Galileo 05 Limited

Lynemore Wind Farm

Additional Information Volume 2:

Chapter 9: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

663991 (00)

JANUARY 2026

GALILEO EMPOWER

RSK

Table of Contents

9.1 INTRODUCTION 9-1
9.2 POTENTIAL EFFECTS 9-2
9.3 METHODOLOGY 9-2
9.4 UPDATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT 9-2
9.5 CONCLUSION 9-2
9.6 SUMMARY OF EFFECTS 9-3
9.7 CROSS REFERENCING 9-4

TABLES

Table 9.1: Summary of Effects 9-3
Table 9.2 Cross-referenced Figures 9-4

FIGURES

AI Figure 9.1: Known Heritage Assets within the site

9 ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This chapter of the AI considers the potential effects of the Revised Proposed Development and associated layout changes upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage in comparison with the EIA Layout as reported in the **EIA Report Chapter 9**.

9.1.2 The Applicant is submitting a revised layout as described in **AI Chapter 2: The Proposed Development**. In summary, the changes to the layout which are of principal relevance to the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage assessment comprise the reduction in the number of proposed turbines of the EIA Layout from 14 to 12 (with the removal of turbines T4 and T5), the re-routeing of the proposed site access to the east, and the re-location of the proposed construction compound (reducing the number of construction compounds from two to one).

9.1.3 A summary of predicted residual effects upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage based on the submitted EIA Layout was presented in **Table 9.6** of **EIA Report Chapter 9** of the EIA Report.

9.1.4 It was concluded that:

- Within the Site boundary there was potential for a direct construction impact on one heritage asset: MHG23810 Perth-Inverness, General Wade's Military Road. The proposed site access would have utilised part of the heritage asset MHG23810 measuring c.230 m in length, along which a construction compound would also have been established. Cut and fill for the construction compound and realignment and/or resurfacing of the existing track for the site access would have physically impacted upon any preserved buried surfaces or associated below grounds remains. The ditch/embankments could also have been physically damaged.
- There was potential for a direct construction impact on one heritage asset as a result of micrositing or accidental damage during construction: HA2 – a modern memorial cairn 35 m south of the cutting for the proposed Turbine 1 crane pad.
- Residual adverse operational effects of minor significance (not significant in EIA terms) were predicted through development within the setting of Inventory Battlefield BTL6 Battle of Culloden, Scheduled Monument SM967 Culloden Battlefield, Graves of the Clans, Cairn and Well of the Dead & CA667 Culloden Muir Conservation Area; and Scheduled Monument SM11446 Isle of Moy, fortified island and laird's house.
- No significant cumulative effects were identified.
- In conclusion, no significant residual effects upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage were identified in the **EIA Report Chapter 9** as a result of the EIA Proposed Development.

9.1.5 **Figure 9.1** of the EIA Report has been updated to demonstrate the adjusted impact of the Revised Proposed Development. The updated figures have been cross-referenced with those figures submitted as part of the EIA Report in **Table 9.7** below.

9.2 Potential Effects

9.2.1 The nature of the revisions made to the layout mean that the potential effects predicted will likely remain unchanged or will see a beneficial reduction in direct (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets during construction in comparison to those predicted in the **EIA Report Chapter 9**.

9.3 Methodology

9.3.1 The methodology for assessment of likely Cultural Heritage impacts as a result of the Revised Proposed Development is the same as that presented in the **EIA Report Chapter 9** for the EIA Proposed Development.

9.4 Updated Impact Assessment

9.4.1 In terms of direct (physical) construction impacts within the Site boundary as a result of the Revised Proposed Development infrastructure in comparison with the EIA Layout, all previously identified direct impacts upon MHG23810 Perth-Inverness, General Wade's Military Road would be avoided as a result of the re-location of the proposed site access and the proposed Construction Compound.

9.4.2 In terms of direct (physical) impacts as a result of micro-siting or accidental damage during construction, these would remain the same as for the EIA Layout.

9.4.3 In terms of archaeological potential (i.e., the potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains within the footprint of the Revised Proposed Development to be present), these would remain the same as for the EIA Layout.

9.4.4 As per the EIA Report, the scope and nature of additional mitigation will be outlined in a written scheme of investigation (WSI) and agreed with THC in advance of construction, which the Applicant agrees can be addressed through appropriately worded planning conditions.

9.4.5 See **Table 9.1** for a summary of Revised Layout changes in relation to previously assessed Archaeology and Cultural Heritage visualisations. In terms of operational setting effect conclusions upon heritage assets, these would be the same as for the EIA Layout.

9.5 Conclusion

9.5.1 The Revised Layout would not result in any additional impact not already considered in the **EIA Report Chapter 9: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**.

9.5.2 The only identified change to effects predicted for the EIA Layout is the avoidance of previously identified direct (physical) impacts upon MHG23810 Perth-Inverness, General Wade's Military Road as a result of the re-location of the proposed Site Access and the proposed Construction Compound. No direct (physical) impacts upon any known heritage assets are therefore anticipated as a result of the Revised Proposed Development.

9.5.3 Following implementation of the proposed programme of archaeological mitigation of construction phase impacts upon hitherto unknown heritage assets ('archaeological potential') there would be no residual physical effects on heritage assets.

9.5.4 No mitigation for the Revised Proposed Development is required in addition to that identified for the EIA Proposed Development in the **EIA Report Chapter 9: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**.

9.5.5 Mitigation has been applied at design stage and no significant operational setting effects upon heritage assets, are identified, including cumulative effects.

9.5.6 In summary, the Revised Proposed Development would not give rise to any additional significant adverse effects but would provide a reduction in/complete avoidance of direct (physical) impacts on known heritage assets during construction. The assessment of the Revised Proposed Development does not change the conclusions of the EIA Report and therefore the updated assessment concludes that there would be no significant residual effects upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.

9.6 Summary of Effects

Table 9.1: Summary of Effects

Topic / Receptor	EIA – Significance of Residual Effect	Change	AI - Resulting Significance of Residual Effect	Retained mitigation measures
Direct (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site during construction	**Negligible**	Avoidance of all impacts through re-location of proposed Site Access and proposed Construction Compound (reducing number of construction compounds from two to one)	**None**	N/A
Potential accidental direct (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets within the Site during construction / potential impacts through micrositing	**Minor Adverse**	No change	**Minor Adverse**	Fencing of HA2 for protection throughout construction. The monument's location should also be included on construction plans and its presence highlighted in project inductions. The WSI for additional mitigation to be agreed with THC in advance of construction will include a method for the fencing of the asset. In the event that micrositing should require physical dismantling of HA2, the monument would be moved to a suitable location outwith the footprint of the Revised Proposed Development.

Topic / Receptor	EIA – Significance of Residual Effect	Change	AI - Resulting Significance of Residual Effect	Retained mitigation measures
Direct (physical) impacts upon unknown heritage assets within the Site ('archaeological potential') during construction	**(up to) Minor Adverse**	No change	**(up to) Minor Adverse**	Implementation of a programme of archaeological fieldwork agreed through a WSI with THC
Effect upon cultural significance through development within setting of Inventory Battlefield BTL6 Battle of Culloden, Scheduled Monument SM967 Culloden Battlefield, Graves of the Clans, Cairn and Well of the Dead & CA667 Culloden Muir Conservation Area	**Minor Adverse**	Nearest turbine (T4) removed from layout. Nearest turbine of Revised Layout 100 m further from SM967. Two fewer turbines visible from assessment viewpoints.	**Minor Adverse**	None
Effect upon cultural significance through development within setting of Scheduled Monument SM11446 Isle of Moy, fortified island and laird's house	**Minor Adverse**	Nearest turbine of Revised Layout (T12) 90 m closer to SM11446, at lower elevation. Two fewer turbines visible from assessment viewpoints.	**Minor Adverse**	None

9.7 Cross Referencing

Table 9.2 Cross-referenced Figures

Figures in Support of the AI	Corresponding Figure in EIA Report
AI Figure 9.1: Known Heritage Assets within the Application Boundary.	Figure 9.1: Known Heritage Assets within the Application Boundary.