

## **15 Cultural Heritage**

### **15.1 Introduction**

- 15.1.1 This chapter presents the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Stage 2 assessment for the potential impacts of each route option on cultural heritage assets including archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape.
- 15.1.2 The assessment was undertaken based on the guidance provided in DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2, HA208/07: Cultural Heritage (Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government, and the Department for Regional Development for Northern Ireland 2007) (hereafter referred to as HA208/07).
- 15.1.3 The assessment is supported by a gazetteer of cultural heritage assets, which is provided in Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A15.1 (Cultural Heritage Gazetteer) of this report.

### **15.2 Approach and Methods**

#### **Scope and Guidance**

- 15.2.1 As noted in paragraph 15.1.2 this assessment was undertaken based on the guidance provided by HA208/07. In addition to HA208/07 guidance, other policy documents and published guidelines taken into account in the preparation of this chapter include:
- Scottish Historic Environment Policy (Historic Scotland 2011) (hereafter referred to as SHEP);
  - Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology (Scottish Government 2011) (hereafter referred to as PAN 2/2011);
  - Scottish Planning Policy (Scottish Government 2014) (hereafter referred to as SPP);
  - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland 2016a); and
  - Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014).
- 15.2.2 Relevant national, regional and local planning policy is presented in Chapter 8 (Policies and Plans) of this report. Where legislation, policy and guidance is relevant to the assessment of sensitivity of a cultural heritage asset it is presented in Section 15.3 (Policies and Plans).

#### **Study Area**

- 15.2.3 For all three sub-topics (archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape), a study area was defined which extended 200m in all directions from each of the route options. These were then combined into the single study area shown on Figures 15.1 to 15.6.

#### **Baseline Data**

- 15.2.4 To establish the cultural heritage baseline, the following sources of information were consulted:
- Historic Environment Scotland's online database PastMap (Historic Environment Scotland 2016b), for information on designated sites comprising: Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Conservation Areas; sites included on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland; Historic Land Use Assessment; and sites included on the Inventory of Historic Battlefields.
  - The Highland Council's Historic Environment Record (HER) (The Highland Council 2016).
  - Published sources, including the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (ScARF).
  - Historic mapping available online (National Library of Scotland 2016).
- 15.2.5 A site inspection was undertaken between on 4 and 5 May 2016. The following cultural heritage assets were inspected:
- Ashton Farm Cottages cropmarks, Scheduled Monument (Asset 14);

- Castlehill House, Category B Listed Building (Asset 9);
- Inshes House, Category B Listed Building (Asset 4); and
- Inshes House Tower House and Dovecot, Category A Listed Building (Asset 3).

15.2.6 To inform the assessment of sensitivity of archaeological remains (Table 15.1), the ScARF was used to identify relevant research objectives to which archaeological remains within the study area could potentially contribute information.

### Consultation

15.2.7 Consultation was undertaken with both Historic Environment Scotland and The Highland Council, requesting comments on the potential impacts of the route options on cultural heritage assets. Further information on the consultation process is provided in Chapter 7 (Overview of Environmental Assessment) of this report.

15.2.8 In a letter dated 6 May 2016, Historic Environment Scotland confirmed that they were content with the proposed approach to the cultural heritage assessment. In relation to the Scheduled Monument, Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles (Asset 14), the need to focus on the avoidance of impact through appropriate design was highlighted. Potential impacts on the setting of B and C Listed Buildings was identified as being a matter for the local authority to advise on, and a view from The Highland Council's conservation and archaeology service would be required.

15.2.9 The Highland Council were consulted in relation to potential impacts relating to cultural heritage assets, in particular those relating to the Category B Listed Building, Castlehill House (Asset 9). In an email dated 11 August 2016 The Highland Council's Principal Officer, Building Conservation and Environment, concurred with impact significance set out in Section 15.5 (Impact Assessment) of this assessment.

15.2.10 A meeting was held with the owner of Castlehill House (Asset 9) on 5 May 2016 to discuss the potential impacts on this historic building, and to collect information held by the owner relating to the history of the property.

### Impact Assessment

#### Sensitivity

15.2.11 Based on the guidance provided by HA208/07, cultural heritage was considered under the sub-topics of 'Archaeological Remains', 'Historic Buildings' and 'Historic Landscape'. For all three sub-topics, an assessment of the sensitivity of each cultural heritage asset was undertaken on a six-point scale of Very High, High, Medium, Low, Negligible and Unknown, based on professional judgement, guided by the criteria provided in HA208/07 as presented in Table 15.1.

**Table 15.1: Criteria to Assess the Sensitivity of Archaeological Remains, Historic Buildings and Historic Landscape Type**

Sensitivity	Criteria
<b>Archaeological Remain</b>	
Very High	World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites). Assets of acknowledged international importance. Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives.
High	Scheduled Monuments (including proposed sites). Undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance. Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives.
Medium	Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives.
Low	Designated and undesignated assets of local importance. Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations. Assets of limited sensitivity, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives.
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest.
Unknown	The sensitivity of the asset has not been ascertained.
<b>Historic Buildings</b>	
Very High	Structures inscribed as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites.

Sensitivity	Criteria
	Other buildings of recognised international importance.
High	Scheduled Monuments with standing remains. Category A Listed Buildings. Other Listed Buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the category. Conservation Areas containing very important buildings. Undesignated structures of clear national importance.
Medium	Category B Listed Buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the category. Conservation Areas containing buildings which contribute significantly to their historic character. Historic Townscape or built-up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Low	Category C Listed Buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Negligible	Buildings of no architectural or historical note; buildings of an intrusive character.
Unknown	Buildings with some hidden (i.e. inaccessible) potential for historic significance.
<b>Historic Landscape</b>	
Very High	World Heritage Sites inscribed for their historic landscape qualities. Historic landscapes of international sensitivity, whether designated or not. Extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factors.
High	World Heritage Sites inscribed for their historic landscape qualities. Historic landscapes of international sensitivity, whether designated or not. Extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factors.
Medium	Designated special historic landscapes. Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional sensitivity. Averagely well preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.
Low	Robust undesignated historic landscapes. Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups. Historic landscapes whose sensitivity is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest.

- 15.2.12 The ScARF [Accessed June 2016] was used to identify relevant research objectives to which archaeological remains within the study area could potentially contribute information, and therefore contribute towards the sensitivity rating of relevant assets.

### Impact Magnitude

- 15.2.13 Magnitude of impact is the degree of change that would be experienced by an asset as a result of the route options, in comparison to the baseline conditions. Magnitude of impact is assessed without reference to the sensitivity of the cultural heritage asset, and may include physical impacts upon the asset, or impacts on its setting or amenity value.
- 15.2.14 Assessment of magnitude of impact was based on professional judgement informed by the methodology and criteria provided by HA208/07 for archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape presented in Table 15.2.

**Table 15.2: Magnitude of Impact on Cultural Heritage Assets**

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

15.2.15 Potential impacts on setting were assessed based on the guidance provided by Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland 2016a).

Impact Significance

15.2.16 For all three sub-topics, impact significance was determined taking account of the sensitivity of the asset and the magnitude of potential impact. This was achieved using professional judgement and informed by the matrix illustrated in Table 15.3. Five levels of significance (Very Large, Large, Moderate, Slight or Neutral) are defined which apply equally to adverse and beneficial impacts.

**Table 15.3: Matrix for Determination of Impact Significance**

Sensitivity \ Magnitude	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Major	Very Large	Large/Very Large	Moderate/Large	Slight/Moderate	Slight
Moderate	Large/Very Large	Moderate/Large	Moderate	Slight	Neutral/Slight
Minor	Moderate/Large	Moderate/Slight	Slight	Neutral/Slight	Neutral/Slight
Negligible	Slight	Slight	Neutral/Slight	Neutral/Slight	Neutral
No Change	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Mitigation

15.2.17 Potential mitigation to reduce the impacts has been considered during this assessment and these are discussed in Section 15.6 (Potential Mitigation) and taken into account in Section 15.7 (Summary of Route Options) when discussing the potential residual impacts and whether proposed mitigation could result in a reduction in significance of impacts.

### Limitations to Assessment

- 15.2.18 This assessment is primarily desk-based using digital information available from Historic Environment Scotland, The Highland Council HER, maps and data gathered during a site visit on 4 and 5 May 2016. Walkover surveys of the route options and non-intrusive or intrusive archaeological investigations have not been undertaken. However, the information available from the desk-based survey and data gathered from the initial site visit is considered sufficient for the purposes of undertaking a DMRB Stage 2 Assessment.

## 15.3 Policies and Plans

- 15.3.1 Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A8.1 (Planning Policy Context for Environmental Assessment) describes the planning policies and guidance from national to local level which are relevant to cultural heritage. An assessment of the compliance of the route options against all development plan policies relevant to this environmental topic is reported in Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A8.2 (Assessment of Development Plan Policy Compliance) and a summary overview is provided in Chapter 8 (Policies and Plans), Section 8.4 (Assessment of Route Options Compliance).
- 15.3.2 Scheduled Monuments are, by definition, of national importance and are protected by law under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014). It is a criminal offence to damage a Scheduled Monument, and Consent must be obtained from the Scottish Ministers before any works affecting a Scheduled Monument may take place.
- 15.3.3 Listed Buildings are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014) and are recognised to be of special architectural or historic interest. Under the Act, planning authorities are instructed to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building, its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, Section 66(1)). Designation as a Listed Building confers additional controls over demolition and alteration through the requirement for Listed Building Consent to be gained before undertaking alteration or demolition.

## 15.4 Baseline Conditions

- 15.4.1 A total of 42 cultural heritage assets have been identified in the study area (Table 15.4). These comprise 23 archaeological remains, 9 historic buildings and 10 historic landscape types (HLTs). Further information on each cultural heritage asset is detailed in the accompanying gazetteer in Part 6 (Appendices) Appendix A15.1 (Cultural Heritage Gazetteer) of this report and Figures 15.1 to 15.6.

**Table 15.4: Summary of Cultural Heritage Asset Sensitivity within the Study Area**

Sub-Topic	Unknown	Negligible	Low	Medium	High	All sensitivity Totals
Archaeological Remains	-	18	3	1	1	23
Historic Buildings	-	2	3	3	1	9
Historic Landscapes	-	2	8	-	-	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>42</b>

### Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.2 A total of 23 archaeological remains have been identified within the study area. These are shown on Figures 15.1 to 15.3, and described in full in Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A15.1 (Cultural Heritage Gazetteer). The descriptions of archaeological remains below are ordered by sensitivity.

#### High Sensitivity Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.3 The ring ditch and pit circles at Ashton Farm Cottages, a Scheduled Monument, (Asset 14) comprises the buried remains of a ring ditch and three pit circles identified from aerial photography. Although not excavated these have been interpreted as evidence of settlement during the Bronze Age (2500 BC to 800 BC) and Iron Age (800 BC to AD 500). In consideration of their potential to contribute to the ScARF

aims of research relating to Bronze Age settlement types and their variety and how these changed over time through their physical and material remains (ScARF 2012b) and reflecting their designations, these assets have been assessed to be of high sensitivity.

Medium Sensitivity Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.4 Ashton Farm possible barrow (Asset 19) comprises the buried remains of ring ditch identified from aerial photography and have been interpreted as barrows. In consideration of their potential to contribute to our understanding of prehistoric funerary traditions in the Highland region through their physical and material remains (ScARF 2012b), these assets have been assessed to be of medium sensitivity.

Low Sensitivity Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.5 Castlehill Possible Enclosure (Asset 6) comprises the site of possible archaeological remains identified by aerial photography, which are currently of unknown nature and extent. It is possible the asset relates to the remains of prehistoric settlement, given its proximity to similar remains (Castlehill settlement, Asset 8; and Cradlehall Farm, Asset 12). This asset has the potential to contribute to our understanding of prehistoric settlement activity within the study area (ScARF 2012a), however the asset may not be of archaeological origin and as such this asset has been assessed to be of low sensitivity.
- 15.4.6 Caulfield's Military Road (Asset 16) is thought to run through the study area. The potential survival of archaeological remains associated with the road are not currently known. In consideration of their potential to contribute to our understanding of the creation and development of the modern state of Scotland, (ScARF 2012c), these assets have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.

Negligible Sensitivity Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.7 A total of 18 cultural heritage assets have been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 15.4.8 These assets (Assets 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32) comprise the locations of archaeological interventions/excavations in advance of construction works, and unstratified findspots. The process of archaeological excavation and subsequent redevelopment of these areas will have removed any buried archaeological remains, and the findspot locations have little detailed supporting information, and therefore they have been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 15.4.9 Assets 8, 11, 12, 13, 21 and 23 to 25, and 27 to 32 are the locations of archaeological investigations and provide evidence of prehistoric settlement and funerary activity at Beechwood Farm, Cradlehall Farm, Stoneyfield and close to Milton of Culloden. While these cultural heritage assets have been removed, they provide an indicator for the potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains within the study area.
- 15.4.10 Asset 26 is the site of Beechwood Farm, a 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse that was demolished in 2010 in advance of development.
- 15.4.11 An area to the north of Castlehill (Asset 8) was subject to archaeological excavation which recorded evidence of potential Neolithic settlement activity, as well as features associated with 19<sup>th</sup>/20<sup>th</sup> century agricultural activity.
- 15.4.12 The area around Beechwood Farm (Asset 11), now occupied by Inverness College (University of the Highlands and Islands Campus), was archaeologically evaluated and excavated prior to the campus construction. Excavations recorded a complex of ditches, pits and postholes which comprised a probably Bronze Age/Iron Age settlement. In addition, the discovery of Grooved Ware found on the site also indicated possible in-situ Late Neolithic activity on the site.
- 15.4.13 At Cradlehall Farm (Assets 12 and 13), archaeological evaluations and excavations in 2003 and 2004, recovered a sherd of Neolithic pottery from a pit, as well as a series of pits that could not be dated.
- 15.4.14 At Stoneyfield, there is evidence for prehistoric remains relating to settlement and funerary activities including a kerb cairn, cup-marked stones, and cremation burial (Assets 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29 and 30). These remains have been removed by the construction of the A9 Perth – Inverness Trunk Road and the business park that now occupies the site; however they provide a further evidence for prehistoric activity within the study area.

Potential for Unknown Archaeological Remains

- 15.4.15 The study area is located within an area of high potential for the presence of archaeological remains. Recorded remains close to at Ashton Farm, Beechwood Farm, Castlehill, Cradlehall Farm and Stoneyfield all indicate that there was extensive settlement and funerary activity in this area during the prehistoric period; particularly from the Late Neolithic through to the Iron Age. Concentrations of known archaeological sites provide an indication of the highest potential for unknown archaeological remains, thus providing context for the rest of the study area.
- 15.4.16 Consultation with The Highland Council at a meeting held on 4 March 2015, as part of the previous A9/A96 Connections Study (Jacobs, 2016), identified that the northern part of the study area between the A9 and A96 Aberdeen - Inverness Trunk Road has a high archaeological potential for unknown archaeological remains, in particular associated with later prehistoric settlement and funerary activities.

**Historic Buildings**

- 15.4.17 A total of nine historic buildings been identified within the study area. These are shown on Figures 15.1 to 15.3, and described in full in Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A15.1 (Cultural Heritage Gazetteer). The descriptions of historic buildings below are ordered by sensitivity.

High Sensitivity Historic Buildings

- 15.4.18 One historic building has been assessed to be of high sensitivity. Inshes House, Tower House and Dovecot (Asset 3; Category A Listed Building) comprises a compact three-storey house dating from c1600 which is thought to have originated as the angle tower of a former castle. The asset is believed to date to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The building is said to have been used as a dovecot although no nesting boxes survive. In consideration of its designation as a Category A Listed Building, this asset has been assessed to be of high sensitivity.

Medium Sensitivity Historic Buildings

- 15.4.19 Within the study area three Category B Listed Buildings have been identified:
- 15.4.20 Inshes House (Asset 4), a substantial symmetrical three-storey house dating from 1767 and incorporating fragments of an earlier house. The house is associated with an earlier tower house (Asset 3), and is located within a small designed landscape (HLT 1).
- 15.4.21 Castlehill House (Asset 9), a large gentry house of early 19<sup>th</sup> century date which incorporates a U-shaped range of earlier cottages to the rear. The principal elevation is of three bays with bowed bay windows to either side of a central classical portico. It looks across a large garden, defined by a stone wall to the west and a tree-lined driveway to the north-east, with long views possible towards Inverness.
- 15.4.22 All the properties broadly conform to polite architectural styles and building conventions, but demonstrate the use of regional vernacular traditions, such as dormer windows and the frequent use of crow-stepped gables. The construction of these three properties over a period of 125 years is indicative of the emergence and augmentation of the 'middling classes', which coincided with an increasing focus on self-improvement and an articulation of moral principles as architectural styles (Cooper 1999). In consideration of their historic interest as evidence of the development of domestic architecture, their designation as Category B Listed Buildings and in consideration of later alterations, these assets have been assessed to be of medium sensitivity.
- 15.4.23 Castlehill House (Asset 9) retains a position within its gardens and is surrounded by its boundary wall which has changed little since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century; the boundary wall is a key element of the setting of the asset. There is also the potential for the house to have an earlier date as evidenced by the recent discovery of a mid-18<sup>th</sup> century wedding stone within the building. This cultural heritage asset has been assessed to be of medium sensitivity due to its Category B Listed Building status and its survival within its grounds in a relatively unaltered state adds to its sensitivity to change.

Low Sensitivity Historic Buildings

- 15.4.24 Three historic buildings have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.
- 15.4.25 Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) is a 19<sup>th</sup> century one-storey rubble built slate roofed property. The building shares architectural similarities with other small cottage types and are of a type common to the

Highlands. In consideration of the frequency of this type of historic building within the Highlands, their modest architectural quality and modern alterations to the building, this asset has been assessed to be of low sensitivity.

- 15.4.26 Two historic buildings associated with agriculture have been identified within the study area, comprising the Dell of Inshes farm offices designed by the architect Alexander Ross in 1869 (Asset 5), and Ashton Farm (Asset 18). Common to the Highlands, these assets employ the ordered courtyard plan character of Scottish farms of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, being laid out on a U or L plan around a central yard. In consideration of the later alteration of these buildings, the limited contribution of these assets in understanding the development of agricultural buildings in 19<sup>th</sup> century Scotland, and the frequency of this type of historic building within the Highland region, these assets have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.

Negligible Sensitivity Historic Buildings

- 15.4.27 Two historic buildings have been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity, the A9 Inshes Bridge (Asset 10), a modern road bridge; and a Filter Block (WWII radar station) that is the only surviving upstanding building associated with the former RAF Fighter Command HQ at Raigmore (Asset 31).

**Historic Landscapes**

- 15.4.28 A total of 10 Historic Landscape Types (HLTs) have been identified within the study area. Table 15.5 provides a summary of these along with an assessment of their sensitivity. The locations of HLTs are shown on Figure 15.4 to 15.6 and are described in full in Part 6 (Appendices), Appendix A15.1 (Cultural Heritage Gazetteer) of this report.

**Table 15.5: Historic Landscape Types (HLTs)**

Number	Historic Landscape Type (HLT)	Sensitivity
HLT 1	Designed Landscape	Low
HLT 2	Rectilinear Fields and Farms	Low
HLT 3	Managed Woodland	Low
HLT 5	Industrial or Commercial Area	Negligible
HLT 6	Recreation Area	Low
HLT 7	Urban Area	Low
HLT 8	Holdings	Low
HLT 9	Motorway	Negligible
HLT 10	Rough Grazing	Low
HLT 11	Cultivated Former Parkland	Low

- 15.4.29 Of the HLTs identified, eight have been assessed to be of low sensitivity, and two have been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity.

Low Sensitivity Historic Landscape Types (HLTs)

- 15.4.30 Designed Landscapes (HLT 1) comprises locations in which country landowners have developed the grounds or 'Policies' associated with an important house or castle for pleasure and/ or productive purposes. Within the study area there are two examples of Designed Landscapes, the Policies associated with Cradlehall House (Asset 46) and the Policies associated with Inshes House (Asset 4; Category B Listed Building). These HLTs have been significantly altered during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with the construction of the A9 and Highland Main Line crossing through them, as well as encroachment from residential and industrial developments to the west and east.
- 15.4.31 Located throughout the study area are three landscape types that represent the results of 18<sup>th</sup> century and later land improvements. Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2) reflect a type of agricultural landscape which was created during the agricultural improvements of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. This led to the redesign of field boundaries into more rectilinear forms.
- 15.4.32 Recognising these changes to the management and organisation of the agrarian landscape, a further type of land holding was created; Holdings (HLT 8) were created in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by the Board



of Agriculture to create holdings for veterans and others. These are found towards the south of the study area. HLT 8 may have previously formed part of the Policies associated with Inshes House prior to them being handed over to the Board of Agriculture.

- 15.4.33 A small pocket of Cultivated Former Parkland (HLT 11) is located towards the south of the study area. This is another type of agricultural landscape created from former parkland.
- 15.4.34 Collectively, these HLTs reflect the continuous process of subdivision and reorganisation of the Highlands during the post-medieval and modern periods. In consideration of the historical significance of these landscape types within the Highlands as evidence of the improvement era, loss of legibility resulting from modification in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as well as their ubiquity within the wider environs of the study area, they have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.
- 15.4.35 In addition to the restructuring of field systems, other forms of land management are present within the study area. Located towards the south of the study area pockets of Managed Woodland (HLT 3) comprise deciduous woodlands, coppiced or pollarded for poles, charcoal burning, roofing and managed for the long-term production of fine timber as well as for recreation. Rough Grazing (HLT 10) located towards the north of the study area comprises an area identified as moorland and rough grazing which have evolved to their present extent as a result of woodland clearance, grazing and episodes of farming over some 6,000 years. In consideration of their character as robust undesignated historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups, but reflecting their lack of rarity within the Highlands they have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.
- 15.4.36 Demographic changes in the 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> centuries resulted in the development of Urban Areas (HLT 7) within the study area focussed on Inverness, Inshes and Cradlehall. Within the study area these types are characterised by suburban development of later 20<sup>th</sup> century date. Linked to the growth of urban areas, Recreation Areas (HLT 6) were created. In consideration of the HLTs contribution towards an appreciation of the modern development of the local area, these have been assessed to be of low sensitivity.

#### Negligible Sensitivity Historic Landscapes

- 15.4.37 Two HLTs assessed to be of negligible sensitivity have been identified within the study area.
- 15.4.38 Industrial or Commercial Area (HLT 5) comprise discrete areas of industrial or commercial activity and are characterised as small districts of sprawling buildings dating from the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, set aside retail and industrial purposes. In consideration of its lack of time depth, HLT 5 has been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity.
- 15.4.39 Motorways (HLT 9), reflects modern transport systems which provide links between major cities and cover considerable areas of land. Within the study area the A9 and A96 bisect other landscape types. Reflecting the modernity and limited historical significance of this type of landscape component, HLT 9 has been assessed to be of negligible sensitivity.

## **15.5 Impact Assessment**

- 15.5.1 This section provides an introduction to the impact assessment of the route options. The potential impacts detailed below are reported in line with the following:
- 15.5.2 Potential impacts represent those which could result from the construction or operation of the route options.
- 15.5.3 Potential impacts are described without mitigation, and therefore represent a worse-case scenario. Mitigation to reduce these impacts should be developed for the preferred option during the DMRB Stage 3 Assessment.
- 15.5.4 The assessment of impacts identifies those that are common to all route options and those that vary between them.
- 15.5.5 Potential impacts during construction can include physical impacts resulting in partial or complete removal of cultural heritage assets by construction activities and impacts on the settings of cultural heritage assets arising from construction activities and traffic.
- 15.5.6 During operation, potential impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets can result arise from the presence of new elements of infrastructure, lighting, visual and noise intrusion from traffic.

15.5.7 Unless otherwise stated, all impacts described below are adverse with significant impacts (Moderate or above) highlighted in bold.

**Impacts Common to All Route Options**

15.5.8 This section provides details on the potential impacts which are common to all route options during construction and operation.

Construction

15.5.9 During construction, there would be a temporary impact on the setting of Ashton Farm Cottages and Ashton Farm (Assets 17 and 18) caused by plant and construction activities. The magnitude of this impact on these low sensitivity assets has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.

15.5.10 Construction would involve the removal of historic landscape elements associated with HLT2. The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

15.5.11 The construction of the lane gain/drop from the Raigmore A9 southbound merge slip to Inshes Junction, and the construction of the roundabout to the north of U1124 Caulfield Road (Cradlehall Roundabout) could potentially impact on buried archaeological remains associated with Asset 11. This is particularly relevant to the Cradlehall Roundabout which is within land that has not been subject to extensive disturbance. The significance of this impact is unknown at this stage of assessment.

15.5.12 Based on the concentration of known assets associated with known and potential prehistoric settlement and funerary activity within the study area, the potential for archaeological remains within the study area has been assessed to be high. All route options could therefore result in the removal of archaeological remains during construction. The significance of this impact is unknown at this stage of assessment.

**Table 15.6: Summary of Potential Construction Impacts - Common to All Options**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
17	Ashton Farm Cottages	None	Low	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset.	Major	<b>Moderate</b>
18	Ashton Farm	None	Low	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset.	Major	<b>Moderate</b>
HLT 2	Rectilinear Fields and Farms	None	Low	Removal of historic landscape elements.	Moderate	Slight
Unknown archaeological remains			Unknown	Removal of unknown archaeological remains.	Unknown	Unknown

Operation

15.5.13 During operation, impacts on the setting of Ashton Farm Cottages and Ashton Farm (Assets 17 and 18) would result from the presence of the new road immediately adjacent to these assets, along with the introduction of noise and visual intrusion from traffic movement. The magnitude of impact on these low sensitivity assets has been assessed to be major, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.

15.5.14 All route options would sever the field systems that characterise HLT2 during operation. The magnitude of impact on this low value asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

**Table 15.7: Summary of Potential Operational Impacts - Common to All Options**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
17	Ashton Farm Cottages	None	Low	Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Major	<b>Moderate</b>
18	Ashton Farm	None	Low	Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Major	<b>Moderate</b>
HLT 2	Rectilinear Fields and Farms	None	Low	Continued severance	Moderate	Slight

**Additional Impacts for Option 1A**

- 15.5.15 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 1A and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).
- 15.5.16 Option 1A is shown on Figures 15.1 and 15.4 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.8 and 15.9.

Construction

- 15.5.17 At Castlehill House (Asset 9), construction would require the removal of a section of boundary wall, and a number of mature trees that form the avenue leading to the house, and would require the removal of historic fabric associated with Castlehill's garden. In addition, the presence of plant and machinery during construction would introduce a temporary visual and noise intrusion into the setting of the building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be major, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.
- 15.5.18 Construction would introduce temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) through the presence and movement of plant and associated infrastructure. In addition, construction would remove any unknown archaeological remains associated with the asset. The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.
- 15.5.19 The construction of the bridge over the A9 would introduce temporary visual and noise impacts in views to the north-west of Inshes House (Asset 4), which is a Category B Listed Building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be minor, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.
- 15.5.20 The construction of the road would remove buried archaeological remains associated with the Castlehill (possible enclosure) (Asset 6). The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be minor, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.
- 15.5.21 Construction would sever an area of Holdings (HLT 8) between Dell of Inshes and B9006 Culloden Road (Millburn Roundabout – Culcabock – Castle Hill – Culloden Moor – Croy – Gollanfield – Fort George Road), removing historic fabric associated with the HLT. The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.
- 15.5.22 The construction of the road could remove elements of HLT 5. The magnitude of impact on this negligible sensitivity asset has been assessed to be negligible, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Neutral.

**Table 15.8: Summary of Potential Construction Impacts – Additional for Option 1A**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
4	Inshes House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Minor	Slight

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
6	Castlehill (possible enclosure)	Undesignated	Low	Removal or partial removal of buried archaeological remains that may be present	Minor	Slight
9	Castlehill House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset Removal of historic elements within the curtilage of the Listed Building. Partial severance of the house from its gardens.	Major	<b>Large</b>
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset Removal or partial removal of any unknown archaeological remains that may be present.	Moderate	<b>Large</b>
HLT 5	Industrial or Commercial Area	Undesignated	Negligible	Removal of historic landscape elements	Negligible	Neutral
HLT 8	Holdings	Undesignated	Low	Removal of historic landscape elements	Moderate	Slight

### Operation

- 15.5.23 During operation, the setting of Castlehill House (Asset 9) would be altered by the presence of the embanked road which would completely sever the garden and alter the views from the principal elevation towards the north-west. It would also introduce new noise and light impacts due to the presence of the embanked road and moving vehicles. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be major, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.
- 15.5.24 During operation, the road would sever the existing relationship between the two individual designated areas of the Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.
- 15.5.25 The operation of the bridge over the A9 would see a continuance of impacts caused by the introduction of a new element in views to the north-west of Inshes House (Asset 4), which is a Category B Listed Building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be minor, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.
- 15.5.26 Operation of the road would result in continued severance of HLT 8. The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

**Table 15.9: Summary of Potential Operational Impacts – Additional Option 1A**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
4	Inshes House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Minor	Slight
9	Castlehill House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Introduction of modern infrastructure into the setting of this asset Continued partial severance of the house from its gardens.	Major	<b>Large</b>
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Severance of the existing relationship between the two individual areas of the Scheduled Monument. Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Moderate	<b>Large</b>
HLT 8	Holdings	Undesignated	Low	Continued severance of the HLT	Moderate	Slight

**Additional Impacts for Option 1B**

15.5.27 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 1B and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).

15.5.28 Option 1B is shown on Figures 15.1 and 15.4 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.10 and 15.11.

Construction

15.5.29 At Castlehill House (Asset 9), construction would require the removal of a section of boundary wall, and a number of mature trees that form the avenue leading to the house, and would require the removal of historic fabric associated with Castlehill's garden. In addition, the presence of plant and machinery during construction would introduce a temporary visual and noise intrusion into the setting of the building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be major, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.

15.5.30 Construction would introduce temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) through the presence and movement of plant and associated infrastructure. In addition, construction would remove any unknown buried archaeological remains associated with the asset. As this option is located further away from Asset 14 than Option 1A, the impact resulting from Option 1B on the setting of Asset 14 and on any associated archaeological remains has been assessed to be lower. The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has therefore been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.

15.5.31 The construction of the bridge over the A9 would introduce temporary visual and noise impacts in views to the north-west of Inshes House (Asset 4), which is a Category B Listed Building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be minor, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

15.5.32 The construction of the road would remove buried archaeological remains associated with Castlehill (possible enclosure) (Asset 6). The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

15.5.33 Construction would sever an area of Holdings (HLT 8) between Dell of Inshes and B9006 Culloden Road, removing historic fabric associated with the HLT. The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

- 15.5.34 The construction of the road would remove elements of HLT 5. The magnitude of impact on this negligible sensitivity asset has been assessed to be negligible, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Neutral.

**Table 15.10: Summary of Potential Construction Impacts – Additional for Option 1B**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
4	Inshes House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Minor	Slight
6	Castlehill (possible enclosure)	Undesignated	Low	Removal or partial removal of buried archaeological remains that may be present	Minor	Slight
9	Castlehill House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset Removal of historic elements within the curtilage of the Listed Building Partial severance of the house from its gardens.	Major	<b>Large</b>
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset Removal or partial removal of any unknown archaeological remains that may be present.	Moderate	<b>Moderate</b>
HLT 5	Industrial or Commercial Area	Undesignated	Negligible	Removal of HLT elements	Negligible	Neutral
HLT 8	Holdings	Undesignated	Low	Removal of historic landscape elements	Moderate	Slight

Operation

- 15.5.35 During operation, the setting of Castlehill House (Asset 9) would be altered by the presence of the embanked road which would completely sever the garden and alter the views from the principal elevation towards the north-west. It would also introduce new noise and light impacts due to the presence of the embanked road and moving vehicles. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be major, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.
- 15.5.36 During operation, the road would be located to the east of Ashton Farm Ring Ditches and Pit Circles (Asset 14) and this would sever the asset's existing relationship with the surrounding open fields, and introduce new highways infrastructure, with associated traffic noise, into the asset's setting. Given that the route option would run to the east of the asset, and not between the two designated elements as with Option 1A, the magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.
- 15.5.37 The operation of the bridge over the A9 would see a continuance of impacts caused by the introduction of a new element in views to the north-west of Inshes House (Asset 4), which is a Category B Listed Building. The magnitude of impact on this medium sensitivity asset has been assessed to be minor, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight
- 15.5.38 Operation of the road would result in continued severance of HLT 8. The magnitude of impact on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

**Table 15.11: Summary of Potential Operational Impacts – Additional for Option 1B**

<b>Asset No</b>	<b>Asset Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Magnitude</b>	<b>Significance</b>
4	Inshes House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Minor	Slight
9	Castlehill House	Category B Listed Building	Medium	Introduction of modern infrastructure into the setting of this asset Continued partial severance of the house from its gardens	Major	<b>Large</b>
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Severance of the open landscape within which the asset is located. Introduction of highways infrastructure into the setting of this asset. Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset.	Moderate	<b>Moderate</b>
HLT 8	Holdings	Undesignated	Low	Removal of historic landscape elements	Moderate	Slight

**Additional Impacts for Option 2A**

- 15.5.39 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 2A and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).
- 15.5.40 Option 2A is shown on Figures 15.2 and 15.5 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.8 and 15.9.

Construction

- 15.5.41 The construction of the road would have the same impacts on Assets 4, 6, 9, 14, HLT 5 and HLT 8 as those identified for Option 1A. Please refer to paragraphs 15.5.17 to 15.5.22 and Table 15.8 for further details.
- 15.5.42 Option 2A would result in the construction of the Inshes overbridge and additional slip roads within and immediately adjacent to HLT 8. The magnitude of impact of this on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

Operation

- 15.5.43 The operation of the road would have the same impacts on Assets 4, 9, 14 and HLT 8 as those identified for Option 1A. Please refer to paragraphs 15.5.23 to 15.5.26 and Table 15.9 for further details.

**Additional Impacts for Option 2B**

- 15.5.44 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 2B and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).
- 15.5.45 Option 2B is shown on Figures 15.2 and 15.5 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.10 and 15.11.

Construction

- 15.5.46 Construction would have the same impacts on Assets 4, 6, 9, 14, HLT 5 and HLT 8 as those identified for Option 1B. Please refer to paragraphs 15.5.29 to 15.5.34 and Table 15.10 for further details.

15.5.47 Option 2B would result in the construction of the Inshes overbridge and additional slip roads within and immediately adjacent to HLT 8. The magnitude of impact of this on this low sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be Slight.

Operation

15.5.48 Operation of the road would have the same impacts on Assets 4, 9, 14, and HLT 8 as those identified for Option 1B. Please refer to paragraphs 15.5.35 to 15.5.38 and Table 15.11 for further details.

**Additional Impacts for Option 3A**

15.5.49 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 3A and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).

15.5.50 Option 3A is shown on Figures 15.3 and 15.6 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.12 and 15.13.

Construction

15.5.51 Construction would introduce temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) through the presence and movement of plant and associated infrastructure. In addition, construction would remove any unknown archaeological remains associated with the asset. The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.

**Table 15.12: Summary of Potential Construction Impacts – Additional for Option 3A**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset  Removal or partial removal of any unknown archaeological remains that may be present.	Moderate	<b>Large</b>

Operation

15.5.52 During operation, the road would sever the existing relationship between the two individual designated areas of the Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14). The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Large**.

**Table 15.13: Summary of Potential Operational Impacts – Additional for Option 3A**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Severance of the existing relationship between the two individual areas of the Scheduled Monument.  Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Moderate	Large

**Additional Impacts for Option 3B**

15.5.53 This section presents the potential impacts that are specific to Option 3B and additional to those which are reported as common to all route options (paragraphs 15.5.9 to 15.5.14 and Tables 15.6 and 15.7).



15.5.54 Option 3B is shown on Figures 15.3 and 15.6 and the impacts specific to this option are summarised in Tables 15.14 and 15.15.

Construction

15.5.55 Construction would introduce temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14) through the presence and movement of plant and associated infrastructure. In addition, construction would remove any unknown buried archaeological remains associated with the asset. As this option is located further away from Asset 14 than Option 3A, the impact resulting from Option 3B on the setting of Asset 14 and on any associated archaeological remains has been assessed to be lower. The magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has therefore been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.

**Table 15.14: Summary of Potential Construction Impacts – Additional for Option 3B**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Temporary noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset  Removal or partial removal of any unknown archaeological remains that may be present.	Moderate	<b>Moderate</b>

Operation

15.5.56 During operation, the road would be located to the east of Ashton Farm Ring Ditches and Pit Circles (Asset 14) and this would sever the relatively open landscape within which the asset is located; and would introduce new visual impacts associated with highways infrastructure as well as the associated traffic noise. Given that the route option would run to the east of the asset, and not between the two designated elements as with Option 3A, the magnitude of impact on this high sensitivity asset has been assessed to be moderate, and the significance of impact has been assessed to be **Moderate**.

**Table 15.15: Summary of Potential Operational Impacts – Additional for Option 3B**

Asset No	Asset Name	Designation	Sensitivity	Impact Description	Magnitude	Significance
14	Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles	Scheduled Monument	High	Severance of the open landscape within which the asset is located.  Introduction of highways infrastructure into the setting of this asset.  Noise and visual intrusion into the setting of the asset	Moderate	<b>Moderate</b>

## 15.6 Potential Mitigation

15.6.1 For a DMRB Stage 2 Assessment the design has not been sufficiently developed to allow mitigation measures to be defined in detail at this stage. The objective of this section is to identify potential mitigation taking into account best practice, legislation and guidance, which would be developed and refined during the DMRB Stage 3 Assessment.

15.6.2 Potential mitigation could include:

- Development of the horizontal and/or vertical alignments and location of the SuDS to avoid or reduce impacts on cultural heritage assets. Design development should seek to avoid impacts and where this is not feasible should seek to minimise impacts.
- Where it is not possible to avoid or reduce impacts on cultural heritage assets, it may be possible to reduce the magnitude of impact through recording works in advance of or during construction, for example archaeological excavation, watching brief, historic building recording, and the dissemination of the results of these works, including readily accessible archives to provide a permanent record of the impact cultural heritage assets. In this way recording can reduce the magnitude of impact that would otherwise occur if a cultural heritage asset were to be damaged or destroyed unrecorded.
- Measures to reduce impacts on the setting of archaeological remains, historic buildings and on historic landscapes potentially include:
- Design of earthworks to avoid an overly engineering appearance and enable as much land as possible to be returned to agriculture.
- Avoidance of loss or damage to landscape features such as mature trees, walls, water features or field systems as far as possible.
- Retention of existing trees and vegetation where possible and incorporation with new planting proposals.
- Mitigation planting to aid the integration of the proposed scheme into the landscape. Planting will initially provide relatively limited screening, but will mature and become more effective over time. It should be noted that unless designed sympathetically, mitigation planting can increase the impact on the setting of cultural heritage assets.

## 15.7 Summary of Route Options

15.7.1 This section provides a summary of the DMRB Stage 2 assessment of potential impacts for the route options. Two aspects are considered: whether any potential impacts would be considered significant (i.e. a residual impact of Moderate or greater), and whether any of the potential impacts identified differ sufficiently between the route options that they need to be considered as part of the overall identification of a preferred option (which as explained in Chapter 7 (Overview of Environmental Assessment) takes into account environmental, engineering, economic and traffic considerations).

15.7.2 Tables 15.16 and 15.17 provide a summary of the potential impacts on cultural heritage assets resulting from construction and operation of each of the route option.

**Table 15.16: Summary of Potential Impacts on Cultural Heritage Assets during Construction**

Significance	Asset Designation	Option						
		All	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B
Large	Designated	-	2	1	2	1	1	-
	Undesignated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate	Designated	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	Undesignated	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slight	Designated	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
	Undesignated	1	2	2	2	2	-	-
Total	Designated	-	3	3	3	3	1	1
	Undesignated	3	2	2	2	2	-	-
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**Table 15.17: Summary of Potential Impacts on Cultural Heritage Assets during Operation**

Significance	Asset Designation	Option						
		All	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B
Large	Designated	-	2	1	2	1	1	-
	Undesignated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate	Designated	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	Undesignated	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slight	Designated	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
	Undesignated	1	1	1	1	1	-	-
Total	Designated	-	3	3	3	3	-	1
	Undesignated	3	1	1	1	1	-	-
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

- 15.7.3 For all Options, an impact of **Moderate** significance during construction and operation is predicted for Ashton Farm Cottages (Asset 17) and Ashton Farm (Asset 18), both undesignated historic buildings. Given the proximity of these assets to the road it is unlikely that the significance of impact can be reduced through landscape screening and the significance of residual impact during construction and operation is predicted to remain **Moderate**.
- 15.7.4 Construction of all route options would result in the removal of land within the Rectilinear Fields and Farms (HLT 2) and this impact would continue through to operation. At present it is unlikely that this impact could be reduced and the significance of residual impact during construction and operation is predicted to remain Slight.
- 15.7.5 The construction of the lane gain/drop from the Raigmore A9 southbound merge slip to Inshes Junction, and the construction of the Castlehill Roundabout, which are both common to all options, could impact on buried archaeological remains associated with the prehistoric settlement at Beechwood Farm (Asset 11). This is particularly relevant to the Cradlehall Roundabout which is within land that has not been subject to extensive disturbance. The significance of this impact is unknown at this stage of assessment.
- 15.7.6 For all Options, there could be potential impacts on as yet unknown archaeological remains during construction activities. The study area is located within an area of high potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains, evidenced by the known sites of prehistoric settlement and funerary remains. The nature, extent and sensitivity of any archaeological remains cannot be identified at this stage of assessment.
- 15.7.7 Construction of Options 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B would result in the removal of key historic building elements (partial removal of the boundary wall and a number of mature trees) associated with Castlehill House (Asset 9; Category B Listed Building). During operation, these options would alter the setting of the building, severing the garden and driveway, and interrupting long views to the north-west. Visual intrusion from the movement of vehicles would also occur. While historic building recording would provide a permanent record of the building's current setting, it is unlikely to reduce this impact. The

significance of residual impact during construction and operation of these route options is predicted to remain **Large**.

- 15.7.8 Construction of Options 1A, 2A and 3A have the potential to remove buried archaeological remains associated with the Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles (Asset 14; Scheduled Monument). These options run between the two separate designated areas associated with this asset, and there is a high potential for as yet unknown buried archaeological remains to be present. It is likely that these impacts could be reduced through sympathetic design and adopting an approach of preservation *in situ* of any buried archaeological remains; or where this is not achievable through preservation by record involving detailed archaeological excavation, recording and dissemination of the results through an ordered archive. With this mitigation in place the significance of the residual impact during construction is predicted to be Slight. During operation, impacts on the setting of the Scheduled Monument are predicted to result from severance of the two Scheduled areas. At present, mitigation in the form of landscape design is not predicted to reduce this impact. The significance of residual impact during the operation of these route options is therefore predicted to remain **Large**.
- 15.7.9 Construction of Options 1B, 2B and 3B also has the potential to remove archaeological remains associated with the Ashton Farm Ring Ditch and Pit Circles (Asset 14; Scheduled Monument). These options are located further away from the asset than Options 1A, 2A and 3A and the potential for encountering buried archaeological remains associated with this asset is considered to be lower. It is likely that any impacts on buried archaeology could be reduced through sympathetic design and adopting an approach of preservation *in situ*. The significance of residual impact during construction is therefore predicted to be Slight. During operation, these route options would impact on the setting of Asset 14, as they would sever its existing relationship with the surrounding open fields and dominate its setting. At present, it is unlikely that this impact could be reduced; therefore, the significance of residual impact during the operation of these route options is predicted to remain **Moderate**.
- 15.7.10 Construction of Options 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B could result in the removal of archaeological remains associated with Castlehill Enclosure (Asset 6). Where it is not possible to develop the design to avoid a physical impact on Asset 6, mitigation in the form of a set piece excavation could be undertaken. The significance of residual impact on Asset 6 has been assessed to be Slight.
- 15.7.11 Construction of Options 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B would result in the removal of land within an area of Holdings (HLT 8) and this impact would continue through to during operation. At present it is unlikely that this impact could be reduced, and the significance of residual impact during construction and operation is predicted to remain Slight.
- 15.7.12 For Options 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B, design of the A9 Inshes Overbridge and landscape planting, would reduce the impact on Inshes House (Asset 4) during operation. After mitigation, the significance of residual impact has been assessed to be Slight during construction, and Neutral during operation.

## **15.8 Scope of DMRB Stage 3 Assessment**

- 15.8.1 As part of the DMRB Stage 3, the design of the preferred option would be reviewed and where possible, the preferred option would be further developed to minimise impacts on cultural heritage assets.
- 15.8.2 A key aim of the Stage 3 assessment would be to understand the impact of the proposed scheme on the Category B Listed Building of Castlehill House (Asset 9), comprising a Detailed Assessment of impacts on its setting as set out in paragraph 15.8.3.
- 15.8.3 Impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets should be assessed based on the guidance provided by Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland 2016a). A three stage process is proposed to assess the impact of the preferred option on the setting of the cultural heritage assets comprising:
- Stage 1: identify the cultural heritage assets that might be affected by the chosen route.
  - Stage 2: define the setting of assets by establishing how the surroundings contribute to the ways in which the asset is understood, appreciated and experienced.
  - Stage 3: assess how the chosen route would affect that setting.
- 15.8.4 Another key aim would be to understand the impacts of, and constraints to, the proposed scheme on Ashton Farm Ring Ditches and Pit Circles Scheduled Monument (Asset 14), through further engagement

with HES. Additional surveys as described below will help to define further any archaeological remains that may be associated with this asset.

- 15.8.5 Detailed assessments (as defined by DMRB HA208/07 (Highways Agency et al. 2007)) are proposed for all three sub-topics to inform the Stage 3 assessment which would comprise:
- Revisiting sources originally consulted for the DMRB Stage 2 assessment and consulting additional sources including historic mapping, published and unpublished archaeological reports and other relevant bibliographic sources, and aerial photographs; and
  - Undertaking a walkover survey.
- 15.8.6 A programme of geophysical survey taking in the footprint of the proposed scheme, with a particular focus on areas around Broomhill Farm (Asset 11), Castlehill Enclosure (Asset 6) and Ashton Farm Ring Ditches and Pit Circles (Asset 14) is proposed. Based on the results of these surveys, and after further consultation with The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team, the need for, nature, scope and scale of additional archaeological fieldwork required to inform the Stage 3 assessment will be reviewed. Historic Environment Scotland would be consulted with regards to geophysical survey at Asset 14 given its Scheduled Monument status.

## **15.9 References**

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014). Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment.

Cooper, N. (1999). The Houses of the Gentry. London. Hambledon and London.

Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government, and the Department for Regional Development for Northern Ireland (2007). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2, HA208/07: Cultural Heritage.

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

Historic Environment Scotland (2016b). PastMap [Online]: Available from <http://pastmap.org.uk/> [Accessed June 2016].

Historic Scotland (2011). Scottish Historic Environment Policy.

Jacobs (on behalf of Transport Scotland) (2016). A9/A96 Connections Study, Transport Appraisal Report. Transport Scotland.

National Library of Scotland Map Images [Online]: Available from <http://maps.nls.uk/geo/explore/#zoom=5&lat=56.0000&lon=-4.0000&layers=1&b=1> [Accessed June 2016].

ScARF (2012a). Brophy, K and Sheridan, A (eds) Neolithic Panel Report, Scottish Archaeological Research Framework: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

ScARF (2012b). Downes, J (eds) Chalcolithic and Bronze Age Scotland Panel Report, Scottish Archaeological Research Framework: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

ScARF (2012c). Dalgligh, C and Tarlow S (eds) Modern Panel Report, Scottish Archaeological Research Framework: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

Scottish Government (2014). Scottish Planning Policy.

Scottish Government (2011). Planning Advice Note 2/2011: Planning and Archaeology.

The Highland Council (2016). Highland Historic Environment Record [Online]: Available from <http://her.highland.gov.uk/> [Accessed June 2016].

**Legislation**

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by the Historic Environment Scotland Act 2014).