



Environmental Appraisal Report

Woolfords Wind Farm - Tip Height Increase

Technical Appendix 9-1: Cultural Heritage Assessment

Woolfords Wind Energy Ltd

wind2

your project our expertise

Contents

9. Heritage Impact Assessment	2
9.1 Introduction	2
9.2 Planning policy and guidance	3
9.3 Assessment Methodology	4
9.4 Baseline Conditions	6
9.5 Assessment of Effects and Mitigation	7
9.6 Designated Heritage Assets Identified by HES	15
9.7 Conclusion	17
9.8 Decommissioning	17
9.9 Cumulative Assessment	17
9.10 Mitigation	18
9.11 Residual Effects and Conclusion	20
9.12 Summary	21
9.13 References	23

Annexes

- Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria
- Annex 9-1-2: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets and Events
- Annex 9-1-3: Woolford Plates of the Consented Development EA Report
- Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage

Figures

- Figure 9-1: Heritage Assets within 1km Study Area
- Figure 9-2: Designated Heritage Assets within 5km Study Area
- Figure 9-3: Selected Scheduled Monuments within 10km Study Area
- Figure 9-4: Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility
- Figure 9-5: Cumulative Turbines within 5km
- Figure 9-6: CH1 Harburn House Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
- Figure 9-7: CH2 Haywood, deserted mining village (Site 2)
- Figure 9-8: CH3 Wilsontown Ironworks (Site 5)

Document Prepared For

Ewan Eley

Woolfords Wind Energy Ltd

Document Prepared By

Natalie Kendrick

Consultancy Project Officer

planning@atmosconsulting.com

Document Approved By

Malcolm Sangster

Technical Director

planning@atmosconsulting.com

Version	Date	Reason
1.0	April 2026	Original Issue
2.0	May 2026	Amended following client review
3.0	June 2026	Final Issue



URS is a member of Registrar of Standards (Holdings) Ltd.

Copyright © 2026 Atmos Consulting Ltd

The copyright in this work is vested in Atmos Consulting Ltd, and the information contained herein is confidential. This work, either in whole or in part, may not be reproduced or disclosed to others or used for any purposes, other than for internal Woolfords Wind Energy Ltd evaluation without Atmos Consulting's prior written approval.



Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
The Applicant	Woolfords Wind Energy Ltd
Environmental and Planning Consultant	Atmos Consulting Limited
The Consented Development	Woolfords Wind Farm (Planning Reference: P/22/0031 & Date of Consent: 30 May 2025)
The Proposed Development	Woolfords Wind Farm - Tip Height Increase
The Site	The site of the Proposed Development outlined in red. This is also the application boundary.
The Planning Act	The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended)

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
ClfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologist
EA	Environmental Appraisal
GDL	Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
HEP	Historic Environment Policy
HEPS	Historic Environment Policy for Scotland
HER	Historic Environment Record
HES	Historic Environment Scotland
NPF 4	National Planning Policy Framework 4
NRHE	National Record of the Historic Environment
LDP	Local Development Plan
PAN	Planning Advice Notes
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

9. Heritage Impact Assessment

9.1 Introduction

This Technical Appendix of the Environmental Appraisal Report provides an assessment of the potential effects on cultural heritage assets, including archaeological remains, which could arise as a result of the construction operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

Specifically, the assessment considers whether there would be any additional or increased impacts to cultural heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development due to the increase in the tip height of the turbines and the related change in the infrastructure as compared to the Consented Development. The details of the Proposed development are provided in Section 3: Description of Development of the EA Report.

This assessment outlines the historical environment baseline and identifies and assesses any changes to the findings and conclusions from the Consented Development EA Report Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Appraisal Appendix, which could result from the Proposed Development.

As with the original Cultural Heritage Appraisal Appendix, this assessment has been produced by AOC Archaeology Group. AOC is a Registered Organisation of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). This chapter conforms to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment (CIfA, 2020a), Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (CIfA, 2020b).

This assessment has been carried out by Natalie Kendrick, Consultancy Project Officer at AOC Archaeology Group. Natalie joined AOC in 2024 after spending two years working as a field archaeologist in the UK, having previously worked in the heritage sector in South Africa. Natalie has been a professional archaeologist since 2011 - predominately at ACO Associates and as a Heritage Officer for the Western Cape Provincial Heritage Authority (South Africa).

Overall quality assurance for the assessment has been provided by Victoria Oleksy who has extensive experience of environmental impact assessments across Britain. Victoria is an Associate Director of AOC, Consultancy Sector Head and a Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and has over 20 years' experience in the commercial heritage sector. Victoria specialises in EIAs, Archaeological Impact Assessment, Conservation Management Plans and has appeared as an expert witness for planning appeals and called-in planning applications.

This chapter is supported by the following figures and annexes:

- **Annexes**

- Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria
- Annex 9-1-2: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets and Events
- Annex 9-1-3: Woolford Plates of the Consented Development EA Report
- Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)
-

- **Figures**

- Figure 9-1: Heritage Assets within 1km Study Area
- Figure 9-2: Designated Heritage Assets within 5km Study Area
- Figure 9-3: Selected Scheduled Monuments within 10km Study Area

- Figure 9-4: Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility
- Figure 9-5: Cumulative Turbines within 5km
- Figure 9-6: CH1 Harburn House Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
- Figure 9-7: CH2 Haywood, deserted mining village (Site 2)
- Figure 9-8: CH3 Wilsontown Ironworks (Site 5)

Figures and annexes are referenced in the text where relevant.

9.2 Planning policy and guidance

National Planning Policy Guidelines

The statutory framework for heritage in Scotland is outlined in the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 both of which are modified by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011.

The following policies and guidance are relevant to this assessment:

- National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) (Scottish Government 2023)
 - Of particular relevance are Policies 7a, 7c, 7h, 7i and 7o;
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (Historic Environment Scotland 2019)
 - Of particular note are HEP2, HEP3, and HEP4;
- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2020)

The assessment for the Consented Development made reference to Planning Advice Notes (PAN) for Scotland PAN2/2011: Planning and archaeology (Scottish Government 2011), however the PAN no longer applies as it was withdrawn by the Scottish Government on the 8th December 2025.

Local Planning Policy Guidelines

The Site lies on the boundary between the local authority administrative area of South Lanarkshire and West Lothian. The following local planning policies and guidance are relevant to this assessment:

- South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2)
 - Policy 1: Spatial Strategy
 - Policy 14: Natural and Historic Environment
 - Policy NHE2 Archaeological Sites and Monuments
 - Non-statutory guidance from the forthcoming LDP2
 - Policy NHE 2 Scheduled Monuments and their Setting
 - Policy NHE 3 Listed Buildings
 - Policy NRHE 4 Gardens and designed landscapes
 - Policy NHE 6 Non-scheduled archaeological sites and monuments
- West Lothian Development Plan (LDP1)
 - Policy ENV 20 Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes
 - Policy ENV 28 Listed Buildings
 - Policy ENV 32 Archaeology
 - Policy ENV 33 Scheduled Monuments

- Non-statutory guidance for the Historic Environment (West Lothian Council, 2021).

There have been no new plans adopted since 2021, therefore these policies, for both administrative areas, are the same planning policy guidelines as the relevant Development Plans referred to in the original assessment for the Consented Development (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

9.3 Assessment Methodology

Extent of the Study Areas

The Study Areas used for this assessment are based on the Study Areas used in the Consented Development EA Report, to ensure consistency in the identified baseline and allow for identification of any material changes to the baseline or impacts upon archaeological and cultural heritage receptors which might result from the proposed changes.

As with the original assessment, the following Study Areas have therefore been identified for the assessment of the Proposed Development:

- A 1km Study Area (Figure 9-1 Heritage assets within 1km Study Area) for the identification of all heritage assets and known previous archaeological interventions in order to identify the potential for direct physical impacts upon known assets and to help predict whether any similar hitherto unknown archaeological remains are likely to survive within the Proposed Development Site and thus be impacted by the Proposed Development;
- A 5km Study Area (Figure 9-2 Designated Heritage Assets within 5km Study Area) for the assessment of potential impacts on the settings of all designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments, Garden Designed Landscapes, and all Listed Buildings. If present non-statutory register assets, coded C and V, identified by WoSAS as being of probable national importance have also been considered; and
- In addition to the designated heritage assets within 5km, HES identified nine additional Scheduled Monuments between 5km and 10km from the Site boundary which they requested be included in the assessment for the Consented Development (Figure 9-3 Selected Scheduled Monuments within 10km). These have also been considered as part of this assessment.

These are:

- Greens Moor, long cairn, cairns and field system NW of Kersewell Mains (Scheduled Monument, SM4212) (Asset 79);
- Burngrange, long cairn 800m N of (Scheduled Monument, SM4295) (Asset 80);
- Kersewell Mains, cairn 1400m ENE of (Scheduled Monument, SM4662) (Asset 81);
- Kersewell Mains, cairn 1400m E of (Scheduled Monument, SM4663) (Asset 82);
- Kersewell Mains, cairn 450m NE of (Scheduled Monument, SM11201) (Asset 83);
- Waulkmill, cairn 310m SE of (Scheduled Monument, SM11284) (Asset 84);
- Hare Law, cairn 730m SSE of Wester Yardhouses (Scheduled Monument, SM11230) (Asset 85);
- Wester Yardhouses, cairn 630m S of (Scheduled Monument, SM11231) (Asset 86); and
- West Yardhouses, hut circles and cairns 270m SSW of (Scheduled Monument, SM11236) (Asset 87).

In consultation for the Consented Development, HES stated that the above Scheduled Monuments; *“...have clearly been positioned to relate to each other and it is therefore possible that, even at a long range, the turbines could have an impact on the visual inter-relationships between the individual cairns.”*

For the Consented Development, HES further requested that the assessment of the following three designated heritage assets within the 5km Study Area be supported by visualisations:

- Harburn House Inventory Designed Landscape (GDL208) (centred Asset 29);
- Wilsontown Ironworks (Scheduled Monument, SM2654) (Asset 5); and
- Haywood, deserted mining village (Scheduled Monument, SM9684) (Asset 2).

HES also noted the potential for “cumulative impacts on the settings of heritage assets caused by the Proposed Development in combination with other existing, proposed and consented wind farms in the surrounding area”. HES requested that cumulative visualisations are produced to support the HIA (HES, 2021- Case ID 300051322).

The wirelines, including cumulative wirelines, requested by HES for the Consented Development have been updated for this assessment and are included as Figures 9-6 to 9-8.

For the original assessment of the Consented Development, all land within the Site was subject to assessment for potential direct impacts. This was subject to a detailed walkover survey to identify cultural heritage assets which could have been directly impacted by the Consented Development. The Site boundary and its land use has not changed since the original assessment of the Consented Development. Therefore, the original walkover survey results for the Consented Development remain valid.

Each heritage asset referred to in the text is listed in the Annex 9-1-2: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets and Events. Each has been assigned an 'Asset No.' or 'Event No.' unique to this assessment, and the Gazetteer includes information regarding the type, period, grid reference, HER number, protective designation, and other descriptive information, as derived from the consulted sources. Photographic plates are located in Annex 9-1-3: Plates of the Consented Development EA Report.

Each heritage asset referred to in the text is plotted on the location maps (Figures 9-1 to 9-3), using the AOC assigned Asset Nos. The Site is shown outlined in red.

Data Sources

This assessment has used updated data as per the following:

- An updated Historic Environment Record extract was acquired from WoSAS in March 2026;
- The NRHE was accessed and downloaded in March 2026; and

The HER and NRHE have been assessed as part of this Technical Appendix to ascertain whether there have been any changes to the historic environment baselines since the production of the Consented Development EA Report.

Limitations

No intrusive archaeological evaluation has been undertaken to inform this assessment, as such there is the potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains to survive within the Site and to be disturbed by the works associated with the Proposed Development. This limitation is addressed in the mitigation section where measures to avoid, minimise or offset any such impacts on hitherto unknown remains are provided for as per the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Standards

This assessment contains sufficient information to meet the requirements for assessing potential impacts upon heritage receptors required by current planning regulations set out in the NPF4 (Scottish Government 2023), HEPS (HES 2019) and local planning policy.

Assessment of Potential Effect Significance

The assessment aims to identify the known and likely archaeological potential of the Site and the relative value or importance of such a resource/asset. The criteria for assessing these factors is laid out in detail in Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria. The criteria for assessing archaeological potential are expressed in this report as ranging between the scales of High, Medium, Low and Uncertain, criteria for which are also noted in Annex 9-1-1.

Levels of importance in the report are expressed as ranging between the scales of High, Medium, Low, Negligible and Unknown. The importance of heritage assets is determined firstly by reference to existing designations – for example Scheduled Monuments are already classified as Nationally Important and therefore of High importance.

For assets where no designation has previously been assigned, the likely importance has been based upon the available evidence and professional knowledge and judgement.

The likely magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development works is determined by identifying the degree of change from the Proposed Development upon the 'baseline' conditions of the Site and the heritage resource/assets identified in the assessment. This impact can be either adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive) and is ranked according to the scale of major, moderate, minor, and negligible.

9.4 Baseline Conditions

Designated Heritage Assets

The baseline within the Site remains unchanged since the Consented Development EA Report. There are no designated heritage assets within the Site or within the 1km study area.

There are nine Scheduled Monuments (Assets 1-9) within the 5km study area. Five (Assets 1, 2, 4, 5, 7) of the Scheduled Monuments are industrial in character; two (Assets 6 & 8) are likely to be prehistoric in date; one is a Romano-British fortlet (Asset 9) and one includes the remains of a post-medieval church (Asset 2).

For the Consented Development, HES requested that nine Scheduled Monuments (Assets 79-87) between 5km and 10km from the Site be included in the initial assessment and these have also been included in this assessment. These Scheduled Monuments are all located to the south-east of the Site.

In relations to Scheduled Monuments NPF4 (Scottish Government 2023) Policy 7h) states that:

“Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:

- i. direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;*
- ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided; or*
- iii. exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.”*

There are 14 Category B Listed Buildings (Assets 11, 13-22, 24, 25 & 28) and five Category C Listed Buildings (Assets 10, 12, 23, 26 & 27) within the 5km study area.

In relation to Listed Buildings the NPF4 Policy 7c) states that:

“Development proposals for the reuse, alteration or extension of a listed building will only be supported where they will preserve its character, special architectural or historic interest and setting. Development proposals affecting the setting of a listed building should preserve its character, and its special architectural or historic interest.”

- 9.4.1. The Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL) of Harburn House (centred on Asset 29) extends within 3.69km northeast of the Site.

In relation to Gardens and Designed Landscapes the NPF4 Policy 7i) states that:

“Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact on important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.”

There are no World Heritage Sites, Category A Listed Buildings, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas recorded within the study areas.

WoSAS has identified two small cairns (Assets 77 & 78) in their non-statutory register Coded V. WoSAS consider Code V sites to be “Probably of national importance”, although these assets have no statutory designation.

Non-designated heritage assets:

The baseline within the Site remains unchanged since the Consented Development EA Report.

There are 14 non-designated heritage assets within the Site (Assets 32, 48, 70-72, 74, 88-92 and 94-96), and 42 within the 1km Study Area. The assets on site primarily comprise remains of post-medieval and modern date related to agriculture and industrial use of the Site and include sheepfolds/shelters (Assets 32, 70, 89-91, and 94), a quarry (Asset 71), an enclosure (Asset 72), a farmstead (Asset 92), two possible buildings (Assets 95-96) and a former model aircraft flying site (Asset 74).

The HER and NRHE recorded no new non-designated heritage assets within the Proposed Development Site and 1km Study Area.

On the basis that the historic environment baseline remains unchanged and there has been no material change to land use within the Site, there is considered to be a Low potential for prehistoric, Roman, Early Historic, medieval and modern remains to survive on Site. There is judged to be a High potential for further post-medieval remains to survive on Site, though these would likely also relate to agricultural and industrial use.

9.5 Assessment of Effects and Mitigation

Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment of Physical Effects

Construction effects on cultural heritage receptors, as discussed in Consented Development EA Report – Technical Appendix 9-1: Cultural Heritage, have been limited to physical impacts on heritage assets. Whilst there is some limited potential for impacts upon the setting of designated heritage assets to occur during the construction phase, any such effects would be temporary, and it

is considered that setting effects resulting from construction would not exceed the predicted operational effects upon the setting of heritage assets.

As such, with the aim of achieving proportionality, the potential for setting effects is considered under operational effects.

The assets brought forward for assessment of physical impacts as a result of the Proposed Development remain unchanged from the Consented Development EA Report.

Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment of Setting Effects

The Consented Development EA Report identified a range of assets within the 1km, 5km and 10km Study Areas which could be sensitive to changes to their settings and thus be subject to impacts as a result from the implementation of the Proposed Development. These are discussed under operational effects in the Consented Development EA Report.

Designated assets located within the Study Areas and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), as set out above, have been subject to detailed setting assessment in the Consented Development EA Report. This assessment has considered whether any revisions are required due to the changes in the Proposed Development.

All designated assets within the Study Areas and the ZTV were reviewed against the information known about their contextual characteristics and against mapping information to identify any assets where views of the Proposed Development in views from or of the asset may impact on their settings.

This assessment has found no changes to this setting assessment from the Consented Development EA Report. The revised ZTV, which accounts for the changes in height of the proposed turbines, has not resulted in any further assets having visibility of the Proposed Development when compared with the Consented Development EA Report (Figure 9-4 Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility). As such the assets taken forward for assessment remain unchanged from the Consented Development EA Report.

Construction Effects

Potential impacts on known or unknown, buried archaeological remains which may survive within the Site relate to the possibility of disturbing, removing or destroying in situ remains and artefacts during demolition and ground-breaking works (including excavation, construction and other works) associated with the Proposed Development.

There would be no change to the location of the proposed turbines from the Consented Development when compared to the Proposed Development. The associated changes to infrastructure required to accommodate the larger turbines would also remain within the existing consented planning boundary. As such the Proposed Development would not result in any new impacts upon heritage assets identified within the Site.

As set out in the EA Report for the Consented Development, the Proposed Development has the potential to have a Permanent Adverse impact on known archaeological remains and hitherto unknown archaeological remains on the Site.

Without mitigation, the construction of Turbine 3 would have a Permanent Adverse impact of High magnitude on the remains of a post-medieval sheepfold (Asset 70) and on the remains of lime camps and a quarry (Asset 71).

The proposed access would cross the area of improved ground centred on Asset 88. The access would be located within 23m of the post-medieval structural remains at Asset 88, and within 43m of

further potential structural remains (Asset 95), though the latter lies out with the development footprint.

The construction of the access in this area would have a Permanent Adverse impact of Low magnitude on cultivation remains associated with Asset 88, though impacts upon the structural remains themselves would be avoided. There is potential for buried remains to survive within the area centred on Asset 88, which could be impacted upon by the construction of the proposed access track. This assessment of impact is unchanged from the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

There remains a clear potential for unknown buried remains to be disturbed during the construction phase and mitigation measures to allow for avoidance or minimisation of any such physical impacts is therefore set out in Section 9.7 below.

The magnitude of any potential impact on previously unrecorded remains cannot be quantified at present as the importance of any further assets which may be present on the Proposed Development Site are, by their very nature unknown.

Operational Effects

Physical impacts upon any known or previously unknown archaeological remains which may be present on the Site would cease with the completion of the groundworks stage of construction and consequently no physical impacts are predicted during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

Review of the revised and comparative ZTV (Figure 9-4) and revised visualisations (Figures 9-6 to 9-8) has indicated that no assets outwith the ZTV for the Consented Development have been brought into the ZTV for the Proposed Development as a result of changes to the height of the proposed turbines.

The visualisations indicate a minor change in the tip heights when viewed from the assets considered. As such, this assessment has found no changes to the magnitude of operational impacts from the Consented Development EA Report.

A bare earth ZTV based on the maximum height of each of the three proposed turbines has been produced for this assessment. The bare earth ZTV suggests that the Proposed Development would have no intervisibility with the following designated heritage assets:

- Category B Dovecot Cleugh House (Asset 13);
- Category B Auchenhard Tower (Asset 14);
- Scheduled Green Moors, long cairn, cairns and field system NW of Kersewell Mains (Asset 79);
- Scheduled Kersewell Mains, cairn 1400m ENE of (Asset 81); and
- Scheduled Kersewell Mains, cairn 1400m E of (Asset 82).

No impacts upon the setting of these assets are therefore anticipated and they are not considered further.

Site visits were made to the following assets in 2021. In all cases it was found that the Proposed Development would be effectively screened by woodland blocks or built structures within their vicinity. There is expected to be no visibility of the Proposed Development, or at worst minimal visibility beyond the screening features.

- Scheduled Tashieburn, horse engine platform 50m NE of (Asset 1);
- Scheduled Old West Calder Church, West Calder (Asset 3);

- Scheduled Cleugh House, bell pits and inclined plane 130m SSW of (Asset 4);
- Scheduled Woodmuir Farm, coke ovens and reservoir 600m SSE of (Asset 7);
- Scheduled Camilty Hill, enclosure, Harburn (Asset 8);
- Scheduled Burngrange, long cairn 800m N of (Asset 80);
- Scheduled Kerswell Mains, cairn 450m NE of (Asset 83);
- Scheduled Waulkmill, cairn 310m SE of (Asset 84);
- Category B Listed Auchengray Church (Asset 11);
- Category C Listed Cleugh House and walled garden (Asset 12);
- Category B Listed Longlea House (Asset 15);
- Category B Listed West Calder 13-19 (Odd Nos) Main Street, Former West Calder Co-op (Asset 16);
- Category B Listed West Calder East End, Library (Asset 17);
- Category B Listed Harwood Farmhouse (Asset 18);
- Category B Listed Harburn House (Hayfield) (Asset 19);
- Category B Listed Charles X Monument, Harburn Policies (Asset 20);
- Category B Listed Harburn Stables (Asset 21);
- Category B Listed Harburn Doocot (Asset 22);
- Category C Listed Addiewell Farm (Asset 23);
- Category B Listed Auchenhard House including summerhouse and gatepiers (Asset 24);
- Category B Listed Auchenhard Farmhouse including boundary wall and gatepiers (Asset 25);
- Category C Listed 43 Main Street, Railway Inn (Asset 26);
- Category C Listed Valve Houses and Watercourses, Cobbinshaw Reservoir (Asset 27);
- Category B Listed West Calder Station, West Calder (Asset 28); and
- Non-Statutory Register (Code V) Lingy Knowe, small cairns (Asset 78).

In many cases operational turbines also already feature between these assets and the Proposed Development and as such any limited visibility of the Proposed Development would be seen in a context which already includes wind turbines in the setting of the assets. It is not expected that the increase in tip height will increase the limited visibility, in relation to the assets above, to the extent that the assessed level of impact would increase. On this basis it is considered that any impact upon these assets remain as previously assessed to be at most negligible and there would be no material change to their current settings and they are not discussed further.

Assets within the ZTV and within 5km of the Site are discussed individually below. This is followed by a discussion of those Scheduled Monuments beyond 5km identified by HES which are included in the ZTV. All distances to the Proposed Development are given to the nearest proposed turbine.

Harburn House Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (centred Asset 29)

The Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL) of Harburn House or Harburn Estate (Asset 29) extends within 5km of the Site Boundary. The GDL was designed around the early 19th century, Category B Listed Harburn House (Asset 19).

The GDL was designed to envelope the House and is composed of a thick perimeter of mixed conifer and deciduous planting which encloses a parkland. This design is similar to other designed landscapes of the era and was intended to limit views of the main house.

The northern portion of the GDL was redesigned in the mid-19th century due to the construction of the Caledonian Railway, which is located within the northern extent of the GDL, and in the modern era ponds have been added. The main designed approaches to the estate are from the north and the south (HES, 2021b- Plates 14 & 15).

Harburn Estate was originally constructed in a rural, agricultural environment and that setting is still retained, although modern forestry plantations have been constructed in the wider environment to the south and west. What appears to be modern forestry planting has also been observed along the western boundary of the GDL, east of the B7008.

Wind turbines were visible to the west of the GDL beyond modern forestry plantations. However, the significance of the GDL and its importance as the setting of its associated Listed Buildings largely relates to the internal character of the GDL rather than its wider context.

The GDL of Harburn House was designed to enclose an estate, in a form typical of the early 19th century, and it is appreciable as an enclosed post-medieval estate.

The Proposed Development would be located 5.54km southwest of Harburn GDL, in the vicinity of existing wind turbines, the closest of which consist of the existing Harburnhead and Pearie Law windfarms (see Plates 16 & 17).

The Proposed Development would not be located on either of the designed approaches to the estate and it would be screened from view by mature vegetation from the northern access, although existing turbines can be seen on the approach to the northern access of the estate.

The comparative ZTV indicates that the Proposed Development would, largely, not be visible from within the wooded GDL. Though the ZTV does indicate some theoretical visibility from an area just east of Harburn House (Asset 19).

Figure 9-6 provides a bare earth wireline from this location and indicates that there is potential for the Proposed Development to be seen from this location behind the operational turbines associated with Pearie Law and Harburnhead Wind Farms and amongst a larger array which includes operational, under construction and consented turbines.

Whilst the wireline presented in Figure 9-6 indicates that all three turbines would be visible, this would only be from very limited locations, on the northern edge of the GDL and from a single point to the east of Harburn House (Asset 19) and large proportions of the proposed turbines would be screened by the woodland surrounding the GDL.

The Proposed Development would increase the number of visible turbines, however, once constructed it is unlikely that an observer would be able to differentiate the additional turbines of the Consented Development from those already in operation within existing wind farms. Whilst there may be partial views of the Proposed Development from within the GDL and from the northern entrance, the Proposed Development would be located beyond the GDL and as such would have no material impact on the way in which elements of the GDL relate to one another or the way in which the estate is understood and/or appreciated. In line with Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Haywood, deserted mining village (Asset 2)

The Scheduled remains of the deserted mining village at Haywood are visible as one upstanding structure, which has been consolidated during the relatively recent past and also includes low earthworks which appear to be the remains of buildings on a north facing slope (Plate 18).

The earthwork remains of the Caledonian Railway siding are located immediately north of the monument. The monument is located in grassland to the north of residential buildings in an agricultural landscape.

The setting of the deserted settlement relates to the former mine workings at Haywood for which the village was constructed, largely located to the east and south-east. The former railway and the immediate environment, which retains dispersed settlement, also contribute to an understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset.

The Proposed Development would be located 2.37km north of the monument. Three turbines are visible to the north of the asset in the same arc of view in which the Proposed Development would be visible (see Plate 19).

A bare earth wireline produced from Haywood (Figure 9-7) suggests that the Proposed Development would be visible beyond a low rise in an arc of view already occupied by turbines. Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible from the monument it would not affect the key characteristics of the asset's setting, namely its relationship with Haywood mine workings and the former railway, and as such it would not impact upon the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset and its relationship to its setting and there would be no significant adverse impacts upon the integrity of the asset's setting. In line with the setting assessment criteria the impact would be, at most, of Low magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Wilsontown Ironworks (Asset 5)

Wilsontown Ironworks Scheduled Monument encompasses Lanarkshire's first ironworks. Upstanding and earthwork remains were visible within the extent of the monument (Plate 20) and the monument was accessed using pathways designed to provide visitors with access to the monument. A number of interpretation boards providing information are also present.

When constructed, the setting of the Ironworks was chosen for its proximity to resources. Evidence for mining remains can be seen alongside accommodation for workers and other amenity buildings constructed to serve the community.

The importance and significance of the monument relates mostly to its surviving remains and their contextual relationship to one another. Much of its significance is derived from its archaeological potential and its setting is not mentioned in the Scheduling as providing any significance (HES, 2021c). The asset is largely surrounded by modern forestry. Tips of existing turbines were visible from the southern portion and the north-west corner of the asset (Plate 23).

The Proposed Development would be located 3.5km northeast of the asset at its nearest point. The ZTV suggests there would be no intervisibility with the Proposed Development due to the monument's location within woodland except for three turbines being theoretically visible from the southwest corner of the Scheduled Area. A bare earth wireline (Figure 9-8) has been produced from where the ZTV indicates some potential visibility. Whilst this indicates visibility of the tips of the three turbines they would be seen behind and amongst operational and consented turbines. As such the Proposed Development would be visible as part of a larger existing group of turbines to the north-

east. The increase in tip height does not increase the impact of the visibility at this distance as the change would not be significantly perceptible.

The Proposed Development would not, therefore, detract from the way in which the monument is understood or appreciated and it would not significantly adversely impact upon the integrity of the asset's setting. In line with the criteria in Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

West Harwood, burial mound 720m SSE of (Asset 6)

The monument is visible as a mound, located beside a derelict post-medieval steading (Plate 21). In the near setting of the asset to the north, west and east lies modern forestry planting, and agricultural land is located further east and to the south.

Further south there is additional modern forestry plantation and six wind turbines.

Whilst a sense of the historic setting of the asset, on a gentle southward facing slope above a boggy area can be appreciated, modern changes to the wider landscape in the form of planted forestry and the construction of Cobbinshaw Reservoir has limited the way in which the asset can be understood in the wider environment and how it may relate to other contemporary remains.

The Proposed Development would be located 3.25km to the south-west of the asset. In this direction three turbines, most likely turbines of the Pates Hill Windfarm, are already visible beyond plantation forestry (Plate 22).

The Proposed Development would be visible from the monument and would be located in the same arc of view as existing turbines. However, the setting of the asset has already been compromised by modern developments and the asset's setting, insofar as it contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the asset, is largely restricted to its near environment.

The Proposed Development would cause no material change to the current setting of the asset and there would be no significant adverse impact upon the integrity of its setting. In line with Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Camilty Hill, Roman fortlet, Castle Greg (Asset 9)

The Scheduled Roman fortlet (Asset 9) on Camilty Hill survives as a banked earth, square in plan earthwork on a relatively flat plateau on the southern side of Camilty Hill (Plate 23). The fortlet occupies a relatively high position in the landscape with views to the south and south-east. The land to the west slopes downwards and as such the fortlet would originally have had views to the east, west and south.

The land to the north gradually slopes upwards and as such whilst there may have been views to the north, these are difficult to appreciate in the fortlet's current setting. The position of modern forestry makes it difficult to appreciate the eastward views which the fort may have had, although the sloping nature of land to the south-east indicates that the fortlet would have had some views in that direction.

The Scheduled Monument is currently located in a clearing east of the B7008. The modern forestry plantation on Camilty Hill is located immediately east and north of the asset and further modern forestry is located to the west on the western side of the B7008.

The plantation, to the west of the monument, makes it difficult to appreciate the extent of historic views from the monument to the west. Existing turbines are visible beyond the forestry to the west of the asset and the Proposed Development would be located 6.04km west of the Site, in the same arc of view (Plate 24).

Based on a ZTV, the three turbines would be visible from the northwestern corner of the Roman fortlet (Asset 9) however it would not be a material addition to the existing group of turbines to the west once constructed.

The Proposed Development would also not affect the way in which the asset is understood in the current landscape, which has been previously detrimentally impacted by nearby forestry plantations. As such no significant adverse impacts upon the integrity of the asset's setting are predicted. In line with the criteria in Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Pigeon Tower, Lawhead (Asset 10)

A circular and roofless Pigeon Tower, which is Category C Listed, is located in grassland to the north-west of a non-designated house at Lawhead, and to the west of a roughly north-south aligned tree avenue which leads to the house at Lawhead (Plate 25).

Mature woodland is located to the north and west of the tower, and forestry is located to the east of the tower. The original setting of the tower appears to relate to the house and agricultural land around Lawhead and it was most likely not designed with the wider setting in mind.

The Proposed Development would be 4.6km north-west of the asset. Whilst the 200m tip height ZTV suggests that there would be intervisibility, its likely there would only be visibility of turbine tips from the base of the tower. The Proposed Development would not impact upon the way in which the tower is understood in its setting or its relationship to Lawhead. In line with the criteria in Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Lawhead Small Cairns (Asset 77)

Lawhead small cairns are considered by WoSAS to be 'probably of national importance'. The cairns are located on a hill, in a relatively low-lying landscape.

The cairns themselves are located on the northern summit and east slope of the hill (Plate 26), to the north of a disused quarry. They survive as earthworks in grassland. In the near setting, the cairns are located in agricultural land, and occupy the higher ground, although in the wider environment large industrial spoil heaps are visible to the north and mixed woodland, forestry and residential areas are visible in all compass directions.

The cairns are likely clearance cairns, related to agricultural clearing of the ground and as such their setting, insofar as it contributes to an understanding, appreciation and experience of them, is largely limited to their immediate surroundings.

The Proposed Development would be located 5.0 km north-west of the cairns (Plate 27). Turbines are already visible in this direction,

The Proposed Development turbines would be located well beyond the setting of the cairns, such that it relates to an understanding, appreciation and experience of them, and the setting of the cairns would still be appreciable. In line with Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would

be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

9.6 Designated Heritage Assets Identified by HES

HES requested that the inclusion of an assessment of the potential impacts on the setting of a group of nine Scheduled Monuments (Assets 79-87) within 10km of the Site be included in the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

- Green Moors, long cairn, cairns and field system (Asset 79);
- Burngrange (Asset 80);
- Kersewell Mains (Asset 81);
- Kersewell Mains (Asset 82);
- Kersewell Mains (Asset 83); and
- Waulkmill (Asset 84).

The Site visit in 2021 found that due to the local topography and existing forestry plantations these Scheduled Monuments are likely to be shielded from direct intervisibility with the Proposed Development.

The existing turbines at East Yardhouses and Muirhall wind farms, will also be visible in part between the Proposed Development and these Scheduled Monuments. As such the Proposed Development would not impact upon the relationship between these cairns and no impacts upon their settings are expected.

The further three Scheduled Monuments which HES requested be included in this assessment are located within the ZTV and are discussed below.

Hare Law Cairn (Asset 85) and Wester Yardhouses, (Asset 86)

The 2021 Site visit to the cairns was limited due to the presence of cows in the field. As such their setting was assessed from the north, from a stone wall lined road to Wester Yardhouses. The cairn known as Wester Yardhouses (Asset 86) was visible on the north-west facing slope, however Hare Law Cairn (Asset 85) was not visible from the roadside.

A previous visit to Hare Law cairn (Asset 85) described it as being “conspicuously located on the summit of Hare Law” and having good views of the relatively lower lying land to the north and to the south.

The original burial cairn (Asset 85) is greatly denuded; measuring approximately 20m in diameter, it is nowhere greater than a metre in height. However, a modern cairn has been constructed on top of the remains and makes it visible for some distance through the landscape.

The cairn has clear intervisibility with the cairn at Site 86 to the north and originally probably had intervisibility with the hut circles at Wester Yardhouse (Asset 87) although that visual relationship has been severed, most likely in the post-medieval period. There are another six prehistoric cairns located to the south-east. These cairns may be contemporary and may have been designed to be intervisible with one another.

Wester Yardhouses (Asset 86) was visible as a low earthwork and visible stone settings are likely to be the remains of an open cist which was disturbed by excavations in the past.

The cairn would have had good and wide views to the north and east when originally constructed, with rising land to the south and west precluding views in that direction, although the cairn would

have intervisibility with Hare Law cairn (Asset 86). Woodland to the north does preclude views in that direction and has severed any intervisibility with the hut circles (Asset 87) to the north.

The Proposed Development would be located 7km northwest of the cairns (Asset 85 & 86) and would be visible along a distant ridgeline, beyond the near Falla Burn valley (Plate 28).

This ridgeline is consistent and is currently occupied and broken by mature plantations and wind turbines. Whilst the Proposed Development is anticipated to be visible, given its distance from the cairns and its location beyond the ridgeline it would clearly be understood as being located well beyond the relevant setting of the cairns (Asset 85 & 86) and will be seen as a distant feature.

In addition, the Proposed Development would not be seen in views from Asset 85, southeastward toward the collection of cairns (Assets 79-84) in that direction. Due to the location of Asset 85 on the highest point of the local area and due to the distance, of the Proposed Development it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be readily identifiable when Asset 85 is viewed from the south or from the cairns to the southeast.

As such the Proposed Development would not have an adverse impact upon the integrity of the settings of Assets 85 and 86. In line with the criteria Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

Wester Yardhouses (Asset 87)

The hut circles and field clearance cairns at Wester Yardhouses survive as earthwork and turf covered stone remains and are located on a terrace on the northwest facing slope above Falla Burn.

It is possible that the relationship of the remains to the burn was significant in their siting and the relationship remains significant to a current understanding of the monuments. The siting would also likely have been based heavily on access to agricultural resources though it is likely that visual and topographic settings were also a consideration, for example for defensive purposes.

The land to the north and east of the asset is agricultural in use, and the remains are bound to the north by a stone-built wall, lining the access to West Yardhouse farm.

Mature woodland is located to the west of the remains. The near setting of the remains appears to be the valley of the Falla Burn. Due to the remains' location, there are wider views across the landscape to the north, which terminate in a consistent ridgeline which is broken by mature forestry plantations and existing wind turbines.

The Proposed Development would be located 6.6 km northwest (Plate 29) of the asset and the ZTV indicates that all three proposed turbines would be visible from the remains. A site visit also indicates that the turbines would be visible in the far distance, in the same arc of view as existing turbines and mature forestry.

Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible, the Falla Burn setting and topographic location of the remains would not be impacted, and this setting would still be understandable. Given the existing turbines, the Proposed Development would not represent a material change to the current setting of the asset. The integrity of the asset's setting would not be adversely impacted. In line with criteria in Annex 9-1-1: Assessment Scope and Criteria, the impact would be of Negligible magnitude. This assessed level of effect is the equivalent to the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)).

9.7 Conclusion

This addendum does not find that the Proposed Development of an increase in tip height poses a significant departure from the initial setting assessment in Technical Appendix: 9-1 of the Consented Development EA Report, and therefore the findings of the original assessment are maintained.

9.8 Decommissioning

As per the original assessment (Annex 9-1-4: Technical Appendix 9-1 Woolfords Wind Farm Cultural Heritage (2021)) - provided decommissioning work does not require any ground-breaking beyond those areas to be disturbed during construction, there would be no direct impacts resulting from decommissioning. Any minimal impacts upon the setting of heritage assets would be reversed following decommissioning.

9.9 Cumulative Assessment

A cumulative impact assessment was requested by HES during the consultation for the Consented Development and as such is included here for the Proposed Development as well.

The assessment of cumulative effects considers whether there would be an increased impact, either additive or synergistic, upon the setting of heritage assets as a result of adding the Proposed Development to a baseline, which may include operational, under construction, consented or proposed developments.

The assessment has been undertaken with reference to the Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook V5 (SNH & HES 2018).

In determining the degree to which a cumulative impact may occur as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline a number of factors are taken into consideration including:

- the distance between wind farms;
- the interrelationship between their Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV);
- the overall character of the asset and its sensitivity to wind farms;
- the siting, scale and design of the wind farms themselves;
- the way in which the asset is experienced;
- the placing of the cumulative wind farm(s) in relation to both the individual proposal being assessed and the heritage asset under consideration; and
- the contribution of the cumulative baseline schemes to the significance of the effect, excluding the individual proposal being assessed, upon the setting of the heritage asset under consideration.
- The Site is located in an area defined by SLC as an “Area of Significant Cumulative Development” (South Lanarkshire, 2021).

The Proposed Development has been designed to appear as an extension to the cluster of wind farms which lie between Greenwall Forth to the west and Harburnhead to the east. There are seven wind turbines immediately north of the Site collective known as Pates Hill Wind Farm.

Ten operational windfarms (Tormywheel, Pearie Law, Pates Hill, Muirhall Windfarm Extension, Muirhall South, Muirhall, Longhill Burn, Haywood Farm Extension, and Nether Longford farm) Harburnhead and five individual existing turbines have been identified within a 5km study area of the Site (Greenwall Forth, Upper Haywood Forth, Stobwood Farm, and Mountainblaw Farm).

In total there are 76 operational turbines within 5km of the Site, three of which are below 50m in height, while the majority range from 65m to 200m (see Figure 9-5). Of these nine are 200m tip height, with the rest being under 150m. A further 23 turbines have been approved for new windfarms and extensions to existing wind farms (Tormywheel Extension, Pearie Law Extension, and Harburnhead Extension). All of the approved turbines are below 122m tip height.

Site visits found that due to the presence of existing, under construction and consented turbines, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be perceived as a separate windfarm within the arc of view of the existing turbine fields. This would also be the case when considering nearby proposed wind developments.

This is confirmed by bare earth wirelines which show that the Proposed Development would be seen in conjunction with this wider turbine field (Figures 9-6 – 9-8). When viewed from the north and south, the Proposed Development would be seen in conjunction with the existing Pates Hill Windfarm and Longhill Burn and from the east and west would be visible in conjunction Harburnhead Wind Farm, Tormywheel, and Pearie Law.

As such the arc of view in which turbines would be perceivable as a new modern development is not anticipated to materially change when viewed from any of the designated heritage assets considered as part of this assessment.

Whilst the height of relative to the Consented Development has increased to 200m which is higher than the average height of the operational and approved turbines, the proposed change is not anticipated to have a materially greater cumulative impact than as presented in the conclusion of the Consented Development EA Report, as such there is not anticipated to be an adverse cumulative impact on the setting of heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development.

9.10 Mitigation

Mitigation during Construction

The Consented Development EA Report recommended the following mitigation:

“National planning policies and planning guidance, HEPS (Scottish Government 2019), SPP (Scottish Government 2014), as well as the local planning policies outlined in this report, require a mitigation response that is designed to take cognisance of the potential for impacts upon heritage assets.

It also requires that the potential for archaeological remains to survive within the Site is assessed and hence allow for any impacts to be mitigated by avoidance or minimisation or where this is not warranted by preservation by record.

There is judged to be a Low potential for prehistoric to medieval and modern remains and a High potential for post-medieval remains to survive on the Site. The possibility of encountering hitherto unknown remains cannot be discounted.

There is also the potential for paleoenvironmental remains associated with local climate change and/or land use to survive in peat accumulations on the Site. In line with national and local planning policies known heritage assets in close proximity to the Proposed Development will be avoided by design and/or micro-siting.

Turbine 3 is proposed to be located in the location of a post-medieval sheepfold (Asset 70) and in close proximity to post-medieval lime extraction and processing remains (Asset 71). The construction footprint for Turbine 3 will be micro-sited around the known heritage remains to ensure that impacts upon them are avoided.

Upstanding remains within the Application Boundary will be fenced prior to the commencement of construction works on Site to ensure that there is no accidental damage to the remains via plant movement. If required a programme of archaeological monitoring, in the form of a watching brief will be undertaken during ground-breaking works associated with the construction phase. It is envisaged that this will be undertaken as a condition of any planning permission gained and the detailed scope and method of the work will be agreed with WoSAS, as advisors to South Lanarkshire Council, via a Written Scheme of Investigation.

The implementation of the above outlined mitigation measures for construction effects, will prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage assets; allow for recording of known remains and allow for the investigation of the potential for previously unknown assets.

Following the completion of construction, no further groundworks would be undertaken. Mitigation would allow for the detailed recording of any remains encountered during the construction phase and the results would therefore enhance our understanding of the area's archaeological heritage.

As undertaken at Pates Hill windfarm to the north, a programme of interpretation of known and any identified archaeological remains may also be undertaken following the completion of the Proposed Development.

No material impacts upon the setting of heritage assets has been identified as part of this assessment. As such no mitigation measures for setting impacts, beyond those inherent in the design, are deemed necessary."

The conditions of the planning approval decision pertaining to archaeology are as follows:

"No development shall take place within the development site as outlined in red on the approved plan until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant, agreed by the West of Scotland Archaeology Service, and approved by the Council as Planning Authority. Thereafter the developer shall ensure that the programme of archaeological works is fully implemented and that all recording and recovery of archaeological resources within the development site is undertaken to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority in agreement with the West of Scotland Archaeology Service." (P 22 0031-Grant Detailed Permission-5643034, South Lanarkshire Council)

In line with updates to national and local planning policies, this assessment has reconsidered the recommendations proposed in the Consented Development EA Report in light of the changes to the Proposed Development. This assessment recommends that no changes are required to the mitigation for physical impacts that are detailed in the Consented Development EA Report.

Mitigation during Operation

This assessment has judged that there are no changes to the level of operational impacts upon the setting of heritage assets as presented within the Consented Development EA Report. Therefore, there would be no likely significant effects upon the setting of designated assets during the operational phase of the Proposed Development and no significant cumulative effects. On this basis, no mitigation for operational impacts is required.

Mitigation during Decommissioning

Demarcation of archaeological assets in close proximity to working areas during decommissioning will ensure that accidental damage resulting from plant movement is avoided. Provided that decommissioning works do not require any ground-breaking beyond those areas previously disturbed during construction, there would be no further direct impacts resulting from decommissioning.

9.11 Residual Effects and Conclusion

Proposed Mitigation/Monitoring

Proposed mitigation measures are set out above and in Section 9.7. No additional mitigation or monitoring is proposed.

Residual Construction Effects

Micrositing and an Archaeological Watching Brief, as outlined above, will allow for avoidance of impacts or, where this is not possible, for the investigation of known and previously unknown assets during the construction phase. This will allow for further avoidance of physical impacts or, in cases where this might not be possible, will allow for recording of elements of assets which would be removed.

Where avoidance and minimisation is not possible, the proposed mitigation will not remove or reduce the impact but it will ensure that the impact is offset by ensuring preservation by record. As such there will be minimal loss of information content.

Following the completion of construction, no further groundworks would be undertaken. Mitigation will allow for the detailed recording of any remains encountered during the construction phase and the results would therefore have the potential to enhance our understanding of the area's archaeological heritage.

Residual Operational Effects

No direct mitigation, beyond those by design, are possible for setting impacts. Given that no significant operational impacts upon setting have been identified, no mitigation measures aimed at offsetting impacts or enhancing heritage assets are deemed necessary. As such, the predicted residual operational impacts on the settings of heritage assets would be the same as assessed for the operational impacts.

Residual Decommissioning Effects

No physical impacts are anticipated to arise from decommissioning, provided works are contained within the construction footprint. Demarcation of archaeological assets in close proximity to working areas will ensure that accidental damage resulting from plant movement is avoided.

All operational and cumulative effects upon the settings of designated assets would be reversed with the removal of the turbines following decommissioning, leading to neutral residual effects.

Residual Cumulative Effects

No direct mitigation, beyond those by design, are possible for setting impacts. Given that no significant cumulative impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures aimed at offsetting impacts or enhancing heritage assets are deemed necessary. As such, the predicted residual

operational cumulative effects on the settings of heritage assets would be the same as assessed for the operational cumulative effects.

Summary

Potential physical impacts during construction on assets identified within the Site remains unchanged from the Consented Development EA Report. Therefore, the assessment from the Consented Development EA Report that no significant residual direct impacts on known heritage assets have been identified remains unchanged.

Potential operational impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets within the defined study areas have been considered as part of this assessment. No significant operational setting impacts have been identified.

The possibility of cumulative effects has also been assessed. No significant cumulative effects have been identified.

9.12 Summary

This assessment identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the Proposed Development Site and assesses the potential for physical and setting impacts on heritage assets resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Consideration has been given to whether the Proposed Development would result in any additional or increased impacts upon heritage assets when compared with the Consented Development.

This assessment also identifies any further measures since the production of the Consented Development EA Report that should be taken to mitigate predicted adverse impacts.

National planning policies and planning guidance as well as local planning policies require that account is taken of potential impacts upon heritage assets by proposed developments and that where possible such impacts are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible these policies require that impacts be minimised or offset.

The historic environment baseline remains unchanged from the Consented Development EA Report and the changes to the heights of the proposed turbines would not result in any additional or increased impacts to known heritage assets within the Site and therefore no additional physical impacts have been identified.

Potential operational impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets within the defined study areas have been considered as part of this assessment. Any heritage assets assessed as requiring assessment through consultation with HES and WoSAS which were included within the Consented Development EA Report, have also been considered here.

Review of the comparative ZTV and updated visualisations (Figures 9-4 and 9-6 – 9-8) has indicated that no assets outwith the ZTV for the Consented Development have been brought into the ZTV for the Proposed Development as a result of changes to the height of the proposed turbines.

Whilst the visualisations indicate there would be slight changes in the heights of the turbines when viewed from the assets considered this would not change the overall magnitude of impact from that predicted for the Consented Development EA Report.

As such, the potential operations impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets within Study Areas remains unchanged from the Consented Development EA Report.

No significant setting impacts have been identified. At most effects would be of Low magnitude and not significant. There would be no significant adverse impacts upon the integrity of setting of any Scheduled Monuments.

The possibility of cumulative effects has also been assessed. Potential impacts remain unchanged from those impacts predicted in the Consented Development EA Report and therefore, no new significant cumulative impacts have been identified.

9.13 References

Bibliographic References

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 (c46). [Online]. London. The Stationery Office. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46/pdfs/ukpga_19790046_en.pdf (Accessed 20/03/2026)

ATMOS Consulting. 2021. Interpolated Peat Depth. Unpublished drawing

British Geological Survey (BGS). (2021). Geology of Britain Viewer. Available: <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> (Accessed 20/03/2026).

CFA Archaeology Ltd. (2010). 'Harrows Law Wind Farm Volume 2: Environmental Statement, Chapter 12 - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology'

Challis, K., Forlin, P. & Kincey, M. (2011) A General Toolkit for the Visualisation of Archaeological Features on Airborne LiDAR Elevation Data. *Archaeological Prospection* 18, pp.279-289

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020a. Standard and guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2023-11/CIfA-SandG-Archaeological-Consultancy-2020.pdf> (Accessed 20/03/2026).

CIfA, 2020b. Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2023-11/CIfA-SandG-DBA-2020.pdf> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

CIfA, 2021. Professional Practice Paper: Delivering Public Benefit. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2024-11/CIfA-Delivering-Public-Benefit_2021.pdf (Accessed 20/03/2026)

CIfA, 2025a. Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2025-10/Code-of-conduct_revOct-2025.pdf (Accessed 20/03/2026)

CIfA, 2025b. Regulations for Professional Conduct. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/2025-10/Regulations-for-professional-conduct_revOct-2025.pdf (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act (2011) (c3). London: UK Government. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Historic Environment Scotland (HES) and Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), 2018. Environmental Assessment Handbook. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=6ed33b65-9df1-4a2f-acbb-a8e800a592c0> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

HES, 2019. Historic Environment Policy for Scotland. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7> (Accessed 07/01/2026)

HES, 2020a. Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7>

[research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549](https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549) (Accessed 20/03/2026)

HES, 2020b. Designation Policy and Selection Guidance. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

HES, 2021. Scotland's Listed Buildings. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=34c90cb9-5ff3-45c3-8bc3-a58400fcbc44> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

HES, 2023. Our Past, Our Future: The Strategy for Scotland's Historic Environment. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=79204155-9eb2-4d29-ab14-aff200ec2801> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA), 2021. Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment In The UK. Available at: [CD-7-19-Principles-of-Cultural-Heritage-Impact-Assessment-2021.pdf](https://www.iema.net/media/oone2qce/iema-mitigation-in-eia-guidance-final.pdf) (Accessed 20/03/2026)

IEMA, 2024. *Implementing the Mitigation Hierarchy from Concept to Construction*. Available at: <https://www.iema.net/media/oone2qce/iema-mitigation-in-eia-guidance-final.pdf> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Mark, G. Rev. (1794). Carnwath, County of Lanark Old Statistical Accounts of Scotland (OSA) Volume X. Available at: [https://stataccscot.edina.ac.uk/static/statacc/dist/viewer/osa-vol10-Parish record for Carnwath in the county of Lanark in volume 10 of account 1/](https://stataccscot.edina.ac.uk/static/statacc/dist/viewer/osa-vol10-Parish%20record%20for%20Carnwath%20in%20the%20county%20of%20Lanark%20in%20volume%2010%20of%20account%201/) (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Mann, B., 2023. Delivery of Public Benefit and Social Value Guidance for Archaeology and the Planning Process. Available at: [https://algao.org.uk/sites/algao.org.uk/files/2023-02/ALGAO Delivery of Public Benefit Social Value Guidance.pdf](https://algao.org.uk/sites/algao.org.uk/files/2023-02/ALGAO_Delivery_of_Public_Benefit_Social_Value_Guidance.pdf) (Accessed 20/03/2026)

National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP), 2026. *Map Search*. Available at: <https://ncap.org.uk/search?view=map> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

National Library of Scotland (NLS), 2026. *Map Images*. Available at: <https://maps.nls.uk/> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Old Maps Online, 2026. *Explore Maps*. Available at: <https://www.oldmapsonline.org/> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act (1997) (c9). London: UK Government. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Scotland's Places. (2021). Ordnance Survey Name Books-Lanarkshire OS Name Books, 1858-1861, Lanarkshire volume 12- OS1/21/12/11. Available at: <https://scotlandsplaces.gov.uk/digital-volumes/ordnance-survey-name-books/lanarkshire-os-name-books-1858-1861/lanarkshire-volume-12/11> (Accessed 20/03/2021)

Scottish Government, 2023. *National Planning Framework 4*. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Scottish Palaeoecological Archive Database; available at <https://www.geos.ed.ac.uk/~ajn/spad/index.html> (Accessed 20/03/2026)

South Lanarkshire Council, 2021. Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2). Available at: https://www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk/info/200305/development_plans/2253/local_development_plan_2_ldp2 (Accessed 20/03/2026)

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act (1997) (c8). London: UK Government. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/8/contents> (Accessed 07/01/2026)

West Lothian Council, 2025. Local Development Plan 1 (LDP1). Available at: <https://www.westlothian.gov.uk/LDP> (Accessed 07/01/2026)

Cartographic References

The following maps were consulted through National Library of Scotland Website (<http://maps.nls.uk>) and (<http://www.oldmapsonline.org/>) – last accessed 20/03/2021

Adair, J. 1735. A Map of Midlothian / survey'd by Mr. J. Adair.

Roy, W. 1747-52. Military Map of Scotland- Lowlands

Laurie, J. 1736. A plan of the county of Mid-Lothian or Shire of Edinburgh ... / from an actual survey made & drawn by John Laurie, 1763. (Alexr. Baillie sculpsit.).

Ross, C. 1773. A map of the shire of Lanark taken from an actual survey and laid down from a scale of an inch to a mile / by Charles Ross ... Engraved by Geo. Cameron.

Forrest, W. 1816. The county of Lanark from actual survey.

Knox, J. 1822. Edinburgh Shire / from actual survey by James Knox under the superintendence of the following gentlemen viz. Mr. Baron Clerk, Sir George Clerk, Mr Sheriff Rae, And[rew] Wauchope Esq., James Rothead Esq., James Dewar Esq., Henry Jardine Esq.

Thomson, J. 1822. [Edinburgh : John Thomson & Co, 1822]

Ordnance Survey. 1864. Lanarkshire, sheet XIV (with inset of sheet XV) (includes: Carn... Survey date: 1859, Publication date: 1864

Ordnance Survey. 1898. Lanarkshire XIV.11 (Carnwath; West Calder) Revised: 1897, Publication date: 1898

Ordnance Survey. 1899. Lanarkshire sheet XIV.NE & SE (includes: Carnwath; West Calder) Date revised: 1897, Publication date: 1899

Ordnance Survey. 1914. Lanarkshire sheet XIV.NE & SE (includes: Carnwath; West Calder) Date revised: 1910, Publication date: 1914

Ordnance Survey. 1922. Lanarkshire sheet XIV (includes: Carnwath; West Calder; Whitburn... Date revised: 1910, Publication date: 1922

Ordnance Survey. 1957. NT05NW - A (includes: Carnwath; Mid Calder; West Calder) Surveyed / Revised: Pre-1930 to 1957, Published: 1957

Ordnance Survey. 1959. NT0056 - A (includes: Carnwath; West Calder) Revised: 1958, Published: 1959

Ordnance Survey. 1963. NS95NE - A (includes: Carnwath; West Calder) Surveyed / Revised: 1961 to 1962, Published: 1963

Ordnance Survey. 1989. OS Plan 1981-1989 1:10000

Ordnance Survey. 1987. OS Plan (partial) 1:10000

Aerial Photographic References

The following aerial photographs were consulted via the National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) website.

Sortie	Frame	Date	Link
ASS/51388	0054	10 June 1988	https://ncap.org.uk/frame/8-1-3-1-13-54?pos=0
ASS/5088	0115	27 May 1988	https://ncap.org.uk/frame/8-1-3-1-8-115?pos=0