhabitants of the asset would have been able to monitor this key route and observe those approaching, providing a defensive position and the ability to anticipate any visitors.
- 10.6.22 Whilst the asset may have monitored views to the north, the asset is not placed in a prominent position within the landscape, and as such, it is unlikely that it was intended to be placed as a show of the inhabitants dominance or control over the landscape, but instead, providing security to those within.
- 10.6.23 The approach towards the asset was likely from the north, potentially following the path of the Burnton Burn or the larger Burnock Water. Due to the placement of



Burnock Water to the assets east, the approach is unlikely to have been from further east due to the watercourse acting as a barrier in the landscape.

- 10.6.24 The asset's current setting is altered compared to the original setting, due to opencast mining directly to the west of the asset. Whilst mining operations have concluded, the mine has filled with water, creating a pit lake which occupies a significant portion of the landscape. A small band of trees, which are shown on the 1st edition 1859 OS map, are positioned immediately to the south of the castle and restrict views in this direction. However, whilst historic, they have not been considered as screening for this assessment as they have the potential to be removed. The castle appears to be situated within an area of overgrown vegetation. The landscape to the east and north of the asset comprises agricultural fields, with an overhead line located c.0.2 km north of the asset running northwest to southeast.
- 10.6.25 **Figure 10.4 (CH VP1)** demonstrating that up to 17 turbine tips and up to five hubs would be visible in views to the south from the asset. The closest turbine would be T2, located c.2.9 km to the southwest.
- 10.6.26 The Proposed Development would not be present in views to the north, due to its placement behind the observer. The Proposed Development would not cause a distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset's north north-facing placement, its views along the Burnton Burn, its views along the larger Burnock Water and any intended north-facing long-distance views. The placement of the asset, intended to monitor any approaches from this direction, would remain unimpacted.
- 10.6.27 As noted, south-facing views from the asset would be impacted in the event of the historic woodland being removed. Whilst the asset does not have extensive long-distance views in this direction, the placement of the asset at the foot of these hills allows for a form of natural defence. The presence of the turbines in these south-facing views may cause a very minor distraction to the ability to appreciate and experience this defensive position, but the hills themselves would be unobscured, and the asset's placement at their base could still be understood.
- 10.6.28 The proposed turbine tips would also be visible in part along the approach from the north, again in a bare earth scenario. The turbines, whilst present, would be visible close to the horizon atop the hills to the south and would be a very minor visual intrusion at most. The remains of the asset are ruinous to a degree that they are not prominent within the landscape, and as such, any introduction of turbines into this view would not challenge the asset for visual dominance within its setting.
- 10.6.29 The mining remains, directly to the west of the asset, are a larger modern addition to the landscape. The eye is likely to be drawn towards these mining remains, impacting the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the approach towards the asset. In comparison, the proposed turbines would cause a very minor visual intrusion within views and would not further impact the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset's approach.
- 10.6.30 As such, the addition of the proposed turbines in north-facing views would present a very minor distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience two



aspects of the asset's setting, its defensive placement at the southern extent of the hill range and the asset's approach from the north. All other aspects of the asset's setting would remain unimpacted.

- 10.6.31 With this in mind, as a monument of high significance, the magnitude of impact as a result of the Proposed Development would be very low adverse. This would result in a very minor significance of effect, which is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

Craigengillan (GDL00111)

- 10.6.32 Craigengillan Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape comprises a complete and unfragmented estate landscape. The estate was established in 1580 as the home of the McAdam family and remained within the family until 1999. The Designed Landscape dates from the late 18th and early 19th century, with some significant elements added in the early 20th century. The estate stretches northwards from the tip of Loch Doon to the southern extent of the village of Dalmellington, containing the River Doon within its eastern extent and expansive agricultural and pastoral land within its western extent.
- 10.6.33 Craigengillan House (**LB18792**) is a Category A Listed building, of which the core was constructed in 1765 and later enlarged in the early 19th century, comprising the addition of crowstepped gables, a glazed arcaded porch and a battlemented tower. The house is located within the southern extent of an estate, c.0.3 km west of the River Doon and enclosed within an area of historic woodland. Until 1770, the driveway through the estate followed the eastern bank of the River Doon. The late 18th-century approach towards the house is from Dalmellington to the north, roughly following the River Doon. The driveway is 3 km in length and is characterised by open views along the northern half, overlooking Bogton Loch and farmland; the southern half is increasingly enclosed by deliberately planted woodland. This affords an increasing sense of seclusion and privacy as the viewer gets closer to Craigengillan House.
- 10.6.34 The driveway starts at a Category B Listed Lodge (LB1086), crossing Muck Water via a Category B Listed bridge (LB1087). The driveway crosses the river again using the Linn Liver Bridge (LB1088). The driveway opens up to the east of the Craigengillan House, and it is only at this point that it provides views of the house, which has been obscured for the majority of the approach.
- 10.6.35 There are two further listed bridges within the estate, both Category C; LB1089, which crosses the River Doon, and LB49506, which crosses the Dalcarnie Burn in the western extent of the estate. The Category A listed stables (LB18794) are located directly to the south of the main house, and were constructed in the late 18th century. Other non-designated historic architectural elements within the estate include the ice house, farmsteads, cottages and non-designated bridges. There are also the remains of a summerhouse and a historic observatory. The structures within the estate form a landscape that was used for both work and pleasure, with



the estate being used as much as a working estate, utilising the surrounding farmland, as well as a place of leisure for the McAdam family.

- 10.6.36 The designed landscape has two principal areas of parkland, both to the northeast of the house. House Park and Dalferson Park make up significant views from the northeast of the house, providing a rural, but ornamental, landscape in views towards the River Doon. The parkland also provides a point of appreciation for the northeast façade of the house, particularly from a point named Corson's Knowe, which provides an elevated vantage point from which both the house and the river can be viewed. There are other areas of parkland scattered throughout the estate, particularly parkland surrounding Dalcairnie Burn.
- 10.6.37 The estate contains an area of formal gardens in the immediate vicinity of the house, comprising a principal formal garden to the southwest of the house, bounded by a Japanese water garden to the southwest. To the north and east of the house are more formal gardens and a walled kitchen garden. These formal gardens are enclosed by trees, preventing outward views and affording privacy and seclusion to the inhabitants.
- 10.6.38 The designed landscape has scattered areas of woodland, in addition to those surrounding the house and driveway. These woodland areas are crisscrossed by walking paths and provide scenic walkways through the estate. In recent times, there has been an extended effort to plant mixed woodland throughout the estate, including on Auchenroy Hill in the estate's northwest. These natural-looking areas of plantation create a mixture of hill pasture and woodland, connecting the estate and its core, containing Craigengillan House and the formal gardens, to the wider surrounding landscape.
- 10.6.39 The estate contains multiple water features, both designed and natural, which contribute to the GDL's cultural significance. Bogton Loch, located along the northern extent of the estate, is especially prominent and provides a focal point along the driveway. The River Doon is a key feature of the estate, creating a linear focus along the eastern edge. The estate features three curling ponds, some smaller lochs and the Dalcairnie Linn Waterfall. The most significant water feature within the estate is arguably the Ness Glen, a deep but narrow gorge which carries the River Doon from Loch Doon to Dalferson Park. The Ladies' Walk is a key route through the estate, following the gorge along its north-south axis.
- 10.6.40 The estate's parklands, woodlands, and hill pastures contain several walks and paths which contribute to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the estate's character. A significant route begins at the house, traverses westwards across the parkland, and leads towards Dalcairnie Burn, offering access to the picturesque waterfall and surrounding scenery. As the path rises along the elevated landscape, it reveals sweeping north-facing views over Bogton Loch, the Doon Valley, the village of Dalmellington, and the distant hills beyond.
- 10.6.41 This designed walk provides an intentional transition from the formal area of the estate and gives an illusion of a wild agricultural landscape. The route keeps to the upper ridges in order to provide extensive views across the wider landscape, particularly focused northwards. Views across this aspect of the estate allow the



- viewer to understand, experience, and appreciate the estate's unfragmented appearance, the way the estate blends into the surrounding landscape, and the estate's well-preserved rural character.
- 10.6.42 Views to the south of the estate and the house are also of significance to the estate's character. Craighead Wood sits at the base of Craighead Ridge, with the ridge providing a 'dramatic backcloth' to Craigengillan House and the estate in general when looking southwards. Again, this vista provides a rural setting for the estate and allows the estate to seamlessly blend with the surrounding landscape.
- 10.6.43 The ZTV (**Figure 10.2**) indicates varied visibility of the Proposed Development from within the GDL. The closest turbine would be T18, located c.4.5 km north of the GDL boundary.
- 10.6.44 There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from the house itself, the parkland to the east or the formal gardens surrounding this aspect of the landscape. The sense of seclusion and privacy in the immediate vicinity of the house would remain, and the key architectural attributes would be able to be appreciated. Furthermore, the Proposed Development would not be visible from within the important Ness Gorge, nor along the key Ladies' Walk.
- 10.6.45 Due to the approach along the drive towards the house being south-facing, the proposed turbines would be located behind the viewer. As such, this aspect of the estate and the ability to appreciate and experience the transition between open rural views at the north of the drive to more enclosed woodland at the southern extent would be retained. It is anticipated that there would be limited views of the proposed turbines in a bare earth scenario when leaving the estate northwards; however, the intentional tree planting along this route would screen outward views for the most part. The Proposed Development would only be visible at the very northernmost end, where the focus of views is drawn to Bogton Loch. The turbines would be placed outwith these key views and, whilst visible, would not form a distraction that would demonstrably change the way the viewer would understand, appreciate and experience this key aspect of the estate.
- 10.6.46 There would be visibility of the Proposed Development from the functional parkland within the western area of the estate; however, outward views from this aspect of the estate are not intentional and do not contribute to the asset's cultural significance.
- 10.6.47 The south-facing views of the asset and Craigengillan House, with the dramatic views of Craighead Hill acting as a backdrop, would not be impacted, as the Proposed Development would be behind the viewer.
- 10.6.48 The only aspect of the asset's setting that would be impacted is the intentional views from the designed pathways through the estate, which focus northwards on the Doon Valley and the distant hills. Both the valley and the ridgeline are a focus of these key views, extending the influence of the estate to the wider landscape and highlighting the rural character. **Figure 10.5 (CHVP 2)** demonstrates a northward view from a point along these pathways. It shows that 14 turbine tips, along with up



to four turbine hubs, would be visible along the ridgeline that forms the edge of the vista.

- 10.6.49 The turbines would act as a visual extension of the North Kyle Wind Farm, extending the North Kyle Scheme westwards and covering more of the ridge. The proposed turbines would draw the eye away from the valley floor towards the ridgeline, and whilst these views are still able to be understood, appreciated and experienced, this ability is diminished by the distraction of the turbines. The turbines would be clearly apparent in views to the north, but given their distance and the placement of the turbines behind the ridgeline, the development as a whole does not appear as a dominating presence upon the horizon. As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development would erode the cultural significance of this singular aspect of the asset's setting to a minor extent.
- 10.6.50 The asset, an Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape, is of high cultural significance. The impact on the singular aspect of the asset's setting outlined above, the views northwards over the valley and ridgeline, would be eroded to a minor extent by the introduction of the turbines. This would result in a low adverse magnitude of impact on the asset's setting, which would result in a minor significance of effect. This is considered to be **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

Dumfries House (GDL00149)

- 10.6.51 Dumfries House Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape comprises the estate surrounding the Category A Listed Dumfries House (LB14413). Historically, the estate belonged to the Craufords of Loudon, with the estate named Lochnorris, by 1440. The estate was purchased by the 2nd Earl of Dumfries in 1635, and the 4th Earl of Dumfries (William Dalrymple) commissioned John, Robert and James Adam to design and build Dumfries House in 1754-1759. The title and lands passed into the hands of the Stuart family in 1814, when the 7th Earl of Dumfries gained the Bute estate and titles. The estate was owned by the Bute family until 2007, when it was purchased by a consortium headed by the then Prince of Wales (now King Charles III). Since 2007, the estate has undergone a period of renovation and enhancement and is now run as a tourist attraction and contains multiple social initiatives.
- 10.6.52 The estate comprises a number of architectural features, which contribute to its significance. Dumfries House itself, designed and constructed by the famed Adams family, acts as the core of the estate. The Avenue Bridge (Category A Listed LB14414) was also designed by John Adam in 1760 and formed part of the main approach towards the house from the north, crossing Lugar Water. A building known as The Temple (Category A Listed LB96) is located c.1 km north of Dumfries House, and was intended to form the gatehouse along the main approach north of the mansion.
- 10.6.53 Architectural features that predate the current Dumfries House provide an understanding of the history of the estate and its prior owners. The estate contains a Doocot (Category A Listed LB14416), which was constructed in 1671. The remains of Terringzean Castle (Category B Listed LB14423) are located within the western extent of the GDL, and was in use during the 1600s. Other architectural



features within the estate that contribute to its cultural significance include the West Gate (LB14421), Stockiehill Lodges (LB14422), a lectern-style sundial (LB14415), Lady's Bridge (LB14417), the coach house (LB14420), and the non-designated Dumfries House Mains.

- 10.6.54 Parkland is situated on either side of Lugar Water, acting as grazing land with interspaced woodland. The woodland within the estate comprises areas of ornamental plantation, such as the roundels (pre-dating Dumfries House itself) located to the south of the A70, woodland avenues, and denser areas of forestry. Shaw Wood, located to the direct west of the house, historically contained a tree-lined avenue and a Bowling Green; however, this has since been planted over and now contains woodland pathways. A modern tree-lined avenue extends south-eastwards from the house, crossing the A70 and creating a vista that draws the eye along the length of the estate. Another modern tree-lined avenue, named the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue, was constructed during the 2010s, extending southwest from The Temple and acting as an extension of the Avenue leading southeast from the B7036.
- 10.6.55 Formal gardens are located to the south of the house, with further gardens to the west. An area of ornamental gardens is located on the north bank of Lugar Water, between the Avenue Bridge and the Queen Elizabeth Walled Garden. The walled garden was renovated and reopened in 2014.
- 10.6.56 The estate is situated in the valley of the Lugar Water, a river which runs through the north of the estate, c.0.4 km north of Dumfries House. The valley comprises gently sloping hills to the north and south, allowing for views across the estate from either side of the valley. Views from the house itself extend south-eastwards, along the path of the modern tree-lined vista towards the historic roundels, and northwards towards Lugar Water across the parkland.
- 10.6.57 When outside of the GDL, or travelling along the A70, which runs through the estate's centre, inward views are limited due to strategic planting of hedgerows and the placement of routeways through lower points in the landscape. As such, the estate maintains a secluded feel when approaching, despite wide-ranging views when inside.
- 10.6.58 Views of the house itself are mainly from the gardens to its south and from the parkland to its north. The historical approach towards the house, from Auchinleck to the northeast, runs through the parkland at the north, but due to the woodland banding, views of the house are limited until passing over the Avenue Bridge (LB14414) and nearing the house itself. As such, the key approaches through the landscape retain a rural, secluded character until the immediate vicinity of the house, where the grandeur of the estate and its architectural features and formal gardens are revealed. The modern approach towards the house is from the south, and whilst the approach is shorter, views into the core of the estate are limited and maintain a similar rural approach. This rural quality to the estate is also



characterised through the historic walking routes and pathways, particularly within the historic woodland to the east of the house.

- 10.6.59 Whilst the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue, leading southwest from The Temple, is a modern addition to the estate, The Temple was originally intended to be the northern terminus of the approach through the estate. As such, views from the temple towards Dumfries House were likely of intended importance. These views, if originally present, have not been retained, with the working buildings of the Pierburg Education Farm and woodland banding obstructing views.
- 10.6.60 The ZTV (**Figure 10.2**) indicates varied visibility of the Proposed Development throughout the estate. The closest turbine would be T2, c.7.2 km southwest of the boundary of the GDL.
- 10.6.61 The bare earth ZTV indicates that there would be no visibility from Dumfries House itself, and extremely limited visibility from within the core of the estate. There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from Shaw Wood to the west, and extremely limited visibility from the parkland to the north and south of the house. When approaching the house across the Avenue Bridge to the northwest, there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development until within the western formal gardens. Even when located within these gardens, visibility would be limited to up to two turbine tips, screened behind the historic and intentional plantation.
- 10.6.62 There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development when approaching along the modern access from the A70, as the turbines would be behind the viewer. There may be some visibility of turbine tips to the southern end of this drive whilst exiting the estate, however, due to the distance and the placement of the turbines outhwith the key field of view, these minor views of turbine tips would not be anticipated to distract from the ability to understand, appreciate and experience this approach through the estate.
- 10.6.63 There are areas of parkland and grazing land which would be anticipated to have higher visibility of the proposed turbines, namely the land to the north and west of the estate, as well as to the east of Shaw Wood. These aspects of the landscape are pastoral in nature, contributing to the rural nature of the outlying areas of the estate. They do not have intended long-distance or outward views, as their placement was practical. The introduction of turbines in distant views would not impact the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the rural nature of the estate.
- 10.6.64 The ZTV indicates that there may be up to 20 turbines visible from the walled garden; however, as walled gardens are not intended to have outward views, the Proposed Development would not impact the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the walled garden. There is anticipated to be some visibility in views from the ornamental gardens; however, historic woodland banding acts as screening along the banks of Lugar Water and whilst the hills to the south form a



larger part of the rural landscape, they do not contribute to the significance of the ornamental gardens.

- 10.6.65 There may be minor views of the proposed turbines from the treelined avenue, leading southeast from the house. However, as the Proposed Development is located to the southwest, these views would be peripheral at most. They would not be expected to cause a distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the views from the house along the avenue, or towards the historic roundels that are placed at the end.
- 10.6.66 The only aspect of the estate in which outward views contribute to their significance that would be impacted would be in views from the Temple, southwest along the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue. **Figure 10.6** (CH VP3) demonstrates the view southwest from the Temple and indicates that all 20 turbines would be visible in a bare earth scenario. When approaching The Temple from the northeast, the turbines would be screened by the structure itself and would not form a distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate, or experience the intended historic entrance to the estate.
- 10.6.67 Figure 10.7 demonstrates the historic south-facing view between The Temple and Dumfries House. As The Temple was intended as a gatehouse, it acted as a functional entrance to the estate, as well as an aesthetic addition. The Temple is facing south and would have faced Dumfries House. The house would have sat on the horizon and been a key feature of this view. Whilst various farm buildings now obscure views between the two listed buildings, the figure demonstrates that the Proposed Development would be peripheral at most in these views. Whilst largely impacted by the present farm buildings, any remaining ability to understand, appreciate and experience this historic approach would be retained.
- 10.6.68 When standing to the southwest of the Temple and moving along the avenue to the southwest, the turbines would be present in views directly aligned with the avenue. The turbines would be at a distance and sitting atop the crest of the hills that form the horizon of the landscape to the southwest. The turbines of North Kyle Wind Farm, which at the time of writing is under construction, would be present to the east of the Proposed Development, with the Proposed Development appearing to extend the spread of turbines westwards. The addition of the Proposed Development would change views along the avenue, introducing further modern aspects to the rural landscape at the end of the avenue. These turbines would cause a minor distraction at most to the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the designed views along the avenue as they would draw the eye away from the avenue and interrupt views of the hills at the southwestern-most end.
- 10.6.69 As outlined above, whilst there are anticipated to be varying levels of views of the proposed turbines from throughout the estate, there is only a singular aspect of the estate that would be potentially impacted by the Proposed Development: views southwest along the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue from The Temple (LB96). The



core of the estate, the key approaches, and significant views to and from the house, would be unimpacted.

- 10.6.70 The Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape is considered to be of high cultural heritage significance. As such, considering the impacts laid out above, the introduction of the Proposed Development would result in a very low adverse magnitude of impact upon the asset, which results in a very minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

The Temple, In Policies of Dumfries House (LB96)

- 10.6.71 The Temple comprises the intended gatehouse for the Dumfries House estate (GDL00149) and was intended to act as the northern terminus for the main driveway to the house (Category A Listed LB96). The gatehouse was constructed in approximately 1760, likely to specifications designed by John Adam, and originally comprised a central arched entrance, flanking walls, rooms to the east and west, and extending boundary walls. Further work on the gatehouse demonstrates the evolving use of the asset, with the construction of two dwellings in 1820 and the roofing of the yards, and further work during military occupation in the 1940s. The 1960s saw the central archway dismantled due to structural concerns, before a restoration process in the 2010s. The asset holds high architectural interest due to its design. Whilst the asset had fallen into disrepair, the restoration work has ensured that the asset retained its design and authenticity. The asset is an outstanding example of Gothic architecture, with a connection to the famed architect John Adam. The asset also holds historic interest through its association with John Adam and the historic landowners (the Earls of Dumfries).
- 10.6.72 The asset also holds architectural interest through its setting, placed within the estate of Dumfries House. The gatehouse is orientated facing southwards, looking along an intended south-facing axis towards Dumfries House. Originally, the asset was intended to form the northern terminus of the driveway towards the house, with the approach starting at Auchinleck, to the northeast, reaching the proposed gatehouse and then running southwards towards the Avenue Bridge (LB14414) to form the final approach towards Dumfries House. The land through which the driveway was meant to run was owned by Lord Auchinleck, but due to a disagreement over the location of the road, it was never built. Instead, the driveway was constructed leading westwards from the south of Auchinleck, missing the Temple entirely.
- 10.6.73 The approach towards The Temple from the northeast appears to be the intended route towards the asset and acts as the key point of appreciation for its architecture during the intended south-westwards approach. In addition, the approach along the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue, heading northwest to exit the estate, also serves as a point of appreciation.
- 10.6.74 The gatehouse also has a practical purpose, forming both a functional and aesthetic entrance to the estate. Those inhabiting the gatehouse would have been well placed to monitor those coming and going from the estate, controlling access. Whilst the intended approach was never constructed, the installation of the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue and the renovation of the avenue to the northeast allow for an



understanding and the ability to appreciate and experience this intended functional approach.

- 10.6.75 The south-facing view from The Temple, towards Dumfries House itself, was the intended view from the gate and would have framed the house. This intended view cannot be appreciated or experienced due to the placement of farm buildings directly south of the asset and the historic tree banding along the Lugar Water. The connection may be able to be understood, due to the orientation of the structure, but the ability to understand this connection is again limited due to screening from the farm buildings.
- 10.6.76 Whilst the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue is a modern addition to the Dumfries House estate, having been constructed post-2007, the tree-lined walkway leading southwest from The Temple does provide an important view across the estate and towards the rural landscape to its south. Whilst not historic, it provides an approximation of the intended historic approach and as such allows for an understanding, appreciation and experience of the gatehouse and its historic setting.
- 10.6.77 The ZTV (**Figure 10.2**) demonstrates that up to 20 turbine tips would be visible from the asset and the avenues from both its northeast and southwest. The closest turbine would be T2, located c.9.4 km southwest of the asset. CHVP 3 (**Figure 10.6**) demonstrates the view from the asset towards the Proposed Development, along the length of the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue. The Proposed Development would be present along the crest of the hills at the southern extent of the views. As shown in **Figure 10.6** (CHVP 3), the turbines of North Kyle Wind Farm (which are currently under construction) would also be present in the west, with the turbines of the Proposed Development acting as a western visual extension of the North Kyle scheme.
- 10.6.78 Views of the asset from the southwest, approaching along the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue, would be unimpacted as the Proposed Development is located behind the viewer.
- 10.6.79 As previously noted, the historic south-facing approach towards Dumfries House is no longer able to be appreciated and experienced due to the placement of farm buildings within the key view. **Figure 10.7** (CH VP4) demonstrates this important southwards view, in a bare earth scenario, and shows that the proposed turbines would be peripheral at most. They would not be expected to form a distraction to the ability to understand the orientation of the historic gatehouse, and as such, the limited ability to understand its placement would be retained.
- 10.6.80 Views from the northeast of the asset, along the approach, are anticipated to have visibility of up to 20 turbine tips. The turbines would be visible on the hills behind the asset, and may act as a slight distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset's architectural value from this key point of appreciation. However, the turbines would be offset and placed on an aspect of the landscape that is visually separated from the avenue and The Temple by the intervening



grazing land. The presence of the turbines would act as a minor distraction at most to understand, appreciate and experience this aspect of the asset's setting.

- 10.6.81 The proposed turbines would be most noticeable in external southwest-facing views, along the modern Duchess of Rothesay Avenue. As noted, whilst the avenue is a modern addition to the landscape, it provides an approximation of a historic approach through the Dumfries House estate. It allows the visitor to experience the intended placement of the gatehouse. The proposed turbines would be placed on the hills at the end of this vista, and the eye would likely be drawn to them. Along with the under-construction North Kyle Wind Farm, the Proposed Development would add a modern element to this rural landscape and potentially draw the eye away from the approach through the estate. This would impact the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the southwest-facing view from the asset to a minor extent.
- 10.6.82 The Temple (LB96) is a Category A Listed building and as such is an asset of high cultural significance. As outlined above, two aspects of the asset's setting will be impacted to a minor degree: the views of the asset from the northeast and the views southwest outwards from the asset. As such, the magnitude of impact as a result of the Proposed Development is low adverse and would result in a minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

Summary of Operational Effects

- 10.6.83 A summary of the anticipated operational effects on Cultural Heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development are outlined in **Table 10-9**.

Table 10-9: Summary of Operational Effects

Cultural Heritage Asset	Cultural Heritage Significance	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Significant in EIA Terms?
Auchencloigh Castle (SM5393)	High	Very Low Adverse	Very Minor	No
Craigengillan (GDL000111)	High	Low Adverse	Minor	No
Dumfries House (GDL00149)	High	Very Low Adverse	Very Minor	No
The Temple, in Policies of Dumfries House (LB96)	High	Low Adverse	Minor	No



Decommissioning Effects

Embedded Measures

- 10.6.84 It is assumed that the decommissioning of the Proposed Development would return the landscape to its current state after the operational period of the Proposed Development.

Potential Effects

- 10.6.85 There would be no direct physical effects on any assets on the assumption that there would be no new ground works taking place during decommissioning, above that already disturbed during construction. There would be no negative effects upon the setting or significance of any assets within 10 km, as the landscape would be returned to its original state

Cumulative Effects

- 10.6.86 There are no anticipated cumulative effects resulting from construction impacts from the Proposed Development. As such, the following assessment is based on the potential for cumulative effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets arising from the operational stage of the Proposed Development.
- 10.6.87 Cumulative effects have been considered with regard to any wind farm developments that are:
- Consented (but not constructed) or the subject of valid applications, but currently undetermined planning or Section 36 applications;
 - Within 15 km of any nationally important assets anticipated to be subject to a Minor adverse effect (or above) as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 10.6.88 The list of wind farm developments considered for the cumulative assessment is laid out in **Table 10-10**. This list is accurate at the time of writing (November 2025).

Table 10-10: Developments Considered for Cumulative Assessment on Cultural Heritage Assets

Wind Farm Development	Status	Number of Turbines
Back Fell	In Planning	10
Craiginmoddie	Consented	14
Enoch Hill 2	Consented	2
Greenburn Wind Park S36C	In Planning	14
Knockcronal	Consented	9
Knockkippen	Consented	12
Knockshinnoch Farm	Consented	2
Lethans	Consented	2
Overhill	Consented	10
Pencloe Extension	In Planning	5



Wind Farm Development	Status	Number of Turbines
Quantans Hill	In Planning	11
Scienteuch (East Ayrshire)	In Planning	9
South Kyle II	In Planning	11
The Drum	In Planning ¹⁶	8
Windy Standard 1 - Repower	Consented	8

Craigengillan (GDL000111)

- 10.6.89 The asset, its setting, and the potential impact as a result of the Proposed Development are outlined in **Section 10.6**.
- 10.6.90 There are 14 developments in planning or consented but not under construction within 15 km of Craigengillan Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape. Of these developments, all bar one would be located outwith any key views from within the Proposed Development or would not be visible from within the Proposed Development. Knockkippen Wind Farm would introduce 12 turbines to the northwest of the asset, with the closest turbine being placed 3.2 km to the northwest.
- 10.6.91 The Knockkippen Wind Farm would feature in the intentional north-facing views from the designed pathways that cross the estate. Both the Doon Valley and the distant hills and ridgeline are a focus of these key views, extending the influence of the estate to the wider landscape and highlighting the estate's rural character. Knockkippen Wind Farm would introduce a modern element to these northwestern views and would be considered to draw the eye away from the important views over Doon Valley and the distant ridgeline. However, they are distant from the viewer and would be considered peripheral in views northwards.
- 10.6.92 As noted in **Section 10.6**, the Proposed Development would only impact a singular aspect of the asset's setting, comprising the key views over Doon Valley and the distant ridgeline. The Proposed Development would act as a visual extension of the already under construction North Kyle Wind Farm, which is considered as baseline. The proposed turbines would draw the eye away from the valley floor towards the ridgeline, and whilst these views are still able to be understood, appreciated and experienced, this ability is diminished by the combined distraction of baseline turbines of North Kyle Wind Farm and the Proposed Development. However, in isolation, the Proposed Development would not be a dominant presence in these views, as the majority of the turbines are placed behind the ridgeline.
- 10.6.93 When viewed cumulatively with Knockkippen Wind Farm, the Proposed Development would form the central portion of an expanse of turbines which stretches across these north-facing views, from the northeast to the northwest. Collectively, the developments would result in this panorama being dominated by turbines, and the Proposed Development would form the central part. As such, the

¹⁶ Refused as of October 2025 but included due to potential to go to appeal and status during the production of the original EIA report.



distraction to the viewer when attempting to understand, appreciate and experience these northwards views can be anticipated to be increased to a minor degree.

- 10.6.94 This would increase the magnitude of impact on this single aspect of setting, which contributes to the cultural significance of the GDL as a whole. Cumulatively, it is considered that this would be increased to be a discernible distraction from this aspect of the asset's setting. However, when considering all other key views, approaches, and points of appreciation (outlined in **Section 10.6**), the GDL as a whole will not experience a change from this development to the point that it would increase the overall Significance of Effect beyond what is assessed in **Section 10.6**.
- 10.6.95 The magnitude of impact as a result of the cumulative impact of the developments outlined in **Table 10-10** and the Proposed Development would be Low adverse, which would result in a Minor significance of effect. This is considered **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

The Temple, in Policies of Dumfries House (LB96)

- 10.6.96 The asset, its setting, and the potential impact as a result of the Proposed Development are outlined in **Section 10.6**.
- 10.6.97 Eight Proposed Developments fall within the criteria to be included within the cumulative assessment for LB96; Greenburn Wind Farm, Knockkippen Wind Farm, Knockshinnoch Farm, Lethans Wind Farm, Overhill Wind Farm, Pencloe Extension, South Kyle II, and The Drum. The Drum and Lethans Wind Farm are placed to the east-southeast of the asset, outwith any key views identified in **Section 10.6**. The other six developments are located to the south and southwest of the asset, all situated along the same stretch of hills that form the distant horizon in south-facing views. These developments are located in views along the Duchess of Rothesay Avenue from The Temple, and would be present in views towards the temple when approaching from the avenue to the northeast.
- 10.6.98 The developments to the south (Overhill, Greenburn, South Kyle II, and Pencloe Extension) would, where visible, blend with the already under construction North Kyle Wind Farm, forming the impression of one coalescent scheme. They are not anticipated to create any further distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate, or experience the key views or approaches outlined in **Section 10.6**. The turbines from the developments to the southwest would be distant enough to be imperceivable against the horizon and again would not be anticipated to impact the cultural significance of the asset.
- 10.6.99 As such, when viewed cumulatively with the developments outline above, the Category A Listed Building will not experience change from the Proposed Development to the point that it would increase the overall Significance of Effect beyond what is assessed in **Section 10.6**.
- 10.6.100 The magnitude of impact would be Low adverse, which would result in a Minor significance of effect. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.



10.7 Mitigation

Construction

- 10.7.1 Where direct impacts on heritage assets have not been able to be avoided by design, mitigation is suggested. These suggestions are in line with NPF4 Policy 7 and Policy HE3 of the East Ayrshire Local Development Plan 2. With reference to the identified construction impacts highlighted in **Table 10-7**, **Table 10-11** outlines the proposed mitigation for the assets that have potential for direct impacts as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. All proposed mitigation and project designs would be subject to approval by West of Scotland Archaeology Service on behalf of East Ayrshire Council.

Table 10-11: Proposed Mitigation for Potential Construction Impacts

Asset	Infrastructure	Proposed Mitigation
SLR29 – Knockgulderon Farmstead	T5 and Access Track	Archaeological monitoring and recording ¹⁷ on any groundbreaking works associated with T5 and its hardstanding. Archaeological monitoring and recording on any track widening works to the south of T5, which coincide with the location of SLR29.
SLR53 – Potential Roman Road	Access Track – potential track widening	Archaeological monitoring and recording for any area of track widening that may coincide with the location of SLR53.
SLR58 – Enclosure	Access Track	Archaeological monitoring and recording – in the event of infrastructure re-routing due to micro-siting
SLR59 – Fodder Store	T4	Archaeological monitoring and recording – in the event of T4 moving due to micro-siting
SLR115 - Enclosure	Access Track	Archaeological monitoring and recording – in the event of infrastructure re-routing due to micro-siting
Potential Unrecorded Remains	All Infrastructure	Site procedure toolbox talk/programme of awareness.

Operation

- 10.7.2 Embedded mitigation measures are outlined in **Revised Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives**. There are no embedded measures in relation to reducing setting impacts on Cultural Heritage assets. Attempts at screening to

¹⁷ Previously referred to as a watching brief, updated as per CifA Standards and Guidance update (2023)



mitigate impacts on changes within the setting of heritage assets can often be more detrimental than the Proposed Development itself

10.8 Residual Effects

Construction

- 10.8.1 A summary of the residual effects of the Proposed Development, following implementation of the mitigation measures detailed above (**Table 10-11**), is presented in **Table 10-12** below.
- 10.8.2 Adverse direct physical impacts on archaeological remains would be offset to some degree by the positive effect that archaeological recording would have in respect to our understanding of the archaeological record, which will be of wider benefit to the archaeological and local community. Whilst the proposed mitigation would be a benefit of the Proposed Development, it would not offset the impact caused by the removal of assets due to proposed construction works. As such, after the implementation of the proposed mitigation, the residual effect upon the impacted assets would remain the same.
- 10.8.3 As noted previously, all mitigation and associated project design would be agreed with WoSAS on behalf of East Ayrshire Council.

Operation

- 10.8.4 As there is no mitigation proposed with regards to operational effects on cultural heritage assets, the residual effect upon the impacted assets will remain the same as outlined in **Table 10-9**.

Decommissioning

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

10.9 Summary of Predicted Effects and Statement of Significance

- 10.9.1 This assessment has considered data from a diverse range of sources in order to determine the presence of heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development. The potential direct (physical), indirect, settings, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Development on the identified assets, mitigation measures for protecting known assets during construction or recording of currently unknown features which could be lost due to groundworks during construction, and the residual effects of the Proposed Development have also been assessed.
- 10.9.2 Of the assets with the potential to be directly impacted by the construction of the Proposed Development (**Table 10-7**), a single set of assets is noted to have a potential minor significance of effect. There is a potential for an impact on unrecorded assets of an agricultural nature, most likely post-medieval in date, in any areas not impacted by commercial forestry or historic mining activity. There are



no significant impacts on cultural heritage assets anticipated as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development.

- 10.9.3 The assessment has considered the setting effects on the designated heritage assets outlined in **Table 10-9**, which provides a summary of the identified significance of effect upon them. Of the assets assessed, two assets have an anticipated significance of effect of Minor. Craigengillan Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL000111) and The Temple (LB96) would have a minor distraction in aspects of their setting that would impact the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience their cultural significance. However, all other aspects of the assets setting would remain unimpacted.
- 10.9.4 The cumulative impact of the Proposed Development was assessed, with the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development remaining the same as assessed for operational impacts.



Table 10-12: Summary of Residual Effects and Significance in EIA Terms

Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect	Significant in EIA terms?	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect	Significant in EIA terms?
Construction Phase							
SLR29 – Knockgulderon Farmstead	Direct - T5 and Access Track	Very Minor	No	Watching Brief on any groundbreaking works associated with T5 and its hardstanding. Watching brief on any track widening works to the south of T5, which coincide with the location of SLR29.	Planning Condition	Very Minor	No
SLR53 – Potential Roman Road	Direct - Access Track	Negligible	No	Watching Brief for any area of track widening that may coincide with the location of SLR53.	Planning Condition	Negligible	No
SLR58 – Enclosure	Direct - Access Track	Minor	No	Watching Brief – in the event of infrastructure re-routing due to micro-siting	Planning Condition	Minor	No
SLR59 – Fodder Store	Direct – T4	Minor	No	Watching Brief – in the event of T4 moving due to micro-siting	Planning Condition	Minor	No
SLR115 – Enclosure	Direct - Access Track	Minor	No	Watching Brief – in the event of infrastructure re-routing due to micro-siting	Planning Condition	Minor	No



Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect	Significant in EIA terms?	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect	Significant in EIA terms?
Potential Unrecorded Remains	Direct - All Infrastructure	Minor	No	Site procedure toolbox talk/programme of awareness.	Planning Condition	Minor	No
Operational Phase							
Auchencloigh Castle (SM5393)	Direct – Settings	Very Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Very Minor	No
Craigengillan (GDL000111)	Direct – Settings	Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Minor	No
Dumfries House (GDL00149)	Direct – Settings	Very Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Very Minor	No
The Temple, in Policies of Dumfries House (LB96)	Direct – Settings	Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Minor	No
Cumulative Effects							
Craigengillan (GDL000111)	Cumulative – Settings	Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Minor	No
The Temple, in Policies of Dumfries House (LB96)	Cumulative – Settings	Minor	No	N/A	N/A	Minor	No





10.10 References

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2023) ClfA Standards and Guidance – Overview of Changes. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2025-07/ClfA-Standards-and-guidance---overview-of-changes_0.pdf

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

Gearey, B., Bermingham, N., Chapman, H., Charman, D., Fletcher, W., Fyfe, R., Quartermaine, J. and Van de Noort, R., 2010. Peatlands and the historic environment. Scientific review for the UK IUCN Commission on Peatlands. Available at: <https://www.iucn-uk-peatlandprogramme.org/resources/commission-inquiry/work-commission-2011/peatlands-and-historic-environment>

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b) A Guide to Climate Change Impact: On Scotland's Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=843d0c97-d3f4-4510-acd3-aadf0118bf82>

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2020) Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationid=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>

Historic Environment Scotland (2023) Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=79204155-9eb2-4d29-ab14-aff200ec2801>

Historic Environment Scotland (2025). Historic Land Use Assessment. Available at: <https://map.hlamap.org.uk/#zoom=1&lat=820000&lon=220000&layers=BTTTTTTTT>

Mann, B. (2022) Guidance for Peatland Restoration and the Historic Environment in Scotland. Available at: <https://www.algao.org.uk/publications/2022/guidance-peatland-restoration-and-historic-environment-scotland>

NatureScot (2024) NatureScot pre-application guidance for onshore wind farms. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/doc/naturescot-pre-application-guidance-onshore-wind-farms>

Scottish Government (2011) Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-2-2011-planning-archaeology/>

Scottish Government (2014) Onshore Wind Turbines: Planning Advice Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-turbines-planning-advice/>

Scottish Government (2023) National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4). Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/>

Scottish Natural Heritage and HES (2018). Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook – Version 5: Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland. Available at:



<https://www.nature.scot/doc/handbook-environmental-impact-assessment-guidance-competent-authorities-consultees-and-others>.

UK Government (1979) The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>

UK Government (1997) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas (Scotland) Act 1997. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents>

UK Government (2014) The Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2014. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2014/19/contents>

UK Government (2017a) The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/contents>

UK Government (2017b) The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/102/contents>

Whatley, C.A. (1983) The Finest Place for a Lasting Colliery. Coal Mining Enterprise in Ayrshire c.1600-1840. Available at: <https://aanhs.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/finest-place-for-a-lasting-colliery.pdf>

Cartographic References:

Baillie, Alexander. (1774) A map of Ayr-shire. Reduced from captain Armstrong's six sheet map / engraved by Alexr. Baillie. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/counties/rec/7158>

Gordon, Robert (1636-1652) Cuningham [sic]. Cunningham. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/681>

Ordnance Survey (1859) Ayrshire, Sheet XL. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/228776653>

Ordnance Survey (1860) Ayrshire, Sheet XLVI. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/228776671>

Ordnance Survey (1897) Ayrshire Sheet XL.SE. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/75495933>

Ordnance Survey (1911) Ayrshire Sheet XL.SE. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/75495930>

Ordnance Survey (1948) Ayrshire Sheet XLVI-SE. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/75496074>

Ordnance Survey (1957) NS40-B Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/91578786>

Ordnance Survey (1957) NS41-B. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/91578789>

Roy Military Survey of Scotland (1747-1755) Roy Strip/Section: 4/5d. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/roy/>

Thomson, John. (1828) Northern Part of Ayrshire. Southern Part. Bottom right section. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/view/74400171>

