

## 7 Cultural Heritage & Archaeology Assessment

### 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This chapter provides an assessment of the likely significant effects on four scheduled monuments associated with the construction and operation of the revised proposed development. It details the post-submission consultation responses and how these have been addressed, relevant changes in policy, legislation and guidance, and the amendments to the original proposed development detailed and assessed in the EIA Report October 2023 that are relevant to cultural heritage.

7.1.2 As interrelationships exist between the assessment of effects on the four scheduled monuments and certain other disciplines, reference should be made to the following chapters of the AEI:

- **AEI Chapter 2: Revised Proposed Development Description;** and
- **AEI Chapter 6: Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment.**

7.1.3 The assessment has been carried out by Elise Christensen (MA Hons, ACIfA, FSA Scot), Senior Archaeology and Heritage Consultant and by Beth Gray (MA Hons, MCIIfA, FSA Scot), Principal Archaeology and Heritage Consultant.

7.1.4 This AEI chapter is supported by the following figures:

- AEI Figures:
  - **AEI Figure 7.1: Non-designated Cultural Heritage Assets;**
  - **AEI Figure 7.2: Designated Cultural Heritage Assets;**
  - **AEI Figure 7.3: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints;**
  - **AEI Figure 7.4: Intervisibility Network between Iron Age Designations;**
  - **AEI Figure 7.5: Viewpoint H1 – Longcroft, Fort (SM372);**
  - **AEI Figure 7.6: Viewpoint H2 – Addinston, Fort (SM362);**
  - **AEI Figure 7.7: Viewpoint H3 – Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473);**
  - **AEI Figure 7.7a: Viewpoint H3 – Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) Illustrative Photomontage;**
  - **AEI Figure 7.8: Viewpoint H4 – Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480);**
  - **AEI Figure 2.4: Viewpoint H1 - Illustrative Schemes Comparison;**
  - **AEI Figure 2.6: Viewpoint H2 - Illustrative Schemes Comparison;**
  - **AEI Figure 2.6: Viewpoint H3 - Illustrative Schemes Comparison; and**
  - **AEI Figure 2.7: Viewpoint H9 - Illustrative Schemes Comparison.**

7.1.5 AEI Figures are referenced in the text where relevant.

### 7.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

7.2.1 The list of legislation, policy, and guidance remains the same as presented in the EIA Report October 2023. Relevant material pertaining to this report specifically are as follows:

- National Planning Framework 4<sup>1</sup>, (NPF4; 2023)
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland<sup>2</sup> (HEPS; 2019)
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting<sup>3</sup> (2020)

## 7.3 Consultation

7.3.1 **AEI Table 7.1** provides a summary of the consultation responses received post the submission of the EIA Report October 2023.

**AEI Table 7.1 Summary of Post Submission Consultation**

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issue Raised	Response/Action
HES (29 February 2024)	Objection after the submission of EIA Report October 2023	<p>HES stated that the (original) proposed development raises significant concerns for their interest, such that they object to the proposal for its significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of the following scheduled monuments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addinston, fort (SM362)</li> <li>• Longcroft, fort (SM372)</li> <li>• Glenburnie fort (SM4473)</li> <li>• Longcroft Hill, homestead (SM4480)</li> </ul>	Wind turbines T1 - T4 and T17 - T19 have been removed to remove the significant adverse impacts on the integrity if the setting of the assets as raised by HES.
East Lothian Council (3 July 2024)	Submission Response	<p>The council's Heritage Officer acknowledges that their comments will be related solely to impacts relating to setting due to the development being located in Scottish Borders Council.</p> <p>The Heritage Officer considers that although there are adverse impacts in terms of the historic environment, these are an acceptable change, though further changes to layout will mean the proposals will need to be reassessed as they are on the cups of being unacceptable from the historic environment of East Lothian</p>	Noted.

<sup>1</sup> Scottish Government. (2023) National Planning Framework 4. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/>

<sup>2</sup> Historic Environment Scotland. (2019) Historic Environment Policy for Scotland, Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7>

<sup>3</sup> Historic Environment Scotland (2020), Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting, Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>

Consultee and Date	Scoping/Other Consultation	Issue Raised	Response/Action
		perspective.	
HES (7 November 2024)	Post-submission Redesign Consultation	<p>HES have concluded that the revised proposed development reduces the level of impact on the integrity of the setting of Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) and have removed their objection associated with this asset.</p> <p>They maintain their objections associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addinston, fort (SM362)</li> <li>• Longcroft, fort (SM372)</li> <li>• Glenburnie fort (SM4473)</li> </ul>	Further response to HES's comments is found in this chapter.

## 7.4 Scope of Additional Environmental Information

7.4.1 As set out in AEI Table 7.1, the revised proposed development responds to comments received from HES relating to specific cultural heritage receptors after submission of EIA Report October 2023. This chapter considers the potential effects of the revised proposed development upon the receptors raised by HES and those effects where the layout changes may affect the assessment for the original proposed development namely operational phase effects relating to the integrity of the settings of:

- Addinston, Fort (SM362);
- Longcroft, Fort (SM372);
- Glenburnie Fort (SM4473); and
- Longcroft Hill, homestead (SM4480).

7.4.2 Effects relating to other receptors are unchanged. Accordingly, the assessment presented in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023 for the original proposed development remains valid.

## 7.5 Methodology

7.5.1 This chapter uses the same assessment methodology as set out in EIA Report October 2023. For the purposes of this assessment, the methodology previously outlined in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023 is unchanged.

## 7.6 Baseline

7.6.1 Baseline conditions remain as summarised in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023. No new baseline studies have been undertaken, aside from confirming that there have been no changes in cultural heritage designations that might be relevant.

## 7.7 Updated Assessment of Potential Effects

### Design Amendments

7.7.1 The following changes have been made to the layout that will affect the predicted operational effects of the original proposed development.

- Deletion of wind turbines T1, T2, T3, T4, T17, T18, and T19

7.7.2 These wind turbines were deleted from the layout of the original proposed development to increase the separation distance from assets within the site, namely Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480), and removed the wind turbines which encroach on the setting of the group of hillforts, especially the aspect of setting viewed from the Whalplaw Burn valley approach. Specific design changes in reference to the affected assets are detailed below.

### Construction Effects

7.7.3 There have been no relevant changes in relation to construction effects from the original cultural heritage assessment. These remain as presented in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023.

### Operational Effects

#### Addinston, Fort (SM362)

##### *Summary of Assessment of Original Proposed Development*

7.7.4 The asset sits on the south-eastern spur of Addinston Hill at 310 m aOD, with impressively scaled ramparts that allow for visibility from significant distances. The asset shares intervisibility with a number of other forts and settlements in the area, notably Longcroft, Fort (SM372), Hog Hill, Settlement (SM4481), Blackchester, Fort (SM364) and Bowerhouse, Fort (SM365). The intervisibility between the forts in Lauderdale valley, which are contemporary assets within the landscape, is a key factor of the asset's setting which contributes to its significance.

7.7.5 The asset's placement above the confluence of the Whalplaw Burn and the Soonhope Burn to the north-east and the confluence of the Cleekhimin Burn and the Leader Water to the south-west references key natural topographic elements. Views towards the Leader Water include its valley, Lauderdale, which runs north to south. The asset's elevated position over these routeways through the landscape would have allowed for the monitoring of movement through the landscape, providing a key defensive position. These aspects of the asset's setting contribute to its significance.

7.7.6 The original assessment found that views to Hog Hill, Settlement (SM4481) and Longcroft, Fort (SM372) would be altered significantly in terms of distraction in the landscape. Views between Addinston, Fort and Longcroft, Forts are assessed to be key in understanding the relationship between the two centres of power and community. The original assessment concluded that the introduction of the original proposed development in views behind Longcroft, Fort would alter the appreciation and experience of the relationship between the two assets.

7.7.7 However, the original assessment found that this aspect of the asset's setting is only one contributing factor to the asset's setting which contributes to its overall significance. Other factors

include the asset's archaeological significance, its defensive placement above the Whalplaw Burn and Soonhope Burn and their valleys, and its wider views over the Lauderdale to the south. The magnitude of change was assessed as medium adverse, resulting in an impact of moderate significance of effect as identified in the EIA Report October 2023. As per the accepted methodology presented in the EIA Report October 2023, professional judgement was applied and this was considered to be not significant.

### Summary of HES's Comments

#### Objection - February 2024

- 7.7.8 HES disagreed with SLR's assessment as summarised above, it being key that HES identified that the proposals would have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument. HES's response identified the key elements of setting which contribute to Addinston, Fort (SM362). These were cited as:
- the strategic importance of its visibility which is indicative of its deliberately selected location. HES state, "*The monument has good views in every direction and is also highly visible to travellers along Lauderdale*" and its "*elevated position on the south-east spur of Addinston Hill, which gives it clear views over and along Lauderdale, a major north/south routeway and views towards forts and settlements across Lauderdale*";
  - the visual appearance of the asset on the approach from the south-east side and from the valley floor, creating a distinct "*sense of place*"; and
  - the direct line of sight towards Longcroft, Fort 500 m NE of (SM372), approximately 1 km away to the north-east and other forts across Lauderdale and on the surrounding hills.
- 7.7.9 HES agreed with SLR that views towards Longcroft, Fort (SM372) are key to understanding both monuments and that the original proposed development would alter the appreciation and experience of the relationship between the two assets.
- 7.7.10 However, HES commented that SLR had underestimated the scale of impacts by primarily considering these views *from* the asset and emphasising less the views towards the asset from the west and south-east approaches and the valley floor.
- 7.7.11 HES disagree with SLR's assessment that the original proposed development would equate to only minor erosion on cultural significance from its impact on its relationship with neighbouring forts.
- 7.7.12 HES specifically cited T17, T18, and T19 as problematic wind turbines as they can be seen "*in their entirety over the monument*" and would be "*particularly dominant in views from slightly further north along Lauderdale, i.e. from the west.*"
- 7.7.13 HES concluded, as the "*very tall modern infrastructure*" would be introduced into the setting of Addinston, Fort, specifically in views on its approach from the west and south-east and in views towards Longcroft, Fort (SM372), the substantial change would have "*a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the monument.*". The appreciation, experience and understanding of the asset would be significantly diminished by the original proposed development. HES stated that no design mitigation has been proposed to lessen adverse impacts and therefore would object to the proposals.

Redesign response - November 2024

- 7.7.14 HES maintain their earlier stated position that significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the settings of Addinston, Fort (SM362), Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) remain.

*“The significant adverse impacts on the integrity of setting of these assets, brought about by the proposed turbines, would significantly reduce the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the monuments’ cultural significance.”*

**Design Amendments**

- 7.7.15 In their objection dated February 2024, HES outlined that the key contributors to understanding the significance of the asset are primarily derived from:

- i the visibility afforded to the asset from its location;
- ii the approach from the south-west at the entrance of the Cleekhimin Burn valley; and
- iii the intervisibility between the asset and neighbouring forts.

- 7.7.16 With respect to the visibility afforded to the asset, HES concluded that the asset “has good views in every direction” (i). It should be noted that the asset is situated on the shoulder of Addinston Hill at 302 m AOD and is not the highest position in the Cleekhimin Burn valley and thereby has limited views in some directions (discussed further in the relevant section below). The deletion of T1-T4 and T17-T19 have reduced the number of wind turbines visible in the specific views to the north-east of the asset, as shown in **AEI Figure 7.6**.

With respect to the approach from the south-west at the entrance of the Cleekahimin Burn valley (ii), the removal of wind turbines directly north-east of the asset, namely T17, T18 and T19, from the more prominent hills of Longcroft Hill (381 m AOD) and Riddel Law (392 m AOD), mitigates this concern, allowing the viewer to appreciate and experience the significance of the asset and its relationship to the valley from this approach. **AEI Figure 2.7** presents the comparison between the original proposed development and the revised proposed development from Blackchester, Fort (SM364) from the south-west of the asset. From this vantage, it is demonstrated that the distraction identified by HES has been removed with the removal of wind turbines T17, T18 and T19.

- 7.7.17 With respect to intervisibility between the asset and neighbouring forts (iii), **AEI Figure 7.6** and **AEI Figure 2.5** clearly demonstrate, through the removal of wind turbines T1 – T4 and T17 – T19 that the revised proposed development presents a reduction in visible wind turbines in views towards Longcroft, Fort (SM372). While this distraction is present in the relationship between the asset and Longcroft, Fort, this relationship only presents a portion of the significance of the asset rather than its entire significance, with other aspects retained.

**Assessment of Revised Proposed Development**

- 7.7.18 An assessment of the revised proposed development is presented below. This references the removal of wind turbines T1 - T4 and T17 - T19.
- 7.7.19 Part of the cultural significance of Addinston, Fort (SM362) is the contribution to group value within the wider landscape. As outlined in Figure 7.4 in the EIA Report October 2023, there are a number of

- contemporary forts which the asset holds intervisibility with. This is a key contributor to the significance of the asset and is outlined in the original assessment.
- 7.7.20 A key aspect of setting from which the asset derives its significance from is the positioning of the asset at the head of the valley, which affords the asset views over the northern and southern aspects of Lauderdale. By being placed at the head of this wider mouth within the topography, the confluence of the Cleekhimin Burn and Leader Water, it allows this visual link to Longcroft, Fort (SM372), which allowed for the monitoring of movement through the natural routeways created by the surrounding watercourses as outlined in the original assessment.
- 7.7.21 Whilst the revised proposed development would still be visible in views from Addinston, Fort looking towards Longcroft, Fort (SM372) where they appear behind that asset, the reduction in the amount of wind turbines visible would remove a significant portion of the distraction on the ability to understand and appreciate the relationship between the two assets. Specifically, this has been afforded by the deletion of T1-T3, T17 and T19. The deletion of these wind turbines reduces the spread and proximity of the revised proposed development and thus allows the viewer to focus on the relationship between the two assets with less distraction being apparent. The conserved understanding of the spatial relationship between the two assets assist in the appreciation of the economy and relationships between Iron Age people. With the reduction in the revised proposed development, the integrity of this relationship is retained. Referring to **AEI Figure 7.4** the asset also has intervisibility with neighbouring forts across Lauderdale, to the south-west, being its principal vantagepoint. HES also confirm this, stating that “*its position gives clear views over and along Lauderdale, a major north/south routeway, as well as views to forts and settlements across Lauderdale and on the surrounding hills*”. Views towards these assets to the west and south-west are unaffected by the revised proposed development. The reciprocal views are represented by **AEI Figure 2.7** which presents the revised proposed development as a more concise spread of wind turbines on the horizon, within the visual context of the existing elements seen from the operational Fallago Rig Wind Farm.
- 7.7.22 In addition to intervisibility between assets, HES reference that the asset has “*good views in every direction*” and the asset’s visibility to travellers along Lauderdale, the main north-south route now followed by the modern A68. Whilst travelling along this main north-south corridor, particularly along the A68, the asset appears along the skyline. However, it is not the highest point from this perspective and appears lower than the surrounding hills. The asset is neighboured by Addinston Hill (383 m AOD) to the north north-west, Hog Hill (399 m aOD) to the north, Longcroft Hill (381 m AOD) to the north-east, Peat Law (414 m AOD) to the east north-east and Lylestone Hill (391 m AOD) to the east south-east and as such has restricted long distance views in multiple directions. This is emphasised in the **AEI Figure 7.4** where a number of assets to the west of the asset have no intervisibility. Given its lower position, the asset is not topographically prominent except on close range views, specifically from the south and south-west. Consequently, its prominence to travellers up this corridor would be unlikely to be a key contributor to its function or setting. As such, visibility of the revised proposed development would not detract from the ability to understand, appreciate or experience the defensive nature of the asset and its commanding views in the landscape.

- 7.7.23 HES also discuss the visual appearance of the asset and the “*distinct sense of place*” it evokes. According to *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting* guidance, ‘sense of place’ refers to “*the overall experience which may combine some of the above factors*” (previously mentioned in the guidance and noted above). However, this concept is broadly defined and inherently subjective. As such, it lacks the precision necessary for robust analysis, particularly in the context of a complex asset like a fort. Given the numerous, clearly articulated factors that contribute to the integrity of the asset’s setting, outlined both above and in the original assessment, it is more appropriate to rely on these tangible elements rather than an ambiguous and interpretive notion such as ‘sense of place’.
- 7.7.24 Overall, the revised proposed development would be visible in views to the north-east towards Longcroft, Fort (SM372) (**AEI Figure 7.6**) but the ability to understand the deliberate siting of the assets in relation to one another would remain intact. Other aspects of its setting would experience slight visual changes, such as views along the watercourses and towards Hog Hill, Settlement (SM4481) and on approach from Lauderdale, but these changes would not detract from the ability to understand, appreciate and experience these aspects of significance.
- 7.7.25 It is anticipated that the magnitude of impact would continue to be medium adverse due to discernible visual changes to one key aspect of the setting and slight visual changes to other aspects of the setting. On an asset of high cultural heritage significance, this would result in a **Moderate** significance of effect.
- 7.7.26 The original assessment concluded that the original proposed development would also have a medium adverse magnitude of impact, resulting in a **Moderate** significance of effect.
- 7.7.27 While the revised proposed development has not reduced the magnitude of impact, the resulting significance of effect is not considered to be significant in EIA terms or to erode the integrity of the setting of the asset. This is due to discernible effects on the experience of the relationship between the asset and Longcroft, Fort (SM372), which is only one aspect of the setting with the other aspects of setting only being impacted to a slight extent.

### Longcroft, Fort (SM372);

#### *Summary of Assessment of Original Proposed Development*

- 7.7.28 The asset is set within a series of forts that are substantial in size and complexity across the Lammermuir Hills. The original assessment finds that the primary contributing factors of setting to significance are the 360-degree views around and across the Leader Water and above Whalplaw Burn, allowing a perspective essential in the monitoring of the natural routeways. Another primary factor of setting which contributes to the significance of the asset is its relationship with other forts in and around Lauderdale where the asset is a focal point in the visibly linked defence system of multiple forts. Views to and from Addinston, Fort (SM362) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) are identified as being particularly important in this system. Intervisibility between these forts is presented in the original assessment and is a key factor of the asset’s setting which contributes to the significance of the asset.
- 7.7.29 The original assessment identified that mitigation through design had occurred through the movements of wind turbines as shown in Figure 2.2 of the EIA Report October 2023. An impact of



moderate significance of effect, primarily due to potential distraction and erosion of views from the asset to Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473), thereby affecting the ability to appreciate its relationship with Glenburnie, Fort. This was identified as significant in EIA terms but the impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument was not classified as significant adverse, concluding that the original proposed development was compliant with NPF4. Other aspects of setting which contribute to its significance, such as views south along Cleekhimin Burn valley, across Lauderdale and to the north-west across the Lammermuirs towards Tollishill grouping, would remain intact with no impact.

### Summary of HES's Comments

#### Objection - February 2024

- 7.7.30 HES disagreed with SLR's assessment as summarised above, it being key that HES identified that the original proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument. HES's response identified what they felt are the key elements of setting which contribute to the significance of the asset. These are:
- the entrances through the ramparts on the south-west and east side of the asset indicate these were key approaches, suggesting views out from these entrances were also key to understanding how asset operated in the landscape. The visual relationship with Addinston, Fort (SM362) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) is particularly appreciable from the south-west entrance;
  - the view towards the asset from the south-west at the confluence of the Whalplaw and Soonhope Burns, as well as longer views along Lauderdale, allow an appreciation of the form within its landscape;
  - open views to and from the asset across Lauderdale;
  - the appreciation of the asset in its setting is considered to be made possible by the "*...unobstructed views with no close, large-scale infrastructure in the immediate setting of the monument.*";
  - visual and spatial relationship with Addinston Hill and the Addinston, Fort (SM362) allows appreciation of the strategic location, sited to deliberately oversee movement along Soonhope Burn, Whalplaw Burn, and Cleekhimin Burn valleys; and
  - the asset's relationship with Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) including the "*more deliberately secluded reciprocal views along the smaller valley towards Glenburnie. Such views which allow appreciation of the intentional exploitation of the topographical landscape and the deliberate placement of the hillfort.*" These views are stated to be integral to the understanding, appreciation, and experience of the asset. HES stated that the original assessment primarily considers views out of the asset and does not place enough consideration on views towards the asset from other monuments and key approaches.
- 7.7.31 HES highlighted that the original proposed development would have a greater impact on the cultural significance of the asset than Fallago Wind Farm, on account of its closer proximity and taller wind turbines. HES stated that the Fallago Wind Farm and the original proposed development acting as an extension of Fallago Wind Farm was not discussed adequately, thereby underestimating the impact on setting and the capacity of the setting of the asset to accept additional change.

- 7.7.32 HES considered the original proposed development would be highly visible behind the asset in views towards the asset from the approach on the south-west and along the Leader Water and Lauderdale. They specifically cite T13, T14, T16, T17, T18, and T19 as drawing focus away from the asset.
- 7.7.33 HES referred to their concerns with the views from Addinston, Fort (SM362) to the asset (as detailed above in under the section titled, Addinston, Fort (SM362)), impacting the ability to appreciate this visual relationship.
- 7.7.34 HES referred to T1 and T19 as particularly problematic in views from Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) towards the asset as they would clearly dominate the setting of the asset in this key view, framing and enclosing the asset.
- 7.7.35 HES stated, “*The introduction of modern infrastructure into the setting of Longcroft would bring about a substantial change that would have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the monument. We consider that this is a direct impact on the cultural significance of the monument.*”

Redesign response - November 2024

- 7.7.36 HES maintain their earlier stated position that significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the of settings of Addinston, Fort (SM362), Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) remain.
- “*The significant adverse impacts on the integrity of setting of these assets, brought about by the proposed turbines, would significantly reduce the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the monuments’ cultural significance.*”

**Design Amendments**

- 7.7.37 In their objection dated February 2024, HES outlined that the key contributors to understanding the significance of the asset are primarily derived from:
- iv approach from the south-west at the entrance of the Cleekahimin Burn valley;
  - v the views to the south-west, across Lauderdale, from the asset; and
  - vi the intervisibility between the asset and Addinston, Fort (SM362) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473).
- 7.7.38 With respect to the approach from the south-west (iv), the removal of wind turbines T17, T18 and T19 completely removes any visibility of the revised proposed development directly behind the asset.
- 7.7.39 Outward views across Lauderdale to the south-west (v) of the asset are unaffected by the revised proposed development.
- 7.7.40 Views from Addinston, Fort to Longcroft, Fort views are discussed above in **Paragraph 7.8.6**. With reference to the intervisibility between the asset and Addinston, Fort (SM362) (vi), **AEI Figure 7.6** and **AEI Figure 2.5** demonstrate, through the removal of wind turbines T1 – T4 and T17 – T19 that the revised proposed development presents a significant reduction in distraction posed by the scale and proximity of the wind turbines in comparison with the original proposed development. Views from the asset to Addinston, Fort are unaffected with no visibility of the wind turbines.
- 7.7.41 With reference to the intervisibility between the asset and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) (vi), **AEI Figure 7.5** and **AEI Figure 2.4** present the position of Glenburnie, Fort within the view from the asset. It demonstrates that during the layout design process for the original proposed development wind

turbines were kept clear from behind the direct line of sight between the assets, as documented in Chapter 2 of the EIA Report October 2023. The removal of wind turbines T1 – T4 and T17 – T19 removes the “*dominating*” effect (as described by HES), of those wind turbines previously in the foreground of the original proposed development. The revised proposed development presents a more concise spread of wind turbines on the horizon, within the visual context of the existing elements seen from the operational Fallago Rig Wind Farm. **AEI Figure 7.7** and **AEI Figure 2.6** present the position of the asset and Longcroft Hill, Homestead from Glenburnie, Fort. With the revised proposed development, there is no visibility of wind turbines in views from Glenburnie, Fort to these assets.

### *Assessment of Revised Proposed Development*

- 7.7.42 A reassessment of the revised proposed development is presented below. This references the removal of wind turbines T1 - T4 and T17 - T19.
- 7.7.43 The revised proposed development reduces the number and dominance of the wind turbines which were posed to draw focus from the prominence of a number of hillforts, specifically Addinston, Fort (SM362) and Longcroft, Fort (SM372), from Lauderdale.
- 7.7.44 The revised proposed development, shown in **AEI Figure 7.5** and **AEI Figure 7.6**, significantly reduces the “*dominating*” effect (as described by HES) and visibility of wind turbines in views of the asset from the south-west by removing T1, T2, T3, T4, T17, T18, and T19. While the wind turbines continue to have a presence in these views, the spread is significantly reduced, resulting in less distraction on the horizon. This is shown in **AEI Figure 2.4** and **AEI Figure 2.5**.
- 7.7.45 The key aspects of setting from which the fort derives its significance from are the views towards routeways created by the watercourses (specifically that of Whalplaw Burn, Soonhope Burn and Cleekhimin Burn and out to the wider Leader Water) its views from these routeways as an impressive monument on approach, and its visual connections to other forts and hilltop settlements which created a defensive network as outlined in the original assessment. The outward views are especially critical to understanding, appreciating and experiencing the assets defensive nature with the wider outlook to Lauderdale.
- 7.7.46 The approach to the asset along Cleekhimin Burn would have been a major routeway to the asset, it is also a point of appreciation at the entrance of the valley, as it is flanked by Addinston, Fort (SM362) to the viewers left. This enhances the dominance of the forts in the landscape. The removal of T17, T8 and T19 minimises the presence of the revised proposed development on the horizon from this viewpoint. With the removal, it is considered that there would only be a slight visual change deemed to not detract from the experience on approach to the asset.
- 7.7.47 Whilst wind turbines would still be within sight of Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) from the asset, the wind turbines would form the backdrop of the wider landscape beyond Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473). During the course of the layout design, wind turbines were specifically placed to keep the field of view behind Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) free of wind turbines as outlined in both **AEI Chapter 2: Design Evolution & Alternatives** of this AEI and the EIA Report October 2023. This allows for the understanding, appreciation, and experience of the relationship between the two assets to remain

- and the ability to understand the complex relationships between these assets within but not limited to the Whalplaw Burn valley.
- 7.7.48 The point of appreciation from Addinston, Fort (SM362) to the asset, allows the viewer to appreciate the relationship between these two assets and understand that there was a complex society that lived here. Whilst the reduced wind turbines would still be evident along the horizon beyond the asset, the ability to understand, experience and appreciate that relationship would be retained. There would be an element of distraction to the appreciation of the asset from this view however it would not impact the ability to appreciate the dominance or relationships that the asset has within the landscape.
- 7.7.49 Views from Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) towards the asset would be unaffected by the revised proposed development with the removal of T1 & T19 (as shown in **AEI Figure 2.6**). Views from the asset to Addinston, Fort (SM362) would also be preserved, as per the original proposed development, with no wind turbines ever proposed between the asset and Addinston, Fort (SM362).
- 7.7.50 HES state that the views from the south-west and east entrance of the asset looking to both Addinston, Fort (SM362) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) contribute to the understanding of how the asset operated in the landscape. Views to the north-east from the south-west entrance, looking to Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) are restricted due to topography and therefore cannot be seen from this position. Addinston, Fort (SM362) is viewed upon exiting the south-west of the asset with no views of the revised proposed development. The eastern entrance would afford views both up (to the north-east) and down (to the south-west) the valley, but the presence of wind turbines would only cause a minor erosion to the relationship between the asset and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473). The ability to understand and appreciate the relationship and the defensive nature between these two assets would be retained. The revised proposed development consolidates this position further. While some residual distraction exists in experience the relationship between the asset and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) this relationship only presents a portion of the cultural significance of the asset.
- 7.7.51 It is anticipated that the magnitude of impact would remain at medium adverse due to discernible changes to two key aspects of the setting and slight visual changes upon the approach towards the asset. On an asset of high cultural heritage significance, this would result in a **Moderate** significance of effect. Professional judgement has been applied and due to multiple aspects of change to the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the asset within its setting, the effect is considered to be significant in EIA terms.
- 7.7.52 The original assessment concluded that the original proposed development would have a medium adverse magnitude of impact, resulting in a **Moderate** significance of effect and considered significant in EIA terms.
- 7.7.53 While the revised proposed development has not reduced the magnitude of impact, it is considered that the proposed changes consolidate the identification of this level of impact and reiterate that the revised proposed development would not significantly impact the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument. The verification of a medium adverse magnitude of impact is due to discernible effects on the experience of the relationship from Addinston, Fort (SM362) and to Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473). Although this relationship contributes to the cultural significance of the

assets, it does not define it in its entirety. Since the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience these relationships, both from the asset and along its approach, remains partially intact, the integrity of the setting is preserved. As such, the revised proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of NPF4.

## Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473);

### *Summary of Assessment of Original Proposed Development*

- 7.7.54 The asset comprises a promontory fort located on Wallace's Knowe, a western spur of Hogs Law. Due to its position, the asset overlooks the valley to the north-west looking out over the confluence of Wide Cleugh and Whalplaw Burn, and then to the south-west looking down the valley of Whalplaw Burn (**AEI Figure 7.7** and **AEI Figure 7.7a<sup>4</sup>**). This would have been a main routeway that the asset would have monitored. Views of other forts in the area such as Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) to the south-west are also considered key aspects of its setting. The original assessment found that the original proposed development, specifically wind turbines T1, T4, T18, and T19, would be a visual distraction in views from these two assets towards Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) which would result in the erosion of the ability to appreciate and experience the asset's setting.
- 7.7.55 Views from the asset to the north-east would have all wind turbines visible, though it is T1, T4, T18, and T19 which were highlighted to cause the most encroachment and distract from the ability to appreciate and experience the asset's relationship to the valley it controls.
- 7.7.56 The original assessment also identified the removal of (previously numbered) wind turbines T3 and T5 of the scoping layout and the movement of T18 further north-east, which limited encroachment from the original proposed development on the setting of the asset. A 500 m buffer was also placed on the asset to avoid any physical direct impacts on the asset and any associated archaeology. This buffer was also to limit any encroachment into key views from the outset of the design process.
- 7.7.57 The original assessment identified potential impacts from T1, T4, T18 and T19, most notably T1 and T19, as these would impact the ability to appreciate and experience the views out of the valley above Whalplaw Burn. Based on the photomontages submitted with the EIA Report October 2023, T1 and T19 would also cause issue with the ability to appreciate Longcroft, Fort (SM372) from the asset. An impact of moderate/major significance of effect was identified in the original assessment. This was identified as significant in EIA terms but the impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument was not classified as significant adverse with the original assessment concluding that the original proposed development was compliant with the NPF4.

### *Summary of HES's Comments*

---

<sup>4</sup> AEI Figure 7.7a is an illustrative photomontage that has been prepared to support this chapter, which is not fully compliant with NatureScot guidance *Visual Representations of Wind Farms* (Version 2.4, February 2017). This departure from best practice arises from a specific requirement to depict a greater vertical field of view than that permitted under the NatureScot guidance. This is necessary in order to illustrate the revisions to the original proposed development in the context of Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473). Despite not conforming to all technical specifications, the visualisation remains accurate, providing an appropriate basis for the identification and understanding of the landscape around the revised proposed development.

#### Objection - February 2024

- 7.7.58 HES disagreed with SLR's assessment as summarised above, it being key that HES identified that the original proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument, thus non-compliant with NPF4. HES's response identified the key elements of setting which contribute the significance of the asset. These were:
- the visual and spatial relationship with Whalplaw Burn and its valley, which it is deliberately sited to monitor the movement of. From the valley, the asset gives a sense of being overseen and watched as a visitor makes an approach along the valley. This experience is a key contributor to the cultural significance and a "*point from which to appreciate its distinct sense of place in the valley landscape.*";
  - the visual impressiveness of the ramparts, built to look imposing in key views. These are sited on the south-east of the monument, thus the visual channel from Hogs Law to the asset and vice versa are important aspects of its setting;
  - the presence of Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) to the south-west of the asset on Longcroft Hill across the the valley from the asset and their direct visual link enhances this setting, and is identified as a key reciprocal view from the homestead; and
  - the visual and spatial relationship with Longcroft, Fort (SM372) to the south-west where such views "allow appreciation of the intentional exploitation of the topographical landscape, and the deliberate placement of the fort".
- 7.7.59 HES stated that the appreciation of the above aspects of setting are made possible by the unobstructed views, with no close, large-scale modern development in the surroundings.
- 7.7.60 HES considered that though the original assessment has identified most of the key views and elements of setting, the scale of impacts has been underestimated.
- 7.7.61 HES agreed that wind turbines T1, T4, T18, and T19 are of key concern, but added that T2, T3, T5 and T7 would draw attention away from the visual impressiveness of the ramparts. Wind turbines T13, T14, T15, T16, T9, and T11 were identified as drawing focus away from the views to the asset from along the valley. New access tracks and hardstands were mentioned as being an intrusive modern feature which would act as a clear visible distraction and intrusion in addition to the proposed wind turbines.

#### Redesign response - November 2024

- 7.7.62 HES maintain their earlier stated position that significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the settings of Addinston, Fort (SM362), Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) remain.
- "The significant adverse impacts on the integrity of setting of these assets, brought about by the proposed turbines, would significantly reduce the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience the monuments' cultural significance."*

#### **Design Amendments**

- 7.7.63 In their objection dated February 2024, HES outlined that the key contributors to understanding the significance of the asset are primarily derived from:

- vii views to the south-west along the Whalplaw Burn valley and across Lauderdale;
  - viii the approach to the asset from the south-west, travelling north-east along the Whalplaw Burn valley;
  - ix views to the south-east across its ramparts towards Hogs Law; and
  - x the intervisibility between the asset and Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480).
- 7.7.64 With respect to views to the south-west along Whalplaw Burn valley and across Lauderdale (vii), **AEI Figure 7.7** and **AEI Figure 2.6** present the view from the Glenburnie, Fort in this direction. Through the removal of T1 and T19, there is no visibility of wind turbines in views from Glenburnie, Fort to the south-west.
- 7.7.65 With respect to the approach to the asset from the south-west (viii), travelling north-east along the Whalplaw Burn valley, HES noted that this can still be appreciated due to the “*steep valley sides providing a sense of enclosure*”. This enclosure is formed by the eastern slopes of Longcroft Hill and Riddel Law and western slopes of Peat Law and Hogs Law. Removal of wind turbines T17, T18 and T19 from Longcroft Hill and Riddel Law and T1, T2, T3 and T4 from Peat Law and Hogs Law ensures that a sense of enclosure is maintained by the surrounding topography with minimal distraction, allowing the viewer to appreciate, understand and experience this key contribution to its significance.
- 7.7.66 With respect to views to the south-east across its ramparts towards Hogs Law (ix) and in response to HES’s concerns around the scale of the visualisation presented in Figure 7.7 of the EIA Report October 2023, **AEI Figure 7.7a** has been prepared which presents the 360 ° photomontage in A1 sheets. **AEI Figure 7.7a (Sheet 6)** specifically demonstrates that, through the removal of wind turbines T2 and T3, that the revised proposed development has no visibility in this view and therefore no impact upon views to the south-east across its ramparts towards Hogs Law.
- 7.7.67 With respect to intervisibility between the asset and Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) both **AEI Figure 7.7 (Sheets 1, 5 and 11)** and **AEI Figure 7.7a (Sheet 1)** clearly demonstrate that the revised proposed development is not visible in the outward views from the asset. Views toward the asset from Longcroft, Fort are discussed above in **Paragraph 7.8.12**.

#### *Assessment of Revised Proposed Development*

- 7.7.68 A reassessment of the revised proposed development is presented below. This references the removal of wind turbines T1 - T4 and T17 - T19.
- 7.7.69 The key aspects of setting from which the asset derives its significance from are its position overlooking and monitoring the valley of Whalplaw Burn to the west, views from the approach of this valley where the fort sits at centrally in view from the south-west, and its visual connection to other forts and settlements, namely Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480). The siting of the asset was likely deliberate on the lower slopes of Hog Hill, utilising the gentler slopes and defensible sides while maintaining visual links to the valley and nearby contemporary assets. Additionally, the asset sits in a more secluded aspect of the valley on a low promontory rather than the high point to be seen. This suggests that dominance in the valley is a less important than its other aspects of setting.

- 7.7.70 The revised proposed development remains visible from Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) in views to the north and north-east, where a maximum of five hubs and two blade tips are visible. Those wind turbines nearest the asset have been removed, leaving only those which are sited further to the north-east, thus removing some of the visual dominance they had on the horizon in views out of the valley, towards Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) to the south-west (former T1 and T19, **AEI Figure 7.7a (Sheet 1)**) and east towards Hog Hill (former T2, T3 & T4, **AEI Figure 7.7a (Sheet 6)**). In views to the north along the valley (**AEI Figure 7.7a (Sheet 3 and 4)**), the asset has a single wind turbine (T16) visible on the horizon in this key view after the removal of T18 and T17, with the effect being a very minor distraction from focus to the valley below. While T14, T13, and T15 are visible, they are peripheral to the key view of the valley.
- 7.7.71 The main contributors to former impacts on two aspects of setting; views toward Longcroft, Fort (SM372) and views south-westwards along the valley from the asset, have been removed. The removal of the wind turbines sited along the hills to the east and west of this aspect would ensure that when moving south-westwards from the asset, along the valley it monitors, there would be no visibility of any wind turbines (**AEI Figure 2.6**). The asset would continue to have unobstructed views towards Longcroft, Fort and Longcroft Hill, Homestead, thus retaining the understanding, appreciation and experience of these relationships.
- 7.7.72 The removal of the south-western most wind turbines (T1, T2, T19, T18, T4, T3 and T17) sets the revised proposed development further to the north-east, reducing the amount of distraction the wind turbines have on the approach along the Whalplaw Burn valley and from Longcroft, Fort (SM372) (**AEI Figure 7.5** and **AEI Figure 2.4**). There would still be visibility of wind turbines set behind the asset when travelling along the valley from the south-west, though the spread is significantly reduced from the original proposed development.
- 7.7.73 HES outline the approach along Whalplaw Burn valley as a key point to experience the asset and its dominance in the valley, however, as shown in **Plate 1**, the asset sits lower in a more sheltered and secluded part of the valley giving the indication through spatial analysis that it was more likely a point to retreat to, especially given its archaeological evidence of a potential watch tower along the narrow point of Wallace's Knowe (Canmore: DP 225403)<sup>5</sup>. This indicates that south-westerly views would be more important to the cultural significance of the asset while looking for attackers.
- 7.7.74 The revised proposed development would have a reduced effect, such that the spatial and visual relationships to and from the Whalplaw Burn valley would be minimally altered and focus on the asset's function would still be appreciable and understood. Albeit reduced, reciprocal views from Longcroft, Fort would remain with an element of distraction, but is considered only a single element of the overall significance of the asset.

---

<sup>5</sup> Publication drawing; plan and section, fort, Wallace's Knowe. <https://canmore.org.uk/collection/1494017>



**Plate 1: Photo from 354025E , 655007N looking north to Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473)**



- 7.7.75 It is anticipated that the magnitude of impact would be reduced to medium adverse due to the reduction in visual changes to key setting elements but in recognition that some key aspects of setting are affected, i.e. the reciprocal relationship from Whalplaw Burn valley and from Longcroft, Fort (SM372). On an asset of high cultural heritage significance, this would result in a **Moderate** significance of effect. Professional judgement has been applied, and given the retained ability to understand, experience, and appreciate the asset within its setting, the effect is not considered significant in EIA terms.
- 7.7.76 The original assessment concluded that the original proposed development would have a medium/high adverse magnitude of impact, resulting in a **Moderate/Major** significance of effect, which is significant in EIA terms.
- 7.7.77 While the revised proposed development has not reduced the magnitude of impact greatly, the resulting significance of effect is not deemed to erode the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument as other aspects integral to its setting are retained. These key aspects of setting, which are considered integral, are the views out of the valley, which contain the links to the Whalplaw Burn valley, Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480) and Longcroft, Fort (SM372), where the ability to understand, appreciate, and experience these relationships are intact. In reciprocal views, the experience of these relationships is impacted, by the drawing of attention away from the asset. However, the relationships are still able to be understood and appreciated. The resulting significance of effect is not deemed to erode the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument as many aspects integral to its setting are retained thus not eroding the cultural significance of the asset.

## Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480);

### *Summary of Assessment of Original Proposed Development*

- 7.7.78 The asset is a scooped homestead likely dating between 1000 BC and 0 CE, consisting of an oval scoop with evidence of agricultural field systems to the south of the asset. The original assessment found that the key factor from which its significance is derived is its contribution to the understanding of prehistoric scooped settlements within a wider Iron Age landscape and that the asset has the potential to further the understanding of the economy and development of such a rich Iron Age landscape in the region surrounding Leader Water. It was concluded that whilst the original proposed development would be visible, the impact would be focussed on the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the relationship between the asset and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473), which is identified as having a defensive relationship with the asset.
- 7.7.79 The EIA process outlined in **AEI Figure 2.1** and **AEI Figure 2.2**, shows the evolution through design outlining the movement of wind turbines away from the asset.
- 7.7.80 Nevertheless, the original assessment found that the introduction of wind turbines behind Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) would impact the visual relationship between the two assets, distracting from this relationship. An impact of moderate significance of effect was identified in the original assessment.

### *Summary of HES's Comments*

#### Objection - February 2024

- 7.7.81 HES disagreed with SLRs assessment as summarised above, it being key that HES identified that the original proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the scheduled monument.
- 7.7.82 HES's response identified the key elements of setting which contribute to Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480). These were:
- its spatial and visual relationship with Soonhope, Homestead (SM4476) to the south-west and Hog Hill, Settlement (SM4481) to the west and their positions along the sides of valleys, which contributes to the experience and appreciation of the monuments;
  - views along the Whalplaw Burn valley into the Leader Water;
  - its approach from the Whalplaw Burn to the south-east entrance to the asset and the corresponding views from the approach (north-east) and towards the approach from the entrance (south-west). This is considered to allow for the appreciation of its distinct 'sense of place'; and
  - the direct line of sight between Glenburnie, fort (SM4473) creating a key reciprocal view from which the sense of being overlooked is clearly appreciable. This also is highlighted by its more intimate and tucked-away location where the fort holds wider and more expansive views up and down the valley.
- 7.7.83 HES agreed that the ability to understand the visual and spatial relationship between the asset and Glenburnie, Fort (SM4475) would be impacted but said that the impacts have been underestimated in the original assessment.

7.7.84 HES stated that T1, T18, T19, and T4 would dominate the setting of the asset when viewed from Whalplaw Burn valley. In addition to those mentioned, the presence of large wind turbines above and along the valley would diminish the appreciation of its position in its prehistoric settlement group.

7.7.85 They considered these visible wind turbines to be a substantial intrusion into the relationship with Glenburnie, Fort (SM4475), such that the integrity of the setting is adversely affected.

Redesign response - November 2024

7.7.86 Considering the revised proposed development which reduces the 19 wind turbines to 12 wind turbines, HES state, “the redesigned scheme appears to have reduced the level of impact on the integrity of the setting of Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480). This would appear to reduce the effect such that we would not object.”

**Design Amendments**

7.7.87 In their objection dated February 2024, HES outlined that the key contributors to understanding the significance of the asset are primarily derived from:

- xi views from the Whalplaw Burn valley looking south-west towards the asset on approach from the valley floor; and
- xii views north-east from the entrance to the asset along the Whalplaw Burn valley. HES noted particular concern with wind turbines T19, T1, T18 and T4.

7.7.88 With reference to Figure 7.8 of the EIA Report October 2023, the removal of wind turbines T1, T2, T3, T4, T17, T18 and T19 is considered to remove all visibility in the views from Whalplaw Burn valley (xi) and reduces proximity and distraction from the nearest wind turbines the views north-east from the asset (xii).

**Assessment of Revised Proposed Development**

7.7.89 A reassessment of the revised proposed development is presented below. This references the removal of wind turbines T1 - T4 and T17 - T19.

7.7.90 The revised proposed development will be visible in views towards the north-east, composed of 7 hubs and 5 blade tips. The nearest wind turbine (T16) would stand 1.4 km away. Those nearest the asset are removed, resulting in the spread of the revised proposed development moving more eastward and resulting in the wind turbines seen as less enclosing and domineering on the horizon.

7.7.91 The key aspects of setting from which the asset derives its significance from are its proximity to Soonhope, Homestead (SM4476) 1 km to the south-west, its location near Whalplaw Burn which was utilised for resources, and its relationship with Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473) being its primary defensive link. Its location on the lower slopes of Longcroft Hill was likely deliberate as it is easily accessible to the nearest water source required for settlement, utilises the topography to protect from visibility to the south-east and is easily protected by Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473).

7.7.92 Those wind turbines which previously dominated the setting of the asset (T19, T1, T18, and T4) have been removed. The settlement would still experience some visual changes in its views towards

Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473), which is affect the ability to clearly appreciate this relationship. The other aspects of its setting would be preserved.

7.7.93 It is anticipated that the magnitude of impact would be low adverse due to clearly discernible visual changes to one key aspect of the setting, i.e. its views towards Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473). Other contributing factors to significance would be preserved. On an asset of high cultural heritage significance, this would result in a **Minor** significance of effect and would not be considered significant in EIA terms.

7.7.94 The original assessment concluded that the original proposed development would have a medium adverse magnitude of impact, resulting in a **Moderate** significance of effect. The revised proposed development has reduced the magnitude of impact by removing wind turbines highlighted through consultation.

## Decommissioning Effects

7.7.95 There have been no relevant changes in relation to decommissioning effects from the original assessment and remain as presented in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023.

## 7.8 Mitigation

7.8.1 Mitigation measures remain as summarised in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023 and remain applicable. Beyond the layout design change and reduction of wind turbines described above, in line with HES's comments on the 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2024, revision to AEI TA8.6 has respected the original 500m buffer to the scheduled assets with no enhancement of biodiversity proposed within this buffer. Further to this, fencing is proposed within 50m of the assets within the site boundary to ensure no accidental damage occurs during construction.

## 7.9 Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

7.9.1 There have been no relevant changes in relation to cumulative effects from the original assessment and remain as presented in Chapter 7 of the EIA Report October 2023.

## 7.10 Summary of Effects

7.10.1 Residual effects after mitigation comparing the original and the revised proposed developments are summarised in AEI **Table 7.2** below.

AEI Table 7.2: Summary of Effects

Receptor and Impact Pathway	Original Proposal Development		Mitigation	Revised Proposed Development		
	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance		Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance	Integrity retained? (Y/N)
Addinston, Fort (SM362)	Medium Adverse	Moderate – not significant	Removal of T17, T19, T1, T2, and T3	Medium Adverse	Moderate – not significant	Yes
Longcroft, Fort (SM372)	Medium Adverse	Moderate - significant	Removal of T1, T2, T3, T17, T18, and T19.	Medium Adverse	Moderate – significant	Yes
Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473)	Medium/High Adverse	Moderate/Major - significant	Removal of T1, T4, T18, and T19	Medium Adverse	Moderate – not significant	Yes
Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480)	Medium Adverse	Moderate - significant	Removal of T1, T4, T18, T19	Low Adverse	Minor – not significant	Yes

## 7.11 Conclusion

- 7.11.1 Following the implementation of embedded mitigation measures which have resulted in the removal of seven wind turbines, SLR assert that adverse effects on cultural heritage from the revised proposed development have been lessened on four assets. The resulting effects on three of these assets, Addinston, Fort (SM362), Glenburnie, Fort (SM4473), and Longcroft Hill, Homestead (SM4480), have been reduced to the point that they are not longer considered significant in EIA terms. Longcroft, Fort (SM372) is still anticipated to experience significant adverse impacts which triggers the NPF4 policy test. This chapter details how the aspects of the asset's cultural significance, which are integral, are still appreciable and understood, such that the integrity of its setting is retained.
- 7.11.2 As such, it is considered that the revised proposed development would not have significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of any scheduled monuments, making it compliant under NPF4 policy.

## 7.12 References

Scottish Government. (2023) National Planning Framework 4. Available at:

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/>

Historic Environment Scotland. (2019) Historic Environment Policy for Scotland, Available at:

<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7>

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