

Appendix A14.4: Cultural Heritage Impact Tables

1.1 Tables 1 and 2 present both the significant (Moderate and above) and non-significant impacts assessed during the construction and operation of the proposed scheme on cultural heritage assets. Recommended mitigation is summarised below, and an assessment of residual impacts is provided. Unless otherwise stated, all impacts described below are adverse. The 'Impact' section of the tables makes reference to 'Links'. These links are described further in Chapter 14 (Cultural Heritage) (paragraph 14.5.6) and in Chapter 4 (The Proposed Scheme) and are shown in Figure 4.1 which accompanies Chapter 4 (The Proposed Scheme).

Table 1: Construction Impacts, Additional Mitigation and Residual Impacts for Archaeological Remains, Historic Buildings and HLTs

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Archaeological Remains								
The Scheduled Monument (Asset 14)	High	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.	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	Protection for the duration of construction using permanent post and rail fence within Draft CPO boundary, appropriate signage, and a toolbox talk for contractors (Mitigation Item CH-08).	Negligible	Slight

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
		<p>While the value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its archaeological remains, construction of Link 3 would sever the Scheduled Monument from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1 (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report)), resulting in a loss of ability to understand the cultural heritage asset.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proximity and scale of the embankment associated with Link 2 (ch425 to ch600), including the construction of the Cradlehall Railway Bridge (PS03) at ch370 to ch450, would change the topographic character of the Scheduled Monument's surroundings during construction. Views across this cultural heritage asset would be limited and the movement of plant during construction of the proposed scheme would introduce new elements into the Scheduled Monuments setting, resulting in a loss of integrity.</p>	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	<p>Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).</p> <p>Opportunities to offset the impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) would be explored with interested parties including Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team including an interpretation board at a suitable location along the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link (Mitigation Item CH-09).</p>	Moderate	Moderate
Caulfield Military Road (Asset 16)	Low	Construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link and Link 2 (ch425 to ch500) would remove the archaeological remains which make up this site.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm Possible Barrow (Asset 19)	Medium	While construction of Link 4 and Link 3 would sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, Asset 19's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Culloden Cropmark (Asset 33)	Medium	Construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link and Link 2 (ch425 to ch500) would remove the archaeological remains which make up this site.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45)	High	Construction of the SuDS associated with Link 4 (ch750 to ch800) would result in the removal of a small proportion of this cultural heritage asset, including one of eight possible hut circles.	Direct	Minor	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
		<p>Construction of Link 3 would also sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information).</p> <p>The proximity of the embankment associated with Link 4 (ch725 to ch825) would change the topographic character this cultural heritage assets surroundings during construction. This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate the cultural heritage asset.</p> <p>While construction activities would dominate its setting introducing noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 45's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.</p>	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Moderate	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Stratton Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 46)	Medium	Construction of the SuDS associated with Link 4 (ch800 to ch850) would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Stratton Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 47)	Medium	While construction of the Link 4 would sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, its value is principally derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Stratton Possible Hut Circles 2 (Asset 48)	High	Construction of the Link 4 (ch600 to ch650) would remove half of one of the three hut circles which make up this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Minor	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49)	High	Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate the cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 49's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50)	High	<p>Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate the cultural heritage asset.</p> <p>While construction activities would introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 50's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.</p>	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 1 (Asset 52)	Medium	Construction of Link 3 (ch500) would result in the removal of a small section of one linear feature associated with this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
		While construction of the Link 3 would sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, its value is principally derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 2 (Asset 53)	High	Construction of Link 3 (ch350 to ch470) would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset, including a number of possible pits and possible hut circles identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55)	High	<p>Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate this cultural heritage asset.</p> <p>While construction activities would introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 55's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.</p>	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Cradlehall Possible Trackway (Asset 56)	Low	Construction of Link 2 (ch220 to ch270) would result in the removal this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Cradlehall Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 57)	High	Construction of Link 2 (ch240 to ch350) and the associated SuDS would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset, including seven pit-like features and three possible hut circles identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Cradlehall Rectilinear Feature (Asset 58)	Medium	Construction of Link 2 (ch175 to ch200) and the associated SuDS and access track would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Inshes Possible Settlement Activity (Asset 59)	High	Construction of the Cradlehall Roundabout, Link 2 (ch0 to ch150), the Caulfield Road North Tie-in (ch150 to ch175), and the SuDS and access track (ch0 to ch150 of Link 2) would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset, including a number of circular features and possible pits identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Scretan Burn Pit-like Features (Asset 60)	High	Construction of the Link 3 (ch50 to ch225) and the associated SuDS and access tracks (ch75 to ch150 and ch200 to ch225 of Link 3) would result in the removal of approximately two thirds of this cultural heritage asset, including nine possible pits identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Scretan Burn Linear Feature (Asset 62)	Medium	Construction of the SuDS associated with Link 3 (ch100 to ch150) would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63)	High	Construction of the Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate this cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would also introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 63's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate
Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 4 (Asset 64)	High	Construction of Link 2 (ch475 to ch575) would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 5 (Asset 65)	High	Construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout, Link 3 (ch570 to ch693), SuDS (ch650 to ch693 of Link 3) and associated access tracks would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset, including a possible hut circle and a number of possible pits identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Inshes Possible Enclosure (Asset 66)	Medium	Construction of Link 1 (ch225 to ch306) and Link 5 (ch225 to ch239) would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset, including a number of pit-like features and a possible enclosure identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Galloway Cropmarks (Asset 67)	Medium	While site clearance activities, the movement of construction traffic and the construction of Link 2 and Link 4 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, Asset 67's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72)	High	Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate this cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would also introduce noise and visual intrusion into its setting, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 72's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate
Beechwood Farm Possible Former Field System (Asset 73)	Low	Construction of Link 3 (ch450 to ch500) would result in the removal of approximately one quarter of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Minor	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Scretan Burn Curvilinear Features (Asset 74)	Medium	Construction of the Link 3 (ch75 to ch150) and associated SuDS would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Stratton Farm Former Field Division (Asset 75)	Low	Construction of Link 4 and SuDS (ch525 to ch575) would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure and Pit (Asset 77)	Medium	While construction of Link 3 would sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area, its value is principally derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78)	High	Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate the cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would also introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 78's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Stratton Farm Possible Hut Circle and Linear Feature (Asset 79)	High	Construction of Link 4 and associated SuDS (ch500 to ch550 of Link 4) would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Large	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Stratton Farm Possible Enclosure and Settlement Activity (Asset 80)	Medium	Construction of Link 4 and associated SuDS (ch450 to ch510 of Link 4) would result in the removal of approximately half of this cultural heritage asset, including a possible enclosure and a number of pit-like features identified by geophysical survey.	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Divisions (Asset 81)	Low	Construction of the SuDS (ch250 to ch275 of Link 4) would result in the removal of approximately half of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Moderate	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Possible Pits 2 (Asset 82)	High	Construction of the SuDS (ch150 and ch160 of Link 4) would result in the removal of a small proportion of this cultural heritage asset, including two of 15 pit-like features.	Direct	Minor	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83)	High	Construction of Link 3 would sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate this cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would also introduce noise and visual intrusion into its setting, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 83's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 8 (Asset 84)	High	Construction of Link 4, the associated SuDS (ch200 to ch250 of Link 4) and Ashton Farm Core Path tie-in would result in the removal of approximately half of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Possible Enclosure 2 (Asset 85)	Medium	Construction of Link 4 and associated SuDS (ch100 to ch150 of Link 4) would result in the removal of approximately half of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Prehistoric Pits and Possible Ring Ditch (Asset 87)	High	Construction of Link 3 (ch500 to ch525) would result in the removal of one pit, out of two, associated with this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Minor	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Beechwood Farm Field Boundary (Asset 88)	Low	Construction of Link 3 (ch375 to ch380) would result in the removal of a small portion of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Boundaries 1 (Asset 89)	Low	Construction of Link 2 (ch440 to ch550) and the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Boundaries 2 (Asset 90)	Low	Construction of Link 2 (ch500 to ch550) and Link 3 (ch350 to ch500) would result in the removal of approximately two thirds of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91)	High	Construction of Link 3 would spatially sever the relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (see Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report for more information). This would result in a loss of ability to understand and appreciate this cultural heritage asset. While construction activities would also introduce noise and visual intrusion into its semi-rural surroundings, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting do not contribute to its value. Asset 91's value is primarily derived from its archaeological remains which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	Topographic survey to record current setting of this cultural heritage asset (Mitigation Item CH-07).	Minor	Moderate
Beechwood Farm Former Field Boundary 1 (Asset 100)	Low	Construction of Link 3 (ch525 to ch550) and the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link would result in the removal of a small section of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Minor	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Beechwood Farm Former Field Boundary 2 (Asset 101)	Low	Construction of Link 2 (ch360 to ch370) would result in the removal of approximately two thirds of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 1 (Asset 103)	Low	Construction of the Eastfield Way Roundabout and associated SuDS and access tracks would result in the removal of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Beechwood Farm Possible Ditches 2 (Asset 104)	Low	Construction of Link 3 (ch475 to ch500) would result in the removal of the majority of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Major	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral
Cradlehall Cropmark (Asset 107)	Medium	Construction of Link 2 (ch225 to ch270) would result in the removal of a small portion of this cultural heritage asset.	Direct	Minor	Slight	A programme of archaeological excavation (Mitigation Item CH-02), the size and scale of which would be informed by trial trenching (Mitigation Item CH-03).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Historic Buildings								
Castlehill House (Asset 9)	Medium	While filtered through the mature trees lining the avenue, the movement of plant, site clearance works and construction activities associated with Link 1, the Cradlehall Roundabout and associated SuDS, and Link 5, including the SuDS (ch125 to ch275 of Link 5), would result in visual intrusion in the setting of this cultural heritage asset; however, its value is principally derived from its historic fabric which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Inshes Bridge, A9 (Asset 10)	Negligible	While the construction of the Proposed Inshes Overbridge (PS02) in proximity to this cultural heritage asset would result in visual intrusion in the setting of this cultural heritage asset, our ability to understand, appreciate and experience Asset 10 as a modern motorway overbridge would not be affected.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17)	Low	Construction of Link 4 (ch0 to ch500) and associated SuDS (ch100 to ch325 and ch425 to ch600 of Link 4), the Ashton Farm Core Path Tie-in and the Eastfield Way Roundabout, including the movement of plant and construction works, would intrude in the setting of this cultural heritage asset. However, the relationship between Ashton Farm Cottages and Ashton Farm (Asset 18) would remain unchanged. The value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric and would not be materially affected by construction.	Direct	Minor	Slight	Photographic survey to document current setting (Mitigation Item CH-09).	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm (Asset 18)	Low	While construction of Link 4 (ch0 to ch500), the Ashton Farm Core Path Tie-in, and the Eastfield Way Roundabout, including the movement of plant and construction works, would intrude in the setting of this cultural heritage asset removing elements of its semi-rural surroundings. However, the relationship between Ashton Farm and Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) would remain unchanged. The value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric and would not be materially affected by construction.	Direct	Minor	Slight	Photographic survey to document current setting (Mitigation Item CH-09).	Negligible	Neutral

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Cradlehall House (Asset 92)	Medium	Construction of Link 2 (ch150 to ch600), including the Cradlehall Railway Bridge (PS03), would result in visual intrusion in the setting of this cultural heritage asset; however, views of construction would be distant, and the value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric, which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Historic Landscapes								
Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2)	Low	The proposed scheme would change the character of this HLT by altering the topography, severing fields (spatially and visually), and removing historic landscape elements of the historic landscape. However, given the lack of rarity of this HLT as an agricultural landscape of the Improvement Era, this would not affect our understanding of the HLT.	Direct	Minor	Slight	Photographic survey to record current condition of HLT (Mitigation Item CH-10).	Negligible	Neutral

Table 2: Operation Impacts, Additional Mitigation and Residual Impacts for Archaeological Remains, Historic Buildings and HLTs

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Archaeological Remains								
The Scheduled Monument (Asset 14)	High	<p>Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the Scheduled Monument from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report), resulting in a loss of understanding and appreciation of this cultural heritage asset.</p> <p>The continued presence of the embankments for Link 2 and Link 3 would change the existing topographic character in this cultural heritage asset's immediate surroundings, resulting in a loss of integrity of this cultural heritage asset's setting.</p> <p>The movement of traffic along Link 3 would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, changing its surroundings.</p> <p>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.</p>	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	<p>Opportunities to offset the impacts on the Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) would be explored with interested parties including Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team including an interpretation board at a suitable location along the Eastfield Way Roundabout to Drumrosach Bridge NMU Link (Mitigation Item CH8).</p>	Moderate	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Barrow (Asset 19)	Medium	<p>Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage asset's value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged.</p>	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Stratton Possible Hut Circles 1 (Asset 45)	High	<p>Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset from other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report). The continued presence of the embankment for Link 4 would change the topographic character this cultural heritage assets surroundings, resulting is a loss of integrity of this cultural heritage asset's setting.</p> <p>While the noise and movement of traffic along Link 4 would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.</p>	Direct	Moderate	Moderate	None proposed	Moderate	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Pits 1 (Asset 49)	High	<p>Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged.</p> <p>While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of this cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.</p>	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 1 (Asset 50)	High	<p>Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged.</p> <p>While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.</p>	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm Pits 1 (Asset 55)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of this cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Beechwood Farm Possible Settlement Activity 3 (Asset 63)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains in the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 6 (Asset 72)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains within the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Ashton Farm Possible Settlement Activity 7 (Asset 78)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains within the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm Possible Pits 3 (Asset 83)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains within the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Beechwood Farm Possible Enclosure 3 (Asset 91)	High	Operation of the proposed scheme would continue to sever the spatial relationship of this cultural heritage asset with other prehistoric archaeological remains within the study area (Table 2 in Appendix A14.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline Report); however, this cultural heritage assets value is derived from its archaeological remains, which would remain unchanged. While the noise and movement of traffic would intrude into the setting of the cultural heritage asset, these aspects of this cultural heritage asset's setting does not contribute to its value which is derived from its archaeological remains.	Direct	Minor	Moderate	None proposed	Minor	Moderate
Historic Buildings								
Castlehill House (Asset 9)	Medium	The continued presence of the proposed scheme would result in visual intrusion from the presence of Link 1, Cradlehall Roundabout, and Link 5; however, this would be distant and filtered through the mature trees of the avenue. While this would intrude in the setting of this cultural heritage asset, its value is derived from its historic fabric which would remain unchanged.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Inshes Bridge, A9 (Asset 10)	Negligible	The continued presence of the proposed Inshes Overbridge (PS02) in proximity to this cultural heritage asset would result in visual intrusion in the setting of this cultural heritage asset; however, our ability to understand, appreciate and experience Asset 10 as a modern motorway overbridge would not be affected.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17)	Low	The continued presence of the proposed scheme in proximity to this cultural heritage asset as well as traffic movement would intrude on the setting of Asset 17. However, the relationship between Asset 17 and Ashton Farm (Asset 18) would be remain unchanged. The value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric and would not be materially affected by the proposed scheme.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight

Asset	Value	Impact	Direct/ Indirect	Impact Magnitude	Impact Significance	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect
Ashton Farm (Asset 18)	Low	The continued presence of the proposed scheme as well as traffic movement would continue to intrude on the setting of Asset 18. However, the relationship between Asset 18 and Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) would be remain unchanged. The value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric and would not be materially affected by the proposed scheme.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight
Cradlehall House (Asset 92)	Medium	The continued presence of the Cradlehall Railway Bridge (PS03), including newly introduced traffic movement, would continue to visually intrude in the setting of this cultural heritage asset; however, these views would be distant, and the value of this cultural heritage asset is principally derived from its historic fabric, which would remain unaltered.	Direct	Negligible	Neutral	None proposed	Negligible	Neutral
Historic Landscapes								
Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2)	Low	The presence of the proposed scheme, as well as visual intrusion from traffic movement, would permanently change the character of this HLT by changing the land-use, topography and continuing to severe fields, spatially and visually.	Direct	Minor	Slight	None proposed	Minor	Slight