

14 Cultural Heritage

This chapter assesses the potential impacts of the proposed scheme on cultural heritage assets comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape.

The study area extended 200m from the proposed scheme. Baseline conditions were established through a desk-based survey and walkover survey, geophysical survey and aerial imagery analysis. Designated cultural heritage assets up to 2km from the proposed scheme were included in the baseline where there was potential for impacts on their setting. In total, 100 cultural heritage assets were considered as part of the baseline, comprising 83 archaeological remains, eight historic buildings, and nine historic landscape types (HLT).

Before mitigation, significant potential impacts during construction resulting from their removal were identified on 16 archaeological remains of possible prehistoric date, comprising Culloden Cropmark (Asset 33), Stratton Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 46), Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 2 (Asset 53), Cradlehall Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 57), Cradlehall Rectilinear Feature (Asset 58), Inshes Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 59), Scretan Burn Pit-like Features (Asset 60), Scretan Burn Linear Feature (Asset 62), Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 4 (Asset 64), Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 5 (Asset 65), Inshes Possible Enclosure (Asset 66), Scretan Burn Curvilinear Features (Asset 74), Stratton Farm Possible Hut Circle and Linear Feature (Asset 79), Stratton Farm Possible Enclosure and Settlement Activity (Asset 80), Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 8 (Asset 84), and Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 85). Mitigation proposed for these assets comprises archaeological excavation the design of which would be informed by archaeological trial trenching. On completion of the assessment, reporting, analysis, publication and dissemination of results associated with the mitigation works, the residual significance of impact on these assets has been assessed to be Neutral.

Potential impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) during construction and operation comprise the severance of this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains identified within the study area. The proposed scheme would also change Asset 14's setting, introducing noise and visual intrusion, as well as changing the topography to the east of this cultural heritage asset. While it is not considered that mitigation would be able to reduce this overall severance effect a topographic survey is proposed to record the current setting of this cultural heritage asset. The residual significance of impact on Asset 14 has therefore been assessed to be Moderate during construction and operation; however, opportunities to offset the impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) through additional interpretation will be explored with interested parties including Historic Environment Scotland and The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team. While the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) would not be physically impacted during construction, works would be within 2m of the Scheduled Area. Asset 14 will be clearly demarcated with protective fencing, and residual impact after mitigation has been assessed to be Slight.

Before mitigation, a potential impact of Moderate significance during construction and operation has been identified on the setting of a further nine cultural heritage assets, comprising Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45), Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49), Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50), Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55), Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63), Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72), Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78), Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83), and Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91). The proposed scheme would result in the severance of the relationship between these prehistoric archaeological remains. However, it is not considered that mitigation would be able to reduce this overall severance effect, and therefore the residual significance of effects on these nine cultural heritage assets has been assessed to be Moderate.

The potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains in the undeveloped areas of the study area has been assessed to be high. Where modern development is likely to have disturbed or removed archaeological remains that may have been present the potential for unknown archaeological remains has been assessed to be low. Further archaeological mitigation may be required in advance of construction to mitigate the impact on any previously unknown archaeological remains identified during archaeological trial trenching.

No significant impacts were identified for historic buildings or historic landscape types as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed scheme.

14.1 Introduction

- 14.1.1 This chapter presents the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 3 Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) cultural heritage assessment for the A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton scheme (hereafter referred to as the proposed scheme).
- 14.1.2 Under the guidance provided by DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2, Cultural Heritage (HA208/07) (Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government and The Department for Regional Development Northern Ireland 2007) (hereafter referred to as HA208/07) this chapter considers the impacts of the proposed scheme on cultural heritage under the three sub-topics of archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape. To facilitate assessment, the historic landscape was divided into Historic Landscape Types (HLTs) defined as 'distinctive and repeated combinations of components defining generic historic landscapes' (HA208/07; Annex 7, paragraph 7.7.3).
- 14.1.3 This chapter is supported by the following figures and appendices, which are cross referenced where relevant:
- Figure 14.1 (Locations of Archaeological Remains and Historic Buildings);
 - Figure 14.2 (Location of Historic Landscape Types (HLT));
 - Figure 14.3 (Potential for Unknown Archaeological Remains);
 - Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report);
 - Appendix A14.2 (Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis);
 - Appendix A14.3 (Aerial Imagery Analysis); and
 - Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

14.2 Legislative and Policy Background

- 14.2.1 Details of relevant legislation and planning policies are provided in Section 2 in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report). An assessment of the compliance of the proposed scheme against development plan policies relevant to this environmental topic is reported in Appendix A18.2 (Assessment of Development Plan Policy Compliance) and a summary overview is provided in Section 18.4 in Chapter 18 (Policies and Plans).

14.3 Methodology

Approach to Assessment

- 14.3.1 The assessment was undertaken based on the guidance provided in HA208/07. Both designated and undesignated cultural heritage assets have been included in this assessment.
- 14.3.2 Due to the potential for significant impacts (Moderate or greater significance of impact) and the high potential for unknown archaeological remains within the study area, a detailed assessment (as defined in HA208/07; Annex 5, paragraph 5.2.2) has been undertaken for archaeological remains comprising a desk-based survey, including walkover survey (Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) geophysical survey (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis) and an aerial photograph rectification survey (Appendix A14.3: Aerial Imagery Analysis).
- 14.3.3 Given that significant impacts (Moderate or greater significance of impact) on historic buildings and the historic landscape are unlikely, a simple assessment (as defined by HA208/07; Annex 6, paragraph 6.2.2; Annex 7, paragraph 7.2.2) which comprised a desk-based assessment, walkover survey and additional site visit (Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) was undertaken. This was considered proportionate to assess the potential impacts that may result from the construction and operation of the proposed scheme on historic buildings and the historic landscape.

- 14.3.4 The above approach was agreed in writing with, and through the formal scoping responses of, The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team and Historic Environment Scotland (HES). Further information on this consultation is provided below and in Chapter 6 (Consultation and Scoping) and Appendix A6.1 (Summary of Consultation Responses).

Study Area

- 14.3.5 Based on the guidance provided in HA208/07 (Annex 5, paragraph 5.4.1) the study area for archaeological remains was defined as an area extending 200m from the proposed scheme. For the purposes of this assessment, this study area was also adopted for historic buildings and the historic landscape.
- 14.3.6 Informed by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) outlined in Chapter 10 (Visual), designated cultural heritage assets up to 2km from the proposed scheme were identified where there was potential for impacts on their setting. While the ZTV extends up to 3km from the proposed scheme, a 2km study area was used as there are unlikely to be any significant visual impacts on the setting of designated assets beyond 2km given the distance, intervening topography, built form, and vegetation. Significant noise impacts beyond 1km are also considered unlikely (Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration), and therefore designated cultural heritage assets which may be affected by changes in noise would also fall within the wider 2km study area.
- 14.3.7 The potential for impacts on six designated cultural heritage assets located outside the study area but within 2km of the proposed scheme were identified and these have been included in the baseline. These comprise:
- Culloden House, Gate Piers and Gardeners' Bothy (LB8039; Asset 109) and Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (LB10954; Asset 110) both Category A Listed Buildings;
 - Castlehill House (LB0835; Asset 9) and Cradlehall House (LB8036; Asset 92) both Category B Listed Buildings;
 - Culloden Inventory Battlefield (BTL6; HLT 12); and
 - Culloden House Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00122; HLT 13).
- 14.3.8 This list of assets for inclusion for further assessment was agreed with The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team on 14 June 2018 and by HES in their response to the scoping report dated 27 June 2018.

Baseline Data

- 14.3.9 Cultural heritage baseline conditions were established through:
- A desk-based survey and walkover survey, including sources consulted, presented in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report).
 - A geophysical survey of 12 land plots (totalling approximately 25.45ha) undertaken between 17 January 2018 and 25 January 2018 and between 9 April 2018 and 18 April 2018. Further details are provided in Appendix A14.2 (Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis).
 - An aerial photograph rectification survey of 12 land plots undertaken in June 2018. Further details are provided in Appendix A14.3 (Aerial Imagery Analysis).

Consultation

- 14.3.10 On 13 March 2018, HES was provided with an outline of approach and a list of Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Historic Battlefields located outside the 200m study area, but which were proposed for further assessment due to the potential for impacts on their settings. HES responded (23 March 2018) stating that they were content with the assessment methodology proposed and agreed a detailed assessment for archaeological remains was appropriate in this case. HES confirmed that they were content with the list of designated assets identified for assessment.

- 14.3.11 A further letter dated 13 June 2018 detailing an amended list of Scheduled Monuments, Category A Listed Buildings, Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Historic Battlefields located outside the 200m study area to be included in the baseline for further assessment was provided to HES. HES confirmed that they were content with the revised list in their response dated 27 June 2018.
- 14.3.12 An outline of approach and a list of Category B and Category C Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas outside the 200m study area, the settings of which could be affected by the proposed scheme, was provided to The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team in a letter on 13 March 2018. The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team responded on 14 March 2018 stating the scope proposed looked adequate for the purposes of the EIAR, and the list of designated assets to be included as part of the cultural heritage baseline was comprehensive.
- 14.3.13 On 13 June 2018 a further letter detailing a list of Category B and C Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas located outside the 200m study area to be scoped out of further assessment was provided to The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team. The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team agreed with the proposals to scope out the assets listed in their response dated 14 June 2018.
- 14.3.14 No impact is predicted on Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12) as a result of the proposed scheme. An outline of the setting of Culloden Battlefield and the justification for this assessment was communicated with HES in writing on 25 July 2018 and is described in paragraphs 14.4.60 and 14.5.21 HES responded on 23 August 2018 confirming that they were content to agree with the rationale for concluding no impact on the Inventory Battlefield. In addition, HES were provided with a copy of the geophysical survey results (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis) for comment, particularly regarding the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14; SM11535) on 6 August 2018. In their response dated 22 August 2018 HES acknowledged the findings of the report and stated they had no immediate plans to review the Scheduled Area of Asset 14 based on the results.
- 14.3.15 The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team were also provided with a copy of the geophysical survey results for comment on 7 August 2018. In their response dated 27 August 2018 they recommended the area around the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) should be treated as if scheduled and that the putative features identified by this survey work should be the subject of further mitigation informed by archaeological trial trenching.
- 14.3.16 On 2 October 2018 a letter was sent to The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team which presented a preliminary assessment of impacts on cultural heritage assets resulting from the construction of the proposed scheme, and the mitigation proposed, which would be informed by archaeological trial trenching undertaken after consent of the proposed scheme. In an email on 8 November 2018, The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team stated that they were content that all the impacted features would be subject to trial trenching to inform the requirement for excavation. In response, an email clarifying that no further work would be undertaken to inform the EIAR and that trial trenching to be undertaken after the proposed scheme had been consented was sent to The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team on 9 November 2018.
- 14.3.17 Information provided by a local landowner suggested that the site of a former castle at Ashton Farm was in proximity to the proposed scheme and also noted that historic carved stones were embedded in the Ashton Farm farmhouse garden wall. The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team was contacted on 7 August 2018 and in an email dated 27 August 2018 they stated that information on decorative stones (included a date stone inscribed '1669' now located in the wall at Ashton Farm) and that flagstones had been identified in a nearby field had been received, but had not yet been entered on the Highland Historic Environment Record (HER). They also stated there is no further evidence for a castle in this location and agree with Jacobs' interpretation that a building visible on historical mapping was an agricultural outbuilding. Nevertheless, desk-based sources and the results of the archaeological geophysical survey undertaken as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment were reviewed. An additional site inspection was also undertaken on 28 September 2018 to carry out a detailed examination of the suggested site of the castle and the decorative historic fabric identified. As stated in paragraph 14.4.24 and presented in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report), based on the evidence identified above there is nothing to indicate the presence of a castle within proximity to the proposed scheme. While decorative historic fabric dating to the 17th century was identified in the garden wall at Ashton Farm, and is of unknown origin, there is no evidence to suggest it came from within the study area for the proposed scheme.

- 14.3.18 Details of the consultation process are provided in Chapter 6 (Consultation and Scoping) and supporting Appendix A6.1 (Summary of Consultation Responses).

Impact Assessment

Value

- 14.3.19 For all three sub-topics; archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape, an assessment of the value of each cultural heritage asset was undertaken on a six-point scale of very high, high, medium, low, negligible and unknown, based on professional judgement and guided by the criteria provided in HA208/07 as presented in Table 14.1.

Table 14.1: Criteria to Assess the Value of Archaeological Remains, Historic Buildings and Historic Landscape Types

Value	Criteria
Archaeological Remains	
Very High	World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites). Assets of acknowledged international importance. Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives.
High	Scheduled Monuments (including proposed sites). Undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance. Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives.
Medium	Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives.
Low	Designated and undesignated assets of local importance. Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations. Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives.
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest.
Unknown	The importance of the site has not been ascertained.
Historic Buildings	
Very High	Structures inscribed as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites. Other buildings of recognised international importance.
High	Scheduled Monuments with standing remains. Category A Listed Buildings. Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the category. Conservation Areas containing very important buildings. Undesignated structures of clear national importance.
Medium	Category B Listed Buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations. Conservation Areas containing buildings which contribute significantly to their historic character. Historic Townscape or built-up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Low	Category C Listed Buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Negligible	Buildings of no architectural or historical note; buildings of an intrusive character.
Unknown	Buildings with some hidden (i.e. inaccessible) potential for historic significance.
Historic Landscape	
Very High	World Heritage Sites inscribed for their historic landscape qualities. Historic landscapes of international value, whether designated or not. Extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factors.
High	Designated historic landscapes of outstanding interest. Undesignated landscapes of outstanding interest. Undesignated landscapes of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national value. Well preserved historic landscapes, exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.

Value	Criteria
Medium	Designated special historic landscapes. Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional value. Averagely well-preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.
Low	Robust undesignated historic landscapes. Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups. Historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest.

Impact Magnitude

- 14.3.20 Magnitude of impact is the degree of change that would be experienced by a cultural heritage asset and (where relevant) its setting resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed scheme, as compared to a 'Do Nothing' situation. Magnitude of impact is assessed without reference to the value of the cultural heritage asset and may include physical impacts on the cultural heritage asset, or impacts on its setting or amenity value.
- 14.3.21 Assessment of magnitude of impact was based on professional judgement informed by the methodology and criteria provided in HA208/07 for archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape presented in Table 14.2.

Table 14.2: Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Heritage Assets

Magnitude	Criteria
Major	Change to most or all key archaeological materials, such that the resource is totally altered. Change to key historic building elements, such that the resource is totally altered. Change to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; extreme visual effects; gross change of noise or change to sound quality; fundamental changes to use or access; resulting in total change to historic landscape character unit. Comprehensive changes to setting.
Moderate	Changes to many key archaeological materials, such that the resource is clearly modified. Changes to many key historic building elements, such that the resource is significantly modified. Changes to some key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape, noticeable differences in noise or sound quality, considerable changes to use or access; resulting in moderate changes to historic landscape character. Considerable changes to setting that affect the character of the asset.
Minor	Changes to key archaeological materials, such that the asset is slightly altered. Changes to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly different. Changes to few key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, slight visual changes to few key aspects of historic landscape, limited changes to noise levels or sound quality, slight changes to use or access; resulting in limited changes to historic landscape character. Slight changes to setting.
Negligible	Very minor changes to archaeological materials or setting. Slight changes to historic buildings elements or setting that hardly affect it. Very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, virtually unchanged visual effects, very slight changes in noise levels or sound quality, very slight changes to use or access; resulting in a very small change to historic landscape character.
No Change	No change to elements, parcels or components; no visual or audible changes; no changes arising from amenity or community factors.

Impact Significance

- 14.3.22 For all three sub-topics, the significance of impact with and without mitigation was determined as a combination of the value of the cultural heritage asset and the magnitude of impact. In accordance with the guidance provided by HA208/07, significance of effect was assessed on a five-point scale of Very Large, Large, Moderate, Slight or Neutral, using professional judgement informed by the matrix illustrated in Table 14.3. Five levels of significance of impact are defined, which apply equally to adverse and beneficial impacts.

- 14.3.23 For the purposes of this assessment, as presented in Section 5.3 (Chapter 5: Overview of Assessment Process), impacts of Moderate or greater significance are considered as potentially significant in the context of the EIA Regulations and are highlighted in bold in Table 14.3.

Table 14.3: Matrix for Determination of Impact Significance

Magnitude Value	No change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/Large	Large/Very Large	Very Large
High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/Slight	Moderate/Large	Large/Very Large
Medium	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate/Large
Low	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Slight/Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Neutral /Slight	Slight

Impacts on Setting

- 14.3.24 Setting is defined by Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting as, *'the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated and experienced'* (HES 2016a; page 6). Based on the guidance provided by this document, a three-stage process was undertaken to assess the effect of the proposed scheme on the setting of cultural heritage assets:

- Stage 1: cultural heritage assets where the setting may be affected by the proposed scheme were identified. As noted in paragraphs 14.3.6 to 14.3.8 and 14.3.10 to 14.3.13, those designated cultural heritage assets located outside the 200m study area, but within 2km of the proposed scheme, to be included in the assessment due to potential impacts on setting, were agreed with HES and The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team.
- Stage 2: modern Ordnance Survey mapping, aerial photography and a walkover survey were used to define the setting of cultural heritage assets by establishing if and how their surroundings contribute to the ways in which the cultural heritage asset is understood, appreciated and experienced. Where relevant, further information on the setting of assets is presented in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report).
- Stage 3: the way in which the proposed scheme would affect the ability to understand, appreciate, or experience a cultural heritage asset was then assessed. This was primarily informed by site inspections, supported by the viewpoint visualisations provided in Figures 10.5 to 10.11 which accompany Chapter 10 (Visual). This is presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Impacts on Historic Battlefields

- 14.3.25 Historic Battlefields are defined by Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Historic Battlefields as those which hold *'a significant place in our national consciousness and have strong resonance in Scottish history and culture'* (HES 2016b, page 4). Based on the guidance provided by the document, a three-stage process was undertaken to assess potential impacts on Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12):

- Stage 1: the baseline of the battlefield was identified. This was achieved through a review of existing information on the battlefield (Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report).
- Stage 2: different types of impact were then assessed; direct impacts, such as the removal or damage, to the special qualities (i.e. the physical remains and archaeological evidence, both known and expected) of the battlefield; contextual changes to key landscape characteristics (the areas in which the main events of the battle are considered to have taken place) such as interruption of key views or alterations to the character of the landscape; and overall (this term is used in place of 'cumulative' to avoid confusion with the term 'cumulative effects' common to EIA) that is, adding to existing negative effects from other development that has been built or is planned, within the battlefield.

- Stage 3: as discussed in paragraph 14.5.21, mitigation measures were not required as no impacts were predicted on Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12).

Limitations to Assessment

- 14.3.26 This assessment has been prepared based on the information available in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) and non-intrusive archaeological investigations and is considered appropriate for the purposes of this DMRB Stage 3 assessment. However, further evaluation, including trial trenching, may be required to further inform detailed mitigation proposals.
- 14.3.27 A walk over survey was undertaken for the study area and included the whole route of the proposed scheme and a windshield survey was undertaken for designated cultural heritage assets outside the study area but included in the cultural heritage baseline due to the potential for impacts on their settings. An additional site visit was undertaken to inspect the carved stones at Ashton Farm (Asset 18) and the site of the possible castle identified by a local land owner (Ashton Farm Building (Site of); Asset 108).
- 14.3.28 Geophysical survey and an aerial photograph rectification survey was undertaken for the 12 land plots covering the route of the proposed scheme. Further details are provided in Appendix A14.2 (Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis) and Appendix A14.3 (Aerial Imagery Analysis).
- 14.3.29 In isolation the results of the magnetometry survey (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis) can only be tentatively identified as archaeological features given the varied and ‘noisy’ background level of magnetism found across the study area, resulting from the natural soils and geology. However, in combination with the results of the desk-based survey (Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) and aerial photograph rectification survey (Appendix A14.3: Aerial Imagery Analysis), these results provide sufficient information to assess the value of these cultural heritage assets and the magnitude of impact. While this increases the confidence in the results of the geophysical survey used to inform the cultural heritage baseline, trial trenching may be required to facilitate the detailed design of the mitigation measures identified.

14.4 Baseline Conditions

- 14.4.1 This section describes the baseline condition for the three sub-topics; archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape. More detailed information on cultural heritage assets considered as part of the baseline is presented in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report).

Cultural Heritage Assets

- 14.4.2 From the sources identified in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) a total of 94 cultural heritage assets have been identified within the study area. A further six designated cultural heritage assets located outside the study area were included in the baseline due to the potential for effects on their settings (paragraph 14.3.7). The total number of cultural heritage assets assessed as part of the cultural heritage baseline is therefore 100, comprising 83 archaeological remains, eight historic buildings, and nine HLTs. A summary of the total number of cultural heritage assets and their value is provided within Table 14.4.
- 14.4.3 The locations of these cultural heritage assets are shown on Figure 14.1 (Locations of Archaeological Remains and Historic Buildings) and Figure 14.2 (Location of Historic Landscape Types (HLT)).

Table 14.4: Total Numbers of Cultural Heritage Assets and their Value

Sub-topic	Unknown	Negligible	Low	Medium	High	Very High	All Values Total
Archaeological Remains	0	24	20	16	23 (including one Scheduled Monument)	0	83

Sub-topic	Unknown	Negligible	Low	Medium	High	Very High	All Values Total
Historic Buildings	0	1	3	2 (Category B Listed Buildings)	2 (Category A Listed Buildings)	0	8
Historic Landscapes	0	2	5	0	1 (a Garden and Designed Landscape)	1 (an Inventory Battlefield)	9
TOTAL	0	27	28	18	26	1	100

14.4.4 In the interest of consistency, asset numbering has been retained from an earlier data gathering exercise as part of the DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report (Jacobs 2017) with new assets added following subsequent baseline data gathering undertaken during the DMRB Stage 3 assessment. Therefore, the cultural heritage asset numbers do not start at one or run sequentially.

14.4.5 The names of some cultural heritage assets, including 'Ashton Farm Cottages, ring ditch 415m SW and pit circles 460m WSW of' (hereafter known as the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14)) have been shortened within the report for legibility and conciseness.

Archaeological Remains

14.4.6 A total of 83 archaeological remains have been included in the cultural heritage baseline. These are characterised predominantly by evidence of prehistoric settlement and habitation, evidence of prehistoric funerary practices, and the post-medieval agricultural landscape.

Archaeological Remains of High Value

14.4.7 The Scheduled Monument (Asset 14; SM11535; Photograph 14.1) comprises a penannular ring ditch and three pit circles identified from aerial photographs and interpreted as the remains of an unenclosed prehistoric settlement. Pit circles may have held a ritual or ceremonial function representing the remains of Neolithic timber circles, with the pits dug to erect large timber uprights in a circle arrangement (Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (ScARF 2012a; Millican 2007). However, the pit circles forming the Scheduled Monument appear to be characteristic of prehistoric roundhouses. They lie within a settlement context (with an associated ring ditch) are less than 15m in diameter, and comprise regularly spaced pits (for structural integrity) with detached pits that may represent a porch structure attached to the roundhouse (Millican 2007). Additionally, the presence of a double line of pits associated with one of the pit circles may suggest more than one phase of construction, resulting from the replacement of posts over time (Millican 2007).

14.4.8 Geophysical survey undertaken as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment identified that Asset 14 may be part of a larger complex of prehistoric settlement (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis). Within the study area features of similar form and character were identified, such as Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63; high value) in close proximity to the Scheduled Areas, as well pit-like features and possible hut circles (such as Assets 45, 48, 49, 55, 60, 79, 82, 83, 86 and 87; assessed to be of high value).

14.4.9 The setting of the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) is characterised by its semi-rural location on a slight topographic rise in the landscape with views in all directions which may have influenced the choice of the location of the settlement (Photograph 14.1). The spatial and temporal relationship of Asset 14 with similar prehistoric archaeology within the study area contributes to our understanding, appreciation and experience of Asset 14 (Table 2 of Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report). Distant traffic, aeroplane and train noise form part of this asset's setting; however, this does not contribute to our understanding, appreciation or experience of it. The value of Asset 14 is derived primarily from its archaeological remains.

14.4.10 In consideration of its designation as a Scheduled Monument and potential to contribute to research themes relating to the range of structures, patterns of land-use, and subsistence strategies during the prehistoric period, as well as questions of regional traditions in construction and identifying trends in the

shape and layout of prehistoric dwellings (ScARF 2012a, 2012b, 2012c) Asset 14 has been assessed to be of high value.

Photograph 14.1: Location of the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14), Looking South.



- 14.4.11 Recent geophysical survey (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis) and aerial imagery analysis (Appendix A14.3: Aerial Imagery Analysis) undertaken as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment identified possible prehistoric settlement activity that indicates that Asset 14 is more extensive than previously thought (Figure 14.1). A number of archaeological remains were identified close to the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) comprising:
- small circular and curvilinear anomalies, interpreted as possible hut circles, given their resemblance to the hut-circle associated with Asset 14 (Asset 45, 48 and 79);
 - possible pits and clusters of pits, based on comparison with known pits located in the Scheduled Areas (Assets 49, 60, 82, 83, 86, 87 and 111); and
 - complexes of pits, and linear, and curvilinear features similar to those located in the Scheduled Areas (Assets 50, 53, 55, 57, 59, 63, 64, 65, 72, 78, 84 and 91).
- 14.4.12 The results of the geophysical survey suggested these archaeological remains are similar in character to the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) and may form a group, or larger area of settlement activity.
- 14.4.13 The setting of these archaeological remains is characterised by their semi-rural location. Their association with other prehistoric archaeology in the study area, including the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) contributes to our understanding, appreciation and experience of these assets. While distant traffic, aeroplane and train noise form part of the setting of these assets, it does not contribute to our understanding, appreciation or experience of them.
- 14.4.14 While their interpretation remains tentative, the possible association of these archaeological remains with the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14), as well as their potential to contribute to ScARF research themes relating to prehistoric structures, patterns of land-use, and subsistence strategies, as well as regional traditions in the construction, shape and layout of prehistoric dwellings (ScARF 2012a, 2012b, 2012c) these assets have been assessed to be of high value.

Archaeological Remains of Medium Value

- 14.4.15 Sixteen archaeological remains identified within the study area may represent further evidence of prehistoric activity. These archaeological remains were identified as cropmarks on aerial photographs and during geophysical survey undertaken as part of the assessment (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis). Five archaeological remains were identified from aerial photographs; these comprise:
- Castlehill Possible Enclosure (Asset 6), a small curvilinear cropmark interpreted as a possible enclosure;
 - Culloden Cropmark (Asset 33), a cropmark site included on The Highland Council's Historic Environment Record;
 - Stoneyfield Bronze Age Site (Asset 34), cropmarks interpreted as a possible ring ditch or henge;
 - Galloway Cropmarks (Asset 67), a scatter of cropmarks including group of at least seven possible pits; and
 - Cradlehall Cropmark (Asset 107), a curvilinear feature identified from aerial imagery rectification as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment (Appendix A14.3: Aerial Imagery Analysis).
- 14.4.16 Ten archaeological remains identified during geophysical survey undertaken as part of the assessment may form possible boundaries and enclosures (Appendix A14.2: Archaeological Geophysical Survey and Aerial Imagery Analysis). These comprise the following:
- Stratton Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 46);
 - Stratton Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 47);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 52);
 - Cradlehall Rectilinear Feature (Asset 58),
 - Scretan Burn Linear Feature (Asset 62);
 - Inshes Possible Enclosure (Asset 66);
 - Scretan Burn Curvilinear Features (Asset 74);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure and Pit (Asset 77);
 - Stratton Farm Possible Enclosure and Settlement Activity (Asset 80); and
 - Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 85).
- 14.4.17 These archaeological remains have been interpreted as discrete areas of possible prehistoric activity within the study area, comprising enclosures and isolated activity. In consideration of their potential to contribute to research themes relating to the prehistoric period including the identification of activity areas, patterns of land-use, and subsistence strategies (ScARF 2012a and 2012c), these assets have been assessed to be of medium value.
- 14.4.18 Possible prehistoric funerary activity within the study area is evidenced by the Ashton Farm Possible Barrow (Asset 19). Identified on an aerial photograph this monument has been interpreted as a possible barrow, characterised by a ring ditch and central pit, with an associated square enclosure and pits to the south-east. The setting of this cultural heritage asset comprises a rise in the landscape with views in all directions which may have influenced the choice of the location of the barrow. Given the potential of Asset 19 to contribute to research themes relating to identity and social structure, belief systems, and the ritual context of prehistoric funerary sites (ScARF 2012c) it has been assessed to be of medium value.

Archaeological Remains of Low Value

- 14.4.19 Caulfield Military Road (Asset 16) is the possible location of a section of 18th century military road constructed in the wake of the Jacobite Risings. Major Caulfield, the Grandson of the 1st Viscount Charlemont, was Inspector of Roads between 1732 and 1767. Caulfield was responsible for directing

the construction and upgrade of military roads and bridges in Scotland overseeing the construction of approximately 900 miles of road (Roy's Roads 2015). The house built by Caulfield, Cradlehall House (Asset 92), is still extant approximately 400m to the south-east of Asset 16. While there is no evidence for this section of military road above ground, its potential to contribute further to our understanding of the network of 18th century military roads is derived from its archaeological remains. In consideration of this, Asset 16 has been assessed to be of low value.

14.4.20 A number of field boundaries and divisions were identified during geophysical survey undertaken as part of the DMRB Stage 3 assessment and are likely to form part of relict field systems – the archaeological remains of past fields identified from the patterns of their former boundaries. These comprise:

- Ashton Farm Possible Former Field Division (Asset 51);
- Ashton Farm Possible Former Field Boundary 1 (Asset 68);
- Ashton Farm Possible Former Field Boundary 2 (Asset 69),
- Ashton Farm Possible Former Field Boundaries 1 (Asset 70);
- Ashton Farm Possible Former Field Boundaries 2 (Asset 71);
- Beechwood Farm Possible Former Field System (Asset 73);
- Stratton Farm Former Field Division (Asset 75);
- Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Divisions (Asset 81);
- Beechwood Farm Field Boundary (Asset 88);
- Beechwood Farm Boundaries 1 (Asset 89);
- Beechwood Farm Boundaries 2 (Asset 90);
- Beechwood Farm Former Field Boundary (Asset 100);
- Beechwood Former Field Boundary (Asset 101);
- Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 1 (Asset 103); and
- Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 2 (Asset 104).

14.4.21 While Assets 100 and 101 are depicted on historic mapping and have been interpreted as former field boundaries (AOC Archaeology Ltd. 2016), the remaining features are not depicted on publicly accessible historic mapping, including 1st Edition Ordnance Survey mapping, suggesting they may pre-date 1868. While no estate plans for the area, both online and at the local archive, were available, the Roy Military Survey of Scotland (1747) does depict cultivated fields in the area and it may be that they are related to pre-19th century agricultural practices. Despite their uncertain date these boundaries could provide insight into post-medieval agriculture, land-use and division, as well as the management of the landscape at a local level; however, these archaeological remains are of a common type and as such have been assessed to be of low value.

14.4.22 A large circular feature was identified during geophysical survey undertaken as part of the assessment (Asset 61), characteristic of a pond or stone pit, and three linear anomalies were identified and have been tentatively interpreted as trackways (Assets 54, 56 and 76). Given these features may provide insight into agriculture and the development of the landscape at a local level, they are of a common type and therefore have been assessed to be of low value.

Archaeological Remains of Negligible Value

14.4.23 Beechwood Farm (Site of) (Asset 26) comprises the location of a recently demolished 19th century farmstead. The farm was constructed as a common planned farmstead comprising several agricultural ranges for livestock centred on a yard. A three-bay two-storey farmhouse with single-storey annexe was located to the north-east of the steading. Historic building recording prior to the farm's demolition identified phases of expansion from the late 19th century to 2010 (AOC Archaeology Ltd. 2010a).

- 14.4.24 Cairnlaw (Site of) (Asset 95) comprises the site of a derelict stone-built, single-storey house with later alterations, including a corrugated asbestos roof. It is assumed that the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (Including Nairn Bypass) scheme would remove this cultural heritage asset. Ashton Farm Building (Site of) (Asset 108) was identified by a local land owner as the site of a possible castle; however, has been interpreted as the site of a now-demolished agricultural building. The building was depicted on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey mapping (1874) as a small rectangular structure to the east of Ashton Farm (Asset 18; low value), that appears to have been demolished by 1902. Given these buildings are no longer extant, Assets 26, 95 and 108 have been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.25 RAF Fighter Command HQ, Raigmore House (Site of) (Asset 31) comprises the location of the Fighter Control Centre and former Area Control Centre for Inverness during World War II. Located within Raigmore House and its grounds, it is likely the house served as the headquarters, Officers Mess and the officers' accommodation while huts were erected in the grounds for military personnel. The house was demolished in around 1965 and the grounds have since been developed into housing and a hospital. Given this cultural heritage asset is no longer extant, and the area has been extensively redeveloped, Asset 31 has been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.26 A total of eight cultural heritage assets comprise excavated archaeological sites within the study area (Assets 11, 12, 13, 21, 23, 28, 29 and 30). While a number of these sites evidence prehistoric occupation, activity and funerary practices, the process of archaeological excavation has removed any buried remains and as such they have been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.27 Archaeological investigations at Beechwood (Asset 11) identified a number of features suggestive of a later prehistoric settlement (AOC Archaeology Ltd. 2009). Several ditches, pits and postholes, as well as artefacts including a flint flake and prehistoric pottery sherds were identified during investigations evidencing ditches, enclosures and timber post-built structures (AOC Archaeology Ltd. 2010b).
- 14.4.28 The site at Stoneyfield (Assets 21, 23, 28, 29 and 30) was excavated in the 1970s, in advance of the construction of the A9. The majority of the cairn (Asset 21), identified as a Clava-type cairn, a Bronze Age circular chambered cairn similar to the cairns at Clava (1.7km to the south-east), approximately 18 metres in diameter with a substantial kerb formed of boulders and an external stone platform, had already been removed by earlier investigations in advance of the construction of the A9. Archaeological investigation revealed the cairn, including pits, cists and cremations (Assets 23, 29 and 30) in the central area, was built upon an earlier prehistoric timber structure (Asset 28) with a central hearth, and a series of associated pits. Following archaeological investigation, Asset 21 (a kerb cairn) was reconstructed in a public park to the east of Inverness (Asset 35).
- 14.4.29 In addition, Assets 12 and 13 comprise the sites of archaeological investigations undertaken within the study area. However, limited archaeological remains were identified including evidence of modern farming and drainage features (Asset 12) and an isolated pit containing Neolithic pottery (Asset 13). Given these archaeological remains have been destroyed and any archaeological information recovered, Assets 11, 12, 13, 21, 23, 28, 29, 30 and 35 have been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.30 Linear Cropmarks and Pits, Raigmore (Asset 36) and Raigmore Cropmark (Asset 37) comprise the location of cropmarks identified from aerial photography. However, given their locations within the Raigmore Hospital development (Asset 36) and within the corridor of the A9 Perth – Inverness Trunk Road and the University of Highlands and Islands (UHI) Inverness Campus (Asset 37) it is assumed these cultural heritage assets have been destroyed. In consideration of this, Assets 36 and 37 have been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.31 Additionally, three possible enclosure features (Asset 97, 98 and 99) were identified to the north of the study area and are possibly associated with post-medieval agricultural practices and the clachans forming Stoneyfield. It is assumed the A96 Dualling Inverness to Nairn (including Nairn Bypass) scheme would remove these cultural heritage assets, therefore Assets 97, 98 and 99 have been assessed to be of negligible value.
- 14.4.32 Six further archaeological remains have been assessed to be of negligible value (Assets 20, 24, 25, 38, 40 and 44), comprising isolated findspots, artefacts, and artefact scatters that evidence activity within the study area from the prehistoric period onwards. However, due to their removal, these cultural

heritage assets can only make a limited contribution to our understanding of past activity within the study area.

Potential for the presence of unknown Archaeological Remains

- 14.4.33 The studies undertaken to inform the cultural heritage baseline provide a robust understanding of the potential for the presence of archaeological remains within the study area. The concentration of known archaeological remains identified by the sources listed in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) and informed by other previous archaeological investigations prior to development, indicates that the potential for the presence of further (unknown) archaeological remains in the undeveloped areas of the study area is high. It is likely that these (unknown) archaeological remains would be of similar form, date and value as those described above. Modern development in the form of the A9 Perth – Inverness Trunk Road, Inverness Campus, Inverness Retail and Business Park, and residential development to the west and south-east of the study area is likely to have disturbed or removed archaeological remains that may have been present. The potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains in these parts of the study area has therefore been assessed to be low. Areas of potential for unknown archaeological remains are shown on Figure 14.3.

Historic Buildings

- 14.4.34 A total of eight historic buildings have been included in the cultural heritage baseline, these are characterised by 18th and 19th century domestic buildings, some with connections to historical figures, and buildings associated with agriculture.
- 14.4.35 Culloden House, Gate Piers and Gardeners' Bothy (Asset 109) and Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (Asset 110) are Category A Listed Buildings located approximately 2km to the north-east of the study area. The house, built in 1788, is a classic example of a two-storey ashlar mansion and was probably built for Arthur Forbes, 7th Laird of Culloden on the footprint of an earlier house. The original house was used as the lodging of Bonnie Prince Charlie, and the headquarters of the Jacobite army, prior to the Battle of Culloden in AD 1746 (HLT 12; paragraphs 14.4.45 to 14.4.61). While the current house was built in the late 18th century, elements of the earlier house were incorporated into its fabric at basement level. The gate piers and gardeners' bothy are contemporary to the later house and comprise a pair of square rusticated polished ashlar piers and a simple two-storey brick dwelling with ashlar dressings. Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (Asset 110) are also contemporary with the later house and comprises a single-storey seven-bay random rubble range, with carriage entrances in the outer bays, and a semi-circular rubble wall that encloses the yard to the west.
- 14.4.36 The setting of Culloden House, Gate Piers and Gardeners' Bothy (Asset 109) and Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (Asset 110) is characterised by its location within the remaining elements of the estate's designed landscape (Culloden House Garden and Designed Landscape; HLT 13). Views from the house to the south-west (across the drive and avenue) are limited by the surrounding mature trees, and residential development and infrastructure of Culloden. Intermittent traffic and noise from the surrounding modern locality form part of the setting of Assets 109 and 110. The stables are located immediately adjacent to C1032 Barn Church Road, surrounded by mature trees with other estate buildings, including the dovecote (Category B Listed Building). The integrity of the relationship between the house and other estate buildings, such as Asset 110, has been maintained, despite the encroachment of modern development in all directions.
- 14.4.37 In consideration of their designations, Culloden House, Gate Piers and Gardeners' Bothy (Asset 109) and Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (Asset 110) have been assessed to be of high value.
- 14.4.38 Castlehill House (Asset 9; Photograph 14.2) a Category B Listed Building, is an early 19th century house located to the east of B9006 Culloden Road and to the north of a modern residential development. The house comprises a two-storey, three-bay white harled construction with an earlier single-storey range to the south-east. Asset 9 is located within the remains of the designed landscape associated with the house, including an established tree-lined avenue to the north-east. The principal view is to the north towards Inverness and the Moray Firth, however this is filtered by the mature trees and the Inverness Campus and construction site beyond.

- 14.4.39 Cradlehall House (Asset 92) is a mid-18th century house. The building comprises a two-storey, three-bay harled house with single-storey flanking wings. A plaque on the south-western gable attributes the house to William Caulfield, Inspector of Roads (1732 to 1767). The setting of Asset 92 is characterised by the modern residential development within which it is now located, positioned on a rise in the landscape with views north over agricultural land to the Moray Firth.
- 14.4.40 In consideration of their designations, Castlehill House (Asset 9) and Cradlehall House (Asset 92) have been assessed to be of medium value.

Photograph 14.2: North Facing Elevation of Castlehill House (Asset 9), Showing Avenue of Trees to the Left



- 14.4.41 Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) and Ashton Farm (Asset 18; Photograph 14.3) form a single farm complex with 19th century origins. Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) are depicted on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey mapping as a small square building associated with the farmsteading. The cottages are similar in architectural style to small cottage types within the Highlands. The current building has been substantially altered and modernised. Ashton Farm (Asset 18), a single-storey range of rendered rubble stone construction, reflects the vernacular architecture of the agricultural improvement era (Maudlin 2009) and is characteristic of the farm steadings of the surrounding historic landscape - Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2) (Paragraph 14.4.65). However, this architectural type is not rare and represents 73% of rural farmsteads still extant in the Scottish Highlands today (Maudlin 2009). A pair of decorative carved red sandstone corunnells (stones or boards forming the top of a door opening (Pride 1996)) of unknown origin have been reused and now form part of a rubble stone garden wall at Ashton Farm.
- 14.4.42 While the setting of these cultural heritage assets, characterised by their semi-rural location, contributes to our understanding of these historic buildings as a farmstead and associated cottages, their value is primarily derived from their remaining historic fabric which has been subject to much modification and alteration. Reflecting the frequency of this type of historic building within the Highland region (Maudlin 2009), modest architectural quality and in consideration of the resultant loss of historic building fabric, Assets 17 and 18 have been assessed to be of low value.
- 14.4.43 Stratton Farmstead (Asset 96) is a farmsteading depicted on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey mapping and comprises an individual two-storey agricultural steading, with associated agricultural buildings and may have been associated with the Culloden House estate. Given its modest architectural quality and in consideration of the loss of historic building fabric, Asset 96 have been assessed to be of low value.

Photograph 14.3: Single-storey Agricultural Ranges Forming part of Ashton Farm (Asset 18), Facing West



- 14.4.44 The A9, Inshes Bridge (Asset 10) is a modern motorway bridge recorded in the Historic Environment Record and has been assessed to be of negligible value.

Historic Landscape Types

- 14.4.45 The Battle of Culloden, which took place on the 14 April 1746, was the last pitched battle fought on British soil and the final battle of the Jacobite Rising. Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12; Figure 14.2) encompasses the areas that the main events of the battle are considered to have taken place (Historic Scotland 2012). A summary of the special qualities and key landscape characteristics of the battlefield is provided below.

Culloden Inventory Battlefield – Special Qualities

- 14.4.46 The following special qualities associated with the battlefield have been identified through desk-based survey, including the analysis of the Battlefield Inventory record for Culloden:

Archaeological remains associated with the battle recorded during 2001

- 14.4.47 Metal detecting, geophysical and radar surveys were undertaken, and established concentrations of metal objects related to the battle, including musket balls, cannon shot and mortar shell fragments, pieces broken from muskets, buttons and buckles, and personal possessions (Historic Scotland 2012; University of Glasgow n.d.). The main concentration was in The Field of the English and indicated most of the hand-to-hand fighting took place further south and over a wider expanse of ground than previously thought (Historic Scotland 2012; University of Glasgow n.d.). A topographic survey undertaken as part of this work also identified subtle undulations in the terrain, which may have served to shelter the Jacobites to the right and centre of the battle (Historic Scotland 2012).

- 14.4.48 Ground penetrating radar survey undertaken in the Clan Cemetery revealed the mounds cover pits, interpreted as burials, and additional features identified during this survey which may indicate further burials in proximity to the Clan Cemetery and a possible grave in The Field of the English (Historic Scotland 2012).

Archaeological remains associated with the battle recorded in 2005

- 14.4.49 Further metal detecting in The Field of the English and Leanach enclosure identified a concentration of metal artefacts, including pistol balls and musket fixtures, confirming this was the likely location of

intense hand-to-hand combat (Historic Scotland 2012). A lower density of musket balls and Jacobite buttons were identified to the south and east, suggesting the 'mopping up' of Jacobites who were hoping to escape following the battle (Historic Scotland 2012). In addition, geophysical survey also identified the possible locations of further grave pits in The field of the English (Historic Scotland 2012).

Possible graves in The Field of the English

- 14.4.50 The Field of the English was subject to Ground penetrating radar survey which identified a feature characteristic of a grave, to the south of the Clan Cemetery, thought to be the possible burial of the Government troops killed in the battle (Historic Scotland 2012). Subsequent metal detecting and geophysical survey identified a dense concentration of anomalies - two of which were interpreted as possible graves – as well as a coin, possibly dropped by a visiting Hanoverian soldier (Historic Scotland 2012).

Potential for archaeological remains associated with the battle

- 14.4.51 The planting of coniferous trees in the 19th century, the construction and widening of a road through the battlefield in the 1830s, and its subsequent realignment in 1984 through the northern part of the battlefield may have disturbed archaeological remains associated with the battle in these areas. However, the potential for archaeological remains in the other areas of the battlefield is considered to be high.

Structures and features of the battlefield

- 14.4.52 The King's Stable Cottage and Leanach Cottage are still extant within the Inventory Battlefield. The King's Stable, so named as the Government troops horses were stabled nearby after the battle, was located behind the original Jacobite line. Leanach Cottage is located to the eastern side of the battlefield and comprises the remains of a post-medieval farmstead present during the battle (Historic Scotland 2012). Both have been subject to detailed recording.

Culloden Estate

- 14.4.53 Culloden House (Asset 109; Category A Listed Building) and grounds were utilised by the Jacobites as a headquarters prior to the battle and the lodgings of Bonnie Prince Charlie (Historic Scotland 2012). While the original house was rebuilt in the late 18th century by the Forbes family, it was constructed on the footprint of the original building (Historic Scotland 2012).

Monuments to the dead associated with the battlefield

- 14.4.54 The Clan Cemetery is located towards the centre of the Inventory Battlefield and comprises several grass-covered mounds, with later granite stones identifying the Clan allegedly buried there (Historic Scotland 2012). Several other commemorative stone markers are also located within the battlefield, including the Keppoch Stone, which supposedly marked where Alasdair MacDonell, a clan chief, fell during the charge (Historic Scotland 2012).
- 14.4.55 Later memorials erected at the battlefield include the cairn started in the 1850s and completed by Forbes in the 1880s (Historic Scotland 2012). Two other memorials, the Irish memorial stone and the French stone, were erected in the latter half of the 20th century (Historic Scotland 2012).

Culloden Inventory Battlefield – Key Landscape Characteristics

- 14.4.56 The key landscape characteristics of the battlefield include:

The location of the battle on Culloden Moor

- 14.4.57 This was the location of the battle, a tactical choice by the Jacobite forces, between the Government camp in Nairn 10 miles to the west, and Inverness. Although the location of the battle was decided by the Jacobites, the scale of the field was determined by the Government forces maximising the effectiveness of their artillery fire and the distance the Jacobite soldiers would have to charge. The

Government forces formed approximately 700m from the Jacobite line, a key factor in the Government force's decisive victory (Historic Scotland 2012).

Topography and the positions of the armies

- 14.4.58 The battlefield is located on a prominent rise in the landscape, on the crest of a ridge running east to west, on Drummossie Moor between Nairn (the location of the Government camp prior to the battle) and Inverness. The undulating moorland identified during topographic survey of the battlefield may have acted as a shield for the Jacobite centre and right flank to an extent from Government fire during the initial charge (Historic Scotland 2012).

The Culloden Parks and Culwhiniac enclosures

- 14.4.59 Stone walled enclosures (Culloden Parks and Culwhiniac) to the north and south were used by the Jacobites, initially anchoring their flanks to these enclosures on their side; however, the Government troops breached the walls and were able to fire on the right flank of the Jacobite army from the cover of the enclosure (Historic Scotland 2012). The Culwhiniac Enclosure comprised a stone-built structure that was demolished in the 1840s; however, this enclosure is still traceable in the fields to the south of the battlefield.
- 14.4.60 The setting of Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12) is characterised by its prominent moorland location, surrounded by 19th coniferous plantation to the north-east, modern residential development to the north-west, and enclosed arable land to the south and south-east. Views from the battlefield towards Inverness are limited by its surroundings; however, the integrity of the views across the battlefield have been maintained. While the relationship between the battlefield itself and Culloden House (Asset 109) has been severed by the construction of the Highland Main Line Railway and the residential developments of Culloden and Smithton, the spatial relationship between the key landscape features of the battlefield remain intact.

Culloden Inventory Battlefield - Value

- 14.4.61 Culloden's importance as a well preserved and legible battlefield is further contributed to by its historic importance as both the last pitched battle fought on the British mainland and its backdrop against other international wars, including the War of Austrian Succession (Historic Scotland 2012). In consideration of this, and its designation as an Inventory Battlefield, it has been assessed to be of very high value.

Other Historic Landscape Types

- 14.4.62 Culloden House Garden and Designed Landscape (HLT 13) comprises the house policies associated with the Culloden House estate. The designed landscape dates from the 17th century but was considerably modified in the late 18th century, with the current house and associated buildings built in approximately 1788 (HES 2003). The landscape features that are still extant date to the 18th and 19th centuries and include; ornate water features, a lime tree-lined avenue, walled gardens (LB10952, Category B Listed Building) and estate parklands.
- 14.4.63 HLT 13 is characterised by its location within the settlement of Culloden surrounded by modern residential developments that have encroached on its parkland and, along with mature woodland and conifer plantations and modern infrastructure, limit views in all directions, including the view northwards from Culloden House and along the avenue to the south-west.
- 14.4.64 Despite the reduction of the wider parkland by 20th century residential development, the core of this HLT remains largely intact. Given that the core of the designed landscape survives, its designation, and historic importance, HLT 13 has been assessed to be of high value.
- 14.4.65 Agricultural HLTs within the study area comprise Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2; Photograph 14.4), Holdings (HLT 8) and Rough Grazing (HLT 10). Most of the study area is dominated by HLT 2, which extends from Stratton in the north-east of the study area to B9006 Culloden Road and the A9 to the south and west of the study area. This HLT is characterised by agricultural pasture land with farm steadings, and associated buildings, with straight field boundaries of single species hedges supplemented by modern post and wire fencing. HLT 8 comprises two small irregular areas to the south

of the study area on the urban fringe of Inverness, to the north-east of Inshes, while these areas characterise areas of former holdings they have since been developed for residential and commercial use. Rough Grazing (HLT 10) comprises an area of grassy scrub to the north of Raigmore Interchange. This area of rough grassland encompasses mudflats and saltings that have been reclaimed from the Moray Firth and drained for agricultural use. As robust examples of agricultural HLTs, but reflecting their lack of rarity within the Highlands, these HLTs have been assessed to be of low value.

Photograph 14.4: Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2), Looking North



- 14.4.66 Recreation Area (HLT 6) and Urban Areas (HLT 7) are areas of more recent development relating to the expansion of Inverness and associated settlements. Examples in the study area are located on the eastern periphery of Inverness adjacent to the A9 Perth – Inverness Trunk Road, comprising a public park and Raigmore Community Centre (HLT 6) and two areas of urban development: Beechwood Business Park and the Raigmore Estate (HLT 7). In consideration of the limited historical significance of these HLTs, and reflecting their frequency within the wider region, HLTs 6 and 7 have been assessed to be of low value.
- 14.4.67 Industrial or Commercial Area (HLT 5) and Motorways and Major Roads (HLT 9) comprise types of modern infrastructure, industry, and commercial activity of limited historic interest. Within the study area HLT 5 is represented by the Inverness Retail and Business Park, to the north, and the Inshes Retail Park, to the south. HLT 9 is exemplified by the A9 Perth – Inverness Trunk Road, and infrastructure to the east of Inverness. Given their limited historic interest, HLTs 5 and 9 have been assessed to be of negligible value.

14.5 Potential Impacts

- 14.5.1 The potential impacts reported in this section are assessed in line with approach set out in Section 14.3 (Methodology). It is acknowledged that the proposed scheme is within an area where large-scale development is planned, as identified in the local development plan and supplementary guidance. In the future the proposed scheme is anticipated to be located within a landscape which has undergone substantial change; the existing (mainly agricultural) land becoming urbanised as an eastern expansion of the City of Inverness. In this situation, it is expected that some of the potential impacts reported in this section would be reduced as other developments may have removed some cultural heritage assets,

adversely impacted the settings of others and may have replaced some HLT with modern, more common, homogeneous HLT with less time depth and of less value than those replaced. The potential cumulative impacts of the proposed scheme in-combination with other committed/reasonably foreseeable developments are assessed in Chapter 19 (Assessment of Cumulative Effects).

- 14.5.2 The design of the proposed scheme has been developed with the aim of avoiding or reducing potential impacts on cultural heritage assets, through an iterative design process involving engineering, landscape and cultural heritage specialists. This includes impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). Further information is provided in Chapter 3 (Consideration of Alternatives). This section considers the embedded and standard mitigation presented in Section 14.6 and describes the impacts that would be expected to occur in the absence of specific mitigation.
- 14.5.3 Potentially significant impacts (i.e. of Moderate or higher significance) on cultural heritage assets are discussed in full below. Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables) presents a detailed assessment of all potential significant and non-significant impacts, mitigation measures (where applicable) and residual impacts on cultural heritage assets. Unless otherwise stated, all impacts described below are adverse.
- 14.5.4 Impacts on cultural heritage assets resulting from the proposed scheme can be both direct and indirect. Direct impacts would include the loss of archaeological remains, loss of the fabric of historic buildings or changes in use of the historic landscape and impacts on setting. Indirect impacts arise from the proposed scheme via a complex route; where the connection between the proposed scheme and the impact is complicated, unpredictable or remote; for example, changes to local land drainage as a result of a scheme could indirectly affect the condition of waterlogged archaeological remains a distance away from the scheme.
- 14.5.5 Close consultation has been maintained with other environmental specialist teams during the development of the landscape and ecological mitigation plans to ensure that any potential impacts on cultural heritage assets, both physical and on setting, have been considered and integrated into mitigation plans (Figure 9.5) and described in Chapter 9 (Landscape) and Chapter 11 (Ecology and Nature Conservation).
- 14.5.6 To facilitate assessment, the proposed scheme to the east of the A9 is split into 'links' which are described in Chapter 4 (The Proposed Scheme) and are shown on Figure 4.1. For ease of reference these include:
- Culloden Road to Cradlehall Roundabout (Link 1 – ch0 to ch306);
 - Cradlehall Roundabout to Eastfield Way Roundabout (Link 2 - ch0 to ch644);
 - Eastfield Way Roundabout to Inverness Retail and Business Park (Link 3 – ch0 to ch693);
 - Eastfield Way Roundabout to Smithton Junction (Link 4 – ch0 to ch1113);
 - Cradlehall Roundabout to Inverness Campus (Link 5 – ch0 to ch289); and
 - Castlehill Road Tie-in (Link 6: ch0 to ch208).

Construction

Archaeological Remains

- 14.5.7 The proposed scheme would:
- remove Culloden Cropmark (Asset 33; medium value) through the construction of Link 2 (ch425 to ch500);
 - remove Stratton Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 46; medium value) through the construction of the Sustainable Drainage System (hereafter referred to as SuDS) associated with Link 4 (ch800 to ch850);
 - remove the majority of Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 2 (Asset 53; high value) through the construction of Link 3 (ch350 to ch470);

- remove the majority of Cradlehall Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 57; high value) through the construction of Link 2 (ch240 to ch350) and the associated SuDS;
- remove Cradlehall Rectilinear Feature (Asset 58; medium value) through the construction of Link 2 (ch175 and ch200) and the associated SuDS and access track;
- remove the majority of Inshes Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 59; high value) through the construction of Link 2 (ch0 to ch150), the SuDS and access track (ch0 to ch150 of Link 2) and Link 6 (ch150 to ch175);
- remove Scretan Burn Linear Feature (Asset 62; medium value) through the construction of the SuDS associated with Link 3 (ch100 to ch150);
- remove Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 4 (Asset 64; high value) through the construction of Link 2 (ch475 to ch575);
- remove Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 5 (Asset 65; high value) through the construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout, Link 3 (ch570 to ch693), SuDS (ch650 to ch693 of Link 3) and associated access tracks;
- remove the majority of Inshes Possible Enclosure (Asset 66; medium value) through the construction of Link 1 (ch225 to ch306) and Link 5 (ch225 to ch239);
- remove Scretan Burn Curvilinear Features (Asset 74; medium value) through the construction of Link 3 (ch75 to ch150) and associated SuDS; and
- remove Stratton Farm Possible Hut Circle and Linear Feature (Asset 79; high value) through the construction of Link 4 and the associated SuDS (ch500 to ch550).

14.5.8 As these archaeological remains would be removed the magnitude of impact has been assessed to be major and the significance of impact Large.

14.5.9 The proposed scheme would also:

- remove approximately two thirds of Scretan Burn Pit-like Features (Asset 60; high value) through the construction of Link 3 (ch50 to ch220) and SuDS and access tracks (ch75 to ch150 and ch200 to ch225 of Link 3);
- remove approximately half of Stratton Farm Possible Enclosure and Settlement Activity (Asset 80; medium value) through the construction of Link 4 and the associated SuDS (ch450 to ch510 of Link 4);
- remove approximately half of Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 8 (Asset 84; high value) through the construction of Link 4, associated SuDS (ch200 to ch250 of Link 4) and Ashton Farm Core Path tie-in; and
- remove approximately half of Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 85; medium value) through the construction of the Link 4 and associated SuDS (ch100 to ch150 of Link 4).

14.5.10 As these archaeological remains would be partially removed the magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.

14.5.11 Given construction of the proposed scheme would be within 2m of the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14; high value), accidental damage could result from construction activities such as plant movement associated with the construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link. While this could damage the Scheduled Monument, Asset 14 is not within the Draft Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) boundary and contractors will not have access to land outwith this boundary without prior agreement. However, there is potential for damage which may result from peripheral activities associated with plant tracking across the surface of the Scheduled Area. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.

14.5.12 The proposed scheme would sever the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14; high value) from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) through the construction of Link 3. The proposed scheme would also change the topographic character of the Scheduled Monument's surroundings given the proximity and scale of the

embankment associated with Link 2 (ch425 to ch600 of Link 2) including the construction of the Cradlehall Railway Bridge (PS03) at ch370 to ch450. Construction activities would dominate its setting by introducing noise and visual intrusion into its surroundings. While this would result in a loss of understanding and appreciation of this asset in its wider context, the value of the Scheduled Monument is principally derived from its archaeological remains which would be unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.

- 14.5.13 The proposed scheme would also sever the relationship of Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45; high value) with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) through the construction of Link 3. Construction activities would dominate its setting introducing noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings and the proximity of the embankment (ch725 to ch825 of Link 4) would change the topographic character this cultural heritage assets surroundings during construction. However, while this would result in a loss of ability to understand, appreciate and experience Asset 45 as part of its wider context, its value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.
- 14.5.14 Construction of the proposed scheme would also sever the relationship of eight high value archaeological remains with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report) through the construction of the Link 3. These comprise:
- Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50);
 - Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83); and
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91).
- 14.5.15 While this would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate these assets as part of their wider context, their value is primarily derived from their archaeological remains which would remain unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be minor and the significance of impact Moderate.
- 14.5.16 In addition to the impacts identified above, a further 23 impacts of Slight and Neutral significance during construction are predicted. These are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).
- 14.5.17 Although Assets 11, 20, 31, and 37 are partially located within the proposed scheme, these are located in previously developed land or have been subject to archaeological investigation and any associated archaeological remains have been completely removed, therefore no impact has been assessed.
- 14.5.18 In addition, construction of the proposed scheme also has the potential to remove any unknown archaeological remains that may be present. The potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains in the study area has been assessed to be high, and any unknown archaeological remains are likely to be of similar form, date and value as those identified in the cultural heritage baseline.

Historic buildings

- 14.5.19 No significant impacts are predicted on historic buildings as a result of the construction of the proposed scheme. Potential impacts during construction of Slight and Neutral significance are predicted on five historic buildings. These are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

- 14.5.20 No impacts are predicted on Culloden House, Gate Piers and Gardeners' Bothy (Asset 109) and Culloden House Stables and Yard Wall (Asset 110). Given the distance between these assets and the proposed scheme and their location in a topographic depression, surrounded by mature trees, there would be no intervisibility and the noise environment would be unaffected. The integrity of the relationships between Assets 109 and 110 and the other estate buildings would be unaffected and their relationship with the remaining landscape elements of HLT 13 would be maintained. The historic association of the estate with the Forbes family, as well as the estate's connection to the Battle of Culloden (Culloden Inventory Battlefield; HLT 12) would also be unaffected.

Historic Landscape Types

- 14.5.21 No significant impacts are predicted on the historic landscape as a result of the construction of the proposed scheme. Potential impacts during construction of Slight significance are predicted on Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2; low value). This is presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).
- 14.5.22 No impacts were predicted on Culloden Inventory Battlefield (HLT 12) as a result of construction and operation of the proposed scheme for the reasons identified below:
- There would be no visual intrusion in the setting of the battlefield from the proposed scheme – views are internal (Historic Scotland 2012) and their integrity would not be affected.
 - Lines of sight across the battlefield (including those identified as obscured lines of sight that may have influenced the outcome of the battle; Historic Scotland 2012) would not be affected.
 - The proposed scheme would not be visible from the battlefield given the surrounding developments and mature tree plantation.
 - Lines of retreat (towards Inverness) are not visible and are already severed by modern development.
 - It is unlikely there would be any noise intrusion into the setting of the battlefield resulting from the proposed scheme as no significant noise effects are predicted beyond 600m.
 - The battlefield's prominent moorland position would not be affected by the proposed scheme which would be positioned in a lowland location approximately 2km away and would not detract from the battlefield's topographic position.
 - The current relationship between the battlefield and Culloden House (Asset 109; Historic Scotland 2012) would be maintained, this is already severed by modern infrastructure and it would not be further altered by the proposed scheme.
 - The key landscape features and special qualities of the battlefield (Historic Scotland 2012) would not be affected.
- 14.5.23 Given the location of Culloden House Garden and Designed Landscape (HLT 13) within the settlement of Culloden, the distance between HLT13 and the proposed scheme, and the lack of intervisibility between the proposed scheme and HLT 13, no impacts were identified on the setting of Culloden House Garden and Designed Landscape (HLT 13).

Operation

Archaeological Remains

- 14.5.24 The continued presence of the proposed scheme near to the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) would continue to spatially sever Asset 14 from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, resulting in a loss of understanding of its context. The continued presence of the embankments for Link 2 and Link 3 would change topographic character in the Scheduled Monument's immediate surroundings, and the movement of traffic along Link 3 would continue to intrude into the setting of the asset. However, while this would result in a loss of ability to understand, appreciate and experience Asset 14 as part of its wider context, its value is derived from its archaeological remains which would be unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.

- 14.5.25 Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to spatially sever Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45) from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, including the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). The continued presence of the embankment for Link 4 would change the topographic character of this cultural heritage asset's surroundings and the noise and movement of traffic along Link 4 would intrude into the Scheduled Monument's setting. However, while this would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate Asset 45 as part of its wider context, its value is derived from its archaeological remains which would be unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact Moderate.
- 14.5.26 The continued presence of the proposed scheme would continue to spatially sever the relationship of eight high value archaeological remains with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, including the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). The eight assets of high value archaeological remains comprise:
- Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49; high value);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50; high value);
 - Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55; high value);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63; high value);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72; high value);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78; high value);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83; high value); and
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91; high value).
- 14.5.27 Traffic movement and noise, in proximity to these archaeological remains would also intrude on their setting. However, while this would result in a loss of ability to understand, appreciate and experience these assets, their value is primarily derived from their archaeological remains which would remain unaffected. The magnitude of impact has been assessed to be minor and the significance of impact Moderate.
- 14.5.28 Potential impacts during operation of Slight significance are predicted on Ashton Farm Possible Barrow (Asset 19; medium value). This is presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Historic Buildings

- 14.5.29 No significant impacts are predicted on historic buildings as a result of the operation of the proposed scheme.
- 14.5.30 Potential impacts during operation of Slight and Neutral significance are predicted on five historic buildings. These are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Historic Landscape Types

- 14.5.31 No significant impacts are predicted on historic landscape as a result of the operation of the proposed scheme.
- 14.5.32 Potential impacts during operation of Slight significance are predicted on Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2; low value). This impact is presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

14.6 Mitigation

- 14.6.1 Mitigation for potential significant and non-significant impacts on cultural heritage assets is described below. Further detail is presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Standard Mitigation

- 14.6.2 The contractor will consult with the appointed Curator should any unexpected cultural heritage assets be discovered or revealed during construction to enable appropriate measures to be implemented to mitigate potential impacts (**Mitigation Item CH-01**).

Embedded Mitigation

- 14.6.3 The design development process and key design developments that have avoided or reduced potential impacts on cultural heritage assets, such as the alignment of the proposed scheme to avoid severing the two Scheduled Areas of the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). These are described in detail in Chapter 3 (Consideration of Alternatives).

Archaeological Remains

- 14.6.4 Where it is not feasible to preserve archaeological remains in situ, archaeological recording in advance of construction for physically affected archaeological remains would be undertaken. Archaeological recording commensurate with the value of the archaeological remains affected, followed by a programme of reporting, analysis, publication, dissemination and archiving would be undertaken to make a permanent record of these archaeological remains. This would reduce the amount of information that might otherwise be permanently lost through the removal of the archaeological remains. This reduces the magnitude of change and significance of residual effect.
- 14.6.5 Archaeological excavation will be undertaken in advance of construction to make a permanent record of any affected archaeological remains (**Mitigation Item CH-02**) at:
- Caulfield Military Road (Asset 16);
 - Culloden Cropmark (Asset 33);
 - Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45);
 - Stratton Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 46);
 - Stratton Possible Hut Circles 2 (Asset 48);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 2 (Asset 53);
 - Cradlehall Possible Trackway (Asset 56);
 - Cradlehall Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 57);
 - Cradlehall Rectilinear Feature (Asset 58);
 - Inshes Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 59);
 - Scretan Burn Pit-like Features (Asset 60);
 - Scretan Burn Linear Feature (Asset 62);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 4 (Asset 64);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 5 (Asset 65);
 - Inshes Possible Enclosure (Asset 66);
 - Scretan Burn Curvilinear Features (Asset 74);
 - Stratton Farm Former Field Division (Asset 75);
 - Stratton Farm Possible Hut Circle and Linear Feature (Asset 79);

- Stratton Farm Possible Enclosure and Settlement Activity (Asset 80);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Divisions (Asset 81);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Pits 2 (Asset 82);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 8 (Asset 84);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 85);
 - Beechwood Farm Prehistoric Pits and Possible Ring Ditch (Asset 87);
 - Beechwood Farm Boundaries 1 (Asset 89);
 - Beechwood Farm Boundaries 2 (Asset 90);
 - Beechwood Farm Former Field Boundary 2 (Asset 101);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 1 (Asset 103);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 2 (Asset 104); and
 - Cradlehall Cropmark (Asset 107).
- 14.6.6 Trial trenching will be undertaken in advance of the archaeological excavation to inform its design. Archaeological trial trenching will also be undertaken in 'blank areas' (where no archaeological remains were identified by geophysical survey) to confirm the presence or absence of unknown archaeological remains and to identify appropriate measures of mitigation of impacts on these remains (**Mitigation Item CH-03**).
- 14.6.7 In addition to the archaeological excavation outlined above, further archaeological mitigation may be required for previously unknown archaeological remains that may be identified during trial trenching, and this may include:
- targeted archaeological excavation (**Mitigation Item CH-04**);
 - strip, map and sample (**Mitigation Item CH-05**); and
 - archaeological recording during construction (watching brief) (**Mitigation Item CH-06**).
- 14.6.8 Topographic surveys will be undertaken in accordance with the guidance provided in Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (Second Edition) (Historic England 2017). This will be undertaken prior to construction to document the current setting of
- the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14);
 - Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50);
 - Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55);
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78);
 - Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83); and
 - Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91). (**Mitigation Item CH-07**)
- 14.6.9 Topographic surveys will be undertaken in accordance with the guidance provided in Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (Second Edition) (Historic England 2017). While this mitigation would not reduce the magnitude of impact, it would provide a record of the current setting of these cultural heritage assets.

- 14.6.10 To mitigate any potential for accidental damage to the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14), Asset 14 will be securely fenced off for the duration of construction (**Mitigation Item CH-08**). This will comprise a permanent post and rail fence, appropriate signage, and a toolbox talk for contactors. The proposed fenced area will be located on the edge of the Draft CPO boundary. Contractors will not be permitted to use land outwith the Draft CPO Boundary without prior agreement.
- 14.6.11 In line with Section 4 (Mitigation of Impacts and Enhancement of Setting) of Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES 2016a) opportunities to offset the impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) will be explored with interested parties including HES and The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team. This could be achieved through measures such as increased interpretation and/or additional research to increase the ability to understand the Scheduled Monument and surrounding prehistoric landscape, such as an interpretation board at a suitable location along the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link and community outreach (**Mitigation Item CH-09**).

Historic Buildings

- 14.6.12 Photographic surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to document the current setting of Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) and Ashton Farm (Asset 18). Photographic surveys will be undertaken in accordance with the guidance provided in Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (Historic England 2016) (**Mitigation Item CH-10**).

Historic Landscape Types

- 14.6.13 Photographic surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to record the current condition of Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2). The photographic surveys will be undertaken in accordance with the guidance provided in Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (Second Edition) (Historic England 2017) (**Mitigation Item CH-11**).

Dissemination

- 14.6.14 To achieve appropriate reporting and dissemination of the results, all cultural heritage mitigation will include a programme of assessment, reporting, analysis, publication and dissemination of results commensurate with the value of the cultural heritage assets affected. This will include the preparation of reports that would be submitted to The Highland Council's HER and the National Record of the Historic Environment, along with ordered archives which will be submitted to an appropriate repository.
- 14.6.15 To achieve adherence to good practice, all cultural heritage mitigation, including that outlined in Appendix 14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables) will be undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, The Highland Council, HES and Historic England, and a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that will be agreed with the appointed Curator in advance.

14.7 Residual Impacts

- 14.7.1 Residual impacts are those that remain once the proposed mitigation measures have been implemented. Residual impacts of Moderate and above are considered to be significant and are described below. Non-significant impacts are not discussed here but are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Archaeological Remains

- 14.7.2 Given the loss of integrity of the setting of the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14; high value) and Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45; high value) as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed scheme, the residual magnitude of impact has been assessed to be moderate and the residual significance of impact Moderate.
- 14.7.3 As identified in paragraphs 14.5.12 to 14.5.15 and 14.5.24 to 14.5.27 during construction and operation the proposed scheme would spatially sever the following archaeological remains from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, including the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14):

- Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49);
- Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50);
- Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55);
- Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63);
- Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72);
- Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78);
- Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83); and
- Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91).

14.7.4 The residual magnitude of impact on these cultural heritage assets during construction and operation has been assessed to be moderate and the residual significance of impact Moderate.

14.7.5 Residual impacts of Slight and Neutral significance have been assessed for 39 archaeological remains during construction, and of Slight significance on one asset (Ashton Farm Possible Barrow; Asset 19) during operation, these are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Historic Buildings

14.7.6 No significant residual impacts are predicted on historic buildings as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed scheme.

14.7.7 Residual impacts of Slight and Neutral have been assessed for five historic buildings during construction and operation, these are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

Historic Landscape Types

14.7.8 No significant residual impacts are predicted on historic landscape types as a result of construction or operation of the proposed scheme.

14.7.9 A residual impact of Neutral significance for construction and Slight significance for operation has been assessed for one HLT (Rectilinear Fields and Farms; HLT 2) as a result of the proposed scheme. These residual impacts are presented in Appendix A14.4 (Cultural Heritage Impact, Mitigation and Residual Impact Tables).

14.8 Statement of Significance

14.8.1 With the proposed mitigation, the overall residual impact on the cultural heritage resource comprising archaeological remains has been assessed to be of Moderate significance.

14.8.2 With proposed mitigation, the overall residual impact on historic buildings and the historic landscape has been assessed to be of Slight significance.

14.9 References

Reports and Documents

AOC Archaeology Ltd (2009). East Beechwood Farm, Inverness, Highland: Archaeological Evaluation Phase 1, Stage 1: Data Structure Report. AOC 21113. [Online]. Available from: https://librarylink.highland.gov.uk/LLFiles/192584/full_192584.pdf [Accessed 24 July 2018]

AOC Archaeology Ltd (2010a). East Beechwood Farm, Inverness: Historic Building Recording Report. AOC 21113. [Online]. Available from: https://librarylink.highland.gov.uk/LLFiles/208075/full_208075.pdf [Accessed 03 July 2018]

AOC Archaeology Ltd (2010b). East Beechwood Farm, Inverness: Archaeological Evaluation (October 2010): Data Structure Report. AOC 21113. [Online]. Available from: https://librarylink.highland.gov.uk/LLFiles/208969/full_208969.pdf [Accessed 24 July 2018]

AOC Archaeology Ltd (2016). A96 Dualling: Inverness to Nairn (Including Nairn Bypass) Geophysical Survey. AOC 23327.

Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government and The Department for Regional Development Northern Ireland (2007). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11, Section 3, (Cultural Heritage), 2007

Historic England (2016). Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice. [Online]. Available from: <https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-historic-buildings/heag099-understanding-historic-buildings.pdf> [Accessed 10 April 2018]

Historic England (2017). Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (Second Edition). [Online]. Available from: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-archaeology-of-landscapes/heag142-understanding-archaeology-of-landscapes/> [Accessed 12 March 2018]

Historic Environment Scotland (2003). Culloden House. [Online]. Available from <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/GDL00122> [Accessed 02 October 2018]

Historic Environment Scotland (2009). Ashton Farm Cottages, ring ditch 415m SW and pit circles 460m WSW of (SM11535). [Online]. Available from: <http://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/SM11535> [Accessed 08 May 2018]

Historic Environment Scotland (2016a). Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting

Historic Environment Scotland (2016b). Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Historic Battlefields

Historic Scotland (2012). The Inventory of Historic Battlefields – Battle of Culloden. [Online]. Available from: http://data.historic-scotland.gov.uk/data/docs/battlefields/culloden_full.pdf [Accessed 10 April 2018].

Jacobs (2017). (on behalf of Transport Scotland). A9/A96 Inshes to Smithton: DMRB Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report.

Maudlin, D. (2009). 'The Legend of Brigadoon: Architecture, Identify and Choice in the Scottish Highlands', in *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review*: 20 (2). pp. 45-57.

Milliacan, K. (2007). 'Turning in circles: a new assessment of the Neolithic timber circles of Scotland', in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries Scotland*: 137. pp. 5-34.

Pride, G. L. (1996). *Dictionary of Scottish Buildings*. [Online]. Available from: <https://issuu.com/hspubs/docs/dictionary-of-scottish-building/16> [Accessed 14 August 2018]

Roy's Roads (2015). Roy's Roads: The Road Network from the Military Survey of Scotland, 1747. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.roysroads.co.uk/major-william-caulfield.html> [Accessed 3 July 2018]

ScARF (2012a). K. Brophy and A Sheridan (eds). Neolithic Scotland: ScARF Panel Report. [Online]. Available from: <https://www.scottishheritagehub.com/sites/default/files/u12/ScARF%20Iron%20Age%20Sept%202012.pdf> [Accessed 10 April 2018]

ScARF (2012b). F. Hunter and M. Carruthers (eds). Iron Age Scotland: ScARF Panel Report. [Online]. Available from:

<https://www.scottishheritagehub.com/sites/default/files/u12/ScARF%20Bronze%20Age%20Sept%202012.pdf> [Accessed 10 April 2018]

ScARF (2012c). J. Downes (ed.). Chalcolithic and Bronze Age Scotland: ScARF Panel Report. [Online]. Available from:

<https://www.scottishheritagehub.com/sites/default/files/u12/ScARF%20Bronze%20Age%20Sept%202012.pdf> [Accessed 10 April 2018]

University of Glasgow (n.d.). Point of Contact: Archaeology at Culloden. [Online]. Available from: <https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/az/battlefieldarchaeology/centreprojects/culloden/> [Accessed 03 October 2018]